# O

## O Lux Beata Trinitas[[@Headword:O Lux Beata Trinitas]]

             SEE AMBROSIAN HYMNS.

## O Miranda Vanitas[[@Headword:O Miranda Vanitas]]

             SEE BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUXS HYMNS.

## O Sapientia![[@Headword:O Sapientia!]]

             (O Wisdom!) These are the opening words of the first of a series of anthems, one of which was sung with the Magnificant every evening, in the Church of England, before the Reformation, for the eight days preceding Christmas-eve; that sung on Dec. 17 beginning “O Sapientia!”' The series is here given in an English translation:

“Dec. 17. O Sapientia! O Wisdom! which camest out of the mouth of the Most High, reaching fron one end to the other, mightily and sweetly ordering all things, come and teach us the way of understanding.

“Dec. 18. O Adonai! O Lord and Ruler of the house of Israel, who appeared to Moses in a flame of fire in the bush, and gavest him the law in Sinai, come and deliver us with an outstretched arm.

“Dec. 19. O Radix Jesse! O Root of Jesse, which standest for an ensign of the people, at whom kings shall shut their months, thou to whom the Gentiles shall seek, come and deliver us now; tarry not.

“Dec. 20. O Claavi David! O Key of David, and Scepter of the house of Israel, thou that openest, and no man shutteth; and shuttest, and no man openeth; come and bring the prisoner out of the prison-house, and him that sitteth in darkness and in the shadows of death.

“Dec. 21. O Orieles! O Day-Spring, brightness of the everlasting light, and Sun of Righteousness, come and enlighten them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death.

“Dec. 22. O Rex Gentium! O King and Desire of all nations, thou Corner-Stone who hast made both one, come and save man whom thou formedst from the clay.

“Dec. 23. O Emmanuel! O Emmanuel, our King and Lawgiver, Hope of the Gentiles and their Savior, come and save us, O Lord our God.”

## O beth[[@Headword:O beth]]

             (᾿Ωβήθ), a Graecized form (1Es 8:32) of the name of EBED SEE EBED (q.v.), son of Jonathan (Ezr 8:6).

## OBrien, John, D.D[[@Headword:OBrien, John, D.D]]

             a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, rector of Zion Parish, Pontiac, Mich., died at that place, December 13, 1864, aged seventy-one years. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. April 1865, page 140.

## OBrien, Matthew, D.D[[@Headword:OBrien, Matthew, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic clergyman, was a native of Ireland, where he enjoyed a high reputation as a preacher. About 1800 he came to New York, and was attached to St. Peter's Church. He afterwards left New York in consequence of difficulties which arose, and died in Baltimore, October 20, 1816. Dr. O'Brien published Sermons on the Most Important Subjects of Morality and Religion (Cork, 1798). See De Courcy and Shea, Hist. of the Catholic Church in the United States, page 351.

## OBryan, William[[@Headword:OBryan, William]]

             the founder of the Bible Christian Societies, was born at Gunwen, in the parish of Luxulion, Cornwall, England, February 6, 1778. At the age of seventeen he obtained a clear manifestation of God's pardoning mercy, and almost immediately began to preach. In 1809 he was engaged as a supply in the place of a Wesleyan minister. In 1810 he was formally excluded from the Wesleyan Methodist Society for preaching in an irregular way, and in 1814 he relinquished business in order to devote himself wholly to the work of the ministry. Hearing that there were fourteen parishes in the east of Cornwall and the west of Devon in which there was no evangelical preaching, he visited them. His labors were successful, souls were converted. He organized the first class, or society, which afterwards received the appellation of Bible Christians, at Shebbear, in the county of  Devon, October 9, 1815. Twenty-two persons gave their names. At the session of the first conference held at Baddash, Launceston, August 17, 1819, he was elected president. He filled this office each succeeding year until 1828. Unpleasant circumstances arising between himself and the brethren, in 1829 he left the conference. At the conference in 1830 William O'Bryan sought reconciliation with his brethren, and a satisfactory union was effected. Afterwards he left the denomination of his own free will. He came to the United States, crossed the Atlantic between New York and England several times, and died at a good old age, in New York city. His remains are interred in Greenwood Cemetery Brooklyn. See Jubilee Volume of Bible Christians (1865); BIBLE CHRISTIANS.

## OConnor, Michael, D.D[[@Headword:OConnor, Michael, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Cork, Ireland, September 27, 1810. He was educated at Queenstown, and entered the Propaganda at Rome in 1833. He became president of the Roman Catholic Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1838. He was consecrated bishop of Pittsburgh in 1843, translated to the see of Erie, Pennsylvania, in 1853, and referred to his former diocese in 1854. He resigned his episcopal office and united with the Jesuits in 1860. He died at Woodstock College, Maryland, October 18, 1872.

## ODaly, Daniel[[@Headword:ODaly, Daniel]]

             an Irish monastic, was born in 1595, in the County of Kerry. He was educated in Flanders, and there took the vows in the Order of the Dominicans. Having been called. to the court of Spain he insinuated himself so much into the favor of Philip IV, that this prince, who was then master of Portugal, charged him to oversee the foundation of a convent in Lisbon for the Irish monks. He became the first superior of it. On the accession of the duke of Braganza to the throne he saw his credit increase, and was employed in the most considerable affairs of the kingdom. In 1655 he went to Louis XIV in the capacity of ambassador, in order to negotiate a treaty of alliance and commerce. Having arrived at Paris, he wished no other lodgings than the convent of the Dominicans, in the street Saint- Honore, where he dwelt during all the time of his embassy. “This beautiful eulogy has been given to him,” says P. Baron, “that no one has ever made a more happy union of piety with prudence, of modesty and religious humility with the gravity and wisdom of an ambassador.” This modesty, however, did not hinder him from discharging the duties of his order, such as censor of the Inquisition, visitor-general and vicar-general of the kingdom. He died at Lisbon June 30, 1662. We have of his works, Initium, increentumn et exitus familice Giraldinorum Desmoniae comitum Kierria in Hibernia (Lisbon, 1655, 8no). See V. Baron, Apologetiques, lib. ii, p. 448; lib. iv, p. 241; Iehard et Quotif, Script. ord. praedicat. 2:617.

## OFihely, Maurice[[@Headword:OFihely, Maurice]]

             an Irish Roman Catholic prelate, studied at the University of Oxford, and joined the Franciscans. He afterwards studied philosophy and theology at Padua, where he graduated, and later taught. In 1480 he was corrector for the renowned printers Octavian Schott and Locatelle, of Venice, a position which learned men at that time did not look upon as beneath their dignity. Julius II made him archbishop of Tuam in 1506, but O'Fihely preferred to remain in Venice, where he devoted himself to scholastic philosophy and to literature. In 1512 he took part in the first two sessions of the Council of Lateran. Finally, in 1513, he made up his mind to go to Ireland, but died on landing at Galway, May 25. He wrote, Expositio in quaestione dialecticas Joannis Scoti in Isagogen Posphyrii (Fer. rara, 1499; Venice, 1512, fol.): — Concordantice et casti. gationes in metaphysicalia Doct. Subtilis (Venice, 1501, fol.): — Compendium veritatum iv libr. Sententiarum (ibid. 1505, 4to): — De rerum contingentia et divina prae destinatione (ibid. 1505, 4to): — Commentaria Doctoris Subtilis J. Scoti in xii lib. Metaphysicae Aristotelis (ibid 1507, fol.): — Enchiridion fidei (ibid. 1509, 4to): — Epithemata informalitatum opus de mente Doctoris Subtilis (ibid. 1514, fol.): — Dictionarium Sacrae Scripturae (ibid. 1603, fol.); the publication stopped at the word exstinguere, but there is said to exist a complete MS. copy in the Bodleian Library. See Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Possevin, Apparatus sacer; Jean de Saint-Antoine, Bibli. oth. Franciscaine, vol. ii; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:548; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (J. N. P.)

## OGorman, James, D.D.[[@Headword:OGorman, James, D.D.]]

             a prelate of the Roman Catholic Church in America. of whose early history we are uninformed, flourished in recent times as vicar-apostolic of Nebraska, the territories of Montana and Wyoming, and part of Dakota, to which he was appointed May 8, 1859, having been previously consecrated bishop of Raphanea, a nominal see. He died in Cincinnati July 3, 1874. His loss was very generally felt by the Roman Catholics. in the United States, by whom he' was highly esteemed.

## OHanly, Donat[[@Headword:OHanly, Donat]]

             an Irish prelate, was educated in Ireland, and went to England, where he became a Benedictine monk at Canterbury. He returned to Ireland, and was consecrated archbishop of Dublin in 1085. He died November 23, 1095. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 35.

## OHanly, Samuel[[@Headword:OHanly, Samuel]]

             an Irish prelate, was a nephew of Donat O'Hanly, and became a Benedictine monk. He was a native of Ireland, and succeeded to the archbishopric of Dublin in 1095. He died July 4, 1121. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 41.

## OKelly Methodists[[@Headword:OKelly Methodists]]

             SEE OKELLY, JAMES.

## OKelly, James[[@Headword:OKelly, James]]

             one of the most noted of American Methodist pioneer preachers, and the father of the first schism among them, was born about 1757. He was converted while yet a youth, shortly after joined the Methodists, and was licensed as a local preacher. He began his ministry in an old colonial church in the southern part of Virginia about the middle of the Revolutionary war. One writer, noticing this early work of O'Kelly's, says: “The people flocked to hear him, and great was the work of God under his powerful exhortations and earnest prayers.” In 1778 he was admitted into the traveling connection, and he soon took a prominent position among the Methodist preachers of Virginia. He was a warm-hearted Christian and a zealous preacher he would rise at midnight and pour out his soul in prayer, crying, “Give me children, or I die.” He was ordained elder at the organization of the Church in. 1784. For several years afterwards he filled high stations in the Church-acting as elder at the head of the South Virginia  District: there he was useful, and had much influence. One of O'Kelly's contemporaries describes him as “laborious in the ministry, a man of zeal and usefulness, an advocate for holiness, given to prayer and fasting, an able defender of the Methodist doctrine and faith, and hard against negro slavery in private and from the press and pulpit.” He was a member of the first council that met in 1789.

In 1790 he addressed a letter to Mr. Asbury, with whom he had been acquainted since 1780, complaining of his power, and bidding him half if his episcopal career for one year, lest he should have to use his influence against him. As this appeal was ignored, Mr. O'Kelly moved in the Conference of 1791, “That if any preacher felt himself aggrieved or oppressed by the appointment made by the bishop he should have the privilege of appealing to the Conference, which should consider and finally determine the matter.” This resolution was lost. Thereupon O'Kelly, and a few who thought like him, withdrew from the Conference. Efforts were at once made to conciliate them: a committee was appointed to wait on O'Kelly and his party, and if possible induce them to resume their seats, but the effort utterly failed. Even Dr. Coke's personal appeal was powerless. The General Conference closed Nov. 14, 1792, and on the 26th of that month Asbury presided at the Virginia Conference. The question was raised whether O'Kelly and his adherents of the ministry were to be continued in the Connection. Mr. Asbury at once pleaded for their retention, and even proposed that the Conference pay Mr. O'Kelly £40. For a while this money was accordingly paid, but O'Kelly, finding that the Conference was not disposed to take much notice of his schemes, refused any longer to receive this pay, and thus broke the last link that bound him to Methodism.

O'Kelly now sought to impress his views on the Methodists of Virginia, but he was firmly opposed by Nicholson, Leroy, Cole, and M'Kendree, the latter, although at first inclined towards O'Kelly, having now become fully satisfied that the exceptions to Asbury's administration were utterly groundless. They met O'Kelly in public discussion, and saved the Church in Portsmouth from a violent rupture. In the section where he had so long labored he was more successful in his bad work. Some societies were entirely led away by his specious plans; a few traveling and a large number of local preachers followed him, and the O'Kelly schism became a fact in the history of Methodism. At the Conference of 1793 the names of James O'Kelly, Rice Haggard, John Allen, and John Robertson were entered as formally withdrawn from the Connection.  O'Kelly and Haggard, assisted by disaffected local preachers, at once began the work of organizing a new and pure Church, free from all such evils as they fancied had corrupted Methodism. Allen settled, and soon after, entering upon the practice of medicine, gave up preaching altogether. Robertson remained local, and after some years became the head of a subordinate schism in the O'Kelly ranks. The Republican Methodists was the title chosen for the new Church. The leaders proceeded to hold conferences and other meetings for the purpose of deciding upon some settled plan of operations. They formed many rules, but upon trial found them extremely defective when compared with those they had abandoned. At length they renounced all rules of Church government, and took the New Testament as their guide. They agreed that all the plans and regulations made at their conferences should be merely advisory. The name for their Church was suggested by the political complexion of the times. Republican principles prevailed in Virginia, and there was something to be gained by a Church bearing the imposing and popular name, “Republican Methodists.”

One of their first measures was to enact a leveling law. All the preachers were to stand on an equal footing. There were to be no grades in the ministry. They endeavored to swell their numbers by promising the laity much larger liberty than they enjoyed in the old Church. The leaders warred zealously, and not without success. In some places they carried off entire societies; in others they wrought ruinotis divisions. A few preachinghouses were seized by them, and the rightful owners turned out of doors; from others the Methodists retired in order to avoid strife. The seceders are even accused of having said all manner of evil against the Methodist Church. They certainly censured the preachers severely. Asbury was the object of their peculiar displeasure. They took special pains to impeach his character in every possible way before the public. The name of bishop they professed to regard with holy horror. They insisted that bishop and elder had the same signification in Scripture; yet they received the one and rejected the other. “The spirit of division,” says Bennett, “prevailed chiefly in the southern counties of the state, and in the border counties of North Carolina. In all this region the influence of O'Kelly was very great, and he scrupled not to use it to the, utmost of his ability in building up his own cause. Although his success-in gaining proselytes from the ranks of Methodism was far less than he anticipated, yet the history of this painful schism is full of sad memorials: families were rent asunder, brother was opposed to brother, parents and children, were arrayed against each other, warm friends became open enemies, and the claims of Christian love were  forgotten in the hot disputes about Church government. The means of grace were neglected, piety declined, religion was wounded in the house of her friends, and the enemies of Christ exulted over many who had fallen away from faith.” “It was enough,” says Jesse Lee, “to make. the saints of God weep between the porch and the altar, and that both day and night, to see how the Lord's flock was carried away captive by that division.”

The conjectures for O'Kelly's secession are very varied. Some writers of his own time and since believe that his ambition craved position — beside the noble Asbury, and that when shut out from the episcopal cabinet, he determined to build up a Church of his own, where, though but a simple presbyter, he could yet rule as chief. It is said that an English lawyer, a man of infidel principles, who, strange to say, admired the Methodist Church, and witnessed with many regrets the O'Kelly schism, advised Jesse Lee and many other leading ministers to make O'Kelly a bishop; “for,” said he, “if you will let him share the dreaded power with Asbury, he will no longer fear it.” The history of O'Kelly's movement shows that the lawyer was nearer right than wrong. Besides this, we learn from certain records that O'Kelly held heterodox views. “He denied,” says Dr. Lee, “the distinct personality of the Holy Trinity. He affirmed that, instead of distinct persons in the Godhead, the terms Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were only intended to represent three offices in one glorious and eternal Being;” It was a favorite expression of his, as we learn from a living contemporary, that “God was Father from eternity, Redeemer in time, and Sanctifier for evermore.” Of the truth of this charge there is proof in the proceedings of the Greenbrier Conference. He had raised doubts of the personality of the Trinity in the minds of two preachers from his district who were present at the Conference, and they only renounced their heretical opinions when their brethren confronted them with overwhelrning scriptural evidence of the true doctrine.

This was in May, six months before the meeting of the General Conference of 1792. We may well believe that a man so bold as O'Kelly would not hesitate to give expression to his doctrinal views, and there is little doubt that many were led astray from the truth in the large district over which he presided so long. The influence of O'Kelly was used against Asbury with a success that should have satisfied any man who had not determined to rule or ruin the Church. The council was O'Kelly's favorite hobby; he kept before the preachers and people the great evil of the council; magnified the power of Asbury as a bishop Until many were impressed with the belief that a great, overshadowing ecclesiastical tyranny  was growing up in the Methodist Church. During his travels in Virginia in the summer of 1790 Asbury saw the sad effects of O'Kelly's influence; and when he reached the Leesburg Conference in August of that year he showed a noble disinterestedness as pleasing as it is rare. He says: “To conciliate the minds of our brethren in the South District of Virginia who are restless about the council, I wrote their leader a letter informing him that I would take my seat in the council as another member, and in that point at least waive the claims of episcopacy; yea, I would lie down and be trodden upon rather than knowingly injure one soul.”

Not long after his withdrawal from the Church O'Kelly issued a pamphlet in which he gave his reasons for protesting against the “Methodist Episcopal government.” This production was chiefly remarkable for its perversion of the plainest historical facts of Methodism, the misrepresentation of its economy, and an unbounded abuse of Asbury. His strictures on the government of the Church, as well as his defamation of Asbury, demanded a reply. Asbury himself collected ample materials for this purpose, and submitted them to the conferences for their action. The papers were accepted, and a committee appointed to prepare them for publication. Nicholas Snethen, on behalf of the committee, published a work in which he “not only vindicated Methodism, but placed the pretended facts and groundless assertions of O'Kelly in a position so variant from truth as to leave the character of their author in more need of an apology than was the mere fact of his ceasing to be a Methodist.” O'Kelly came forward in another small pamphlet, entitled A Vindication of an Apology. This was promptly met by Snethen in An Answer to James O'Kelly's Vindication of his Apology. The readiness with which O'Kelly's charges were met, and the ability with which they were refuted, gave a decided check to his revolutionary measures. He proceeded, however, with the formal organization of the Republican Methodist Church. He scrupled not to ordain such preachers as consented to receive ordination at his hands, although he denounced Methodist ordination, in the line of which he himself stood, as a “spurious episcopacy.” The success of the separatists in making proselytes was far below their expectations. By a careful comparison of the returns from the large circuits in O'Kelly's old district, and wchere he wielded the greatest influence, we find that from 1792 to 1795, when the schism was at its height, the largest decrease in any one circuit was only a little over two hundred, while in two circuits lying in the very field of strife there was a gain of nearly four hundred. It is true that  the returns from all the Virginia circuits in 1794 show a decrease of two thousand members; but there were probably other causes for this besides this schismatic movement.

In 1801 O'Kelly changed the name of his party. Renouncing their original title, he issued a pamphlet in which he announced himself and his adherents as The Christian Church. Some of his societies readily assumed the high- sounding name, others hesitated, a few protested, and divisions speedily followed. The more modest among them shrunk from an appellation that declared all men heretics except themselves. Divisions and subdivisions became the order of the day. One party clung to O'Kelly as the Christian Church; another followed John Robertson as Republican Methodists; and yet another, under the lead of William Guirey and others, set up for themselves under the title of “The Independent Christian Baptist Church.” These different parties continued to maintain a sickly existence for some years; but their numbers and influence gradually diminished. The decline continued until there could be found no organization worthy to be called a Church, but only fragments of societies scattered over the country. almost equally powerless against the Church they had left, and against the wickedness by which they were surrounded.

It is not difficult to discover the causes that produced the failure of O'Kelly's plans. The most potent was the heresy which his system contained. . This was the taint that corrupted the whole scheme. His Unitarian errors allowed no Savior to be offered to the people; and destitute of this vital and central force, his Church was soulless and its name a mockery. But the motives of the leaders seem to have been devoid of purity, as their system was of saving truth. “If the real cause of this division were known,” says Asbury,” I think it would appear that one wanted to be immovably fixed in a district; another wanted money; a third wanted ordination; a fourth wanted liberty to do as he pleased about slaves, and not to be called to account.” The fierceness of their attacks on Asbury contributed to their ruin. Their swords, raised to strike him down, pierced their own hearts, and their violent dealings came down on their own heads. Their wrath against him knew no bounds. In one of their ephemeral pamphlets he was called the “Baltimore Bull,” and a rude picture of a bull's head graced the title-page. They proclaimed him an enemy to the country, and charged him with laying up money to carry with him to England. Such injustice could not fail to have a speedy and powerful reaction; and as the light shone more brilliantly on the path of Asbury, the  darkness grew deeper on that of his traducers.

Many who had been drawn off in a moment of excitement, after calming down and re-examining the points in controversy, returned to the Church. Although Asbury spared no pains to expose O'Kelly's errors and to thwart his plans, yet he kept his heart right towards him, and when occasion offered treated him with Christian courtesy. The first and last meeting after the rupture took place at Winchester. Hearing that his former friend was lying ill, Asbury sent two brethren to say that he would wait on him, if he desired it. They “met in peace, asked of each other's welfare, talked of persons and things indifferently, prayed, and parted in peace. Not a word was said of the troubles of former times.” This, as far as we know, was their last interview on earth. O'Kelly lived to an extreme old age, the sad spectator of the failure of his cherished schemes. He saw the man whom he had sought to ruin descend to his grave in peace and full of honors, mourned by grateful thousands as the father of American Methodism.

He saw Asbury's place filled and his principles defended by another whom he had fondly marked for a leader in his own ranks, He saw hundreds of his own followers forsaking him, and rallying again to the standard of Methodism. He saw those who remained scattered and broken into contending factions. But in the face. of all these facts the stern old man clung to his cause with a heroism worthy of a better fate, and with faltering voice and failing strength proclaimed his confidence in its ultimate success. In 1805 Asbury, passing through Virginia, writes of O'Kelly as “coming down with great zeal, preaching three hours at a time on government, monarchy, episcopacy, occasionally varying the subject with abuse of the Methodists.” Hope did not desert him even “in age and feebleness extreme.” We are assured by one of his followers that he” went down to the grave satisfied with the past, and peaceful and trusting with respect to the future.” His stormy and eventful life closed Oct. 16, 1826. Dr. Stevens says, “O'Kelly was an Irishman of fiery temperament, and, as usual with such temperaments, his conscience was weak, easily swayed by his prejudices; weak to yield to them, though strong to defend them.” Of the O'Kelly schismatics, Lee, their historian, writing in 1806, says: “They have been divided and subdivided till at present it is hard to find two of them that are of one opinion. There are now but few of them in that part of Virginia where they were formerly the most numerous, and in most places they are declining.” See Stevens, Hist. Methodist Episcopal Church, 3:16-37; Lednum Rise of Methodism in America, ch. 33; Bennett, Memeorials of Methodism in Virginia (Richmond, 1871, 12mo), ch. 9.

## OLeary, Arthur[[@Headword:OLeary, Arthur]]

             an Irish Roman Catholic divine of note, was born, near the middle of last century, at Cork, and educated at St. Maloes, where he became a Franciscan. On his return to his native place he distinguished himself by his open adherence to tie British government. He persuaded his brethren to take the oath of allegiance; for which and his other exertions in the cause of loyalty he obtained a pension, and won the esteem of moderate men of all parties. He afterwards settled in London, and officiated as principal minister in the Roman Catholic chapel in Soho Square. He died in 1802. His addresses to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and other tracts, were collected into one volume, under the title Miscellaneous Tracts, Theological and Political (1780-1, 2 vols. 8vo: 3d ed. 1782, and often; N. Y. 1821, 8vo); besides which he published A Defence of his Conduct and Writings, in reply to the bishop of Cloyne. O'Leary was an acute and spirited writer, and was remarkable for his powers of wit and humor. He engaged in controversy with Wesley also, and though the two divines occupied ground which kept them forever at a distance in theological views, John Wesley vet hesitated not to pay tribute to O'Leary, and called him ,an arch and lively writer.” See Life of Rev. Arthur O'Leary, by England (1822, 8vo); Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Lond. Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 72. (J. H. W.)

## OReilly, Bernard, D.D[[@Headword:OReilly, Bernard, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic bishop, was born in Ireland in 1803. He was consecrated bishop of Hartford, Connecticut, November 10, 1850, and died at sea in January 1856.

## OToole (Or Tuathal), Laurence[[@Headword:OToole (Or Tuathal), Laurence]]

             an eminent Irish prelate, belonged to the princely sept of the Hy Murrays of Leinster, in which province he was born in 1134. He was educated in the monastery of Glendolough, one of whose seven ancient churches still remains. He was very pious in early youth, and at the age of twenty-five was chosen a bishop; the duties of the office were almost literally forced upon him. Afterwards he became the abbot of the above monastery, and in 1162 he was elected archbishop of Dublin, a position which he readily accepted, that he might the more easily distribute the available funds of the diocese to the poor. He was consecrated by Gelasius, the Irish bishop of Armagh, who Leland says refused to attend the Roman Catholic council in Cashel. Grienne, his predecessor, and three other Dano-Irish bishops before him, had been ordained by the archbishops of Canterbury, to whom they had severally promised “canonical. obedience.” With O'Toole the foreign consecrations of the Dublin bishops ceased. He was the first archbishop ever consecrated in Ireland (comp. Usher, Religion of the Early Irish, vol. 4; Ware, Irish Antiq. 1:312). O'Toole was a prominent member in the national council at Clane, called by Roderick, the last Irish king. At this meeting the school or monastery of Armagh was raised to the rank of a university, and a rule was passed that no one should be received as a lector or theological professor unless he had graduated in this university. In this and several other instances we perceive the-efforts which were then made to introduce Romish doctrines into the Irish Church, and to bring the “diverse and schismatical usages,” of which Guillebertus, the pope's legate, had spoken, to “the one Catholic and Roman office.” O'Toole was a true patriot. When the treachery of MacMorrough was developed, and the English invasion had become evident, he took a decided stand for his country. After several fruitless efforts to adjust matters, he risked his life between the conflicting parties to prevent the massacres of the people.

In 1171, during a serious division among the English, he conceived the idea of arousing the whole nation, and of driving all the foreigners at once out of the island. For this purpose he went from province to province, addressing the nobles and common people, and urging them to arise simultaneously,  and to meet in Dublin. He was so far successful as to collect a great number of untrained and unorganized men, but king Roderick and his chieftains at that time were unequal to the hour, and through their jealousies, indolence, and self-confidence the golden moment was passed, and all was lost. In 1175 he was sent to England to sign articles of arrangement between Roderick and Henry, which then amounted simply to an acknowledgment of the latter as feudal lord, without any reference to the soil or internal government. In 1179 O'Toole set out for Rome, no doubt to present the oppression of Ireland; but in passing through England Henry would not let him proceed unless he would take an oath not to do or say anything in Rome that would be contrary to his interests in Ireland. This oath, however, he is accused of not having kept. Again, in 1180, he was sent by Roderick to England; but Henry refused to see him, to hear his message, or to allow him to go back to Ireland, and, to end the whole matter, the king set out immediately for Normandy. O'Toole, however, being determined to get a hearing, soon followed him. But on reaching Eu, or Augum, in France, he was taken sick and died — some say of poison (Ware, Irish Antiq.). At all events the king was glad to get rid of him. When about to 'die he was asked to make his will, to which he replied, “The Lord knows I have not a hap'urth [a penny] on earth that is my own.” He was canonized in the Church of Rome by pope Honorius III in 1225. Laurence O'Toole lived in eventful and perilous times. From the general history of this period there must have been strife and controversies going On between the old Irish Church, founded seven hundred years before by St. Patrick, and the new hierarchy which the bishops of Rome were then establishing in Ireland. But on which side he was cannot be easily determined. We only know that politically and nationally he was opposed to the English and Romanizing party. At this period, and for centuries afterwards, all the materials of history were exclusively in the keeping of Rome and England, and they are not known to publish anything against themselves. Tradition says there was found among his books in Dublin a copy of the New Testament in the Irish language, although there is no documentary testimony for it, since between the Danes and the Anglo- Saxons all such testimony seems to have been destroyed. Geraldus who was historiographer to the invading army of Henry, very coolly says that in his time “man old and precious manuscripts were torn up by the boys for book-covers, and were used by tailors for measurements” — (inter pueros in ludiis literariis ad librorum sittibus, et inter snatores ad lasernias pro vestium forma dimetiendi, in Moore's Hist. of Ireland, Am. ed. p. 154).  The same destruction seems to have been continued down to the time of James II of England, for it appears to have been the policy of the first English invaders of Ireland, as a means of preserving their own authority, to efface as far as possible from the memory of the people every trace of their former nationality and the independence of their Church. See Todd, Ancient Irish Church, p. 133 sq.; De Vinne, History of the Irish Primitive Church. (D. D.)

## Oahu[[@Headword:Oahu]]

             one of the principal of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands group, is situated in 158° W. long. and between 21° and 22° N. lat., with a population in 1872 of 20,671, of whom 3129 were foreigners. It is twenty-five miles W.N.W. of Molokai, the most romantic and fertile of the whole group, and its port is the best in the islands. Honolulu, on the south side of Oahu, is the residence of the king and seat of government. Oahu is about forty-eight miles long and twenty-three miles wide. It is of volcanic formation and mountainous, but the highest peaks are clothed with vegetation. There are two distinct ranges of mountains, the windward and the leeward, called respectively the Konahuinui and the Waianae ranges. They exhibit few craters in perfect condition, but there are groups of tufa cones along the shore. The American Board have seven stations on this island. SEE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

## Oak[[@Headword:Oak]]

is the rendering in the A.V. of four Hebrew words ( אֵיל[in the plural, however, only so rendered, אֵילַים], אֵלָה, אִלָּה. and אִלּוֹן), but is usually thought to be the meaning also of two others ( אַילָן and אֵילוֹן); which are all from the same or cognate roots (אוּל, אַיל, or אָלִל), significant of strength. We take each of these in regular order, and then give a general statement of the subject. For the various opinions upon the meaning of these kindred terms, see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 47, 51, 103; and Stanley, Sinai and Pal. p. 519. SEE TRUE.

1. Eyl (אֵיל, Sept.Vat. τερέβινθος; Alex. τερέμινθος; Aq., Sym., Theod., Apivg; Vulg. campestria) occurs only in the singular number in Gen 14:6 (“El-paran”). It is uncertain whether e'l should be joined with Paran to form a proper name, or whether it is to be taken separately,  as the “terebinth,” or the “oak,” or the “grove” of Paran. Onkelos and Saadias follow the Vulg., whence the “plain” of the A. V. (margin) (see Stanley, Sinai and Pal. p. 519,520, App.). Rosenmüller (Schol. ad 1. c.) follows Jarchi (Comment. in Pent. ad Gen 14:6), and is for retaining the proper name. Two plurals and one collective form of el occur: eylim, eyldth, and eyldth. Elim, the second station where the Israelites halted after they had crossed the Red Sea, in all probability derived — its name from the seventy palm-trees there; the name el, which more particularly signifies an oak, being here put for any grove or plantation. Similarly the other .double form, Eloth or Elath, may refer, as Stanley (Sinai and Pal. p. 20) conjectures, to the palm-grove at Akaba. The plural eylim occurs in Isa 1:29, where probably “oaks” are intended; in Isa 61:3, and Ezra 31:14, any strong, flourishing trees may be denoted. SEE ELIM.

2. Elah (אֵלָה, Sept. τερέβινθος, δρῦς ᾿Ηλά, δένδρον ῝῾δένδρον συσκίαζον, Symm.]; πλάτανος in Hosea iv. 13 [δένδρον σύσκιον]; Vulg. terebinthus, quercus; A. V. “oak,” “elah,” “teil-tree” in Isa 6:13; “elms” in Hos 4:13). SEE ELAH.

3. Eylon (אֵילוֹן; Sept. ἡ δρῦς ἡ ὑψηλή, ἡ βάλανος ᾿Ηλων; Vulg. convallis illustris, quercus) occurs frequently in the O.T., and denotes, there can be little doubt, some kind of oak. The A. V., following the Targum, translates eylon by “plain.” SEE PLAIN.

4. Ilan (Chald. אַילָן; Sept. δένδρον; Vulg. arbor) is found only in Daniel iv as the tree which Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream. The word appears to be used for any “strong tree,” the oak having the best claim to the title, to which tree probably indirect allusion may be made.

5. Ahh (אִלָּה; Sept. ἡ τέρμινθος, Aq. and Symm. ἡ δρῦς; Vulg. quercus) occurs only in Jos 24:26, and is correctly rendered “oak” by the A. V.

6. Allon (אִלּוֹן; Sept. ἡ βάλανος, δένδρον βαλάνου, δρῦς; Vulg. quercus) is uniformly rendered “oak” by the A. V., and has always been so understood by commentators. It occurs in Gen 35:8; Jos 19:32; Isa 2:13; Isa 6:13; Isa 44:14; Hos 4:13; Amo 2:9; Zec 11:2.

There is much difficulty in determining the exact meanings of the several varieties of the term mentioned above; the old versions are so inconsistent  that they add but little by way of elucidation. Celsius (Hierob. 1:34) has endeavored to show that eyl, eylim, eylon, elah, and allah all stand for the terebinth-tree (Pistacia terebinthus), while allon alone denotes an oak. Royle (in Kitto's Cyc. art. Alah) agrees with Celsius in identifying the elah (אֵלָה) with the terebinth, and the allon (אִלּוֹן): with the oak. Hiller (Hierophyt. 1:348) restricts the various forms of this word to different species of oak, and says no mention is made of the terebinth in the Hebrew Scriptures. Rosenmüller (Bib. Not. p. 237) gives the terebinth to eyl and elah, and the oak to allah, allon, and eylon ( אֵילוֹן). It should be stated that allon occurs in Hos 4:13, as distinguished from the other form, eldh; consequently it is necessary to suppose that two different trees are signified by the terms. Others believe that the difference is specific, and not generic that two species of oaks are denoted by the Hebrew terms, allon standing for an evergreen oak, as the Quercus pseudo-coccifera, and eldh for one of the deciduous kinds. The Pistacia vera could never be mistaken for an oak. — If, therefore, specific allusion was ever made to this tree, it probably would have been under another name than any one of the numerous forms which are used to designate the different species of the genus Quercus; perhaps under a Hebrew form allied to the Arabic butm, “the terebinth.” SEE TEREBINTH.

That various species of oak may well have deserved the appellation of mighty trees is clear, from the fact that noble oaks are to this day occasionally seen in Palestine and Lebanon. On this subject we have been favored with some, valuable remarks from Dr. Hooker, who says, “The forests have been so completely cleared off all Palestine that we must not look for existing evidence of what the trees were in Biblical times and antecedently. In Syria proper there are only three common oaks. All form large trees in many countries, but very rarely now in Palestine; though that they do so occasionally is proof enough that they once did.” Abraham's oak, near Hebron, is a. familiar example of a noble tree of one species, the prickly evergreen oak (Quercus pseudo-coccifera [see Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 369]). Dr. Robinson (Bib. Res. 2:81) has given a minute account of it; and “his description,” says Dr. Hooker, “is good, and his measurements tally with mine.” If we examine the claims of the terebinth to represent the eldh, as Celsius and others assert, we shall see that in point of  size it cannot compete with some of the oaks of Palestine; and that therefore if eldh ever denotes the terebinth which we by no means assert it does not. the term etymologically is applicable to it only in a second degree; for the Pistacia terebinthus, although it also occasionally grows to a great size, “‘spreading its boughs,” as Robinson (Bib. Res. 2:222) observes, “far and wide like a noble oak,” yet does not form so conspicuously a good tree as either the Quercus pseudo-coccifera or Q. aegilops. Dr. Thomson (The Land and the Book, 1:375) remarks on this point: “There are more mighty oaks here in this immediate vicinity (Mejdel esShems) than there are terebinths in all Syria and Palestine together. I have traveled from end to end of these countries, and across them in all directions, and speak with absolute certainty.” At 2:414, the same writer remarks, “We have oaks in Lebanon twice the size of this (Abraham's oak), and every way more striking and majestic.” Dr. Hooker has no doubt that Thomson is correct in saying there are far finer oaks in Lebanon; “though,” he observes, “I did not see any larger, and only one or two at all near it. Cyri Graham told me there were forests of noble oaks in Lebanon north of the cedar valley.” It is evident from these observations that two oaks (Quercus pseudo-coccifera and Q. oegilops) are well worthy of the name of mighty trees; though it is equally true that over a greater part of the country the oaks of Palestine are at present merely bushes. The oaks of Bashan probably belong to the species known as Quercus oegilops, the Valonia oak which is said to be common in Gilead and Bashan. It rises on a stout gnarled trunk, from one to two yards in circumference, to the height of twenty to thirty feet; a rather round-headed, densely leaved tree, giving an open park-like appearance to the landscape. The wood is said to be excellent, and the tree is, like all other timber in Syria, indiscriminately cut for house-fitting and fuel. Its acorns form the valonia of commerce, of which 150,000 cwt. are yearly imported into England for the use of tanners. Another species of oak, besides those named above, is the Quercus infectoria, which is common in Galilee and Samaria. It is rather a small tree in Palestine, and seldom grows above thirty feet high, though in ancient times it might have been a noble tree. It is also called the Kermes oak (Quercus coccifera), from an insect (kernes, of the genus coccus) which adheres to the branches of this bushy evergreen shrub, in the form of small reddish balls about the size of a pea. This affords a crimson dye, formerly celebrated, but now superseded by cochineal. This dye was used by the ancient Hebrews; for the word told (תּוֹלָע), which denotes a worm, and particularly the kermes worm, denotes also the dye prepared from it  (Isa 1:18; Lam 4:5), and is accordingly rendered κόκκινον in those passages where it occurs. For a description of the oaks of Palestine, see Dr. Hooker's paper read before the Linnnaan Society, June, 1861.

The oak is, in fact, less frequently mentioned in the original than in the A.V., where it occurs so often as to suggest that the oak is as conspicuous and as common in Palestine as in this country. But in Syria oaks are by no means common, except in hilly regions, where the elevation gives the effect of a more northern climate; and even in such circumstances it does not attain the grandeur in which it often appears in our latitudes. Indeed, Syria has not the species (Quercus robur) which forms the glory of our own forests. The “oaks of Bashan” are in Scripture mentioned with peculiar distinction (Isa 2:13; Zec 11:2), as if in the hills beyond the Jordan the oaks had been more abundant and of larger growth than elsewhere. Of these the Tyrians used to make their oars (Eze 27:6; comp. Theophr. Plant. v., 8; Val. Flac. 2:644; Strabo, 4:195), and idolaters their images (Isa 44:14). They are abundant even t at the present day. In the hilly regions of Bashan and Gilead. Burckhardt repeatedly mentions forests of thick oaks — thicker than any forests he had seen in Syria, making a grateful shade, and imparting to the scenery a European character (Syria, p. 265, 348). On that side of the river a thick oak forest occurs as far south as the vicinity of Amman, the capital of the Ammonites (p. 356). Oaks of low stature are frequent in the hills and plains near the sources of the Jordan (p. 45, 312, 315); and sdme of large dimensions are found in different parts of the country, beside the natural reservoirs of water fed by springs (p. 193, 315). On the lower slopes of Lebanon low oak-trees are numerous, and the inhabitants employ their branches in the construction of the flat roofs of their dwellings (p. 4, 7, 18, 193, 312, etc.). Lord Lindsav also makes frequent mention of oaks in Palestine. He confirms their existing abundance in the countries of Bashan and Gilead. — He calls them “noble prickly oaks,” and “evergreen oaks,” and notices a variety of the latter with a broader leaf than usual (Travels, 2:132, 124, 137; see also Pococke. East, 3:270; Hasselquist, Trav. p. 554). But oak- trees are by no means wanting on the west of the Jordan, in the proper Land of Canaan. Lord Lindsav describes the hills of southern Judaea about Hebron as covered to the top with low shrubs of the prickly oak. Fine park scenery, composed chiefly of prickly and evergreen oaks, occurs between Samaria and Mount Carmel. The same trees abound on the southern  prolongations of that mountain, and on the banks of the Kishon. The thick woods which cover Mount Tabor are composed chiefly of oaks and pistachio-trees; and oaks are found in the valleys which trend from that mountain (Lindsay, 2:51, 77, 85). Hasselquist found groves of the Kermes oak (Queicus coccifera) in the valleys beyond the plains of Acre, on the road to Nazareth (Travels, p. 153). Under oaks the dead were buried (Gen 35:8; comp. 1Sa 31:13;:1Ch 11:12), offerings were made to idols (Hos 4:13; comp. Virg. Geor. 3:332; Ovid, Met. vii, 743 sq.; Kiesling. De Superstitione Israel. sub quercub. cult. [Leips. 1748]), and national assemblies were held (Jdg 9:6; Jdg 9:37). Single oaks of great height served also as landmarks (1Sa 10:3), and bore a distinguishing name (Jdg 9:6; Jdg 9:37, where אֵלוֹן, oak, is mistakenly rendered plain in the English version). SEE MEONENIM; SEE OAK-WORSHIP.

## Oak of Reformation[[@Headword:Oak of Reformation]]

             During the turmoil which preceded the Reformation various insurrections took place in different parts of England. The insurrection in Norfolk was headed by one Ket, a tanner, who assumed to himself the power of judicature under an old oak, called thence the Oak of Reformation. The rebels were 20,000 strong; but the earl of Warwick, with 6000 foot and 1500 horse, quickly dispersed them. Several of the leaders were executed, and Ket was hanged in chains.

## Oak, Council (or Synod) Of The[[@Headword:Oak, Council (or Synod) Of The]]

             SEE CHALCEDON, COUNCILS OF.

## Oak-worship[[@Headword:Oak-worship]]

             The oak has in all ages been looked upon as the most important of all the trees of the forest. Groves of oak-trees were even in the earliest times reckoned peculiarly appropriate places for religious resort; and, as we learn from Eze 6:13, they were likewise the scene of idolatrous practices. Altars were set up under them (Jos 24:26), and, probably in the East as well as in the West, appointments to meet at Conspicuous oaks were made, and many affairs were transacted or treated of under their shade, as we read in Homer, Theocritus, and other poets. It was common among the Hebrews to sit under oaks (Jdg 6:11; 1Ki 13:14). Jacob buried idolatrous images under an oak (Gen 35:4); and Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, was buried under one of these trees (Gen 35:8; see 1Ch 10:12). Abimelech was made king under an oak (Jdg 9:6). Idolatry was practiced under oaks (Isa 1:29; Isa 57:5;  Hos 4:13). Idols were made of oaks (Isa 44:14). SEE BAAL; SEE GROVE Among the ancient Greeks the oak, as the noblest of trees, was sacred to Zeus, and among the Romans to Jupiter. Oak-worship, however, was one of the most remarkable peculiarities of the religion of the northern nations. The inhabitants of the holy city of Kiev, in Russia, offered their sacrifices under a sacred oak in their annual voyages to the Black Sea in June. The oak was considered by the Hessians as the symbol and the abode of the gods. Winifred, an apostle of the Germans, cut down an enormous oak which was sacred to Thor; and such was the horror which the sacrilegious deed excited that judgments were expected to fall upon the head of the impious missionary. “The gods of the ancient Prussians,” says Mr. Gross, “showed a decided predilection both for the oak and for the linden. The ground upon which they stood was holy ground, and was called Romowe.

Under their ample shade the principal gods of the Prussians were worshipped. The most celebrated oak was at Romowe, in the country of the Natanges. Its trunk was of extraordinary size, and its branches so dense and diffusive that neither rain nor cold could penetrate through them. It is affirmed that its foliage enjoyed. an amaranthine green, and that it afforded amulets to both man and beast — under the firm belief of the former at least that thus employed it would prove a sure preventive against every species of evil. The Romans, too, were great admirers of this way of worship, and therefore had their Luci in most parts of the city.” “As Jupiter,” to quote from the same intelligent writer, “gave oracles by means of the oak, so the oaken crown was deemed a fit ornament to deck the majestic brow of the god, contemplated as Polieus, the king of the city. The origin of the oaken crown as a symbol of Jupiter is attributed by Plutarch to the admirable qualities of the oak. ‘It is the oak,' says he, ‘which among wild trees bears the finest fruit, and which among those that are cultivated is the strongest.' Its fruit has been used as food, and the honey-dew of its leaves drank as mead. This sweet secretion of the oak was personified under the name of a nymph denominated Melissa. Wheat, too, is indirectly furnished in supplying nourishment to ruminant and other quadrupeds suitable for diet, and in yielding birdlime, with which the feathered tribes are secured. The esculent properties of the fruit of some trees, as the Quercus esculus, and the many useful qualities of their timber, may well entitle them to the rank of trees of life, and to the distinction and veneration of suppliers of the first food for the simple wants of man. Hence, on account of its valuable frugiferous productions recognized as the mast, the beech is generally known as the fagus, a term  which is derived from φαγεῖν, to eat. There was a period in the history of mankind when the fruit of the oak, the “neatly encased” acorn, formed the chief means of subsistence; and the Chaonian oaks of the Pelasgic age have justly been immortalized on account of their alimentary virtues. It was then, according to Greek authors, that the noble oak was cherished and celebrated as the mother and nurse of man. For these reasons Jupiter, the munificent source of so great a blessing, was adored as the benignant foster-father of the Pelasgic race, and denominated Phegonaiis. In the blissful and hallowed oak-tree, according to the puerile notions of those illiterate people, dwelt the food-dispensing god. The ominous rustling of its leaves, the mysterious notes of the feathered songsters among its branches, announced the presence of the divinity to astonished and admiring votaries, and gave hints and encouragement. to those whose interest or curiosity prompted them to consult the oracle. For this reason odoriferous fumes of incense were offered to the oracling god under the Dodonaean oak.”

The religious veneration paid to the oak-tree by the original natives of Britain- in the time of the Druids is well known to every reader of British history. The Druids esteemed the oak the most sacred object in nature, and they believed the mistletoe also which grew upon it to partake of its sacred character. Hence originated the famous ceremony of cutting the mistletoe, which took place at the beginning of the year. SEE MISTLETOE. We have reason to think that this veneration was brought from the East, and that the Druids did no more than transfer the sentiments their progenitors had received in Oriental countries. In fact, since in hot countries nothing is more desirable than shade nothing more refreshing than the shade of a tree, we may easily suppose the inhabitants would resort for such enjoyment to

“Where'er the oak's thick branches spread

A deeper, darker shade.”

The Supreme Being, whom the Druids termed Haesus or Mighty, was worshipped under the form of an oak. SEE DRUIDS.

## Oakes, Urian[[@Headword:Oakes, Urian]]

             president of Harvard College, was born in England in 1631, and brought to America in his childhood. A sweetness of disposition exhibited itself early, and remained with him through life. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1649. He soon after returned to England, and was settled in the ministry at Titchfiedl, in Hampshire; but being silenced in 1662 as a nonconforming  divine, he longed for employment on this side the Atlantic. The church of Cambridge, on the decease of Mr. Mitchell in 1668, sent a messenger to England to invite him to become their minister. He accepted in 1671, and was also placed at the head of Harvard College April 7, 1675, still however retaining the pastoral care of his flock. On Feb. 2, 1680, the corporation appointed him president, and persuaded him to be inaugurated, and to devote himself exclusively to this object. He died July 25, 1681. Mr. Oakes was a man of extensive erudition and distinguished usefulness. He excelled equally as a scholar. as a divine, and as a Christian. By his contemporaries he was considered as one of the most resplendent lights that ever shone in this part of the world. In the opinion of Dr. Mather, America never had a greater master of the true, pure, Ciceronian Latin, of his skill in which language a specimen from one of his commencement orations is preserved in the Magnalia. With all his greatness he was very humble, like the full ear of corn which hangs near the ground. He published an artillery-election sermon, entitled, The Unconquerable, All-Conquering, and more than Conquering Christian Soldier (1672): — Election Sermon (1673): — A Sermon at Cambridge on the Choice of their Military Officers: — A Fast Sermon — and an Elegy on the Death of Rev. Mr. Shepard, of Charlestown (1677), pathetic and replete with imagery. See Holmes, Hist. of Cambridge; Peirce, Hist. of Harvard University; Allen, Amer. Biogr. s.v.; Sprague Annals Amer. Pulpit, vol. v.

## Oannes[[@Headword:Oannes]]

             the name of a Babylonian god, who, in the first year of the foundation of Babylon, is said to have come out of the Persian Gulf, or the old Erythtaean Sea, adjoining Babylon. He is described as having the head and body of a fish, to which were added a human head and feet under the fish's head and at the tail. He lived among men during the daytime, without, however, taking any food, and retired at sunset to the sea from which he had emerged. Oannes had a human voice, and instructed men in the use of letters and in all the principal arts and sciences of civilization, which he communicated to them. Such is the account of him preserved by Berosus and Apollodorus. Five such monsters are said to have come out of the Persian Gulf: one. called Anedotos or Idotion, in the reign of Amenon, the fourth king of Babylon; another in that of the fifth king; and the last, called Odacon (or Ho Dagon), apparently the Phoenician Dagon, under the sixth. Many figures of Oannes, resembling that of a Triton, having the upper part of a man and the lower of a fish, or as a man covered with a fish's body,  have been found in the sculptures of Kuyunjik and Khorsabad, as well as on many cylinders and gems. Oannes is supposed to have symbolized the conquest of Babylonia by a more civilized nation coming in ships to the mouth of the Euphrates; but he is apparently a water-god, resembling in character the Phoenician Dagon and the Greek Proteus and Triton. See Helladius, Apud. Phot. Cod. 279, p. 535, 34; Richter, De Beroso; Cory, Anc. Fraigm. p. 30; Bunsen, Egypt's Place, 1:706; Layard, Nineveh, p. 343. SEE DAGON.

## Oates, Titus[[@Headword:Oates, Titus]]

             (alias AMBROSE), a noted character in English ecclesiastical history, was born about 1620 at London. He was the son of a ribbon-weaver, who, having seceded from the Anabaptists among whom he had preached, after the Restoration conformed to the doctrines of the English Established Church, took orders, and held a benefice. Titus was educated at Merchant Taylors' School in London, and at the University of Cambridge. Having received ordination, he was made chaplain to the duke of Norfolk, who also settled him in a small living. He was subsequently accused of perjury, but he escaped conviction, and became chaplain in one of the king's ships, from which he was disgracefully expelled. Shortly afterwards he embraced Roman Catholic doctrines. Later he entered the college at St. Omer, and resided for some time among the students. On his return from a mission to Spain in 1677, the Jesuits, who were heartily tired of their convert, dismissed him from their seminary; and it is probable that resentment for this dismissal, combined with a prospect of gain, induced him to contrive the atrocious scheme known as the “Popish Plot,” which alone has preserved his name in history. The English people were in Oates's time greatly agitated by religious controversy. It was generally asserted and believed that king Charles was at heart a Roman Catholic; and his brother, the duke of York, afterwards James II, was an active and avowed zealot on the same side. The growing confidence of the Roman Catholics was unconcealed; and with or without special reason, the cry so often since heard arose, and was everywhere reechoed, that the “Protestant religion was in danger.” In this fevered state of general feeling Oates saw his opportunity, and dexterously and boldly availed himself of it. In September, 1678, he made a disclosure before Sir Edmundbury Godfrey, a noted and active justice of the peace, and afterwards before the council and the  House of Commons, to the effect “that the pope felt himself entitled to the possession of England and Ireland on account of the heresy of prince and people, and had accordingly assumed the sovereignty of these kingdoms; that power to govern them had been delegated by the pope to the Society of Jesuits, who, through Oliva, the general of their order, had issued commissions appointing various persons whom they could trust to the chief offices of state, both civil and military. Lord Arundel (he said) was to be chancellor; lord Powis, treasurer; lord Bellasis, general of the papal army; lord Stafford, paymaster; Sir William Godolphin, privy seal; and Coleman, secretary of state. All the dignities, too, of the Church he alleged to be newly appropriated, and many of them to Spaniards and other foreigners. Two men, named Grove and Pickering, he declared, were hired to shoot the king, and Sir George Wakeman. the queen's physician, had engaged to poison him, the queen herself being privy to the scheme. He also stated that the Roman Catholics were to rise in different districts of the kingdom; and that every means would be adopted for the extirpation of Protestantism.” His evidence was confirmed by two men named Torige and Bedloe, especially the latter, who was of low extraction and bad reputation. (For the list of persons, both Jesuits and men of importance in the kingdom, who suffered imprisonment and execution through the accusations of Oates, we must refer to the general histories of the time.)

Notwithstanding the almost universal credence which was given to him at the time, it has subsequently been placed beyond doubt that the plot which Oates pretended to reveal was an infamous fabrication. His circumstances, his character, the nature of his evidence, the manner of its production, not at one time but at several times, though he had previously professed to have told all that he knew, the mode in which the first disclosure was made, together with inconsistency and errors, evidently betray imposture. It may be urged that the universal credit given to Oates's evidence at the time is a strong proof that his story was true. There are circumstances, however, which account for the ready belief with which his accusations were received, although they do not prove their truth. The English Protestants had long apprehended an attempt on the part of the Roman Catholics to restore their religion and re-establish their power; and an anxiety on this account had latterly been augmented in some degree, by the conduct of the king, and in a still greater degree by the duke of York's open profession of the old religion, and his attachment to its adherents. Moreover, there were immediately connected with Oates's disclosure two  events giving it an apparent corroboration, which was eagerly assumed to be real by the feverish minds of contemporary partisans. The first of these was the sudden and violent death of Sir Edmondbury Godfrey, the magistrate who had taken Oates's depositions. No proofs could be adduced to show the manner of his death whether he committed suicide or was murdered; but the fact that he had taken Oates's evidence, and had been active in searching out the supposed plot, was sufficient to convince the Protestants, excited as they were, that he had been murdered by Roman Catholics, partly out of revenge and partly to aid the escape of their conspirators. The second apparent corroboration of Oates's evidence — which, though no real confirmation, had at the time an influence in maintaining its credibility — is that it led to the discovery of a plot, though not such a plot as he disclosed (see Hallam, Const. Hist. 2:571). Oates denounced Coleman, the secretary of the duchess of York; and upon searching his house there were found among his correspondence with Pere la. Chaise papers which proved a combination for the purpose of re- establishing Roman Catholicism in England. That it was a plot, that it was on the part of the Roman Catholics, and discovered through Oates, was sufficient in the state of public feeling then prevailing to reflect credit on his disclosures, though Coleman's plans did not coincide with the schemes which Oates pretended to have discovered. During the closing years of the reign of Charles II Oates was protected by the government, and received a pension of £1200 a year. In the following reign, as might be expected, his enemies revenged themselves. The duke of York had not long succeeded his brother on the throne before Oates was tried and convicted of perjury, sentenced to imprisonment for life, and to be whipped and stand in the pillory at intervals. The punishment was enforced with such dastardly brutality as to leave no doubt that it was intended, under cover of carrying out the sentence, to take away his life. He survived, however; and after much urgent petitioning he was, after the accession of king William, declared by Parliament the subject of an illegal trial, and therefore pardoned and granted anew a pension of £400 a year. He was not much heard of after this event, and died in 1705 in comparative obscurity. Oates is considered as the author of Εἰκὼν βασιλικη , or the Picture of the late King James drawn to the Life (Lond. 1696, 4to, 3d ed.): — The Tryall of Richard Langhorn, Esq., Counsellor at Law,for conspiring the Death of the King, etc. (published by authority [ibid. 1679, fol.]): — The true Speeches of Thomans Whitebread, Provincial of the Jesuits in England; William Harcourt, pretended Rector of London; John Fenwick,  Procurator for the Jesuits in England; John Gavin and Anthony Turner, all Jesuits and Priests, before their Execution at Tyburn, June 20, 1679, etc. (ibid. 1679, fol.): The Report of the Conmmittee upon the Conplaint of Mfr. Peter Norris (ibid. 1680, fol.): — The Popish damnable Plot against our Religion and Liberties, etc. (ibid. 1680, fol.): — A Collection of Letters and other Writings relating to the horrid Popish Plott, etc. (published by order of the House of Commons [ibid. 1681, fol.]). See State Trials., x 1079-1330; Evelyn, Diary; North, Examen; Burnet, Hist. of his Own Times, vol. i; Crosby, Hist. of the Baptists Neal, Hist. of the Puiritans; Collier. Eccles. Hist. (see Index in vol. viii); Hume, Hist. of England; Macaulay, Hist. of England; Darling, Cycl. Bibliog. 2:1224; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Knight, Pict. Hist. of England, 3:717 sq.; and especially the article in the English Cyclopaedia s.v.

## Oath[[@Headword:Oath]]

             (JEWISH), an appeal to God, or to authorities recognized by the respective adjurers, or to anything esteemed sacred, in attestation of an assertion or in confirmation of a given promise or a duty undertaken. The following statement as to Hebrew oaths gives the ancient information with whatever light modern research has thrown upon it. SEE SWEARING.

I. Scriptural Terms. — “Oath” is the rendering in the A. V. of two Hebrew words, alah', אָלָה, and shebuah' שְׁבוּעָה, each of which is used in the three significations: 1. A n oath as an appeal to God in attestation of the truth of a statement (Neh 10:30; Exo 22:10); 2. A sworn covenant (Gen 26:28;.2Sa 21:7) 3. A curse or imprecation (Num 5:21; Dan 9:11). In the first of these senses, which answers to our word “oath,” the Sept. renders both words by ὅρκος, and the Vulg. byjuramentum or jusjurandum; while in the last sense we have the rendering ἀρά, maledictio. The two words אלהand שבועה, however, are by no means synonymous. They denote two different modes of swearing, or rather two classes of oaths. Thus אלה(from hא; to lament; to wail, to express woe; or, according to Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 44, 99, akin with אֵל, God) properly means the invocation of woe upon one's self, and shows that the mode of swearing which it describes was connected with an invocation of divine vengeance on the party, if the asseveration made were not true; while שבועה(from שבע,  seven) literally signifies to seven one's self, to produce seven, i.e. to make a declaration confirmed by seven victims, or before seven witnesses, because, as Ibn-Ezra (comp. צחות, p. 41 a), who is followed by most modern expositors and lexicographers, rightly remarks, seven animals were used in ancient times when mutual promises were given and when alliances were effected (Gen 21:28-30). This -is moreover confirmed by the practice of the ancient Arabians, who, in pledging their faith, drew blood by an incision made in their hands, and smeared it on seven stones (Herod. 3:8). The primary distinction, therefore, between the two oaths is, that in the case of the former an imprecation was used, while in the latter no imprecation was employed. Hence in Num 5:21, where an oath with an imprecation is described, the phrase שבועת האלהis used, and the formula of imprecation is forthwith given.

II. Nature and Sanction of Oaths. — The term jusjurandumn is defined by Cicero (De Offciis, 3:29) as an affirmation vouched for by an appeal to a divinity. To these two elements which every oath contains —

1, an affirmation or promise;

2, an appeal to God as omniscient and the punisher of falsehoods — a third is commonly added, a solemn or judicial occasion. To these three requisites the canon law refers when it enumerates judicium, veritas, justitia, as entering into the constitution of an oath. An oath is accordingly a religious undertaking either to say (juramnentum assertoriumn) or to do (juramentum. promnissorium) something entered into voluntarily with the customary forms. Being a religious undertaking, the appeal will vary according to the religion of him who makes it. In some instances it will be an appeal immediately to God.; in others, to objects supposed to have divine power; and by a natural declension, when men have left the only true God, they may appeal in their oaths even to stocks and stones. Accordingly the Romans swore by their own heads or those of their children, or by the genius of the emperor. We shall find similar errors and abuses among the Jews.

The essence of an oath lies obviously in the appeal which is thereby made to God, or to divine knowledge and power. The customary form establishes this, “So help me God.” The Latin words (known to have been used as early as the 6th century), whence our English form is taken, run thus: “Sic me Deus adjnvet et haec sancta Evangelia,” So may God and  these holy Gospels help me; that is, “as I say the truth.” The present custom of kissing a book containing the Gospels has, in England and the United States, take in the place of the latter clause in the Latin formula.

1. The cardinal principle on which an oath is held to be binding is incidentally laid down in Heb 6:16 — viz. as an ultimate appeal to divine authority to. ratify an assertion (see the principle stated and defended by Philo, De Leg. Alleg. 3:73; 1:128, ed. Mang.). There the Almighty is represented as promising or denouncing with an oath, i.e. doing so in the most positive and solemn manner (see such passages as Gen 22:16; Gen 12:7 compared with 24:7; Exo 17:16 and Lev 26:14 with Dan 9:11; 2Sa 7:12-13 with Act 2:30; Psa 110:4 with Heb 7:21; Heb 7:28; Isa 45:23; Jer 22:5; Jer 32:22). With this divine asseveration we may compare the Stygian oath of Greek mythology (Homer, I1. 15:37; Hesiod, Theog. 400, 805; see also the Laws of Men, ch. viii, p. 110; Sir W. Jones, Works, 3:291).

2. On the same principle that oath has always been held most binding which appealed to the highest authority, both as regards individuals and communities.

(a) Thus believers in Jehovah appealed to him, both judicially and extra- judicially, with such phrases as “The God of Abraham judge;” “As the Lord liveth; ““God do so to me and more also;” “God knoweth,” and the like (see Gen 21:23; Gen 31:53; Num 14:2; Num 30:2; 1Sa 14:39; 1Sa 14:44; 1Ki 2:42; Isa 48:1; Isa 65:16; Hos 4:15). So also our Lord himself accepted the high-priest's adjuration (Mat 26:63), and Paul frequently appeals to God in confirmation of his statements (Act 26:29; Rom 1:9; Rom 9:1; 2Co 1:23; 2Co 11:31; Php 1:8; see also Rev 10:6).

(b) Appeals of this kind to authorities recognized respectively by adjuring parties were regarded as bonds of international security, and their infraction as being not only a ground of international complaint, but also an offense against divine justice. So Zedekiah, after swearing fidelity to the king of Babylon, was not only punished by him, but denounced by the prophet as a breaker of his oath (2Ch 36:13; Ezra 17:13, 18). Some, however, have supposed that the Law forbade any intercourse with heathen nations which involved the necessity of appeal by them to their  own deities (Exo 23:32; Selden, De Jur. Nat. 2:13; see Livy, 1:24; Laws of Men, ch. viii, p. 113; Smith, Dict. of Antiq. s.v. Jus Jurandum).

3. As a consequence of this principle,

(a) appeals to God's name on the one hand, and to heathen deities on the other, are treated in the Scripture as tests of allegiance (Exo 23:13; Exo 34:6; Deu 29:12; Jos 23:7; Jos 24:16; 2Ch 15:12; 2Ch 15:14; Isa 19:18; Isa 45:23; Jer 12:16; Amo 8:14; Zep 1:5).

(b) So also the sovereign's name is sometimes used as a form of obligation, as was the case among the Romans with the name of the emperor; and Hofmann quotes a custom by which the kings of France used to appeal to themselves at their coronation (Gen 42:15; 2Sa 11:11; 2Sa 14:19; Martyr. S. Polycarp. c. ix; Tertull. Apol. c. xxxii; Sueton. Calg. c. xxvii; Hofmann, Lex. s.v. Juramentum; Michaelis, On Laws of Moses, art. 256, vol. iv, p. 102, ed. Smith).

4. Other objects of appeal, serious or frivolous, are mentioned: as, by the “blood of Abel” (Selden, De Jur. Nat. v. 8); by the “head;” by “heaven,” the ‘“Temple,” etc., some of which are ,condemned by our Lord (Mat 5:33; Mat 23:16-22; and see Jam 5:12). Yet he did not refuse the solemn adjuration of the highpriest (Mat 26:63-64; see Juv. Sat. 6:16; Mart. 11:94; Mishna, Sanh. 3:2, compared with Amo 8:7; Spencer, De Leg. Heb 2:1-4).

III. Occasions when Oaths were taken. — From time immemorial the Hebrews used oaths both in private intercourse and public transactions.

1. In private intercourse, or on extra-judicial occasions, oaths were taken or demanded when promises were made (2Sa 15:21; 2Sa 19:23) or exacted (Gen 24:2-4; Genesis 1, 5, 25; Jos 2:12-21; Jos 6:26; Jos 9:15; Ezr 10:5); when covenants were concluded (Gen 31:53; 2Ki 11:4; 1Ma 7:15; Joseph. Ant. 14:1, 2); when a solemn asseveration was made (Gen 14:22; Jdg 21:1-7; 1Sa 14:39; 1Sa 14:44; 1Sa 19:6); and when allegiance to God, fealty to a sovereign, or obedience from an inferior to a superior was professed (1Ki 18:10; 2Ki 11:17; 1Ch 11:3; 1Ch 29:24; 2Ch 15:14-15; 2Ch 36:13; Ecc 8:2; Joseph. Ant. 12:1; 15:10, 4). A vow was in the nature of an oath (Lev 5:4).

2. Public or judicial oaths were demanded by the Mosaic law on the four following occasions:

(a) When goods deposited with any one were stolen or destroyed, the depositary was to take an oath that he was not guilty in the loss, and the proprietor was bound to accept it without restitution (Exo 22:10-11; 1Ki 8:31; 2Ch 6:22). A willful breaker of trust, especially if he added perjury to his fraud, was to be severely punished (Lev 6:2-5; Deu 19:16-18).

(b) When one was suspected of having found or otherwise come into possession of lost property, he was to take an oath, and thereby vindicate himself of the charge (Lev 6:3).

(c) When a wife was suspected of incontinence, she was required to clear herself by an oath (Num 5:19-22).

(d) When a theft was committed or an injury sustained, and the offender remained undetected, a judicial oath was to beimposed upon the whole community, or every one was adjured to make known the criminal; and if any one knew the culprit and refused to make him known after hearing this public adjuration, he bore the guilt (Lev 5:1; Jdg 17:2).

(e) It appears that witnesses were examined on oath, and that a false witness, or one guilty of suppression of the truth, was to be severely punished (Pro 29:24; Michaelis, . c. art. 256, vol. iv, p. 109; Deu 19:16-19; Grotius, in Crit. Sacr. on Mat 26:63; Knobel on Lev 5:1, in Kurzg. Exeg. Handb.).

It will be observed that a leading feature of Jewish criminal procedure was that the accused person was put upon his oath to clear himself (Exo 22:11; Num 5:19-22; 1Ki 8:31; 2Ch 6:22; Mat 26:63).

IV. As to the forms of oaths, the Jews appealed to God with or without an imprecation in such phrases (cited above) as “God do so and more also if,” etc. (1Sa 14:44); “As the Lord liveth” (1Sa 14:39; 1Sa 19:6; 2Sa 15:21; 1Ki 18:10); “As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth” (1Sa 20:3); “The Lord be between thee and me forever” (1Sa 20:23); “The God of Abraham judge between us” (Gen 31:53). The Jews also swore “by heaven,” “by the. earth,” “by the sun,” “by Jerusalem,?' “by the Temple” (Mishna, Shebuoth, 4:2;  Mat 5:34; Mat 23:16; Berachoth, 55; Kiddushin, 71 a; Maimonides, Jad ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Shebuoth, xii); “by the angels” (Joseph. War, 2:16, 4); by the lives of distinguished persons (Gen 42:15; 1Sa 1:26; 1Sa 17:55; 2Sa 11:11; 2Sa 14:19).

V. The external manner observed when taking an oath was one of the following:

1. Originally the oath of a covenant was taken by solemnly sacrificing seven animals, or it was attested by seven witnesses or pledges, consisting either of so many animals presented to the contracting party, or of memorials erected to testify to the act, as is indicated by one of the Hebrew names for oath (שבועה), which properly denotes seven, and by the verb to swear (נשבע), which means to seven, to produce seven (comp. Gen 21:28-31; Knobel, Comment. on Genesis ad oc.).

2. Another primitive custom which obtained in: the patriarchal age was that the one who took the oath “put his hand under the thigh” of the adjurer (Gen 24:2; Gen 47:29). This practice evidently arose from the fact that the genital member, which is meant by the euphemistic expression “thigh” (יר)ִ, was regarded as the most sacred part of the body, being the symbol of union in the tenderest relation of matrimonial life, and the seat whence all issue proceeds, and the perpetuity so much coveted by the ancients (comp. the phrase!יוצאי יר, Gen 46:26; Exo 1:5; Jdg 8:30). Hence this creative organ became the symbol of the Creator and the object of worship among all nations of antiquity (comp. Eze 16:17; Jerome, Comment. in ilos. iv; Nork, Etymologisch-symbolisch- mythologisches Real- Worterbuch, s.v. Phalluscultus; Pauly, Real- Encyklopadie d. classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, s.' v.Phallus); and it is for this reason that God claimed it as the.sign of the covenant between himself and his chosen people in the rite of circumcision. Nothing, therefore, could render the oath more solemn in those days than touching the symbol of creation, the sign of the covenant, and the source of that issue who may at any future period avenge the breaking of a compact made with their progenitor. To this effect is the explanation of the Midrash, the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, Rashi, and the oldest Jewish expositors, though it simply specifies the covenant of circumcision. Further from the point is the opinion of Aben-Ezra, followed by Rosenmüller and others, that it is used as a symbol of submission on the part of the servant  to his master. “It appears to me more probable,” says Aben-Ezra, “that it was the custom of those days for a servant to place his hand on his master's thigh; and the meaning of the phrase is, Now if thou art under my subjection, put thy hand on my thigh. The master sat with [the servant's] hand on his thigh, as if saying, Behold my hand is in subjection to thee to execute thy will. And this custom still obtains in India” (Comment. on Gen 24:2). More unnatural is the explanation of Grotius, that Eliezer put his hand on Abraham's thigh, where the sword was hanging (Psa 45:3), as much as to say, “If I falsify my word, may I perish by thy sword;” or that of Michaelis, that it alludes to a supposed custom of pressing blood from the hand by putting it under the thigh.

3. A less usual form of oath or ratification was dividing a victim and passing between or distributing the pieces (Gen 15:10; Gen 15:17; Jer 34:18). This form was probably used to intensify the imprecation already ratified by sacrifice according to the custom described by classical writers under the phrases ὄρκια τέμνειν, fledus ferire, etc. We may perhaps regard in this view the acts recorded in Jdg 19:29; 1Sa 11:7; and possibly in Herod. 7:39.

4. The more general custom, however, was to lift up ‘the right hand towards heaven, pointing to the throne of him who was invoked as witness to the truth and avenger of falsehood (Gen 14:22; Deu 32:40; Dan 12:7; Rev 10:5-6). Hence the phrase, “to lift up the hand,” came to denote to swear, to take an oath, and is even applied to the Deity (Exo 6:8; Psa 106:26; Eze 20:5). These practices chiefly refer to oaths taken in private intercourse, or on extra-judicial occasions. The manner in which a judicial oath was taken is thus described in the Jewish codes: “The oath-taker held the scroll of the Law in his arms, stood up and swore either by the name of God or by any one of his attributes, with or without an imprecation (או באלה בשבועה), uttering it either by himself or repeating it after the judge; and this judicial oath, according to the enactment of our rabbins, had to be taken in the Hebrew language. If he pronounced the oath by himself, and without an imprecation, he said, ‘I swear by Jehovah, the God of Israel, or by him who is merciful, or by him who is compassionate, that I owe nothing to this man;' and if with an imprecation he said, ‘Behold I am accursed of Jehovah, or of him who is merciful, if I possess anything belonging to this man.' And if the judges spoke the oath, they said to him, ‘We adjure thee by Jehovah, the God of Israel, or by him who is merciful, that thou hast  nothing which belongs to that man.' To which he replied, ‘Amen!' Or they said, ‘Behold A, the son of so-and-so, is accursed of Jehovah, the God of Israel, or of him who is merciful, if he has any money in his possession and does not confess it to the owner;' and he responded, ‘Amen!'“ (Maimonides, Jad ha-Chezaka, Bilchotl Shebuoth, 11:8-10). Instead of holding the Law, the oath-taker was also allowed to touch the phylacteries (Maimonides, ibid.). This simple response, Amen (אמן), or Thou hast said it (σὺ ειπας), which was all that was required to constitute an oath in case any one was adjured (Num 5:19; Mishna, Shebuoth, 3:11; 4:3), explains the reply of our Savior (Mat 26:63-64).

On the same analogy witnesses laid their hands on the head of the accused (Gen 14:22; Lev 24:14; Deu 32:40; Isa 3:7; Eze 20:5-6; Sus. 5:35; Rev 10:5; see Homer, 11. 19:254; Virgil, — En. 12:196; Carpzov, Apparatus, p. 652).

Oaths were sometimes taken before the altar, or, as some understand the passage, if the persons were not in Jerusalem, in a position looking towards the Temple (1Ki 8:31;. 2Ch 6:22; Godwyn, 1. c. 6:6; Carpzov, p. 654; see also Juvenal, Sat. 14:219; Homer, II. 14:272).

VI. Sanctity of an Oath. — The only oath enacted in the Mosaic code is a clearance oath, i.e. the prosecutor is not to be put on his oath to prove the guilt of the accused, but the defendant is to swear and thereby clear himself of the charge or suspicion (Exo 22:11; Lev 5:1; Lev 6:3; Num 5:19-22). Hence the great care exercised in inculcating the sacredness of oaths, and the heavy punishment for perjury or frivolous swearing (Exo 20:7; Lev 19:12; Deu 19:16-19; Psa 15:4; Jer 5:2; Jer 7:9; Eze 16:59; Hos 10:4; Zec 8:17; Mishna, Shebuoth, 3:11; 4:3). Whether the “swearing” mentioned by Jeremiah (Jer 23:10) and by Hosea (Hos 4:2) was false swearing, or profane abuse of oaths, is not certain. If the latter, the crime is one which had been condemned by the Law (Lev 24:11; Lev 24:16; Mat 26:74).

From the Law the Jews deduced many special cases of perjury, which, are thus classified:

1, Jusjurandum promissorium, a rash inconsiderate promise for the future, or false assertion. respecting the past (Lev 5:4);

2, Vanum, an absurd self-contradictory assertion;

3, Depositi, breach of contract denied (Lev 19:11);

4, Testinonii, judicial perjury (Lev 5:1; see Nicolaus and Selden, De Juramentis, in Ugolini, Thesaurus, xxvi; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. on Mat 5:33, vol. 2:292; Mishna, Shebuoth, 3:7; 4:1; 5:1, 2; Otho, Lex. Rabb. s. v, Juramentum).

The Jewish canons enacted that when the demand of the prosecutor is very trifling, the defendant's simple denial is sufficient, and he cannot be compelled to take the judicial oath to clear himself (Mishna, Shebuoth, 6:1- 3). For the same reason it is enacted that when the complainant is deaf and dumb, silly, or a minor, the defendant need not take the oath, because such people not being able to appreciate the solemnity of an oath, may multiply swearing on too trivial grounds; and that a minor is not to be asked to take an oath (Shebuoth, 6:4). Women, though forbidden to bear witness on oath (Deu 19:17 with Mishna, Shebuoth, 4:1), may take the clearance oath (Mishna, ibid. v. 1). If one simply says to another, “I adjure thee,” the oath is valid; but if any one swears by heaven, earth, or Jerusalem, or any other creature, the oath is invalid (Mishna, Shebuoth, 4:13). As this oath could be taken with impunity, it became very common among the Jews, who thought that, because it involved nothing, it meant nothing. Hence the remarks of our Savior (Mat 5:34-36; Mat 23:16-22). If any one swears frivolously, which is defined by the Jewish canons as follows: If he swears that something is different from what it is known to be, e.g. if he says that a stone pillar is gold, that a woman is a man; or if it is about anything impossible, that he saw a camel flying in the air; or if any one says to witnesses, “Come and give testimony to what you have seen,” and they say, “We swear that we will not bear witness” (Lev 5:1).; or if one swears to transgress a commandment, e.g. not to make a tabernacle, or not to put on phylacteries, this is a frivolous oath, for which, if taken deliberately, the man must be scourged (Mishna, Shebuoth, 3:8). So great was the sanctity with which the pious Jews, prior to the days of Christ, regarded an oath, that they discountenanced swearing altogether (comp. Sir 23:11, etc.; and especially Philo, De decem oraculis, sec. xvii, in Opp. 2:194, etc., ed. Mang.). The Pharisees took great care to abstain from oaths as much as possible (comp. Shebuoth, 39 b'; Gittin, 35 a; Midrash Rabba onl Numbers 22), while the Essenes laid it down as a principle not to swear at all, but to say yea yea, and nay nay. How firmly  and conscientiously they adhered to it may ‘be seen from the fact that Herod, who, on ascending the throne,' had exacted an oath of allegiance from all the rest of the Jews, was obliged to absolve the Essenes from it (comp. Joseph. Ant. 15:10, 4; Ginsburg, The Essenes, their History and Doctrines [Lond. 1864], p. 34). Whether our Savior's prohibition of swearing (Mat 5:33-37) refers to the same total abstinence from all judicial oaths, or to profane and careless oaths, is a matter of dispute.

VII. Oaths of contemporary and later Nations. — The stringent nature of the Roman military oath, and the penalties attached to infraction of it, are alluded to, more or less certainly, in several places in the N.T., e.g. Mat 8:9; Act 12:19; Act 16:27; Act 27:42; see also Dionys. Hal. 11:43, and Aul. Gen 16:4. SEE SACRAMENT.

The most solemn Mohammedan oath is made on the open Koran. Mohammed himself used the form, “By the setting of the stars” (Chardin, Voy. 6:87; Sale's Koran, lvi, p. 437).

Bedouin Arabs use various sorts of adjuration, one of which somewhat resembles the oath “by the Temple.” The person takes hold of the middle tent-pole, and swears by the life of the tent and its owners (Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1:127 sq.; see also another case mentioned by Burckhardt, Syria, p. 398).

The Christian practice in the matter of oaths was founded in great measure on the Jewish. — Thus the oath on the Gospels was an imitation of the Jewish practice of placing the hands on the book of the Law (P. Fagius, on Onkel. ad Exo 23:1; — Justinian, Nov. c. viii, Epil.; Matthew Paris, Hist. p. 916). Our Lord's prohibition of swearing was clearly always understood by the Christian Church as directed against profane and careless swearing, hot against the serious judicial form (Bingham, Antiq. Eccl. 16:7, § 4, 5; Aug. Ep. 157, c. v. 40); and thus we find the fourth Council of Carthage (c. 61) reproving clerical persons for swearing,' by created objects. SEE PROFANITY.

VIII. Literature. — The Mishna, Tractate Shebuoth; Maimonides, Jad ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Shebuoth, 3:1 sq.; Lightfoof, Hebrew and Talnmudical Exercitations on Mat 5:33; Frankel, Die Eidesleistung der Juden in- theologischer und historischer Beziehung (2d ed. Breslau, 1847); by the same author, Der gerichttlche Beweis nach:losaisch- talmudischem Rechte (Berlin, 1846), p. 304 sq.; Saalschiltz, Das  JIosaische Recht (Berlin, 1853), p. 608 sq.; Ewald, Die Alterthumer des Volkes Israel (Gottingen, 1854), p, 15 sq. SEE PERJURY.

## Oath (2)[[@Headword:Oath (2)]]

             (Anglo-Saxon, ath) may be defined (see above) as an expressed or implied solemn invocation of a superior power, admitted to be acquainted with all the secrets of our hearts, with our inward thoughts as well as our outward actions, to witness the truth of what we assert, and to inflict vengeance upon us if we assert what is not true, or promise what we do not mean to perform. Almost all nations; whether savage or civilized, whether enjoying the light of revelation or led only by the light of reason, knowing the importance of truth, and willing to obtain a barrier against falsehood, have had recourse to oaths, by which they have endeavored to make men fearful of uttering lies, under the dread of an avenging Deity. The antiquity of oaths seems almost coeval with man's existence. The absence of the practice in any people is one of the clearest proofs of a want of conception of the existence of God. Indeed, it is a noticeable fact that in the earliest state of civilization the belief of the special interference of the Deity in the affairs of men was a prevailing and all but universal idea. Man, it was thought, by certain mystic forms and hallowed ceremonies could compel the interference of the Divinity either to establish. innocence or to detect guilt. Hence came ordeals and trials by battles and by lot; hence the belief that by the eating of bread or by the drinking of water by walking barefoot over burning plowshares, by thrusting the hand amid poisonous serpents, or throwing the accused, bound hand and foot, into water, amid prayers and the imposing forms of antique superstition, God would manifest the truth by a miraculous violation of the laws of nature. So extensively diffused was. this idea, that it was alike believed by the polished Athenian on the banks of the Ilissus, Western Israelite amid the hills of Judaea, the African dwelling under the burning heat of the torrid zone, and the Scandinavian worshipper of Thor or Odin amid the fastnesses of the North. All nations, barbarous or just. emerging from barbarism, have resorted to the Divinity for the decision of disputed questions with somewhat similar ceremonies, and undoubtedly with like success. Part and parcel with ordeals, whether of bread or of water, of poisons or of plowshares, whether of Grecian, Jewish, Hindf, or Scandinavian form and origin, based upon the same principle, involving the same leading idea, is the oath by which divine vengeance. is imprecated upon falsehood, and by the use of which ceremony, if it be effective, the Deity is, specially and for that cause,  bound to inflict the requisite and appropiate punishment in case of its violation. As the analogies traceable amid the radical words of different languages all point to a common origin — a primal language — so the innumerable resemblances discernible amid the elemental forms of jurisprudence among nations diverse in their local habitations, with varying customs and sympathies and languages, would equally seem to indicate a common source, from which at some point of time; now uncertain or lost in the darkness of a remote antiquity, they originally sprang. (For an inquiry into the origin of oaths; and an acute disquisition on oaths generally, see Heineccius, Exercit. xviii, De Lubricitate, etc.)

Among Christians an oath is a solemn appeal for the truth of our assertions, the sincerity of our promises, and the fidelity of, our engagements, to the one only God, the Judge of the whole earth, who is everywhere present, and sees and hears and knows whatever is said or done or thought in any part of the world. Such. is the Being whom Christians, when they take an oath, invoke to bear testimony to the truth of their words and the integrity of their hearts. Surely, then, if oaths be a matter of so much moment, it well behooves us not to treat them with levity, nor ever to take them without due consideration. Hence we ought, with the utmost vigilance, to abstain from mingling oaths in our ordinary discourse, and from associating the name of God with low or disgusting images, or using it on trivial occasions, as not only a profane levity in itself, but .tending to destroy that reverence for the Supreme Majesty ‘which ought to prevail in society and to dwell in our own hearts. Perhaps all excesses in this case are caused by the extravagant, profuse, and wasteful, use of oaths among us, so utterly at variance with the command, “swear not at all,” making the oath so powerless for good and so potent for evil.

To develop clearly the use of oaths in early and modern times, we will here briefly notice the purposes for:which and the occasions on which they have been taken, their different forms and ceremonies, the various punishments for their violation, the theory which justifies and requires their adoption as a sanction for truth, and their real force and efficiency in the administration of judicial affairs. (We rely mainly on Appleton's Rule of Evidence Stated and Discussed [Phila. 1860, 8vo], ch. 16). For the usages among the Jews, see the preceding article.

Perjury, by the Mosaic law, was an offense against the civil law; to God alone was left its punishment. The civil magistrate had no jurisdiction of  the offense charged, except in the case of a false charge of crime, when punishment was to be inflicted upon the person falsely charging it. The perjurer might expiate his guilt by making the prescribed and predetermined trespass offerings. The misunderstanding or misinterpretation of this may in later times have led to the Romish doctrines of absolution and the sale of indulgences; for it is difficult to perceive much difference in principle whether the offerings made to escape the punishment of the Deity be in certain specific articles or in certain money payments.

The form of swearing among the Greeks was by lifting up the hand to heaven or touching the altar, adding a solemn imprecation to their oaths, for the satisfaction of the person by whom the oath was imposed, as well as to lay a more inviolable obligation upon the person taking it — in terms something like this: If what I swear be true, may I enjoy much happiness; if not, may I utterly perish. In judicial proceedings the oath was administered to the witness before an altar erected in the courts of judicature, and with the greatest solemnity. The parties were likewise sworn the plaintiff that he would make no false charge, the defendant that he would answer truly to the charge preferred.

An ancient form among the Romans was for the juror to hold a stone in his hand, and imprecate a curse upon himself: should he swear falsely, in these words: “If I knowingly deceive, while he saves the city and citadel, may Jupiter cast me away from all that is good, as I do this stone.” Among the Greeks and Romans, the oath was not merely used. to induce faith in judicial proceedings, but the gods were invoked as witnesses to contracts between individuals and treaties between nations.

When the shrine of Jupiter gave place to that of St. Peter; when the innumerable gods and goddesses of ancient superstition were converted into the equally numberless saints and saintesses of Catholicism; when the Poutifex Maximus of consular and imperial, became the Pontifex Maximus of papal Rome, without even the change of his sacerdotal vestments; when the rites and ceremonies — the whole ritual of the pagan worship were transferred bodily to the worship of the papacy, the oath, which was essentially a religious ceremony, was adopted as it had heretofore been administered, except so far as was required by, the alteration in the name of the object of worship, and in its purposes and its beliefs. As before this change the altar, or the sacred things upon it, were touched or kissed, as  the more gods one swore by the stronger the oath, so we find after this change similar forms and ceremonies were adopted, with slight variations. The very form of the imprecation used is of pagan origin. “So help me Jupiter and these sacred things” became “So help me God and these sacred relics,” or “these holy Evangelists.” The flamen of Jupiter, from the sacredness of his office, was not compelled to take an oath, and the word of the priest, “verbum sacerdotis,” in conformity with the old superstition, has sufficed. Justinian prescribes the following form: “I swear by God Almighty, and by his only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, by the Holy Ghost and by the glorious St. Mary, mother of God, and always a virgin,. and by the four Gospels which I hold in my hand, and by the holy archangels Michael and Gabriel,” etc., closing with an imprecation upon his head of the terrible judgment of God and Christ, our Savior, and that he might have part with Judas and the leper! Gehazi, and that the curse of Cain might be upon him. Besides oaths on solemn and judicial occasions, the ancients were in the habit of making use of them, as nowadays, as the “supplemental ornament of speech” “as expletives to plump the speech, and fill up sentences;” swearing by the patron divinities of their cities. as in later days by patron saints; by all manner of beasts and creeping things, by the fishes of the sea, and by stones and mountains.

“Per Solis radios, Tarpeiaque fulmina jurat

Et Martis frameam, et Cirrhaei spicula Vatis;

Per calamos Venatricis pharetramque Puellse,

Perque tuum pater AEgaei Neptune tridentem;

Addit’et Herculeos arcus, hastamque Minervse,

Qulidquid habent telorum armamentaria coeli.”

Indeed, the common profane oath of the English is but a translation of the “Dii me perdant” of classical antiquity. But the oaths of the ancients, however absurd or ridiculous, were infinitely exceeded in absurdity by the exuberant and grotesque profaneness of the Christians of the Middle Ages. They swore “by Sion and Mount Sinai,” “by St. James's lance,” “by the brightness of God,” “by Christ's foot,” “by nails and by blood,” “by God's arms two” — they swore

“By the saintly bones and relics

Scattered through the wide arena;

Yea, the holy coat of Jesus,

And the foot of Magdalena.”

Menu, the great lawgiver of the East, the son of the Self-existent, as he is termed in the sacred books of the Hindus, ordains that the judge, having assembled the witnesses in the court, should in the presence of the plaintiff and defendant address them as follows:

“What ye know to have been transacted in the matter before tus, between to parties reciprocally, declare at large and with truth, for your evidence is required.

“The witness who speaks falsely shall be fast bound under water in the sinaky cords of Varuna, and he shall be wholly deprived of power to escape torment during a hundred transmigrations; let mankind give therefore no false testimony.

“Naked and shorn, tormented with hunger and thirst, and deprived of sight, shall the man who gives false testimony go with a potsherd to beg bread at the door of his enemy. Headlong and in utter darkness shall the inmpious wretch tumble into hell, who, being interrogated in a judicial inquiry, answers one question falsely.

“The priest must be sworn by his veracity; the soldier by his horse, or elephant, or weapons; the merchant by his kine, grain, and gold; the mechanic, or servile man by imprecating on his head, if he speak falsely, all possible crimes.”

In this code the guilt of perjury varies in intensity according to the subject- matter of testimony.

“By false testimony concerning cattle in general, the witness incurs the guilt of killing five men; he kills ten by false. testimony concerning kine; he kills a hundred by false testimony concerning horses; and a thousand by false testimony concerning the human race.”

But what is human life compared with gold, or with land? The scale rises, the atrocity increases:

“By speaking falsely in a cause concerning gold, he kills, or incurs the guilt of killing, the born and unborn; by speaking falsely concerning land, he kills everything animated. Beware, then, of speaking falsely concerning land. Marking well all the murders  which are comprehendied in the crime of perjury, declare the whole truth as it was heard and as it was seen by thee.”

Notwithstanding all this, pious falsehood — for instance, perjury to save life which would be forfeited by the rigor of the law — is not merely allowed, but approved, and eulogistically termed “the speech of the gods.”

“To a woman on a proposal of marriage, in the case of grass or fruit eaten by a cow, of wood taken for a sacrifice, or of a promise made for the preservation of a Brahmin, it is no deadly sin, to take a slight oath.”

Somewhat famous has been the lubricity of lovers' oaths. The lover swore, indeed; but, as was said by the Greeks, oaths made in love never enter into the ears of the gods. This, probably, is the only code not only allowing and approving falsehoods by lovers, but by others. Various are the modes of administering an oath. A cow is sometimes brought into court, that the witness may have the satisfaction of swearing with her tail in his hand; the' leaf of the sweet basil and the waters of the Ganges are swallowed; the witness holds fire, or touches the head of his children or wife; while the less orthodox followers of Brahmin, those of the jungle tribes, impressed with the belief that if they swear falsely, they shall be food for tigers, are sworn in the skin of one. — Among the Mohammedans the oath is administered with the Koran on the head of the witness; but it is not binding illness taken in the express name of the Almighty, and then it is incomplete unless the witness, after having given in his evidence, again swears that he has spoken nothing but the truth. The oath is not worthy of credit unless taken in the name of God; and the swearer must corroborate it by reciting the attributes of God, as, “I swear by the God besides whom there is no other righteous God, who is acquainted with what is hidden,” etc.

Much of the judicial proceedings of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors rested upon oaths, and the punishment for their violation was severe. The perjurer was declared unworthy of the ordeal, was incompetent as a witness, denied Christian burial, and classed with witches, murderers, and the most obnoxious members of society. Oaths were administered to the complainant in criminal proceedings, and to the accused. The oath of the complainant was as follows: “In the Lord, I accuse not N either from hate, or art, or unjust avarice, nor do I know anything more true; but .so my mind said to me, and I myself tell for, truth that he was the thief of my  goods.” The accused swore as follows: “In the Lord, I am innocent, both in word and deed, of that charge of which P accused me.” The oath of the witness was: “In the name of Almighty God, as I stand here a true witness, unbidden and unbought, so I oversaw it with mine eyes, and even heard it in my ears, what I have said.” From this it would appear that, in those early days before the inveterate chicanery of Norman jurisprudence had cursed English soil, it was usual to swear the parties — those who knew something about the matter. The different oaths of modern Europe — ordeal oaths, oaths of compurgators, decisory oaths, oaths of calumny, oaths military and masonic-might well deserve attention; but we have already, perhaps, occupied too much attention in reverting to the forms and usages of the past. There are but two instances of nations among whom oaths have not been adopted in judicial proceedings. Among the Chinese no oath is exacted by the magistrate upon the delivery of testimony. When they question each other's testimony, appeals to the gods are only made by cutting off the head of a fowl and wishing they may thus suffer, or blowing out a candle, and wishing they may thus be extinguished, if they do not speak the truth. The other instance is to be found in the code of laws formed with great judgment and much discrimination by the missionaries at Tahiti, where, we believe, oaths have for the first time been abolished by Christian people (comp. Ellis, Polynesian Researches, p. 150).

The form of oaths in Christian countries varies greatly, but in no country in the world are they worse contrived, either to convey the meaning or impress the obligation of an oath, than in Great Britain and America. The juror with us, after repeating the promise or affirmation which the oath is intended to confirm, adds, “So help me God;” or, more frequently, the substance of the oath is repeated to the juror by the magistrate, who adds in the conclusion, “So help you God.” The energy of this sentence resides in the particle so — that is, hac lege, upon condition of my speaking the truth or performing this promise, and not otherwise, may God help me! The juror, while he hears or repeats the words of the oath, holds his right hand upon a Bible, or other book containing the Gospels, and at the conclusion kisses the book. This obscure and elliptical form, together with the levity and frequency of oaths, has brought about a general inadvertency to the obligation of them, which, both in a religious and political view, is much to be lamented; and it merits public consideration whether the requiring of oaths upon so many frivolous occasions, especially in the customs and in the qualification of petty offices, has any other effect than  to make such sanctions cheap in the minds of the people. A stranger among us would imagine it was a precept of our religion to swear always, at all times and on all occasions. Not an executive officer, from the president to a marshal, from a governor to a constable; not ajudicial officer, from the chief-justice to the lowest magistrate known to the law; not a member of our numerous legislative assemblies not an officer of the army or navy; not a soldier or sailor enlisting, but is sworn in certain set and prescribed formulas.

A sworn assessor is required to assess our taxes, a sworn collector to collect, and a sworn treasurer to receive the money collected. Not a lot of land is levied upon without the intervention of oaths. The whole custom-house department is rife with them. As has been well said, “Not a pound of tea can travel regularly from the ship to the consumer without costing half a dozen oaths at least.” Through all the innumerable gradations of life official, civil, military, executive, and judicial the oath is the established security by which, in their respective spheres, they are all bound to the performance of their several duties-and that, too, by a people, one of the clearest precepts of whose religion is “Swear not at all;” and when, in many of the above instances, the violation of the several duties sworn to be done and performed is not punishable as perjury. Nor are these the only cases in which the oath is used. No testimony is received in any judicial proceeding until after its administration.

As a security for official faithfulness, or as a preventive of official delinquency, it is notoriously worthless and inoperative. What may be its value in the preserving and promoting of trustworthiness of testimony we propose to consider. Those who advocate the use of oaths should bear in mind that for the purpose of justice it is perfectly immaterial whether the testimony uttered be sworn or unsworn, provided it be true. Before considering the supposed efficiency of an oath,' it may be advisable to see what other and how powerful securities for testimonial veracity are attainable without resort to this supernatural agency... “Truth is the naturial language of all it is the general rule; falsehood the rare and occasional exception: Even of those least regardful of veracity, truth is the ordinary and common language. The greatest liar, no matter how depraved he may be, usually speaks the truth. And why? Invention is the work of labor. To narrate facts in the order of their occurrence, to tell what has been seen or heard, is what obviously occurs to any one. To avoid doing this is a work of difficulty. Falsely to add to what has occurred, carefully to insert a dexterous lie, requires ingenuity, greater or less, according to the greater or less degree of skill with which the lie is dovetailed among the truths that  surround it. No matter how cunning the artificer, the web cannot be so woven that the stained and colored thread cannot be seen. Love of ease, fear of labor, the physical sanction, are always seen cooperating with truth. Any motive, however slight and even infinitesimal, is or may be sufficient to induce action in a right direction, except when overborne by other and superior motives in a sinister direction. By a sort of impulse, by the very course of nature, the usual tendency of speech is in the line of truth. Regard for public opinion, the pain and shame universally attendant upon the ignominy attached to falsehood detected, the disgrace of the liar — in other words, the moral and popular sanction, with but rare and accidental exceptions — is found tending in the same direction.

Much the greater part of what is known, is known only from the testimony of others. Our necessities, the necessities of others and of social intercourse, require that, for our own preservation as well as for that of others, the truth should be told. Hence among all nations, barbarous and civilized, and among civilized in proportion to their advancement, the term Liar has been one of deep reproach, never used without inflicting pain on the person to whom it is applied. However great the disgrace, it is immeasurably increased when the occasion upon which the falsehood is uttered is a judicial one. The more important the occasion, the greater the public indignation and scorn attached to its violation. The law regarding veracity, which is peculiarly desirable in judicial investigations, may impose severe penalties for false testimony — mendacity — penalties varying in degree of severity according to the aggravation of the offense, and thus may furnish additional sanction to and security for testimonial trustworthiness. It may happen that the statement of a witness, while true in part, may be defective in detail, either by the omission of true or the utterance of false particulars. Correctness and completeness are both included in perfect veracity. Incorrect in part, incomplete to any material extent, the evils of such incompleteness and incorrectness, when not the result of design, may be as great as those of deliberate and intentional falsehood, How best to attain those indispensable requisites is the problem, the solution of which becomes so important in the practical administration of the law. How best to compel the reluctant an d evasive witness; how to quicken the careless and indifferent; how to check and restrain the rash and presumptuous; how to convict the deliberately and wilfully false; how to extort from reluctant lips the truth, and nothing but the truth — by what processes these results may be attained, is the great question; Interrogation and cross- interrogation — rigid, severe, and scrutinizing-under a proper system of  procedure, confirmed and strengthened by the sanctions already alluded to, are the securities upon which all real and substantial reliance must be placed. The ordinary motives to veracity, without the aid of cross- examination, and unaccompanied by fear of punishment in case of falsehood, are found sufficient in the common affairs of life to produce veracity. The extraordinary security afforded by punishment, compulsory examinations and cross-examinations, would seem to suffice in the case of evidence judicially given. As, however, testimony is judicially given only updn and after the ceremony called an oath, it is only punishable, if false, after the oath has been legally administered. This is not necessarily so; for, if the legislature should so will, the temporal punishment might as well be inflicted without as with an oath.”

Having briefly considered the temporal securities for truth, it now remains to ascertain the real significance and true value of the oath as a preventive of testimonial mendacity.

“‘What is universally understood by an oath,' says lord , Hardwicke, is that the person who undertakes imprecates the vengeance of God upon himself if the oath he takes be false.' ‘An oath,' says Michaelis, ‘is an appeal to God is a surety and the punisher of perjury; which appeal, as he has accepted, he of course becomes bound to vindicate upon a perjured person irremissibly.' ‘Were not God to take upon himself to guarantee oaths, an appeal to him in swearing would be foolish and sinful. He undertakes to guarantee it, and is the avenger of perjury, if not in this world, at any rate in the world to come.' By the use, then, of this ceremony, the Deity is engaged, or it is assumed that he is engaged, in case of a violation of the oath, to inflict punishment of an uncertain and indefinite degree of intensity — at some remote period of time, in some indefinite place, according to the varying and conflicting theological notions of those holding this belief — notions varying according to the time when and place where they are entertained, and the education and character of those entertaining them. It cannot be questioned that the Deity will punish for falsehood, whether judicially or extra-judicially uttered; nor that such punishment, whatever it may be, whensoever, wheresoever, or howsoever inflicted, will be junstitting, and appropriate. Were the ceremony not used, were unsworn testimony delivered, subject to temporal punishment, were all oaths abolished, false testimony, so far as this world is concerned, would be as injurious as if uttered under the sanction of an oath.

The injurious effects in the administration of justice would be the same. The unsworn witness  would be amenable to the penalties of the law, as the sworn witness is now. Now, what is accomplished by the oath? The falsehood and its disastrous effects to the course of justice are the same whether the oath has been taken or not, the temporal punishment is or maybe made the same. The oath, if effective, therefore, is only effective so far as future punishment is concerned, which, inconsequence of its administration, will thereby be increased or diminished-for if the future punishment were to remain the same, then nothing would have been effected; the oath would be a mere idle ceremony-telumque imbelle sine ictu. That punishment hereafter will thereby be diminished, no one will pretend, certainly not those who repose confidence in the efficacy of this sanction. If it be increased, then, and then only, is the ceremony effective — then only is a valid reason given for its adoption. The falsehood being the same, whether the testimony be sworn or unsworn, the punishment for the falsehood itselfmust necessarily be the same. For if falsehood be a proper subject of punishment, when the effects are the same, the lie will be punished without as well as with any ceremony preparatory to its utterance. If, then, an increase of punishment will be inflicted, it must be for the profanation of the ceremony, and nothing else.

All that is alleged, then, to have been accomplished is that an increased amount of punishment is to be inflicted simply for the violation of a ceremony, and entirely irrespective and regardless of any evils flowing from the falsehood. No sanction for truth is really obtained. But in what does the binding force of oan oath consist? When Jephthah, returning in triumph, was met by his daughter with timbrels and dances, was Jephthah under any obligation to perform the vow he had made, to offer up for a burnt offering whatsoever should come forth from the doors of his house to meet him? If yea, such obligation arose not from the rightfulness or propriety of the matter vowed, for that was a dark and atrocious murder, ‘for she was his only child; besides her he had neither son nor daughter.' The performance, if required, was required solely in consequence of the vow, ‘For I have opened my mouth to the Lord, and cannot go back.' If nay, if the vow was not to be performed, then does it not follow that it is the fitness of the thing sworn to be done or not which is the basis of the obligation, and upon which its binding force rests? When Herod, pleased with the dancing of the daughter of Herodias,' ‘promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would,' and when she requested the head of. John the Baptist in a charger, was he thereby bound to give it to her?  “Mohammed says, when you swear to do a thing, and afterwards find it better to do otherwise, do that which is better, and make void your oath. The very definitions of an oath show that, by reason and in consequence of an oath, the Deity becomes bound to punish a perjured person irremissibly.

History, too, shows that obligations upon man, and so, too, upon the Deity, arising from the oath, varied, or were supposed to vary, in intensity, according to the changing forms and circumstances attendant upon its administration. When Robert, the pious king of France, abstracted the holy relics from the cases upon which the oath was taken, and substituted therefor the egg of an ostrich, as being an innocent object, and in capable of taking vengeance on those who should swear falsely, he might have been correct as to the incapacity of the egg; but did he thereby save his subject from perjury, or avert the punishment of the Deity? When Harold, shuddering, saw the bones and relics of saints and martyrs, real or fictitious, upon which he had unconsciously sworn, were the obligations he had assumed increased by their unknown presence? Or was it the unreasoning fear of abject superstition which led him to believe that he had thus immeasurably increased the dangers of superhuman punishment? Indeed, when men consider they are under obligation to utter the truth or not, as they stand upon a tiger's skin or hold in their hand the tail of a cow; as they have their hat on or off; as certain spurious relics of fictitious saints are closed in the pyx or not; as the lips touch the thumb or the book; as the book has, or not, a cross upon it — who is there so wise as to affirm that the person so swearing does not believe that the virtue resides, or is considered by those believing, to reside in the ceremony, and in that alone? that the thing sworn to be done or not done, and its propriety, are not even matters deemed worthy of thought? Or, as Mr. JunLin has aptly said, ‘No one pretends that the material of a book — the leather, the paper, the cord, the ink is God, and yet many, hei; the book (Bible) is used, lift their thoughts no higher.' (This position has, however, been questioned by the editor of the Princeton Review, Jan. 1846, p. 176 sq.) Now, can it be possible that by acts of idolatry the obligation to utter truth is increased? Is not truth eternal and immutable? Is not the duty to utter the truth, and nothing but the truth, paramount and prior to all oaths?

The oath may be the same, so far as the ceremony is concerned, either to utter the truth or a falsehood, but is the .obligation the same? If the obligation rests on, the oath, each alike must be performed as sworn. If it rests on the rightfulness of the thing to be done, then why add the oath?  “The oath is not without its accompanying evils. By imposing punishment only when it has been administered, it lessens the iniportance of and the respect due to truth, in. statements uttered extra-judicially, and gives an implied license to falsehood out of court. The truth seems only to be specially requisite in the case of an oath, otherwise it is comparatively immaterial. Charles Lamb, in his quaint and quiet way, and with great humor and truth, says, The custom of resorting to an oath in extreme cases is apt to introduce into the laxer sort of minds the notion of two kinds of truth: the one applicable to the solemn affairs of justice, and the other to the common proceedings of daily intercourse. As truth, bound upon the conscience by an oath, can be but truth, so, in the common affirmations of the shop and the market, a latitude is expected and conceded upon questions wanting this solemn covenant. Something less than the truth satisfies. It is common for a person to say, You do not expect me to speak as if I were upon my oath. Hence, a kind of secondary or laic truth is tolerated when clerical truth, oath truth, is not required: A Quaker knows none of these distinctions.' Not very dissimilar was the idea of St. Basil, that ‘it is a very foul and silly thing for a man to accuse himself as unworthy of belief, and to proffer an oath for security.' The oath, too, is a disturbing force in giving the just degree of weight to testimony. It tends to place all testimony upon the same level, to cause equal credence to be given to all, because all have passed through the same ceremony. The attention of the court or the judge is withdrawn from the just appreciation, of the grounds of belief or disbelief in the evidence. The same ceremony for all, the tendency is to believe that its force is the same upon all, and thus the bad receive undue credence, while the good are reduced to the standard of the bad.

“In what does the difference consist between judicial and extra-judicial falsehood? The consequences of the latter may be more or less injurious than those of the former; the injury greater, the loss in the latter case of property, reputation, or even life, in the former of a few shillings, it may be; is the falsehood judicially uttered the greater offense? To suffer the same by the utterance of the same words in court or out of court, in the street or on the stand, with or without assenting with upraised hand to certain words, in what is the difference to the loser, or the general injury to the community? Why in one case punish, in the other exempt from punishment? Does it not degrade the general standard of veracity? does it not create the notion that truth is not expected on ordinary occasions, but  is only required as a sort of court language? What are the lessons of experience? To determine the real value of this sanction, one must abstract all those concurring and cooperating securities which alone are of real importance, but which, not being estimated at their value, give this an unnatural and undeserved efficiency.

Take away public opinion; let falsehood be regarded with as much indifference as among the Hindus; remove all fear of temporal punishment in case of testimonial falsehood; abolish the test of crossexamination; leave the willing or unwilling witness to state more or less, according to the promptings of his inclination, and you then see the measure of security for trustworthiness derivable from the oath. When the oath-sanction is in accordance with the other securities of trustworthiness, its weakness is not perceived. Let the religious cease to be in conformity with the popular sentiment or even with convenience, and its violation is looked on with indifference or even complacency. ‘If you wish,' says Bentham, ‘to have powder of post taken for an efficacious medicine, try it with opium and antimony; if you wish to have it taken for what it is, try it by itself.' Definite, certain, immediate punishment alone is powerful to restrain or coerce. The future, enshrouded in darkness, yields to the present. The fear of punishment hereafter to he imposed for falsehood, without oath, or with oaths, so far as it may be increased thereby, is a motive of little strength. The uncertainty whether any will be inflicted, the unalterable ignorance as to what the amount may be, or when in time or where in space it is to be inflicted, render it a security untrustworthy and powerless in its action upon even the most intelligent and conscientious, while unaided and unsupported by other sanctions. The oaths of Oxford University have been taken by the most cultivated minds of Europe; by those who, in after-life, attained the highest dignities of the Church or the State; by those who, from their station, their education and intelligence, would be least likely to disregard their obligation. These oaths required obedience to statutes framed centuries ago by and for a ‘set of monks, and are about as consonant with the present state of society as the monkish costume would be to a general-in-chief at the head of his army. Consequently, they are not merely not observed. but their observance would be a matter of astonishment to all, equally to those sworn to observe and those sworn to require their observance. Another habitual violation of oaths has been seen in the conduct of English judges and juries in the administration of the criminal law. The English code was written in blood.

Draco would have shuddered at the multiplicity of its bloody enactments. Death was inflicted in case of larceny dependent upon .the value of the  thing stolen. With greater regard to the dictates of humanity than to their oath — obligations, juries, at the suggestion of the court, and for the express purpose of evading the law, have intentionally returned the article stolen as of less than its true value, to avoid the punishment of death, which otherwise would have been the penalty in case of conviction. Unanimity, too, is required in juries. A difference of opinion exists; in most contested cases of much complexity it is likely to exist. The really dissenting minority yield to the majority. The court aid or advise, and if advice will not serve, compel agreement by partial starvation; thus bringing physical wants to their aid to coerce real opinion. The open and profligate violation of custom-house oaths has attracted so much attention that in England they have been abolished. In this country a bill to that effect, with the approbation of the late John Quincy Adams, was introduced, but we believe it was defeated.

“A committee of the British Parliament, in their report on the judicial affairs of British India, recommended the abolition of oaths, on the ground that their moral sanction does not add to the value of native testimony, Hindu or Mohammedan; that the only practical restraint on perjury is the fear of punishment, imposed by law for that offense, and that the fear of consequences in a future state, or the loss of character or reputation among their own countrymen, has little effect upon the great majority of the people in securing true and honest testimony, when they may be influenced by the bias of fear, favor, affection, or reward.

The legal exclusion consequent upon, and caused by the oath, affords an unanswerable argument against its use. Most nations, in the spirit of religious bigotry and barbarian exclusiveness, so characteristic of unenlightened legislation, have excluded as witnesses those whose faith differ from their own. The government, determining what shall be the faith, decrees that dissidents shall be branded as infidels. The term infidel expresses merely dissent or disbelief, without reference to the truth Or falsehood of the thing disbelieved. It is the epithet which majorities apply to minorities, and consequently one of reproach. Justinian excluded infidels. Hindus and Mohammedans excluded infidels, because of their infidelity, and, by way of reprisal, they in their turn were excluded by Christians for the same cause. Such was the common law, as drawn from its purest fountains — from Fileta and Bracton. Coke, its greatest expounder, excludes them as unworthy of credit; for, says he, they are perpetual enemies as between them, as with the devils, whose subjects they are, and Christians, there is  perpetual hostility, and can be no peace; for, as the apostle said, “And what concord hath Christ with Belial, or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel.” It was not until the East India Company commenced that splendid career of conquest by which they acquired dominion over millions of subjects, and it was seen that an urgent necessity required the testimony of the natives, that the court, overruling the well-established law of ages, threw Bracton and Fleta overboard, because they were papists, and because in their day ‘little trade was carried on but the trade in religion; and in the suit of Omichunld, the great Hindu banker, whose melancholy fate reflects little credit on British faith, against Baker, by an act of judge- made law, decided that all infidels, without reference to their religion, might be received and sworn, according to the customs of their respective countries; not because such was the law, but because to exclude them would be a ‘most impolitic notion, and would tend at once to destroy all trade and commerce.' Even judicial optics, with dim and beclouded vision, saw that if the whole population of a country were ‘excluded as infidels, proof might be deficient; but as it was thought to be to ‘the advantage of the nation to carry on trade and commerce in foreign countries, and in many countries inhabited by heathens,' it was judged advisalle to trample the law under foot. A judicial caveat, however, was at the same time entered against giving the same credit, either by court or jury, to an infidel witness as to a Christian; provided only the wrath of God be imprecated, whether Vishnu or Fo, or any other of the innumerable gods of heathenism. But in none of them does the Christian repose faith. The witness imprecating the vengeance of false gods, of gods who will not answer, what is the belief of the Christian?

That the true God will as much hear and punish in consequence of the use of this ceremony, and for its violation, as if the adjuration had been in his name. If so, then are the magic virtues of the oath more enhanced, being compulsory upon the Deity, even when his name is not invoked? If not, then why swear the witness in the name of false gods? Why give a judicial sanction to superstition and idolatry by invoking false gods? why not rather let testimony be delivered under the pains and penalties of perjury, and let that suffice? Yet, by the common law, the swearer by broken cups and saucers, or he who thinks truths obligatory only when he has held the tail of the sacred cow, was heard when the oath was administered; while the intelligent and pious Quaker, who, in the simplicity of his heart, was so heretical as to believe that the command, ‘Swear not at all,' meant what its obvious language imports, was excluded, because he believed the divinity of the command he was  anxious to obey. He was thus left without protection to his person or property, unless he should be able to find a witness outside the pale of his sect by whom his legal rights could be established. But by that patchwork legislation so eminently distinguishing all law reform, an act was passed, and the law so amended — that a Quaker, when property was endangered, was admitted to. testify — but in cases of property alone, his testimony not being admissible in criminal cases. In this country, however, the legislature has removed the disqualification entirely; the absurdity is that it should ever have existed. These limited reforms do not afford a complete remedy for the evil. The incorrectness of religious belief is not the ground of exclusion; for, if so, one would think Hinduism sufficiently erroneous for that purpose. The theological jurist view's with more complacency the worst forms of paganism than a question alle variety of Christianity or entire unbelief. The only required qualification, in his view, is belief in future punishment, of which, in some aspect, there must be a recognition. If, believing the general doctrines of Christianity, the person sworn is so unfortunate as to believe that the cares and sorrows and misfortunes of this life are a sufficient punishment for transgressions here committed, and that God, in his infinite goodness and mercy, will hereafter receive all into a state of happiness, the common law excludes his testimony.

The judicial dabbler in theology in this country has generally followed the lead of transatlaitic jurisprudence. But whether the Universalist be a witness or not, all authorities agree that he who disbelieves in the existence of God, who, in the darkness of his beclouded reason, sees no God in the earth, teeming with its various and innumerable forms of animal or vegetable life, sees him not in the starry firmament — nor yet in the existence of man, the most wonderful of his works — is excluded. Atheism is always rare, yet we have, three times in one country, known the attempt made to exclude for that cause. The general bad character of the witness for truth and veracity affords no ground for exclusion, however much it may be for disbelief in testimony; but even if it did, it would not have been established in those cases. Erroneous belief was the only reason urged. The error of such belief, or want of belief, may not merely be conceded, but the entertaining of such sentiments may be deemed the misfortune of one's life. But because one of the securities for truth may be wanting, it is difficult to perceive why, all others remaining in ill force and vigor, the witness should not be heard; and why after, not, as the common law does, before such hearing, some judgment should not be formed by those who are to decide upon the matter in dispute of the truth or falsehood of his statements. He is rejected only  because he is disbelieved. If he is to be believed when the truth uttered would expose him to reproach and ignominy, why not hear him under more favorable circumstances when the rights of others may be involved, and then judge? Exclude him, and any outrage may be committed upon him — his property may be robbed, his wife may be violated, his child maybe murdered before his eyes — and the guilty go unpunished, if he be the only witness; not because he cannot and will not tell the truth, but because the law will not hear him. Practically, the law is that, provided a man's belief be erroneous, anybody whose belief is better — and it matters little what it be, Hinduism or Fetichism — may inflict any and all conceivable injuries on his person and property, and the laws will permit such a person to go unpunished, unless there happens to be a witness whose belief should comport with the judicial idea of competency. Let the witness testify under the pains and penalties of perjury, and the great argument for the wholesale exclusion of testimony by the law is done away with. No intelligent judge or juryman ever relied upon the security of an oath alone. Judge of the witness by his appearance, manner, answers, the probability of his statements, comparing them with the lights derivable from every source. Punish falsehood injuriously affecting the rights of others in proportion to the wrong done, not with one uniform measure of punishment, as if the offense were in all cases the same. Tolerate not two kinds of truth, the greater and lesser, else both are lost. Elevate the standard of veracity by requiring it on all occasions, and in this way public morality is increased, and the real securities upon which the social fabric rests are strengthened.”

It may be added in defense of those who approve of the practice of judicial swearing, that such look upon the oath as a reminder of the obligation to tell the truth only, a duty which they claim “man is too prone to forget.”' The object of all forms of adjuration, they teach, “should be to show that we are not calling the attention of man to God; that we are not calling upon him to punish the wrong-doer, but upon man to remember that he will” (Tyler, p. 14). In this sense the oath should be defined as “an outward pledge given by the juror that his assertion or promise is made under an immediate sense of his responsibility to God.” Those who approve of oaths teach that God will punish false swearing with more severity than a simple lie or breach of promise, and assign for their belief the following reasons: — “1. Perjury is a sin of greater deliberation. 2. It violates a superior confidence. 3. God directed the Israelites to swear by his name (Deu 6:13; Deu 10:20), and was pleased to confirm his covenant  with that people by an oath; neither of which, it is probable, he would have done had he not intended to represent oaths as having some meaning and effect beyond the obligation of a bare promise.” SEE PERJURY. Promissory oaths, it is generally agreed, are not binding where the promise itself would not be so. SEE PROMISES. As oaths are designed for the security of the imposer, it is manifest that they must be interpreted and performed in the sense in which the imposer intends them.

Refusals to take the oath have been frequent in modern times, but mainly in English-speaking countries. Of Protestants, the Anabaptists were the first to teach that oaths should not be taken. The Mennonites also held thus. Like them, the Quakers and the Moravians, applying literally the words of Christ (Mat 5:34), regard all oaths as unlawful. But other, communions generally restrict this prohibition to ordinary and private discourse, and find in Rom 1:9; 2Co 11:21; Gal 1:20; Php 1:8; and 1Th 2:5, full warrant for the lawfulness of oaths in judicial and other solemn use. From some passages of the fathers it appears that they had scruples as to the lawfulness of swearing (comp. Browne, Exposition of the XXXIX Artices, p. 840-843); but those Christians who advocate the ceremony explain the writings of these fathers as for the most part referring to the oaths required of Christians by the pagans, which generally involved a recognition of particular pagan divinities; and that they condemned these pagan oaths, rather as involving, or even directly containing, a profession of the popular paganism, than as unlawful in themselves. The Christians of the later ages may perhaps be said to have multiplied in an opposite degree the occasions of oaths, especially of what were called “purgatorial” oaths, in which, a party charged with a crime justified himself by swearing his innocence. These oaths were commonly accompanied by some imprecatory form or ceremonial, and were often expected to be followed by immediate manifestations of the divine vengeance upon the perjurer. The common instrument of attestation On oath was the Bible, or some portion of it; but oaths were sometimes sworn on the relics of saints, or other sacred objects; sometimes simply by raising the hand to heaven, or by laying it upon the breast or the head. In canonical processes the oath was often administered to the party kneeling. The forms varied very much, the most general being that which the English oath still retains (Sic me Deus adjuvet). Divines commonly require, in order to the lawfulness of an oath, three conditions  (founded upon Jer 4:2), viz. truth, justice, and judgment; that is to say,

(1) that the asseveration, if the oath be assertive, shall be true, and that the promise, if the oath be promissory, shall be made and shall be kept in good faith,

(2) that the thing promised shall be objectively lawful and good;

(3) that the oath shall not be sworn without due discretion and deliberation, nor without satisfactory reasons founded on necessity, or at least on grave and manifest utility.

Hence the person who is a witness must have sufficient understanding to know the nature and obligations of an oath; and on this ground young children are incompetent to be witnesses. Another condition or qualification required in the party who takes an oath as a witness is, that he has a competent sense of religion; in other words, he must not only have some religious knowledge, but some religious belief. He must, in substance, believe in the existence of a God, and in the moral government of the world; and though he cannot be questioned minutely as to his particular religious opinions, yet, if it appear that he does not believe in a God and future state, he will not be allowed to give his evidence, for it is assumed that without the religious sanction his testimony cannot be relied upon. So long, however, as a witness appears to possess competent religious belief, the mere form of the oath is not material. The usual practice in the United States and in Great Britain is for the witness, after hearing the oath repeated by the officer of court, to kiss the four gospels by way of assent; and in Scotland the witness repeats similar words after the judge, standing and holding up his right hand, “swearing by Almighty God, as he shall answer to God at the great day of judgment,” but without kissing any book. Jews, if they so desire, are sworn on the Pentateuch, keeping on their hats, and the oath ends with the words, “So help you Jehovah.” A Mohammedan is sworn on the Koran; a Chinese witness has been sworn by kneeling and breaking a China saucer against the witness- box. Thus the mere form of taking the oath is immaterial; the witness is allowed to take the oath in whatever form he considers most binding upon his own conscience — the essential thing being, however, that the witness acknowledge some binding effect derived from his belief in a God or a future state. The policy of insisting upon the religious formalities attending the taking of an oath has been much discussed of late years, and it has been  disputed whether atheists, who avow an entire absence of all religious belief, should be entirely rejected as witnesses (as is sometimes the case), and justice be thereby frustrated. See Paley, Moral Philosophy, vol i, ch. xvi; Grotius, De Jure, I, ll, c. 13, § 21; Barrow, Works, vol. i, ser. 15,; Burnet, Exposition of the 39 Articles of the Church of England, p. 475, 515 sq.; Herport, Essay on Truths of Importance and Doctrine of Oaths; Doddridge, Lectures, lect. 189; Tillotson, 22d Sermon; Wolsely, Unreasonableness of Atheism, p. 152; Blackstone, Commentaries, vol. iii; Junkin, The Oath a Divine Ordinance (N.Y. 1845); Tyler, Oaths, their Origin, Nature, and History. On the casuistry of oaths: Sanderson, De Jurament. Oblig. Prcelect. (ed. 1688). See also Literature in Malcom, Theol. Index, s.v., and Notes and Queries, Jan. to June, 1860, and Dec. 1859.

## Oath against Simony[[@Headword:Oath against Simony]]

             Canon 40, in the Church of England, provides the following oath:

“I do swear that I have made no simoniacal payment, contract, or promise, directly or indirectly, by myself or by any other, to my knowledge or with my consent, to any person or persons whatsoever, for or concerning the procuring or obtaining of this ecclesiastical place, preferment, office, or living, nor will at any time hereafter perform or satisfy any such kind of payment, contract, or promise made by any other without my knowledge or consent. So help me God, through Jesus Christ.”

SEE SIMONY.

## Oath of Abjuration[[@Headword:Oath of Abjuration]]

             is a name for the oath which was administered to the subjects of Scotland after the deposition of king James. The obnoxious clause in this oath reads as follows:

“And I do faithfully promise, to the utmost of my power, to support, maintain, and defend the succession of the crown against him, the said James, and all other persons whatsoever, as the same is and stands settled by an act entitled ‘An Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and settling the Succession of the Crown to her present Majesty and the Heirs of her Body, being Protestants;' and as the same, by another act entitled ‘An Act for the further limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject,' is and stands settled.”

SEE NONJURORS.

## Oath of Allegiance[[@Headword:Oath of Allegiance]]

             SEE OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE AND SUPREMACY.

## Oath of Canonical Obedience[[@Headword:Oath of Canonical Obedience]]

             SEE INSTITUTION; SEE OBEDIENCE; SEE ROMANISM.

## Oath of Conformity and Obedience[[@Headword:Oath of Conformity and Obedience]]

             is the title of the vow taken by all beneficed priests, professors, and bishops of the Romish Church. The oaths taken by the priests and professors will be inserted in the article ROMANISM. We make room here only for the bishop's oath, which is translated from the Pontificale. Romanum, published by authority of the popes, and reprinted at Rome in 1869 by the Congregation of Rites and the Propaganda:

“I, N, elect of the Church of N, from this hour henceforward will be faithful and obedient to the blessed Peter the apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our lord, the lord N [Pius], pope N [IX], and to his successors canonically coming in. I will not advise, or consent, or do anything that they may lose life or member, or be taken by an evil deception, or have hands violently laid upon them in any way, or have injuries ofered to them under any pretense whatsoever. The counsel indeed which they shall intrust to me, by themselves, or by their messengers or letters, I will not, to their harm, knowingly reveal to any one. The Roman papacy and the royalties of St. Peter I will help them to retain and defend, without prejudice to my order, against every man. The legate of the apostolic see, in his going and returning, I will treat honorably and help in his necessities. The rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the pope, and of his aforesaid successors, I will take care to preserve, defend, increase, and promote. Nor will I be in any counsel, or deed, or working, in which any thing may be contrived against our lord himself or the said Roman Church, to the injury or prejudice of  their persons, right, honor, state, and power. And if I shall know such things to be taken in hand or managed by any whomsoever, I will hinder this as far as I cans; and as soon as I shall be able , will make it known to our said lord, or to some other one by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy fathers, the decrees, ordinances, or dispositions, reservations, provisions, and mandates apostolical, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels against our said lord or his aforesaid successors I will, as far as I can, follow after (persequar) and fight against. When called to a synod I will come, unless I shall be prevented by a canonical impediment. I will myself personally visit the thresholds of the apostles [i.e. Rome] every three years [this period applies to those in Italy and its vicinity; once in four years is the rule for those in France, Spain, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland, etc.; once in five years for those in remoter parts of Europe, in North Africa, etc.; once in ten years for those in Asia, America, etc. — thus the Pontificale Romanumn determines]; and I will render to our lord and his aforesaid successors an account of my whole pastoral office, and of all things in anywise pertaining to the state of my Church, to the discipline of the clergy and people, finally to the salvation of the souls committed to my trust; and I will in turn humbly receive and with the utmost diligence perform the apostolic commands. But if I shall be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger specially authorized for this purpose, one of my chapter, or some other one placed in ecclesiastical dignity, or else having a parsonage; or, if these are lacking to me, by a priest of the diocese; and if the clergy are altogether lacking, by some other secular or regular presbyter, of tried honesty and piety, well instructed in all the above-named subjects. In respect to an impediment of this sort, however, I will give information by legitimate proofs, to be transmitted by the aforesaid messenger to the cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the Congregation of the Sacred Council. Assuredly the possessions belonging to my table I will not sell, nor give away, nor pledge, nor enfeoff anew, or in any way alienate, even with the consent of the chapter of my Church, without consuling the Roman pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I desire by that very act  to incur the penalties set forth in a certain constitution published on this subject. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.”

At the solicitation of the bishops in council assembled at Baltimore in 1846, the pope of Rome “consented,” according to archbishop Kenrick, “to the omission of the feudal phrases, and sanctioned a simpler formulary to be used by all the bishops in' the United States.” Yet a gentleman who was present at the consecration ceremonies of bishop Bailey and others on Oct. 30, 1853, was confident that the longer oath given in the Pontificale Romanum, which he held in his hand at the time, was taken by the bishops elect, and the decrees of the plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866 contain no modification of the oath. It is believed that nothing regarded as essential was omitted then or is omitted now. We give the oath as reported taken by the bishops elect at that date according to the New York Times, Oct. 31, 1853:

“The bishops elect then knelt and severally read the following oath [in Latin]: ‘Elect of the Church of N, I will from this hour henceforward be obedient to blessed Peter the apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to the blessed father, pope N, and to his successors canonically chosen. I will assist them to retain and defend against any man whatever the Roman pontificate, without prejudice to my rank. I will take care to preserve, defend, and promote the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of the pope, and of his successors as aforesaid, With my whole strength I will observe, and came to be observed by others, the rules of the holy fathers, the decrees, ordinances, or dispositions, and mandates of the apostolic see. When called to a synod I will come, unless prevented by a canonical impediment. I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger specially authorized for this purpose, a priest of the diocese, or by some secular or regular priest of tried virtue and piety, well instructed on all the above subjects. I will not sell, nor give away, nor mortgage, enfeoff anew, nor in any way alienate the possessions belonging to my table, without the leave of the Roman pontiff. And should I proceed to any alienation of them, I am willing to contract, by the very fact, the penalties specified in the constitution published on this subject.' The consecrator held the Gospels open on his lap, and received the oath from the bishops elect, who, kneeling, also placed both hands upon the book, and said, ‘So may God help me, and these holy Gospels of God.'  “The bishop elect and the assistant bishops now took their seats; and while the consecrator read aloud the examen. [examination] the assistant bishops accompanied his words in a low voice. The concluding questions were answered by the bishops elect. ‘ It ex toto corde, volo in omnibus consentire et obedire' [Thus from my whole heart I desire in all things to consent and to obey].

“Among the questions in the examination are the following:

“Consec. — ‘Wilt thou teach, both by word and example, the people for whom thou art to be ordained those things which thou understandest from the holy Scriptuies?'

“Elect. — ‘ I will.'

“Qu. — ‘Wilt thou with veneration receive, teach, and keep the traditions of the orthodox fathers and the decretal constitutions of the holy and apostolic see ?'

“Ans. — ‘I will.'

“Qu. — ‘Wilt thou exhibit in all things fidelity, subjection, and obedience, according to canonical authority, to the blessed Peter the apostle, to whom was given by God the power of binding and loosing: and to his vicar, our lord pope Pius IX, and to his successors the Roman pontiffs?'

“Ans. — ‘I will.'”

The examination having closed, the bishops elect were led to the consecrator, before whom they knelt, and reverently kissed his hand. Monsignor Bedini, laying off his mitre, turned to the altar and commenced the mass, the bishops elect being at his left hand, and the assistant bishops at their seats. See Barnum, Romanism, p. 271, 272. 2

## Oath of Purgation[[@Headword:Oath of Purgation]]

             In an ecclesiastical process, when full proof is not to be had against a person accused and strongly suspected, he is allowed at length to clear himself by an oath:

“I, A B, now under process before the Session of the Congregation of C for the sin of , alleged to have been committed by me: For ending said process, and giving satisfaction to all, do declare,  before God and this session, that I am innocent and free of the said sin of charged against me. And I hereby call the great God, the judge and avenger of all falsehood, to be witness, and judge against me in this matter if I be guilty. And this I do by taking his blessed name in my mouth, and swearing by him who is the searcher of the heart, and that in sincerity, according to the truth of the matter and my own innocence, as I shall answer at the great day of judgment, when I stand before him to answer for all that I have done in the flesh, and as I would partake of his glory in heaven after this life is at an end.”

## Oath of Supremacy[[@Headword:Oath of Supremacy]]

             SEE OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE AND SUPREMACY.

## Oath of a Christian[[@Headword:Oath of a Christian]]

             See the last of the SEE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

## Oath, Burgess[[@Headword:Oath, Burgess]]

             an old oath in some Scottish burghs. It was:

“Here I protest before God and your lordships that I profess and allow with my heart the true religion presently professed within this  realm, and authorized by the laws thereof: I shall abide thereat, and defend the same to my life's end, renouncing the Roman religion called papistry.”

## Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy[[@Headword:Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy]]

             The appointment of these oaths was a measure, of defense against the pretensions and practices of Romanism.

1. The Oath of Allegiance (1606), or of submission to the king as temporal sovereign, independently of any earthly power, took its rise from the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot. The Oath of Allegiance is as follows:

“I, A B, do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance to her majesty queen Victoria. So help me God.”

2. The Oath of Supremacy (1559) was connected with the Act of Supremacy, which was entitled “An Act for restoring to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same.” It was the same in effect with an act passed in the reign of Henry VIII, but fell short of that in point of severity. The oath was enjoined to be taken by all ecclesiastics, on penalty of forfeiting their promotions, and of being incapable of holding any public office. The taking of this oath was enforced by a stringent act of Parliament in 1563. The Oath of Supremacy is “I, A B, do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position that princes excommunicated or deprived by the pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no .foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. So help me God” (1 Will. and Mary, cap. 8).

Dispensations for violating oaths form one of the most frightful features of popery. Many theologians and canonists in that Church have inculcated this doctrine. Quotations might be given to this effect from Bailly, Dens, Cajetan, Aquinas, Bernard, and the Jesuits. One specimen may be taken from Dens, whose work is a standard of popery in Ireland. He says a confessor “should assert his ignorance of the truths which he knows only by sacramental confession, and confirm his assertion, if necessary, by oath. Such facts he is to conceal, though the life or safety of a man, or the destruction of the state, depended on the disclosure.” The reason assigned is as extraordinary as the doctrine itself: “The confessor is questioned and answers as a man. This truth, however, he knows not as man, but-as God.” See Willett, Synop. Pap. (Index in vol. vii).

## Obadiah[[@Headword:Obadiah]]

             (Heb. Obadyah', עֹבִדְיָה, servant of Jehovah [1Ch 3:21; 1Ch 7:3; 1Ch 8:38; 1Ch 9:16; 1Ch 9:44; Ezr 8:9; elsewhere the lengthened form, Obadya'hu, עֹבִדְיָהוּ]; Sept. variously , Α᾿βδίας, Α᾿βδιάς, Α᾿βδείας, Α᾿βδία, Α᾿βαδία, Ο᾿βδία, Ο᾿βδιά; v. r. Α᾿βδειάς, Ο᾿βδιάς ), a frequent name among the Hebrews, corresponding to the Arabic Abdallah.

1. The second in order of the eleven lion-faced Gadites, captains of the host, who joined David's standard at Ziklag (1Ch 12:9). B.C. 1054.

2. The father of Ishmaiah, which latter was chief of the tribe of Zebulon in David's reign. (1Ch 27:19). B.C. ante 1014.

3. According to the received text, the third named of the five sons of Izrahiah, a descendant of Issachar, and a chief man of his tribe (1Ch 7:3). Four only, however, are mentioned, and the discrepancy is rectified in four of Kennicott's MSS., which omit the words “and the sons of Izrahiah,” thus making Izrahiah the brother, and not father, of Obadiah. and both sons of Uzzi. The Syriac and Arabic versions follow the received text, but read “four” instead of “five” (Smith). The latter is the less probable reading, as the other can be readily explained as an error of repetition. The five “sons” are doubtless here descendants, of the time of David. B.C. cir. 1014.

4. The second named of five nobles (“princes”) whom king Jehoshaphat sent as itinerant teachers in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:7). B.C. 909.

5. An officer of high rank in the court of Ahab, who is described as “over the house,” that is, apparently, lord high chamberlain, or mayor of the palace (1Ki 18:3). — B.C. cir. 904. His influence with the king must have been, great to enable him to retain his position, though a devout worshipper of Jehovah, during the fierce persecution .of the prophets by Jezebel. At the peril of his life he concealed a hundred of them ins caves, and fed them there with bread and. water. But he himself does not seem to have been suspected (1Ki 18:4; 1Ki 18:13). The occasion upon which Obadiah appears in the history shows the confidential nature of his office. In the third year of the terrible famine with which Samaria was visited, when the fountains and streams were dried up in consequence of the long- continued drought, and horses and mules were perishing for lack of water, Ahab and Obadiah divided the land between them, and set forth, each unattended, to search for whatever remnants of herbage might still be left around the springs and in the fissures of the river-beds. Their mission was of such importance that it could only be entrusted to the two principal persons in the kingdom. Obadiah was startled on his solitary journey by the abrupt apparition of Elijah, who had disappeared since the commencement of the famine, and now commanded him to announce to Ahab, “Behold  Elijah!” He hesitated, apparently afraid that his long-concealed attachment to the worship of Jehovah should thus be disclosed and his life fall a sacrifice. At the same time he was anxious that the prophet should not doubt his sincerity, and appealed to what he had done in the persecution by Jezebel. But Elijah only asserted the more strongly his intention of encountering Ahab, and Obadiah had no choice but to obey (1Ki 18:7-16). The interview and its consequences belong to the history of Elijah (q.v.). According to the Jewish tradition preserved in Ephrem Syrus (Assemani, Bibl. Or. Clem. p. 70), Obadiah the chief officer of Ahab was the same with Obadiah the prophet. He was of Shechem in the land of Ephraim, and a disciple of Elijah, and was the third captain of fifty who was sent by Ahaziah (2Ki 1:13). After this he left the king's service, prophesied, died, and was buried. The “certain woman of the wives of the sons of the prophets” who came to Elisha (2Ki 4:1) was, according to the tradition in Rashi, his widow.

6. The fifth named of the six sons of Azel (1Ch 8:38; 1Ch 9:44), and a descendant of Jonathan, son of Saul, in the tenth generation. B.C. cir. 720.

7. A Merarite Levite, who with Jahath was overseer of the workmen in the restoration of the Temple under Josiah (2Ch 34:12). B.C. 623.

8. The fourth of the minor prophets, according to the arrangement of the Hebrew and English texts, and the fifth in that of the Septuagint. As we know nothing certain of him except what we can gather from the very short prophecy which bears his name, we shall find it most convenient; to consider him personally in connection with his book. In doing this we gather together whatever is available in the ancient testimony with the modern speculations upon it.

I. Date. — The attempts to identify him with one or other of the persons of the same name mentioned in Scripture are mere unfounded conjectures. Entirely baseless also is the suggestion of Augusti (Einleit. § 225) that עבדיה, in the title of this prophecy, is an appellative=a servant of Jehovah, or “some pious person; “for the word is never so used, and all the ancient versions give it as a proper name; nor is there any ground for the assertion of Abarbanel that he was an Idumnean, who, on becoming a proselyte to Judaism, took' the name of servant or worshipper of Jehovah (Praef. in Ezech. p. 153, Colossians 4; see also Jarchi on ver. 1 of the Prophecy).  The: Targum on 2Ki 4:1, and Josephus (Ant. 9:2), followed by Christians, e.g. Jerome, as well as Jews, e.g. Kimchi, Abarbanel, etc., identify this Obadiah with the husband of that woman “of the wives of the sons of the prophets” who sought the protection of Elisha for her two sons from their father's creditor (2Ki 4:1); for of Obadiah, the governor of Ahab's house; it is said that he “feared the Lord greatly,” and of the husband of this widow that he “did fear the Lord;” and it is supposed that the gift of prophecy was conferred on him as a reward for his singular faith and clemency.

The question of his date must depend upon the interpretation of the 11th and 20th verses of his prophecy. He there speaks of the conquest of Jerusalem and the captivity of Jacob. If he is referring to the well-known captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, he must have lived at the time of the Babylonian captivity, and prophesied subsequently to the year B.C. 588. If, further, his prophecy against Edom found its first fulfillment in the conquest of that country by Nebuchadnezzar in the year B.C. 583, we have its date fixed. It must have been uttered at some time in the five years which intervened between these two dates.

Jager (so also Jahn and others) argues at length for an earlier date. He admits that 2Ki 4:11 refers to a capture of Jerusalem, but maintains that it may apply to its capture by Shishak in the reign of Rehoboam (1Ki 14:25; 2Ch 12:2); by the Philistines and Arabians in the reign of Jehoram (2Ch 21:16); by Joash in the reign of Amaziah (25:22): or by the Chaldaeans in the reigns of Jehoiakim and of Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:2; 2Ki 24:10). The Idumseans might, he argues, have joined the enemies of Judah on any of these occasions, as their inveterate hostility from an early date is proved by several passages of Scripture, e.g. Joe 3:19; Amo 1:11. He thinks it probable that the occasion referred to by Obadiah is the capture of Jerusalem by the Ephraimites in the reign of Amaziah (2Ch 25:22). The utmost force of these statements is to prove a possibility. Hengstenberg (Gesch. Bileams, p. 253), Havernick (Einleit. 2:321), and Caspari (Der Proph. Obadjah), while admitting that the prophecy relates to the time of the captivity, would assign an earlier date to its composition, placing that in the reign of Uzziah, and regarding the reference to the Chaldaean invasion as prophetic.

The only argument of any weight for the early date of Obadiah is his position in the list of the books of the minor prophets. Why should he have  been inserted between Amos and Jonah if his date is about B.C. 585? Schnurrer seems to answer this question satisfactorily when he says that the prophecy of Obadiah is an amplification of the last five verses of Amos. and was therefore placed next after the book of Amos. The conclusion in favor of the later date assigned to him is that of most critics, including Pfeiffer, Schnurrer, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Hendewerk, and Maurer, and the English commentators generally.

II. Originality. — The exceeding brevity of this prophecy gives no good reason to regard it (with Eichhorn and others) as only a fragment of a longer writing. It is a compact and complete composition, and has no appearance of having been detached from another work.

From a comparison of Obadiah 2Ch 25:1-4 with Jer 49:14-16; Obadiah Jer 49:6 with Jer 49:9-10; and Obadiah Jer 49:8 with Jer 49:7, it is evident that there was some connection between the two works. It is not easy observes Calmet, to decide whether one of the two was copied from the other, or whether both were borrowed from a common source (see Horne's Introd. 2:955, 10th ed.); but from the fact that Jeremiah had made use of the writings of other prophets also, it has generally been concluded that Obadial was the original writer (see Eichhorn, Einleit. § 512; Rosenmüller, Scholia, and Jager, Ueb. die Zeit Obadiah's). That Obadiah borrowed from Jeremiah has been maintained by Credner, De Wette, and others. De Wette supposes (Introd. § 235) that Obadiah made use of Jeremiah from recollection; Bertholdt (Einl. 4:1627) that no prophet of the name ever lived. Those who give an early date to Obadiah thereby settle the question of borrowing, — Those who place him later leave the question open, as he would in that case be a contemporary of Jeremiah. Luther holds that Obadiah followed Jeremiah. — Schnurrer makes it more probable that Jeremiah's prophecy is an altered form of Obadiah's. Eichhorn, Schultz, Rosenmüller, and Maurer agree with him. Whatever be the relation of Jeremiah to Obadiah, Obadiah is independent of Jeremiah. The verses common to the two form in Obadiah one compact, consecutive, progressive piece, in Jeremiah they are scattered and disjointed. This feeling was so powerful with Ewald that he could not regard Obadiah as the follower of Jeremiah, but concluded that Oba 1:1-10 and Oba 1:17-18 belonged to an earlier prophet, and had been appropriated bodily by Obadiah, i.e. the writer of the present book, and freely used by Jeremiah (Propheten, 1:399). Stahelin, too, under the same feeling, though he regards Jeremiah's original prophecy as having preceded  Obadiah's, yet fancies that Jeremiah in his latest revision of his prophecies used Obadiah, and embodied much of him in his own work! (Einl. p. 312). Bleek, who also considers Jeremiah prior to Obadiah, yet comes to this conclusion because he fancies the day of Jacob's calamity can be no other than the Chaldaean conquest; still he does not bring the question to the test of a comparison of the two prophets (Einl. p. 537).

There are likewise remarkable coincidences between Obadiah and others of the minor prophets, especially Joel. Both call the treatment of Judah by Edom violence (Joel 4:19; Oba 1:10, comp. Amo 1:11); both complain of the carrying off a great spoil from Jerusalem (Joel 4:5; Oba 1:11); both say it was done by strangers (Joel 4:17; Oba 1:11): both use the formula, cast lots on Jerusalem (Joel 4:3; Oba 1:1; again in Nah 1:10); both speak of the day of the Lord (Joel 4:14; 1:15; Oba 1:15); both make prominent the idea of requital in that day (Joel 4:4, 7; Oba 1:15); both speak of the remnant or refuge that shall be in that day (Joe 3:5; Oba 1:17), both saying it shall be on Mount Zion (Joe 3:5; Oba 1:17), and both that it shall be holy (Joel 4:17; Oba 1:17); both employ the simile of fire for a destroyer (Joe 2:3; Joe 2:5; Oba 1:18); and both clinch their predictions against Jerusalem's foes and invaders with the formula, For the Lord hath said it (Joel 4:8; Oba 1:18). The correspondences with Amos are fewer, consisting mainly in the similarity of their allusions to Edom, the absorption of which by Israel is predicted by both (Amo 9:12; Oba 1:21), an advance over Joel, who merely predicts Edom's destruction.

III. Contents, and their Verification. — The book of Obadiah is a sustained denunciation of the Edomites, melting, as is the wont of the Hebrew prophets (comp. Joel 3; Amos 9), into a vision of the future glories of Zion, when the arm of the Lord should have wrought her deliverance and have repaid- double upon her enemies. Previous to the captivity, the Edomites were in a similar relation to the Jews with that which the Samaritans afterwards held. They were near neighbors, and they were relatives. The result was that intensified hatred which such conditions are likely to produce, if they do not produce cordiality and good-will. The Edomites are the types of those who ought to be friends and are not — of those who ought to be helpers, but in the day of calamity are found “standing on the other side.” The prophet first touches on their pride and self-confidence, and then denounces their “violence against their brother  Jacob” at the time of the capture of Jerusalem. There is a sad tone of reproach in the form into which he throws his denunciation, that contrasts with the parallel denunciations of Ezekiel (25 and 35), Jeremiah (Lam 4:21), and the author of the 137th Psalm, which seem: to have been uttered on the same occasion and for the same cause. The Psalmist's “Remember the children of Edom, O Lord, in the day of Jerusalem, how they said, Down with it, down with it, even to the ground!” coupled with the immediately succeeding imprecation on Babylon, is a sterner utterance, by the side of which the “Thou shouldest not” of Obadiah appears rather as the sad remonstrance of disappointment. He complains that they looked on and rejoiced in the destruction of Jerusalem; that they triumphed over her and plundered her; and that they cut off the fugitives who were probably making their way through Idumaea to Egypt.

The last six verses are the most important part of Obadiah's prophecy. The vision presented to the prophet is that of Zion triumphant over the Idumaeans and all her enemies, restored to her ancient possessions, and extending her borders northward and southward and eastward' and westward. He sees the house of Jacob and the house of Joseph (here probably denoting the ten tribes and the two) consuming the house of Esau as fire devours stubble (Lam 4:18). The inhabitants of the city of Jerusalem, now captive at Sepharad, are to return to Jerusalem, and to occupy not only the city itself, but the southern tract of Judaea (Lam 4:20). Those who had dwelt in the southern tract are to overrun and settle in Idumaea (Lam 4:19). The former inhabitants of the plain country are also to establish themselves in Philistia (ibid.). To the north the tribe of Judah is to extend itself as far as the fields of Ephraim and Samaria, while Benjamin, thus displaced, takes possession of Gilead (ibid.). The captives of the ten tribes are to occupy the northern region from the borders of the enlarged Judah as far as Sarepta, near Sidon (Lam 4:20). What or where Sepharad is no one knows. The Sept., perhaps by an error of the copyist, reads Ε᾿φραθά. Jerome's Hebrew tutor told him the Jews held it to be the Bosporus. Jerome himself thinks it is derived from an Assyrian word meaning “bound” or “limit,” and understands it as signifying “scattered abroad.” So Maurer, who compares οἱ ἐν τῇ διασπορᾶ'/ of Jam 1:1. Hardt, who has devoted a volume to the consideration of the question, is in favor of Sipphara in Mesopotamia. The modern Jews pronounce for Spain. Schultz  is probably righti in saying that it is some town or district in Babylonia, otherwise unknown.

The question is asked, Have the prophet's denunciations of the Edomites been fulfilled, and has his vision of Zion's glories been realized? Typically, partially, and imperfectly they have been fulfilled, but, as Rosenmüller justly says, they await a fuller accomplishment. The first fulfillment of the denunciation on Edom in all probability took place a few years after its utterance. For we read in Josephus (Ant. 10:9, 7) that five years after the capture of Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar reduced the Ammonites and Moabites, and after their reduction made an expedition into Egypt. This he could hardly have done without at the same time reducing Idumaea. A more full, but still only partial and typical fulfillment took place in the time of John Hyrcanus, who utterly reduced the Idumaeans and only allowed them to remain in their country on the condition of their being circumcised and accepting the Jewish rites, after which their nationality was lost forever (Joseph. Ant. 13:9, 1). Similarly the return from the Babylonian captivity would typically and imperfectly fulfill the promise of the restoration of Zion and the extension of her borders. But “magnificentior sane est haec promissio quim ut ad Sorobabelica aut Macabaica tempora referri possit,” says Rosenmüller on Jam 1:21; and “necessitas cogit ut omnia ad praedicationem evangelii referamus,” says Luther. The full completion of the prophetical descriptions of the glories of Jerusalem — the future golden age towards which the seers stretched their hands with fond yearnings — is to be looked for in the Christian, not in the Jewish Zion — in the antitype rather than in the type. Just as the fate of Jerusalem and the destruction of the world are interwoven and interpenetrate each other in the prophecy uttered by our Lord on the mount, and his words are in part fulfilled by the one event, but only fully accomplished in the other, so in figure and in type the predictions of Obadiah may have been accomplished by Nebuchadnezzar, Zerubbabel, and Hyrcanus,but their complete fulfillment is reserved for the fortunes of the Christian Church and her adversaries. Whether that fulfillment has already occurred in the spread of the Gospel through the world, or whether it is yet to come (Rev 20:4), or whether, being conditional, it is not to be expected save in a limited and curtailed degree, is not to be determined here.

The book of Obadiah is a favorite study of the modern Jews. It is here especially that they read the future fate of their own nation and of the. Christians. Those unversed in their literature may wonder where the  Christians are found in the book of Obadiah. But it is a fixed principle of rabbinical interpretation that by Edomites is prophetically meant Christians, and that by Edom is meant Rome. Thus Kimchi (on Obadiah) lays it down that “all that the prophets have said about the destruction of Edom in the last times has reference to Rome.” So rabbi Bechai, on Isa 66:17; and Abarbanel has written a commentary on Obadiah resting on this hypothesis as its basis. Other examples are given by Buxtorf (Lex. Talm. in voc. אּדֵוֹם, and Synagoga Judaica). The reasons of this rabbinical dictum are as various and as ridiculous as might be imagined. Nachmanides, Bechai, and Abarbanel say that Janus, the first king of Latium, was grandson of Esau. Kimchi (on Joe 3:19) says that Julius Caesar was an Idumaean. Scaliger (ad Chron. Euseb. n. 2152) reports, “The Jews, both those who are comparatively ancient and those who are modern, believe that Titus was an Edomite, and when the prophets denounce Edom they frequently refer it to Titus.” Aben-Ezra says that there were no Christians except such as were Idumaeans until the time of Constantine, and that Colstantine having embraced their religion, the whole Roman empire became entitled Idumaean. Jerome says that some of the Jews read רוּמָה, Rome, for דּוּמָה, Dumrah, in Isa 21:11. Finally, some of the rabbins, and with them Abarbanel, maintain that it was the soul of Esau which lived again in Christ. The color given to the prophecies of Obadiah, when looked at from this' point of view, is most curious. The following is a specimen from Abarbanel on Isa 21:1 :

“The true explanation, as I have said, is to be found in this: The Idumaeais, by which. as I have shown, all. the Christians are to be understood (for they took their origin from Rome), will go up to lay waste Jerusalem, which is the seat of holiness, and where the tomb of their God Jesus is, as indeed they have several times gone up already.”

Again, on Isa 21:2 :

“I have several times shown that from Edom proceeded the kings who reigned in Italy, and who built up Rome to be great among the nations and chief among the provinces; and in this way Italy and Greece and all the western provinces became filled with Idumaeans. Thus it is that the prophets call the whole of that nation by the name of Edom.”  On Isa 21:8 :

“There shall not be found counsel or wisdom among the Edomitish Christians when they go up to that war.”

On Isa 21:19: “Those who have gone as exiles into the Edomites', that is, into the Christians' land, and have there suffered affliction, will deserve to have the best part of their country and their metropolis as Mount Seir.” On Isa 21:20: “Sarepta” is “France;” “Sepharad” is “Spain.” The “Mount of Esau,” in Isa 21:21, is “the city of Rome,” which is to be judged; and the Saviors are to be “the [Jewish] Messiah and his chieftains,” who are to be “Judges.”

IV. Style, etc. — The language of Obadiah is pure; but Jahn and others have observed that he is inferior to the more ancient prophets in his too great addiction to the interrogatory form of expression (see Isa 21:8). His sentiments are noble, and his figures bold and striking (De Wette's Introd. Engl. transl.). De Wette's tradslator observes that his hatred towards other nations is not so deep and deadly as that of some of his younger contemporaries.

V. Commentaries. — The special exegetical helps on this prophecy are the following: Ephraem Syrus, Explanatio (in Svriac, in his Opp. v. 269); Jerome, Commentarius (in Opp. 2:145); Hugo a St. Vietore, Annotationes (in Opp. i); Luther, Enarratio (in Opp. 3:538); Regius, Commentariolus (Cellee, 1537, 4to; also in Opp. 3:100); Draconites, Commentariolus (Argent. 1538, 8vo; Rost. 1548, 8vo; 1598, 4to); Del Castillio, Commentarius (Romans 1556, 4to); Pontac, Commentarii [Rabbinic, includ. other books] (Par. 1566; Heb. oniy, Jena, 1678, 8vo); Grynaeus, Commentarius (Basil. 1-84, 8vo); De Leon, Commentarius [includ. Gal.] (Salmant. 1589, 4to); Drusius, Lectiones [includ. other books] (Lugd. 1595, 8vo); Leucht, Erklarung (Darmst. 1606, 4to); Reynolds, Application (Lond. 1613, 4to); Reuter, Commentarius (Fr. ad Od. 1617, 4to); Gesner, Commentarius (Hamb. 1618, 8vo); Zierlin, Erkldrung (Rotenb. 1620, 4to); Mercier, Commentarii [from the Rabbins, includ. other books] (Lugd. 1621, 4to); Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rost. 1624, 4to); Marbury, Commentarii (Lond. 1639, 4to); Ellis, Commentarius (ibid. 1641, 8vo); Konig, Dissertationes (Alt. 1647, 4to); Leusden, Commentarii [from the Rabbins, includ. Joel] (Ultraj. 1657, 8vo); Stephens, Raslzi's Comment. [in Heb., includ. other books] (Par. 1658, 4to); Pilkington, —  Exposition [includ. Hag.] (Lond. 1662, 8vo; also in Works, p. 201); Pfeiffer. Commentarius (Vitemb. 1666, 1670, 4to); Croze, Commentarius [Rabbinical] (Brem. 1673, 4to); Wasmuth, Raslzi Comment. [in Heb.] (Jen. 1678, 8vo); Acoluthus, Annotationes [on the Armen.] (Lips. 1680, 4to); Leigh, Commentariius (Hafn. 1697, 4to); Heupel, Annotationes (Argent. 1699, 4to); Outhof, Verklaaring (Gron. 1700, 8vo; Dort, 1730; 4to); Zierold, Erkldruing (Frankf. and Leips.' 1719 4to); Abresch, Specim. philol. [on vers. 18] (Fr. ad M. 1757, 4to); Schror, Erlauterung (Bresl. and Leips. 1766, 8vo); Happach, Anmerk. (Coburg, 1779, 8vo); Kohlers, Anmerk. [on certain parts] (in Eichhorn's Repert. 15:250); Schnurrer, Dissertatio (Tubing. 1787, 4to; also in his Dissertatt. p. 383); Holzapfel, Er'laute'ru.g (Rinteln, 1796, 8vo); Plum, Observationes [includ. Hab.] (Gotting. 1796, 8vo),— Grimm, Editio [onn the Syriac, includ. Jonah]. (Duisi. 1799, 8vo); Venema, Lectt. (in Ousc. Ultraj. 1810); Krahmer, Obser-vationes [on parts] (Marb. 1834, 8vo); Hendewerk, Enucleatio (Regiom. 1836, 8vo); Jager, Zeitalter Ob. (Tubing. 1837, 8vo); Caspari, Auslegung (Leips. 1842, 8vo; also in Delitzsch and Caspari's Exeg, Handb.). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

9. A descendant of David (1Ch 3:21), probably the son of Arnan (as the Sept. and Vulg. have it, reading בְּנוֹ, “his son,” instead of בְּנֵי, “sons of”); apparently the same with JUDA (Luk 3:26) and ABIUD (Mat 1:13) of Christ's genealogy (q.v.). B.C. cir. 470.

10. The son of Jehiel, and descendant of Joab, who led back from captivity. under Ezra, a company containing two hundred and eighteen male kinsmen (Ezr 8:9). B.C. 459.

11. A Levite, son of Shemaiah, and descended from Jeduthun (1Ch 9:16). He appears to have been a principal musician in the Temple choir in the time of Nehemiah (Neh 12:25). B.C. cir. 446. It is evident, from a comparison of the last-quoted passage with 1Ch 9:15-17 and Neh 11:17-19, that the first three names, “Mattaniah, Bakbukiah, and Obadiah,” belong to Neh 11:24, and the last three, “Meshullam, Talmon, Akkub,” were the families of porters. The name is omitted in the Vat. MS. in Neh 12:25, where the Codex Fred. Aug. has Ο᾿βδίας and the Vulg. Obedia. In Neh 11:17 this Obadiah is called “ABDA, the son of Shammua.”

12. One of the priests who joined in the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:5). B.C. 410.

Obadiah, a name common to many distinguished Jewish writers, of whom the following are especially noteworthy:

1. OBADIAH DI BOZZOLO, so called from his native place, Bozaolo, in Italy, flourished about the beginning of the 14th century, and wrote בְּאֵר מִיַם חִיַּים, cabalistic expositions and explanations of the Jewish ritual, consisting of four parts, of which the first part, entitled עֵצ חִיַּים, “the tree of life,” treats of meals; the second, מְקוֹר חִיַּים, “the fountain of life,” treats of what is to be done when going to bed; the third, חִיַּאּם דֶּרֶךְ, “the way of life,” treats of the reading of the law in the original and in the Chaldee paraphrase; and the fourth part, entitled אוֹרִח חִיַּים, “the path of life,” treats, of mystic thoughts during prayer. Only the first two parts were printed (Salonica, 1546), but the whole work is to be found in MS. in the Oppenheim Library. See First, Bibl. Jud. 1:129; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:375; 3:260; Jocher, Allgemeines GelehrtenLexikon, s, v.

2. OBADIAH BEN-DAVID, who flourished about 1322, and wrote פהַ קַדּוּשׁ הִחֹדֶשׁ לְהָר מבם, a commentary on that section of Maimonides's (q.v.) Jad ha-Cheraka which treats on the Jewish calendar and astronomy, reprinted in the-edition of the Jad ha-Cheraka ed. by D. N. Torres (Amst. 1702, fol, and often since). See Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 3:43; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:938 sq.; 3:865 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeinnes Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

3. OBADIAH DA BERTINORE, who flourished A.D. 1470-1520, was a native of Citta di Castello, in the Romagna, Italy. In the year 1488 he left his native place for Palestine, where he soon occupied a high position; having been appointed chief rabbi at Jerusalem. This eminent place he held until his death, which occurred in 1520. He is especially known in Jewish literature for his commentary on the Mishna, the מַשְׁנָה פֵּרוּשׁ עִל שַׁשָּׁהסַדְרֵי, which is generally reprinted in the editions of the Mishla, and which has also been translated into Latin by Surenhusius in his excellent edition of the Mishna. Obadiah also wrote a commentary on Ruth, entitled פֵּרוּשׁ עִל רוּת, printed at Cracow under the title מַדְרִשׁ רוּת, and reprinted in the collection מַקְרָא קֹדֶש ׁ(Venice, 1585). Besides, he wrote a super- commentary on Rashi's commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled עֲמִר נְקֵא  (Pisa, 1810; Sdilikow, 1837; Czernowitz, 1857). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:113 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:938; 3:865; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth . u. sSekten, 3:129; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, viii,' 259 sq. (2d ed. Leips. 1875, p. 248 sq., 280); 9:28 sq.; Cassel, Leitfaden fuir jid. Geschichte u. Literatur (Berl. 1872), p. 91, 107; Coxforte, Kore ha-Dorot, p. 30 b; Miscellany of Hebrew Literature (Lond. 1872, 1:113-150), where two letters of Obadiah are given from a Hebrew. MS., containing his travels from Italy to Palestine.

4. OBADIAH BEN-JACOB DE SFORNO, who figured as physician, divine, and commentator, was a native of Cesena, in Italy, and was born about the year 1470. In the year 1498 we meet him at Rome, as the teacher of the famous Reuchlin, whom he instructed in the Hebrew language. He then settled at Bologna, where he practiced medicine until his death in 1550. He wrote אוֹר יי, A Commentary on the Pentateuch (Venice, 1567): — A Commentary on the Song of Songs and Koheleth (ibid. 1567): — A Commentary on Job, entitled מַשְׁפִּט צֶדֶק (ibid. 1590): A Commentary on the Psalms (ibid. 1586): — A Commentary on Ruth: — A Commentary on the Later Prophets (i.e. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel); all these commentaries are reprinted in the Rabbinical Bible, entitled קְהַלִּת משֶׁה, edited by Frankfurter (q.v.) (Amst. 1724-1727, 4 vols. fol.): — A commentary on the treatise Aboth, פֵּרוּשׁ עִל פַּרְקֵי אָבוֹת reprinted in the Machasor of Bologna, 1541: — A treatise on metaphysics, entitled סֵ אוֹר עִמַּים (Bologna, 1537), against. atheists and Epicureans. Of this treatise Sforno made a Latin translation, which, with the commentary on Ecclesiastes, he dedicated to king John II of France. Besides, he also wrote some other works which have not as yet been published. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:319; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 295 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. 1:938-40; 3:866 sq.; 4:939; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 487; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. u. s. Sekten, 3:121; Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:50, 94, 235; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 414; Steinschneider, Catalogus librosrum Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 2075; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v. Sforno; Jahrbuch der Gesch. d. Judeni u. d. Judenthums, 2:345. \ (B. P.)

## Obal[[@Headword:Obal]]

             (Heb. Obal', עובָל, a bare district; Sept. Εὐάλ v. r. Γέβαλ; Vulg. Ebal), son of Joktan, B.C. post 2060, and head of an Arabian tribe, mentioned in Gen 10:28, and of the region wherein it dwelt, 1Ch 1:22 (where it is called EBAL, q.v.). Bochart (Phal. 2:23) understands the Avalites, a people on the ‘Ethiopian coast, near the Strait of Bab el- Mandeb (Ptolemy, 4:87), who gave name to the Sinus Abalites (Pliny, 6:34). They were a commercial people-(Forster, Geogr. of Arabia, 1:148). Others make Obal the same with the Gobolitis of Josephus (Γοβολῖτις, Ant. 2:1, 2; 3:2, 1; see Schulthess, Parad. p. 84), but here there is not even a resemblance (גְּבָל and עֹבָל). SEE ARABIA.

## Obdia[[@Headword:Obdia]]

             (Ο᾿βδία v. r. Ο᾿ββεία; Vulg. Obia), a corrupt form (1Es 5:38) of the Heb. name HABAIAH (Ezr 2:61).

## Obduracy[[@Headword:Obduracy]]

             SEE HARDNESS OF HEART; SEE SIN.

## Obe, Obeah, Or Obi[[@Headword:Obe, Obeah, Or Obi]]

             (etymology unknown), designates a species of witchcraft practiced among the Negroes, especially in the West Indies, the apprehension of which, operating upon their superstitious fears, is frequently attended with disease and death. The practicer is called an Obiah man or Obiah woman. It differs in no essential respect from the corresponding superstitions all the world over. SEE MAGIC; SEE WITCHCRAFT.

## Obed[[@Headword:Obed]]

             (Heb. Obed', עוֹבֵד, servant, i.e. of Jehovah; Sept. ᾿Ωβήδ in Ruth, and so in the N.T.; Ι᾿ωβήδ in Chronicles; v. r. ᾿Ωβήδ, etc.), the name of several Hebrews. SEE OBED-EDOI.

1. The son of Boaz and Ruth, and father of Jesse the father of David, according to the apparently incomplete genealogical list (Rth 4:17; 1Ch 2:12). B.C. cir. 1360. The name occurs in the genealogies of Christ given in Mat 1:5 and Luk 3:33. SEE DAVID; SEE GENEALOGY.

2. One of David's mighty men (1Ch 11:47). B.C. cir. 1046.

3. The third named of the sons of Shemaiah who were gate-keepers of the Temple (1Ch 26:7). B.C. cir. 1017.

4. Son of Ephlal and father of Jehu, descendant of Jarha, the Egyptian slave of Sheshan in the family of Jerahmeel (1Ch 2:37-38, from which it appears that he was grandson of Zabad [q.v.], one of David's warriors). B.C. considerably post 1014.

5. Father of Azariah, which latter was one of the captains of hundreds who joined with. Jehoiada in the revolution by which Athaliah fell. (2Ch 23:1). B.C. ante 876.

## Obed-edom[[@Headword:Obed-edom]]

             (Heb. Obed'-edom', עֹבֶד אדֵוֹם, servant of Edom; Sept. in 2 Samuel Ο᾿βὴθ Ε᾿δώμ, in Chronicles Α᾿βεδδαρά, Α᾿βδεδόμ, Α᾿βδοδόμ, with many other v. rr.), the name apparently of three Levites.

1. A person in whose premises, and under whose care, the ark was deposited when the death of Uzzah caused David to apprehend danger in taking it farther. B.C. 1043. It remained there three months, during which the family of Obed-edom so signally prospered that the king was encouraged to resume his first intention, which he then happily carried into effect (2Sa 6:10-12; 1Ch 13:13-14; 1Ch 15:25). We learn from 1Ch 16:38, where the name is used generically, that Obededom's connection with the ark did not then terminate, he and his family having charge of the doors of the sanctuary (1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:24). This individual is distinguished from the following, whose time, functions, and circumstances closely resemble his, by the clear indications in the text:

(a.) He is described as a Gittite (2Sa 6:10-11), that is, probably, a native of the Levitical city of Gath-Rimmon in Dan, which was assigned to the Kohathites (Jos 21:25), and is thus distinguished from “Obed- edom the son of Jeduthun,” who was a Merarite. SEE JEDUTHUN. That the former was a Kohathite or Korhite is plain from 1Ch 26:1; 1Ch 26:8.

(b.) In one passage (1Ch 16:38) they are both named separately. It is Obed-edom the Gittite who was appointed to sound “with  harps on the Sheminith to excel” (1Ch 15:21; 1Ch 16:5). That it was also he, with his family of eight sons and their children, “mighty men of valor” (1Ch 26:4-8), who kept the south gate (1Ch 26:15) and the house of Asuppim, is evident from the expression of the chronicler (1Ch 26:5), adding, “for God blessed him,” referring apparently to 2Sa 6:11, “the Lord blessed Obededom and all his household.” J. Rowland, in Fairbairn's Dictionary, remarks, “The site of Obed-edom's house is still a remarkable spot. About two miles from the site of Kirjath- jearim, near Chesla, or ancient Chesalon, on the way thence to Jerusalem, a little beyond Khirbet el-Uz, or the ruins of Uzzah, Perez-uzzah, on the right-hand side of the road, is a little ravine; and on the other side of that ravine — i.e. on the south side of it-is a high and prominent ridge, in the western extremity of which is a little depression, a flat space or plateau, about three or four acres of land, intensely green, surrounded by a belt of trees, and called Kuryet es Suideh, the Blessed City, or abode of the Blessed One.” SEE KIRJATH-JEARIM.

2. A son of Jeduthun, and one of the Temple wardens (1Ch 16:38, second clause; and apparently mentioned there only). B.C. 1043.

3. A person who had charge of the sacred vessels in the time of Amaziah, king of Judah (2Ch 25:24). B.C. cir. 835. But the name is possibly generic here also (see 1), and may merely denote the descendants of the Obed-edom in whose house the ark had rested.

## Obedience[[@Headword:Obedience]]

             is, in a general or abstract sense, a readiness to carry out or perform the ordinances of another, i.e. to put the design of another into execution, and thereby satisfy the will of another person or persons. The word, then, signifies the capacity to hearken to any one's advice, directions, or orders. In religion obedience must be animated by love (q.v.). Obedience -maybe paid (a) on the part of man (1) to God and Christ; (2) to one's parents; (3) to superiors generally, especially one's government. There is also (b) the obedience which Christ paid to God the Father. See below.

1. Obedience to God may be considered

(1) as virtual, which consists in a belief of the Gospel, of the holiness and equity of its precepts, of the truth of its promises, and a true repentance of all our sins;

(2) actual obedience, which is the practice and exercise of the several graces and duties of Christianity;

(3) perfect obedience, which is the exact conformity of our hearts and lives to the law of God, without the least imperfection. This last is peculiar to a glorified state, though it should be our aim in this. SEE PERFECTION.

The obligation we are under to obedience arises —

(1) from the relation we stand in to God as creatures (Psa 95:6);

(2) from the law which he has revealed to us in his Word (Psa 119:3; 2Pe 1:5; 2Pe 1:7);

(3) from the blessings of his providence which we are constantly receiving (Act 14:17; Psalms 145);

(4) from the love and goodness of God in the grand work of redemption (1Co 6:20).

As to the nature of this obedience, it must be —

(1) active, not only avoiding what is prohibited, but performing what is commanded (Col 3:8; Col 3:10);

(2) personal, for though Christ has obeyed the law for us as a covenant of works, yet he has not abrogated it as a rule of life (Rom 7:22; Rom 3:31);

(3) sincere (Psa 51:6; 1Ti 1:5);

(4) affectionate, springing from love and not from terror (1Jn 5:19; 1Jn 2:5; 2Co 5:14)

(5) diligent, not slothful (Gal 1:16; Psa 18:44; Rom 12:11);

(6) conspicuous and open (Php 2:15; Mat 5:16);

(7) universal; not one duty, but all must be performed (2Pe 1:5; 2Pe 1:10);

(8) perpetual, at all times, places, and occasions (Rom 2:7; Gal 6:9).  The advantages of obedience are these:

(1) it adorns the Gospel (Tit 2:10);

(2) it is evidential of grace (2Co 5:17);

(3) it rejoices the hearts of the ministers and people of God (3Jn 1:2; 2 Thessalonians 1:19, 20);

(4) it silences gainsayers (2Pe 1:11-12);

(5) encourages the saints, while it reproves the lukewarm (Mat 5:16);

(6) it affords peace to the subject of it (Psa 25:12-13; Act 24:16);

(7) it powerfully recommends religion, as that which is both delightful and practicable (Col 1:10).

(8) it is the forerunner and evidence of eternal glory (Rom 6:22; Rev 22:14).

2. Obedience to parents is taught us in the N.T. Scriptures in Epheshians 6:1 (also in Col 3:20): “Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.” Thus also servants are to obey their masters, as taught in Eph 6:5 (also Col 3:22; 1Pe 2:18): “Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ.”

3. Obedience to authority (q.v.); this, however, the Christian is taught to exercise only when not out of harmony with the divine commands, for it is the duty of the Christian to obey God rather than man (Act 4:17; Act 5:29).

See Krehl, New-Testament. Handworterbuch, s.v. Gehorsam; Charnock, Works, 11:1212; Tillotson, Sermons, ser. 122, 123; Saurin, Sermons, vol. i, ser. 4; Ridgley, Body of Divinity, qu. 92; Dwight, Theology; Walker. Sermons; Fuller, Works; Robert Hall, Works. SEE HOLINESS; SEE LIBERTY; SEE NECESSITY; SEE SANCTIFICATION.

## Obedience (Ecclesiastical)[[@Headword:Obedience (Ecclesiastical)]]

             in canon law, means the duty by which the various gradations in ecclesiastical organization are held subject, in all things consistent with the law of God or of the Church, to the several superiors placed immediately above them, respectively, in the hierarchical scale. Thus priests and inferior clergy owe canonical obedience to the bishop, and priests are bound thereto by a solemn promise administered at ordination. The bishop primitively took a similar oath to the metropolitan; but by the modern law the jurisdiction of the metropolitan is confined to the occasions of his holding a visitation or presiding in the provincial synod. Bishops, by the present law of the Roman Catholic Church, take an oath of obedience to the pope. This obedience, however, is strictly limited by the canons, and is only held to bind in things consistent with the divine and natural law.

In ecclesiastical history the word obedience has ‘a special signification, and is applied to the several parties in the Church who during the great Western schism (q.v.) adhered to the rival popes. Thus we read of the “Roman obedience,” which included all who recognized the pope chosen at Rome, and the “Avignon obedience,” which meant the supporters of the Avignon pope. So, again, historians speak of “the obedience of Gregory XII,” and “the obedience of Benedict XIII,” etc.

Applied to the monastic institute, obedience means the voluntary submission which all members of religious orders vow, at their religious profession, to their immediate superiors, of whatever grade in the order, as well as to' the superior general, and still more to the rules and constitutions of the order. This forms, in all orders, one of the essential vows. It is, however, expressly confined to lawful things; and although it is held that a superior can command certain things under pain of sin, yet Roman Catholics repudiate the notion that the command of a superior can render  lawful, much less good, a thing which is of its own nature or by the law of God sinful or bad.

The word “obedience” is in this connection used also to designate a place or office, with the estate and profits belonging to it, in a monastery, subordinate to the abbot, and corresponding to a dignity in a cathedral or collegiate church. In 1222 the incumbeits were required to render half- yearly or quarterly accounts, as well as the greater prelates, abbots, and priors. The obedientiares were usually the subprior, precentor, cellarer, sacristan, chamberlain, kitchener, infirmarer, keeper of annals, hosteler, almoner, pitanciar, lumberer, and master of the lady chapel. But the obediences varied according to the size of the monastery; sometimes the gardener, fruiterer, or keeper of the orchard was included.

The word is also sometimes given to the written precept or other formal instrument by which a superior in a religious order communicates to one of his subjects any special precept or instructions-as, for example, to undertake a certain office, to proceed upon a particular mission, to relinquish a certain appointment, etc. The instruction, or the instrument containing it, is called an “— obedience,” because it is held to bind in Virtue of religious obedience.

## Obedience of Christ[[@Headword:Obedience of Christ]]

             (ὐπακοή) is generally divided into active and passive. His active obedience implies what he did; his passive what he suffered. Some divines distinguish the two. They refer our pardon to his passive, and our title to glory to his active obedience; though Dr. Owen observes that it cannot be clearly evinced that there is any such thing, in propriety of speech, as passive obedience; obeying is doing, to which passion or suffering does not belong. As to the active obedience of Christ, the Scriptures assure us that he took upon him the form of a servant, and really became one (Isa 49:3; Php 2:5; Hebrews 8). He was subject to the law of God: “He was made under the law; “the judicial or civil law of the Jews, the ceremonial law,, and the moral law (Mat 17:24; Mat 17:27; Luk 2:22; Psa 40:7-8). He was obedient to the law of nature; he was in a state of subjection to his parents; and he fulfilled the commands of his heavenly Father as respects the first and second table. Christ's obedience was

(1) voluntary (Psa 40:6);

(2) complete (1Pe 2:22);

(3) wrought out in the room and stead of his people (Rom 10:4; Rom 5:19);

(4) well pleasing and acceptable in the sight of God;

(5) followed by a glorious reward (Php 2:9). SEE ATONEMENT.

Theologians commonly hold that the active obedience of Christ was as much a part of his atonement or satisfaction as his passive obedience. This might be more clearly and definitively expressed as follows: The satisfaction which Christ has made consists both in his enduring the punishments incurred by men and in his yielding a perfect obedience to the divine laws. This opinion is derived from the twofold obligation of men (a) to keep the divine laws, and (b) when they have failed, to suffer punishment for their sin. In this way the satisfaction of Christ came to be considered as consisting of two parts, active and passive. This view was then connected with the theory of Anselm respecting the removal of the guilt and penalty of sin. The suffering of Christ removes the penalty, and his active obedience the guilt of sin; and the perfect righteousness of Christ, or his fulfillment of the law, is imputed to us in the same way as if we ourselves had fulfilled the law, and thus our defective obedience is  made good. Respecting this doctrine de renmissione culpae et pence, SEE IMPUTATION; SEE PUNISHMENT; SEE REMISSION OF SINS.

We subjoin a brief history of this doctrine. Good materials for its history may be found in Walch's inaugural disputation, De obedientia Christi activa (Gottingen, 1754, 4to). See also Bullet. Theol. Jan. 17, p. 22. Passages are found even among the ancient fathers which teach that the fulfillment of the divine law by Christ is to be considered as if done by us (see the passages cited by Walch). Many of these passages, however, appear very doubtful and indefinite, and this doctrine was by no means universally established in the early Church. Even Anselm, who built up such an artificial system, did not make this application of the twofold obedience of Christ. This, nevertheless, was the tendency of his theory, especially of the doctrine de remissione culpce et pence. But after his time this explanation of the satisfaction made by Christ by means of his twofold obedience was adopted by several schoolmen, who now looked up texts for its support. Yet it was never very generally adopted by theologians of the Romish Church. In the Protestant Church, on the contrary, it has been almost universally taught by the theologians since the sixteenth century, and even introduced into the “Form of Concord” (Morus, p. 169, n. 5), which, however, never received a universal symbolical authority in the Lutheran Church. This explanation is not found in the other symbols. One reason, perhaps, of the reception of this explanation in the Protestant Church is the supposition that the theory de obedientia activa could be used to advantage against the Catholic tenet of the value of one's own good works.

Another reason is that the imputation of the active obedience of Christ was denied by the Socinians and Arminians. On these grounds, most of the Lutheran and Reformed theologians accounted this doctrine essential to sound orthodoxy. But doubting whether the active obedience of Christ constitutes a part of his satisfaction has no influence upon the plan of salvation through repentance, faith, and godliness. Baumgarten and Ernesti have therefore justly pronounced this dispute as of no great dogmatical importance. In fact, the difference among theologians upon this subject has often been more apparent than real. There were, indeed, some Protestant theologians, even in the 16th century, who denied the merit of the active obedience of Christ — e.g. the Lutheran theologian Karg (or Parsimonius), also the Reformed theologian John Piscator, who had many followers; more lately, John la Placette, and others. The same was done by many of the English theologians, who in general adopted the Arminian  views. But from the end of the. sixteenth to the middle of the eighteenth century the opinion was by far the most prevalent in the Lutheran Church that the active obedience of Christ is of the nature of satisfaction, or vicarious. This opinion is defended even by Walch in the work just referred to. Since the time of Tillner, however, the subject has been presented in a different light. He published a work entitled Der thtige Gehorsanm Christi (Breslau, 1768, 8vo). In this he denied that the active obedience of Christ is of the nature of satisfaction. Thereupon a violent controversy ensued. Schubert, Wichmann, and others, wrote against him, and he, in reply, published his Zusatze (Berlin, 1770). The best critique of this matter is that of Ernesti, Theol. Bibl. 9:914 sq. For the history of the whole controversy, see Walch, Neueste Religionsgeschichte, iii. 311 sq. The subject is considered also by Eberhard, Apologie des Socrates, 2:310 sq. Of late years, a great number of Protestant theologians have declared themselves in favor of the opinion that the active obedience of Christ is properly no part of his satisfaction, which is the effect solely of his passive obedience. Among, these are Zacharia, Griesbach, and Doderlein.

It may help to settle the controversy on this subject to consider that it has originated solely in mistake. Two things have been separated which never can be put asunder, and which never are so in the Bible, but, on the contrary, are always connected. All that Christ did and suffered for our good receives its peculiar worth from the fact that he did it from obedience to the divine will. This is the virtue or obedience of Christ. If we would partake of the salutary consequences of his sufferings, we must, under divine guidance and assistance, follow his example. This is an indispensable condition. The two things are always connected in the Bible, and should be so in our instructions; and then this doctrine cannot be abused. The remarks made by Morus (p. 170, 171) are directed to this point. The Bible, indeed, justifies us in saying (1) that everything which Christ actively performed during his whole life, in obedience to God, is salutary to us, was done on our account and for our good. But (2) we therefore truly affirm that our whole happiness (σωτηρία) is the fruit in a special manner of his obedience to the divine command, both in his suffering and in all the actions of his life. Had he not shown this obedience, we should not have .attained to this happiness. So the Scriptures everywhere teach. The obedience of Christ in suffering is therefore the foundation, and imparts to us the assurance that all his other obedience, in respect to all the divine commands, will be for our benefit (Joh 6:51; Joh 3:14-16; Joh 12:24; John 1  Joh 4:9; 1Th 5:9 sq.). No injury to morals need be apprehended if the Scripture doctrine is followed, and things which belong together are not separated. See Knapp, Christian Theology, § 115; Smeaton, Doctrine of the Atonement (see Index); Harless, Christian Ethics (see Index); Ullmanii, Sinlessness of Jesus (see Index); Graves, Works, vol. iv; Edwards, Works; Fletcher, Works; Presb. Confession; Theol. Mediumn, or Cumberl. Presb. Rev. Oct. 1871; Presb. Quar. and Princet. Rev. Jan. 1874, art. iv; and the references in Malcolm, Theol. Index, s.v.

## Obeirne, Thomas Lewis, D.D.[[@Headword:Obeirne, Thomas Lewis, D.D.]]

             an Irish prelate of some note, was born in the Coulty of Longford in 1747. He enjoyed excellent educational advantages, and after taking holy orders rapidly rose to positions of trust in the Church. In 1775 he accompanied lord Howe to this country as chaplain. In 1796 he was elevated to the episcopate and given the see of Ossory; in 1798 he was transferred to that of Meath. He died in 1822. “As a preacher, Dr. O'Beirne ranked in the first class. His sermons seldom related to the thorny points of controversial theology. He was generally satisfied with expatiating on the grand and essential doctrines of Christianity, and his diction was perspicuous, animated, and nervous. He was occasionally sublime, frequently pathetic, always intelligible” (Annual Biogr. vol. vii). The bishop published, besides three volumes of his sermons (1799, 1813, 1821), a poem on the Crucifixion (1775, 4to), several political pamphlets, and a comedy. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, S. V.

## Obeisance[[@Headword:Obeisance]]

             (a frequent rendering of שָׁחָה, shachah', in Hithpael, to bow one's self in reverence). In 1Ki 1:16, when Bathsheba presented herself to David, it is said, “And Bathsheba bowed and did obeisance unto the king; and the king said, What wouldest thou?” In India, “When a husband goes on a journey, or when he returns,” Roberts says, “his wife on seeing him puts her hands together, and presents them to him as an act of obeisance. When she has an important request to make, she does the same thing; and it is surprising to see the weakness of him who pretends to be the stronger vessel, for, undersuch circumstances, she will gain almost anything she wants. Hence the force of their popular proverb, ‘The woman who regularly makes obeisance to her husband, can make it rain whenever she pleases.' When Bathsheba made her obeisance to the king, he asked, ‘What wouldest ‘thou?' but the Hebrew has this, ‘What to thee?' This accords with the idiom of the Tamul language. Thus it will be asked of a person who stands with his hands presented to a great man, ‘To thee what?' If speaking of a third person, ‘To him what?' or, literally, ‘Him to what?' SEE ATTITUDE; SEE BOWING; SEE COURTESY; SEE SALUTATION.

## Oben[[@Headword:Oben]]

             SEE STOOLS.

## Ober-Ammergau[[@Headword:Ober-Ammergau]]

             is a village of Upper Bavaria, in the valley of the Ammer, 46 miles S.W. of Munich, containing a population of about 1100, chiefly engaged in carving on wood. The place is celebrated for the decennial performance on twelve consecutive Sundays in the summer season of a play representing the passion and death of Christ, in which three hundred and fifty actors are employed, besides eighty members of the orchestra and chorus, all selected from the villagers, some of whom exhibit.great dramatic power and genius. The performances generally last from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M. A considerable portion of the space allotted to the theater is uncovered. There is room for from 5000 to 6000 spectators, but the attendance is generally much larger, including visitors from foreign countries. The performance in 1870 was interrupted by the Franco-German war, but was resumed in 1871. It is the only important passion or miracle play which continues to be performed. It originated in a vow taken by the population in 1634 to perform it every ten  years in the event of their escaping from the plague which then prevailed. In the summer of 1875 they inaugurated another drama called the “School of the Cross.” It is a series of scenes taken from Old-Testament history, in the original, as many as seventeen scenes being given. The good people of Ammergau will discover, however, that the performing of the passion play once in ten years in fulfillment of a religious vow, and carrying on a dramatic performance continually in response to the popular interest, will soon prove to be two very different things. The consecration of the simple- minded but talented actors gave a charm to the old performance which will soon be lost in the more worldly and unattractive attempt for pecuniary success. SEE MYSTERIES.

## Obereit, Jakob Hermann[[@Headword:Obereit, Jakob Hermann]]

             a Swiss alchemist and mystic, was born at Arbon, in Thurgau, in 1725. Almost the first books he read were the works of Miss Bourignon and Madame Guyon. He first studied surgery, then architecture, and traveled through Germany. He completed his studies at the universities of Halle and Berlin. After graduating, he settled at Lindau in 1750, and soon acquired great reputation as a physician. Here however, his love for all novelty made him lose the confidence of the public, and he fell into deep mystical speculation, the result of which is apparent in his Defence of Mysticism (1775), and Promenades de Gamaliel, Juif Philosophe (1780). He died at Jena in 1798.

## Oberhauser, Benedict[[@Headword:Oberhauser, Benedict]]

             a German canonist, was born Jan. 25, 1719, at Waitzenkirchen, in Austri. He joined the Benedictines, and became successively professor of philosophy at the University of Salzburg, and of canon law at Fulda. His views, very much opposed to ultramontanism, led him into trouble, which induced him to return to Salzburg, where he was appointed archiepiscopal counsellor in 1776, and died April 20, 1786. He wrote Praelectiones canonicae juxta titulos librorum Decretaliumn ex monumentis, auctoribus et controversiis (Antwerp, 1762, 1763, 3 vols. 4to): — System historico- criticuma divisarumpotestatum in legibus matrimoniclibus impedimentorum dirimentium (Francf. 1771, 8vo): — Apologia historico- critica (ibid. 1771, and Vienna. 1776, 8vo): — Compendium prcelectionum canonicarum juxta libros V Decretalium (Francf. 1773 and 1779, 2 vols. 8vo): — Thomassinus abbreviatus, seu vetus et nova  Ecclesice disciplina de benefciis et beneficiariis (Salzburg, 1775, 4to): — Manuale select. conciliorum et calonrm juxta abbatis de Fleury Historiam ecclesiasticam (ibid. 1776, 4to): — Specimnen cultioris jurisprudentice canonicce cad justfas ideas divindi primatus in Romana ecclesia evolvendas (ibid. 1777, 8vo): — De dignitate utriusque cleri scecularis et regularis (ibid. 1786, 8vo). See Memoria Oberhauseri (ibid. 1786, 8ve); Luca, Gelehrtes Oestreich, vol. i; Hirsching, Handbuch; Meusel, Lexikon.

## Oberkirchenrath[[@Headword:Oberkirchenrath]]

             (Ger. for Superior Ecclesiastical Council) is the highest ecclesiastical tribunal of the Evangelical Church of Prussia. It was founded by the king in 1850, with the view of giving to the Church more independence. SEE PRUSSIA.

## Oberlin Theology[[@Headword:Oberlin Theology]]

             Animpression has very generally prevailed that the theological views inculcated at Oberlin College by the late Rev. Charles G. Finney and his associates involve a considerable departure from the accepted orthodox faith; and the term Oberlin Theology was for many years supposed to embrace very serious errors, if not “damnable heresies.” There has been, doubtless, much misapprehension on the subject; and while these teachers have held views of their own on some points of metaphysical or ethical theology, and even of practical religion, there has scarcely been such divergence from the accepted doctrines of the Church as to warrant the idea of a new theology.

1. The general type of doctrine inculcated has been the New-School Calvinism, of which the characteristic thought is that all responsible character pertains to the will in its voluntary attitude and action, and that each moral agent determines for himself, in the exercise of his own freedom, under the motives which gather about him, whatever is morally praiseworthy or blameworthy in his character and life; that sin is a voluntary failure to meet obligation, and that nothing else is sin; and that righteousness or holiness is a voluntary conforming to obligation, such as is always in the power of every moral agent. Anything desirable or undesirable in the nature or the thought or the feeling, which lies beyond the range of voluntary action, is riot a matter of immediate obligation, and can be neither holiness nor sin. Hence neither sin nor holiness can be transmitted or inherited or imputed, in the sense of being reckoned to the account of one in whose will it has not originated. As punishment can be inflicted only as an expression of blameworthiness, no one can be liable to  punishment for Adam's sin, because no one can be blameworthy for any sin but his own; just as impossible is it that one should be forgiven any sin but his own.

The repentance required as a condition of salvation is the renunciation of sin, an obligation which presses upon every sinner, and which is always within his power. The power to sin involves the power to renounce it, and this voluntary renunciation of sin is the change required of every sinner in order to acceptance with God. The work of the Holy Spirit in the sinner's conversion is a moral work, accomplished by the presentation of motives which induce repentance; and the subsequent work of sanctification and preservation is essentially of the same nature — a work accomplished by the Spirit through the truth. — The sovereignty of God works always in harmony with the freedom and responsibility of the creature, so that one factor in man's salvation must always be his own voluntary consent and cooperation. As the sin of one cannot be imputed to another, so neither can righteousness or merit. Hence the atonement cannot involve the transfer either, of our guilt to Christ, or of his righteousness or merit to us, but consists rather inn such an exhibition, in the cross of Christ. of divine love and faithfulness, and of man's sin and ill-desert, as to make the remission of penalty safe and right in the case of the penitent sinner. These views, in general, characterize what has been called the Oberlin Theology.

2. The ethical philosophy inculcated by Mr. Finney and his associates of later years is essentially that of the elder Edwards, which makes the well- being or blessedness of the sentient universe the summum bonum, or ultimate good; and the voluntary regard for this goodrespect for all interests according to their value — which is called benevolence, the grand element of all virtue. This benevolence is the love which is the fulfilling of the law — not, a mere kindly or amiable feeling, or any emotion whatever, but an attitude of will giving to every apprehended interest its proper place; a good-will exercised towards every being capable of good, beginning with God, the value of whose being is infinite, and coming down to the meanest of his creatures, embracing alike the evil and the good, the just and the unjust. This benevolence is consistent with every natural emotion, involving complacency when exercised towards God and .other virtuous beings, and displacency when exercised towards the wicked, but exhibiting the same essential character-regard for the well-being of its object.  The faculty by which the primary duty of benevolence is apprehended is conscience, and its affirmation, in its own sphere, is inevitable and infallible. Every moral being affirms the duty by the very necessity of his nature; and in reference to primary, subjective duty, the utterance of conscience is forever the same, and always right. A being whose conscience failed in this respect would cease to be a moral being. In all executive action — the carrying out of the benevolent attitude of the will in the performance of relative duties — the judgment must decide what on the whole will tend to promote well-being, or the good; then conscience follows the judgment, and enjoins the performance of this apprehended duty as an expression of benevolence. But the judgment is fallible; and there may be and often is misjudgment on the subject of outward or objective duty, and conscience may thus require us to do what is outwardly wrong. Still we must follow the best judgment we call obtain, and the error is a mistake, and not a sin. The moral character is right while the conscience is followed in the maintenance of the benevolent attitude. Blameworthiness can be involved only in a failure in this required ultimate attitude of the will. Hence a moral being always knows his duty — that which is immediately binding upon him and meeting this duty he is truly conscientious, and at the same time truly righteous.: His mistakes are not sins. They require correction, enlightenment, not forgiveness. Thus the voluntary attitude called benevolence is the constant element in all virtuous character, and the source of all virtuous action. It is the root of all the particular virtues, and constitutes the virtuous element in them all. Justice, mercy, obedience, veracity, and the like, become virtues by being expressions of benevolence under varying conditions, and they cease to be virtues when the benevolence fails. All duty finds its binding force and its limitations in the primary duty of benevolence. In this all duties must forever harmonize. The duty of benevolence is apprehended intuitively and rationally in connection with the idea of well-being, and can never fail to be duty to every moral being. It is seen to be binding from its own inherent nature, irrespective of all tendency, while all executive action prompted by benevolence is seen to be duty only on condition of its tendency to promote well-being. In: this respect the Oberlin view is distinguished from every scheme of utilitarianism.

As benevolence is the whole of virtue, so the refusal to be benevolent is the whole of sin, whatever the motive which induces this refusal These motives are always the solicitations of impulse, desire, or passion, which turn the  will aside from the requirements of benevolence. The sin takes its form from the immediate impulse to which the will subjects itself; but the essence of the sin is the refusal to assume that benevolent attitude which reason or conscience requires. The sinner then is not pursuing his own good as his supreme end. He sacrifices duty and his own good alike, in his subjection to an unworthy impulse. He is “carnally minded” — cares for the flesh or the desires. Benevolence requires him to regard his own well- being as well as that of his neighbor, but he sacrifices both in his voluntary subjection to desire. Every moral being, in the exercise of his freedom, stands between the motives which the reason presents, which urge to benevolence — regard for the well-being of God, and of the sentient universe because of its value-and the motives which the desires or impulses present, urging to self-gratification immediate or more remote, to the neglect of the true good of himself and of the universe at large, including the Creator. The character and action determined by the motives of the reason are right — they meet obligation; — determined by the motives of the flesh — the desires and passions they are wrong, and are in violation of obligation. The righteousness on the one hand and the sinfulness on the other must lie in the voluntary attitude assumed in the acceptance of one or the other class of motives which address the will; and this character, right or wrong, remains while the voluntary attitude remains, whether the circumstances admit of outward action or not. Virtue or righteousness lies in that primary attitude of benevolence, and virtuous action is the action which springs from benevolence. Sin is in the refusal to be benevolent, and sinful action is the expression of the unbenevolent will in the outward life.

Thus it is a peculiarity of the Oberlin ethical philosophy to regard virtue, or righteousness, and sin as in their own nature antagonistic to each other; each being contradictory of the other, and necessarily exclusive of it. Virtue being. benevolence, and sin the refusal to be benevolent, they cannot coexist in the same will. The will must be, at any given time, wholly in one attitude or the other. They may alternate, one giving place to. the other, but in the unity of action which of necessity belongs to the will they cannot coexist. The supposition of coexistence involves essentially a twofold personality, capable of maintaining at the same instant contradictory ultimate attitudes of will. Hence the sinner, in turning from his sin, discards it utterly for the time being, and yields his whole will to God.; and the good man, falling into sin, fails utterly in the benevolent attitude of the will; and, so far as his moral action is concerned, during that  lapse he is wholly wrong. Many of his former experiences and plans and executive purposes may remain unchanged; but the element of righteousness — the benevolent attitude of the will is at the time wholly wanting.

3. This view of moral action as necessarily either right or wrong, and of moral character as necessarily, at any given time, either one thing or the other, has shaped what has been known as the Oberlin doctrine of sanctification. The view first promulgated at Oberlin by Mr. Finney and others was based upon the prevalent idea that somewhat of sin still remains in the character and action of the converted man, coexisting with his obedience. The problem of sanctification must be to eliminate this remnant of sin, and make the obedience entire and permanent. This view led to the idea of a special experience, corresponding with the original conversion, in which the Christian rises from a partial to a complete obedience. The attainment of this condition must be always possible and obligatory, just as the original conversion was possible and obligatory to the sinner. The only difficulty in the way must be a partial and imperfect faith. On this view, there would be two classes of Christians — the simply converted, rendering a partial consecration and obedience, and the entirely sanctified, whose consecration ‘and obedience are entire. The preaching of the privilege and duty of entire sanctification, as thus apprehended, in the community at Oberlin, led to a very general quickening of the religious life, and to many marked experiences regarded at the time as the experience of entire sanctification. But in the fuller development of the conception of moral action as necessarily simple, forbidding the coexistence of sin and holiness, a restatement of the doctrine of sanctification became necessary. In this view conversion necessarily becomes entire consecration, and obedience and faith, as moral exercises, are necessarily complete. — The difficulty with the regenerate soul is not that he has made only a partial surrender of his will, but that he is weak and temptable and inexperienced, liable at any moment to lapse into sin under the pressure of temptation. Sanctification, then, becomes a growth, an attainment of experience and strength, not to be found in one special experience, an instantaneous rising from a partial to an entire consecration, but in the attainment of stability and strength and spiritual power by successive enlightenments and baptisms of the Spirit, and by “patient continuance in well-doing.” No clear line of division can separate sanctified and unsanctified Christians. Every believer is sanctified in the sense of being entirely consecrated; and there  are as many degrees of enlightenment and strength and stability as there are varying experiences in the Church of God. With this clearer view of the nature of moral action, the inculcation of the attainment of sanctification by one special experience ceased to be a feature of the religious instruction at Oberlin. The baptism of the Spirit is still presented as an object of faith and prayer, the standing promise of Christ to his people, affording to him who receives it light and strength and stability.

4. The theoretical and practical views maintained at Oberlin may be gathered from the following publications: The Oberlin Evangelist (Oberlin, 1839-1862, 24 vols.); The Oberlin Quarterly Review (ibid. 1845-1849, 4 vols.) Finney's Systematic Theology (ibid. 1845, 1846,. 2 vols.; republished in London, 1851, 1 vol.); Acceptable Holiness and The Gift of the Holy Ghost (two small vols. by Prof. Morgan [ibid. 1875]); Fairchild's Moral Philosophy (N. Y. 1869). See also New-Englander, Oct. 1872, art. vi; Bullet. theol. 1869, Dec. 25, p. 310; Hauck, Theol. Jahresbericht, 1869, 2:65. (J. H. F.)

## Oberlin, Jean Frederic[[@Headword:Oberlin, Jean Frederic]]

             one of the most noted of French Lutheran divines, was born August 31, 1740, in Strasburg, formerly the capital of Alsace, near the Rhine. Blessed with pious parents and reared under Christian influences, Frederic from his childhood exhibited evidences of consistent piety, and was noted for the benevolence and gentleness of his disposition, his coinstant desire to protect the weak, to relieve the suffering, and to promote the comfort and happiness of the race. On the completion of his preparatory course, he entered the university for the purpose of prosecuting his studies, with a view to the Christian ministry. While a student he attended upon the religious instructions of one who was distinguished for the earnestness with which he preached “Christ and him crucified.” A permanent change in the character of the young man was effected; impressions and influences at that time were made upon his mind which were never effaced. He was thoroughly awakened to the claims of the Gospel, and brought to make a full surrender of himself to Christ. At. the age of twenty, in a solemn covenant, he consecrated himself to the service of God. This act of self- dedication, written and signed January 1, 1760, and renewed ten years afterwards, gives us some idea of his earnest Christian principles at this very early period, the key-note of his unfaltering devotion to Christ and his cause.

On the conclusion of his theological course he was ordained to the work of the ministry, but he did not immediately enter upon it. He was for several years employed as a private instructor in the family of a physician,  with whom he incidentally acquired a. large amount of medical knowledge, which proved of great value to him in his subsequent labors. In 1766 he was appointed chaplain in the French army, which position he had concluded to accept, and was already preparing himself for its duties when he received a most earnest appeal to labor in the interests of the parish of Waldbach, in the Ban de la Roche. This changed his plans. So fine a prospect of usefulness was here presented, that with his views of duty he could not disregard its claims, and he at once determined to occupy this field of labor. Waldbach was at the time a desolate, scarcely civilized village in the bleak, wild, and mountainous Ban de la Roche, which derived its name from a castle called La Roche, or the Rock, which the Ban or district surrounds. It is also known by the German name of Steinthal, the Valley of Stone. The district had suffered severely in the Thirty-years' War, and the population that survived its ravages were reduced to poverty and debased by ignorance. It was only in 1750 that any effort was made for the moral improvement and social elevation of this obscure and degraded people. He commenced .his labors by combining faithful diligence in the ordinary duties of the pastorate, with wise and earnest endeavors to advance the education and general prosperity of the community. He projected more extended plans of improvement than his predecessor had attempted, and, as the best means of preparing the way for his pastoral instructions, he determined to teach the people the ordinary arts and comforts of life. His efforts at first met with great opposition. The people had been accustomed to indulge so long in an indolent life that they could not believe that their happiness would be increased by exertion. Some of the more malicious too, united in a plot to lie in ambush for their good minister, and inflict upon him personal violence. Having been informed of their intentions and the time they had selected, he preached as usual, from the words, “But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also,” and inculcated the lesson of Christian patience and submission under injury. At the conclusion of the services the conspirators gathered together, wondering whether the preacher would act in accordance with his principles when they were brought to the test; but, to their surprise, in the midst of their discussion he made his appearance among them. “Here am I, my friends,” he said. “I know all about your designs. If I have violated the rules which I have laid down for your government, chastise me. It is better that I should deliver myself into your hands than that you should be guilty of the meanness of lying in wait for me.”

Deeply touched by his simple address,  and ashamed of their conduct, they implored his forgiveness and mercy, and promised never again to oppose his kind and well-meant efforts. Only a few weeks afterwards another scheme was concocted, in one of the other villages in the district, to seize him as he was returning from the services of the sanctuary and beat him. Having heard of the plot, he preached on the safety of those who put their trust in the Lord, and .of the sure protection promised them in all the trials and conflicts of life. He returned home after the exercises by the usual way, although he knew that those who had plotted against him lay concealed in the bushes, and were awaiting his approach. He felt, however, that the everlasting arms were underneath him. Undaunted he passed by his enemies, and so completely were they discomfited that not one ventured to touch him. These incidents had a salutary influence, and greatly aided him in his benevolent mission. Confidence in the man and his work was increased; and these very individuals who had been detected in their wicked designs subsequently became his most devoted friends, and were most faithful in their cooperation. One of Oberlin's first enterprises for the improvement of the people was the construction of a road, so that their territory might be accessible, and communication effected with the more civilized districts of the country. The proposition at first was listened to with astonishment and incredulity. Its execution seemed to the ignorant and benighted peasants impossible, and they began to make excuses for not participating in the labor. But when they saw the worthy pastor take up a pick-axe and vigorously engage in the work, they all soon joined him. He continued to direct and share their labors, until a road was opened to Strasburg, and a bridge thrown over the intervening river. When this was accomplished, he easily persuaded the people to make other roads, by means of which communication with all the fire villages was established. He also introduced among the people the mechanical arts by selecting from the older boys the best qualified, and apprenticing them to mechanics at Strasburg. He likewise improved their dwellings; neat cottages and comfortable homes were gradually substituted for the miserable cabins, which had generally been hewn out of the rocks or sunk into the sides of the mountains.

He made them also acquainted with the improved methods of cultivating the soil, and infused among them a taste for rearing fruit- trees, so that in a few years a marvelous change was wrought in the appearance of this wild and sterile country. After instructing them in the various arts of agriculture, of which they were before totally ignorant, in 1778 he formed an agricultural society, which, in addition to providing  books and instruction on the subject, also instituted prizes for successful competition in this department of labor. His principal efforts were, however, directed to the moral and spiritual improvement of the community. His labors were all made subordinate and tributary to this one great object. On the Lord's-day he carefully instructed them in the principles, doctrines, and duties of the Christian religion, and neglected no opportunity of improving their character, reminding them of their natural depravity, of the necessity of repentance, and the consecration of all their powers to the Savior. His labors on behalf of the rising generation were most faithful and effective. His confidence in God was so strong that he commenced the erection of a schoolhouse in each of the villages, although without the means necessary to defray the expenses. He firmly relied on the divine promises. Fervent in spirit and earnest in prayer, he felt that success was sure. His expectations were not disappointed. Assistance came from various directions, and the people cordially supported him in his measures. The buildings were erected, teachers were specially prepared for their work and evidences of a marked change in the community were everywhere visible. The face of the country was completely renovated. Poverty and misery were supplanted by rural happiness and contentment. But Oberlin, in his desire to perfect the system of instruction, so as to make it beneficial to all ages, having observed with concern the disadvantages from which the younger children suffered while their elder brothers and sisters were at school and their parents busily engaged in their daily avocations, presented a plan for the organization of infant schools, the first established of which there is any record. For each village he appointed a female teacher. In the exercises, amusement and instruction were blended, very much on the same principle on which these schools at the present day are conducted. Two women were employed in each school, one to direct the manual tasks, and the other the lessons, and amusements of the children, whose ages were from two to seven years. When they became weary, the teacher would exhibit and explain to them pictures relating to scriptural subjects, natural history, and geography. The children were also taught to sing hymns, and to avoid the use of the barbarous patois which was their vernacular tongue. Thus trained, in due time they entered the higher schools, in which a more advanced course of instruction was adopted. He also instituted Sunday- schools.

The children of each hamlet assembled in rotation every Sunday in the church to sing the hymns and to recite the religious lessons which they had learned during the week, and to receive the counsels of their minister. Besides this meeting, all the scholars were once a week collected at  Waldbach and examined in their studies. His friends at-Strasburg contributed liberally in aid of his schools, so that he was enabled to procure books for a library, and also philosophical apparatus and mathematical instruments. At a certain period the scholars were required, each one to plant at least two trees, for the purpose of impressing upon the youthful mind the duty of contributing something to the general prosperity. He also organized in 1782, for the religious improvement of the people, a Christian Society similar to the Young Men's Christian Associations of the present day. The exercises consisted chiefly of prayer and religious conversation. Among the regulations of the society we find one requiring the members on the first day of every month to pray for the success of missions; and another proposing. that every Sunday and Wednesday, at five o'clock P.M. the members offer supplication on behalf of all connected with the society, that they and their households may be saved; also for all God's children of every denomination, that they may be united more and more in Christ, that the kingdom of Satan may be destroyed, and the kingdom of God established among the heathen and nominal Christians; also for teachers and magistrates, for all pastors and laborers in the vineyard of the Lord, and for the young, that they may be preserved from the seductive influences of wicked example and early led to a knowledge of the precious Redeemer. Another of the rules required that every Saturday evening all the members should pray for God's blessing on the preached Word the following day. He also selected various mottoes and topics which he desired the members to consider and remember; among them were such as these, “Bring forth much fruit;” “Lose no time;” “Love not the world, neither the things of the world;”' “Search the Scriptures diligently.” Texts from the Bible were to be seen everywhere on the walls of his house.

It was his constant aim to omit no occasion of doing good, or of impressing upon the heart and conscience important religious truths. He also established in his parish a Bible Society, auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society. Stated meetings were held and collections taken for the parent institution; the Scriptures were also read and prayer offered for the success of the cause. Female Bible societies were likewise formed, the members of which loaned the sacred volume to their neighbors, and read it to those who could not read it for themselves. His success in reconciling differences and adjusting difficulties among the people was most remarkable. So much confidence was reposed in the integrity of his character and the judiciousness of his counsels that all seemed disposed to trust his decisions and follow his advice. He successfully terminated an  angry controversy which had existed for eighty years between the peasantry of Ban de la Roche and some proprietors of the territory in reference to the woodland which covered their mountains. The lawsuit originating from this dispute was a source of constant annoyance, a great drawback to their industry, and a loss to the whole community. After years of acrimonious conflict, the contest was abandoned on terms regarded by both parties as advantageous. The magistrate of the province, who had so signally failed in settling the controversy, was so deeply impressed with the power of the good pastor that he begged him to preserve in his study the pen with which the amicable agreement had been signed, as a memorial of the triumph which Christian virtue and principle had secured over bitter prejudices and long-continued hostilities. During the period of the French Revolution, when almost every interest suffered, and religious worship of every kind was interdicted, this good man was unmolested in the discharge of his faithful duties. His house was the asylum of the persecuted and oppressed, of the many who had fled for refuge from the cruel scenes and bloody persecutions which were elsewhere enacted. All men had confidence in his integrity. His consistent piety, active benevolence, and untiring energy everywhere made a deep impression. About this time so deeply was his heart touched by the reports in reference to the wretched condition of the slave population in the West Indies that he resolved no longer to use sugar or coffee, because they were the product of slave labor; and this resolution he faithfully kept during the remainder of his life, although its observance required the practice of great self-denial, inasmuch as from his infancy he had been accustomed to these luxuries. But he was so much under the influence of Christian principle that, no matter how great the sacrifice, he was ever willing to make it, in obedience to his convictions of duty. The missionary spirit, also, was so strongly awakened in his breast, as the pathetic appeals reached him from distant-lands, that his heart yearned towards those who were perishing in their sins, ignorant of the glad tidings of redemption through Jesus Christ.

When he heard of the spiritual destitution that existed among brethren of his faith in the United States he was ready to respond to the earnest Macedonian cry, “‘Come over and help us.”' He had determined to immigrate to ‘this country, where, it seemed to him, there was so much work to be done for the German population, and his arrangements were nearly completed, when his designs, greatly to his sorrow, were frustrated by the American Revolution. His work evidently was not yet done in the  Ban de la Roche, or Providence would have opened the way for his departure. As the population of the Ban increased, Oberlin introduced among the peasants cotton-spinning and weaving, the art of dyeing, and various branches of manufacture. The flourishing settlement began to attract attention from abroad, and in 1818, in testimony of his services to mankind; and especially in the science of agriculture, a gold medal was presented to the worthy pastor by the Royal Agricultural Society of Paris. The decoration of the Legion of Honor was also awarded him by Louis XVIII as an appreciation of his services to humanity. He was visited, too, by distinguished travelers from different parts of Europe, who expressed their utmost gratification with the order and happiness which prevailed, and their astonishment at the great changes that had been effected. Oberlin's influence over his parish continued to the last. As he advanced in years, and physical infirmities increased, he resigned to his son-in-law his more active duties; but there was no abatement of his interest in the work. With a face habitually serene, his life presented one of the finest specimens of happy old age. When he could no longer labor, with unfaltering devotion he prayed for his beloved people; and that no one might be passed by, he was accustomed to keep a list of his parishioners and pray for them individually; and frequently he would write on his door the names of such as claimed special attention, lest they might be forgotten. He also spent a portion of his time in epistolary correspondence, and in writing essays on religious subjects for the instruction of his people. Every sentiment he uttered seemed animated by the spirit of the Master — an earnest desire to do good and to fulfill the object of life, by simple-hearted faith in God and patient submission to his will. His last illness was brief. On the morning of June 2,1826, in the eighty-sixth year of his age, and the sixtieth of his ministry in the Ban de la Roche, he gently passed to his rest, the place “which sin can never touch nor sorrow cloud.”

As the intelligence of the good man's death spread through the district it was received with unfeigned sorrow. The peasants in a vast concourse came from all directions, through drenching rains and muddy roads, to look for the last time upon the countenance of their father and friend, to pay their tribute of gratitude and affection to the memory of him who had been so closely identified with their interests, and who had steadfastly and enthusiastically dedicated his life to their moral elevation. When the procession with the corpse, on which were placed the Bible from which he had so long preached and the robes which he had worn in the pulpit, preceded by the oldest inhabitant carrying a cross designed to be placed by the grave,  reached the church — a distance of two miles — the mourners had not yet all left the house. At the funeral services in the church, which, although closely packed, only a small portion could enter, a paper written by Oberlin many years before in prospect of this event was read. Among other things, the following tender and impressive language occurs: “God will neither forget nor forsake thee, my dear parish! He has towards thee, as I have often said, thoughts of peace and mercy. All things will go well with thee. Only cleave thou to him. Forget my name, and retain only that of Jesus Christ, whom I have proclaimed to thee. He is thy Pastor; I am but his servant. He is the Good Master who sent me to thee that I might be useful. He alone is wise, good, and almighty; I am but a poor, fallen, wretched man. Pray, my friends, that you may all become the beloved sheep of his pasture. There is salvation in none other than Jesus Christ. Jesus loves you, seeks you, and is ready to receive you. Go to him just as you are, with all your sins and infirmities. He alone can deliver you from them, and heal you. He will sanctify and perfect you. .Consecrate yourselves to him. Whenever any of you die, may you die in him and may I meet you, with songs of triumph, in the mansions of the blessed, before the throne of the Lamb.”

There is much that is attractive in the faithful labors of Jean Frederic Oberlin, and the lessons derived from his useful life may be profitable in their relation to our own personal efforts to do good. There have been men of more brilliant talents, of greater erudition and more varied attainments, but few individuals have been more earnest and devoted to their work, or more successful in the influence which they wielded and the results they accomplished, than this humble Lutheran minister. He was the ideal of a good pastor — holy, harmless, separate from sinners; a man of warm heart and generous impulses, of great simplicity, of a frank, genial nature, uniform kindness, and unsullied integrity. He possessed energy, industry, unconquerable perseverance, and a wonderful power of endurance. He was a man of methodical habits, a lover of order and subordination, sincere and unreserved in his intercourse, practical in his character, and entirely consecrated to the service of the Master. His career was one scene of active benevolence and zealous piety, an exhibition of a loving heart, a blameless life, and a tireless hand. He was thoroughly evangelical in his views, importunate in prayer, and strong in faith, and strikingly illustrated in his own walk and conversation the power and blessedness of the Gospel. Notwithstanding the comparatively obscure and humble sphere which he  occupied, he became the: beloved patriarch of a renovated country and a regenerated people. His fame as a philanthropist has extended over the world, and his example has stimulated and guided others in their Christian efforts to advance the welfare and elevate the character of the race. See North Amer. Rev. 1831, p. 453; Princet. Repos. 1830, p. 532; Bullet. Theol. Oct. 25, 1869, p. 310; Neander, Ziige aus dem Leben u. Wirken des Pastor Oberlin (1835); Merlin, Le Pasteur Oberlin (1833); Rothert, Leben J. F. Oberlin's (1847); The Ban de la Roche and its Benefautor (Lond. 1820).; Lutteroth, Notice sur . F. Oberlin (1826); Stoeber, Vie de J. F. Oberlin (1834); Schubert, Ziige aus dem Leben Oberlin's (1854); Sims, Brief Memorials of Oberlin (Lond. 1830); Memoirs of Oberlin (8th ed. Lond. 1838); Menzoirs of John Frederick Oberlin, Pastor of Waldbach, in the ‘Ban de la Roche; compileil from authentic sources, chiefly French and German, with a dedication and translation, by the Rev. Luther Halsey (N.York, 1855); Blackie, Morals, p. 270; Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, ii,:380sq. (M.L.S.)

## Oberlin, Jeremiah James[[@Headword:Oberlin, Jeremiah James]]

             an eminent French educator, was an elder brother of the philanthropist Oberlin, and was born at Strasburg August 7, 1735. He was educated at the gymnasium of that town. He afterwards spent a few months at Montbeliard for the, purpose of learning the French language, and returned to Strasburg in 1750, where he prosecuted his university studies. He took the degree of doctor of philosophy in 1758, and afterwards paid considerable attention to the study of theology. In 1768 he was appointed a teacher in the gymnasium where he had been. educated, and in 1763 was entrusted with the care of the library of the University of Strasburg, and obtained permission to give lectures on the Latin language. In 1770 he was appointed professor of rhetoric, and from that time was accustomed to give lectures on Greek and Roman archaeology, ancient geography, etc. In 1778 he was appointed extraordinary professor in the university, in 1782 ordinary professor of logic and metaphysics, and in 1787 director of the gymnasium. During the Revolution his life was in considerable danger. He was imprisoned at the beginning of November, 1793, but obtained his liberty at the end of a few months, and again resumed his lectures at Strasburg, continuing them till his death, which took place Oct. 10, 1806. Oberlin was an accurate and industrious scholar. He published good editions of several of the Latin classics, of which his Tacitus and Caesar are considered the most valuable. He had also paid great attention to the study  of the ancient French language, and traveled more than once through some of the provinces of France in order to become acquainted with the different patois spoken in the country. He published several works on this subject. He was also the author of several other works, the principal of which are, Dissertatio Philologica de Veterum Ritu condiendi Mortuos (1757): — Rituum Romanorum Tabulce in usum Auditorum (1774; reprinted.in 1784): — Jungendorum Marium Fluviorumque omnis cevi Molimina (1770-1775):and Dissertations sur les Minnesingers (the Troubadours of Alsace) (1782-1789). The life of Oberlin has been written by Schweighauser in Latin, and by Winckler in the Magas. Encyclopd. (1807).,

## Oberndorfer, Celestin[[@Headword:Oberndorfer, Celestin]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Landshut in 1724. He joined the Benedictines, and became successively professor of logic, then of natural philosophy' and afterwards of theology in the College of Freysing. He died in 1765. He wrote, Scholae catholicorum, tum philosophia, turn theologia propter suam, quam in docendo usurpant, etc. (Freysing, 1756, 2 pts. 4to): — Resolutiones ex psychologia et theologia naturali (ibid. 1758, 4to): — Brevis apparatus eruditionis de fontibus theologice (Augsb. 1760, 5 pts. 4to): — Theologia dogmatico — historico — scholastica (Freiburg, 1762-1765, 5 vols. 8vo): — Systemna theologice dogmatico- historicocriticum (Freysing, 1762-1765, 5 vols. 8vo); Zacher added seven more volumes to this work. See Baader, Lexikon Baierischer Schriftsteller; Meusel, Lexikon.

## Oberrauch, Anton Nicolaus[[@Headword:Oberrauch, Anton Nicolaus]]

             (called also Herculanus), a. Roman Catholic theologian of note, was born in the Sarnthal, in Tyrol, Dec. 5, 1728. His early education he received at Innspruck, where he studied philosophy and theology. In the year 1750 he joined the Order of Franciscans, and continued his studies until the year 1756. After having been engaged as an instructor in the Franciscan monastery for some years, in 1762 he was appointed professor of theology  at Botzen; from 1763 to 1765 he lectured on ecclesiastical law at Halle; from 1766 to 1782 he occupied the chair of moral theology at Innspruck, and died in 1808 at the monastery of Schwaz. He wrote, besides several smaller works, Institutiones justitio Christiane s. theologia moralis (1774- 75, 8 vols.; 2d ed. 1796), which had the honor of being placed in 1797 on the Index librorum prohibitoruem: — Tractatus de lege Dei ceterna (1776). He also left in MS. pretty well advanced De Juventute religiose educanda. See Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, in the supplementary volume of Rottermund, v. 895; De Luca, Gelehrtes Oesterreich, i,l; Nova Bib. Eccles. Friburgensis, 1775, No. 28; Wetzer und Welte Kirchen-Lexikon, 7:879, 680; Waitzenegger, Gel. — u. Schriftsteller-Lexikon d. deutschen Kath. Geistlichkeit, 2:47- 71. (B. P.)

## Oberthur, Franz, Dr[[@Headword:Oberthur, Franz, Dr]]

             a noted Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Wurzburg Aug. 6,1745. Patronized by the bishop, Adam Frederick, count of Seixsheim, he was admitted into the Julius Hospital at Wurzburg, where from 1763 to 1771 he studied philosophy, theology, and law, and was afterwards sent by his patron to Rome, in order to complete his studies there. In 1773 he was appointed counselor of curacy and consistory, and in 1774 he was elected professor of dogmatics at Wurtzburg. In 1782 he was appointed spiritual counselor and head of the city schools, in which position he labored especially with a view to reformation. On account of the liberal dogmatic views which Oberthiur expounded in his Idea biblica ecclesiae Dei. a division was caused between him and his bishop. Oberthur was tendered another position instead of his professorship, which offer he, however, refused; but he was finally deprived of his position in 1803, and again in 1809, at the new organization of the university. In 1821 he was appointed as theologian of the chapter, which position he held until his death, Aug. 30, 1831. Oberthor was a very learned man, of a practical and catholic mind, who not only had the wants of the students at heart, but also those of the common people, to enlarge whose ideas was one of his main objects in life. In this his reformatory movement he also perceived the good in those who were not of his own creed, and, as his biographer Ruland states: “Maxime est gavisus laudari ab iis, qui erant aliense confessionis.” Oberthur was a fertile writer. He published, Dogmaticae etpolekiae pars una (Wtirzburg, 1776): — idea biblica ecclesiae Dei (1790-1821, 6 vols.): — Biblische Anthropologie (Minster, 1807-10, 4 vols.): — Encyclopcedia  (Wurzburg, 1786; Germ. ed. 1828): —Methodologia (1828): — Opera polemica Sanctoruni Pats-lum de veritate religionis Christiance contra Gentiles et Judaeos (ibid. 1777-92, etc., 34 vols.). See Ruland, Series et vita professorun S. S. Theolog., qui Wirceburgi a fund. Academia usque in ann. 1834 docuerunt (ibid. 1835); Dix, in Wetzer und Welte's Kirchen- Lezikon, vol. vii, s.v.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:44; Bruhl, Gesch. der Kathol. Literatur Deutschlands (1861), p. 713 sq.; Werner, Gesch. der Kathol. Theologie (see Index). (B. P.)

## Oberto, Francesco Di[[@Headword:Oberto, Francesco Di]]

             was the earliest painter of the Genoese school, and his works are still extant. Lanzi mentions an altar-piece by him in the church of St. Domenico at (Genoa, representing the Virgin between two angels, signed “Franciscos de Oberto, 1368.”

## Obi[[@Headword:Obi]]

             SEE OBEAH.

## Obi (2)[[@Headword:Obi (2)]]

             SEE OLD MAN.

## Obil[[@Headword:Obil]]

             (Heb. Obil', אוֹבַיל, from the Arabic abal, an overseer of camels; Sept. Οὐβϊvας v. r. Α᾿βίας and ᾿Ωβίλ , Vulg. Ubil), an Ishriaelite, or Arab, doubtless of the nomade tribes, who had charge of the royal camels in the time of David — an exceedingly fit employment for an Arab (1Ch 27:30). As the name means in Arabic ‘“a keeper of camels,” Jerome (2:2) infers that the person had his name from his office, which has always been a very common circumstance in the East (see Bochart, Hieroz. I, 2:2).

## Obit[[@Headword:Obit]]

             (Lat. obitus, a going down, i.e. to death, therefore decease), of an individual, is used in ecclesiastical language to designate the commemoration of a saint's death; called also his celebration, departure, falling asleep, or, if a martyr, his passion. The term is a contraction of the  phrase “Obit mortem,” i.e. he meets death, and is used specially to designate a funeral office performed for the dead, and for his soul's health, as they say, at certain times and places. The Assumption is ascribed to the blessed Virgin, the Deposition to St. John, from the tradition that he laid himself down in his grave.

It was an early practice of the primitive Church to commemorate the martyrs on the anniversary of their death; and when the days of persecution had come to an end the custom was extended, or continued to prevail in respect to others of the departed besides martyrs, such as relatives, friends, and benefactors. Indeed, in former times, under the influence of the Romish priesthood, it was not uncommon for dying persons, though they had children to provide for or debts to pay, to postpone all care of relatives and other considerations, in order to secure for themselves masses satisfactory, anniversaries, obits, requiems, dirges, placebos, tribunals, lamps, lights, and other offices to be performed daily, monthly, or yearly, as far as the sums left would afford, for the ease and help of the testator's soul. In “religious houses” they had a register, wherein they entered the obits or obitual days of their founders and benefactors, which was thence termed obituary. Thus in many colleges the obit or anniversary of the death of the founder is piously observed. There have been since the Reformation commemoration days at Oxford and Cambridge, on which the names of all the known benefactors to the universities are proclaimed and a special service is recited. For the offices used on the occasion of these commemorations in England, see the Annotated Book of Common Prayer. Appendix to the Burial Office.

## Obituary[[@Headword:Obituary]]

             SEE OBIT.

## Obizzini, Tommaso[[@Headword:Obizzini, Tommaso]]

             an Italian Orientalist, who flourished in the first half of the 17th century, was born in Non, near Novara. He entered the Order of the Minor Brothers, and applied himself to the study of the Oriental languages. Devoted to the missions of the East, he went to Jerusalem in the capacity of apostolic commissary and guardian of a convent of his order. During his sojourn in the Holy Land he succeeded in restoring to Christian worship two churches dedicated to the Virgin and St. John the Baptist, of which the Turks had taken possession, and by order of pope Paul V he presided over  a synod which condemned the heresies of Nestor and Eutyches, still influential in the East. On his return to Rome he taught for several years Arabic, Syriac, and Coptic in the monastery of St. Peter in Montorio, and formed a great number of missionaries. It was there that he died, according to Wadding, in 1638, at an advanced age; but Achille Venerio, one of his disciples, says expressly in the dedication of Thesaurus, published in 1636, that he was no longer living sometime previous to that date. Obizzini is also known by the name of Thomas Novariensis, or Novaria. We have of his works, Isagoge id est breve introductorium Arabicum in scientiam logices, cum versione Latina, ac theses sanctcefidei (Rome, 1625, 4to):Grammatica Arabica agrumia appellata, cum versione Latina et dilucida expositione (ibid. 1631, 8vo): this is a valuable edition of the Arabic Grammar entitled Jarumia, and favorably quoted by Silvestre de Sacy: Thesaurus Arabico-Syro-Latinus (ibid. 1636, 4to); the printing, superintended by Achille Venerio, is very faulty; this book was largely composed from a Syriac vocabulary whose author is Elias Barsines, a metropolitan of Nisibis, of the 11th century. See Wadding, Script. Ord. Minorum; Tiraboschi, Storia della letter. Ital. vol. viii.

## Object[[@Headword:Object]]

             in the language of metaphysics, is that of which any thinking being or subject can become cognizant. This subject itself, however, is capable of transmutation into an object, for one may think about his thinking faculty. To constitute a metaphysical object, actual existence is not necessary; it is enough that it is conceived by the subject. Nevertheless, it is customary to employ the term objective as synonymous with real, so that a thing is said to be “objectively” considered when regarded in itself, and according to its nature and properties, and to be “subjectively” considered when it is presented in its relation to us, or as it shapes itself in our apprehension. Skepticism denies the possibility of objective knowledge; i.e. it denies that we can ever become certain that our cognition of an object corresponds with the actual nature of that object. The verbal antithesis of objective and subjective representation is also largely employed in the fine arts; but even here, though the terms may be convenient, the difference expressed by them is only one of degree, and not of kind.

## Objections To Christianity[[@Headword:Objections To Christianity]]

             SEE APOLOGETICS.

## Objective[[@Headword:Objective]]

             is a term which, like the preceding (i.e. OBJECT), is much used in scholastic theology for the purpose of expressing that phase of anything which comprehends its existence, but of excluding that phase of anything which comprehends our knowledge of it. Thus applied, the energy of thought may be objectively directed towards the Divine Nature: Objectively by contemplation of the Divine Nature as in itself, and not as in its relation to us; i.e. our contemplation of it as “non ego;” subjectively, on the other hand, by contemplation of the Divine Nature as it forms part of a system, of which “Ego” is the starting-point, if not the center. Applying the illustration to faith, it will be seen that Objective faith looks to that in which we believe; Subjective faith to that with which we believe: the first being that phase of belief in God, e.g. which fixes its gaze on God as its object; while the second is that phase of faith which sees the believer in God, and the operation of his mind in believing. Or again, the first represents a dogma, the second a faculty. In the same manner the terms may be applied to worship. Objective worship is adoration in its purest and most unselfish form; adoration of God as its object, without reference to the person adoring. Subjective worship, on the other hand, is praise, prayer, or thanksgiving offered for the advantage of the subject, that is, the person worshipping. For a full account of the history and use of the words, see notes at the end of Hamilton's edition of Reid's Works (Edinb. 1846).

## Oblata[[@Headword:Oblata]]

             (Lat. for offered), the name of the host before consecration. The oblatoe, not consecrated, though blessed on the altar, were given by the priest, before food in the refectory, to those monks who had not received the sacrament. Oblatae were made in a kind of mold of a small pattern. Females, called sanctimoniales, had assigned to them the office of making these oblatoe, but always without leaven. They were occasionally placed on the bosoms of the dead. The host, before consecration, was cut in the form of a cross by a knife specially set apart for that purpose, and the vessels in which it was preserved were made in the form of small towers. According to the Mozarabic Liturgy, it was to be mystically divided into nine parts, called ‘Gloria, etc. Information on these particulars may be obtained from Du Cange, s. v, Gloria, Lancea, Oblata, Panis, Turris.

## Oblates[[@Headword:Oblates]]

             (Lat. oblati, oblatae, “offered up”) is the name of three different classes of religious bodies in the Roman Catholic Church, which differ from the religious orders strictly so called in not being bound by the solemn vows of the religious profession.

(1.) The institution of the first of these, called The Oblates of St. Ambrose, was one of the many reform; introduced in the diocese of Milan by St. Charles Bor romeo towards the close of the 16th century. The members consisted of secular priests who lived in community, and were merely bound by a promise to the bishop to devote themselves to any service which he should consider desirable for the interests of religion St. Charles made use of their services chiefly as missionaries in the wild and inaccessible Alpine districts of his diocese. He drew up their constitutions, which were revised by St. Philip Neri (q.v.) and St. Felix Cantalici, and approved repeatedly by the papal see This institute, which had many establishments at Milan Verona, and other parts of Northern Italy, still exists and has recently been introduced into England by cardinal Wiseman, and the order possesses at present in London five houses, and serves four city missions.

Attached to the London oblates, but distinct from them in idea and institutes, is St. Joseph's Society of the Sacred Heart of Foreign Missions, with a central house at Mill Hill, near London, and intrusted by pope Pius IX with the spiritual care of the freedmen of the United States. All missionaries educated by St. Joseph's Society leave Europe for life, devoting themselves to non-European races. They make vows of obedience, and bind themselves to practice evangelical poverty, and to go wherever sent: This society counts (1875) twelve priests and thirty students in divinity from men of all nations. They have three missions to blacks exclusively, in Baltimore, Charleston, and Louisville. Bishop Herbert Vaughan, of Salford, is the superior general.

(2.) Another institute, confined to females, is the Oblates of the blessed Virgin Mary, a body of French origin, which arose in the present century, and has been very widely extended. Their chief object is to assist the parochial clergy, by holding missions for the religious instruction of the people in any district to which they may be invited. This body was approved by pope Leo XII Feb. 17, 1826. They have been established in  England and in Ireland, the British colonies, the islands of the Pacific, and the United States. Called to Canada in 1841, they immediately occupied in the extreme north and west of British America the old Jesuit missionary posts, and extended their labors to the remotest tribes. In' Canada they have several colleges, seminaries, and academies, with a constantly increasing body of priests. They also have numerous establishments in Northern New York, Minnesota, Texas, and Washington Territory. Other similar institutes might be enumerated, but the constitution of all is nearly the same.

(3.) There is also a female institute of oblates. which was established in Rome, about 1440, by St. Francisca of Rome, and which consists of ladies associated for charitable and religious objects, and living in community, but bound only by promise, and not by vow.

(4.) There are besides the Oblates Sisters of Providence, a sisterhood of colored women, founded at Baltimore in 1825 by the Rev. H. Jowbert, for educating colored girls, taking charge of colored orphans, and attending to the general needs of the colored people in the United States. These sisters were approved by Gregory XVI in 1831. Their mother house is in Baltimore.

## Oblates (2)[[@Headword:Oblates (2)]]

             was also the name of those children who were dedicated from infancy to the cloister (the parents wrapped their boy's hand in altar-cloth, with a petition), and of the dying who assumed the cowl. In 1191 Celestine III freed children from such vows. See the art. .Converssi in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:270; Alzogi Kirchengesch. 2:422; Barnum, Romanism, p. 437.

## Oblati[[@Headword:Oblati]]

             SEE OBLATES.

## Oblation[[@Headword:Oblation]]

             is the rendering frequently employed in the A.V. for several Heb. words, elsewhere with equal propriety rendered by the synonymous word OFFERING SEE OFFERING (q.v.), and in one passage (Eze 20:40) for מִשְׂאֵת, maseth' (lit. a lifting up, hence a present), as applied to the first-fruits in which relation only we will here consider it. “There are  various regulations in the law of Moses respecting first-fruits, which would be of much interest to us could we in every case discern the precise object in view. No doubt the leading object, so far as regards the offering of the first-fruits to God, was that all the after-fruits and after-gatherings might be consecrated in and through them; and it was not less the dictate of a natural impulse that the first-fruits should be offered to God in testimony of thankfulness for his bounties. Hence we find some analogous custom among most nations in which material offerings were used. There are, however, some particulars in the Mosaical regulations which these considerations do not adequately explain.

“1. First-fruits of Fruit-trees. — It was directed that the first-fruits of every tree whose fruit was used for food should, for the first three years of bearing, be counted ‘uncircumcised,' and regarded as unclean (Lev 19:23-24). It was unlawful to sell them, to eat them, or to make any benefit of them. It was only in the fourth year of bearing that they were accounted ‘holy,' and the fruit of that year was made an offering of firstfruits, and was either given to the priests (Num 18:12-13), or, as the Jews themselves understand, was eaten by the owners of it ‘before the Lord at Jerusalem,' as was the case with second tithe. After the fourth year all fruits of trees were available for use by the owner.

“2. First-fruits of the Yearly Increase. — Of these there were several kinds:

(1) The first-fruits in the sheaf (Lev 23:10).

(2.) The first-fruits in the two waveloaves (Lev 23:17). These two bounded the harvest, that in the sheaf being offered at the beginning of the harvest, upon the 15th of the month Nisan; the other at the end of the harvest, on the feast of Pentecost. These two are both called תְּנוּפוֹת, tenuphoth', offerings.

(3.) The first of the dough, being the twenty-fourth part thereof, which was given to the priests (Num 15:20); and this kind of offering was not neglected even after the return from Babylon (Neh 10:37).

(4.) The first-firuits of the threshing-floor. These last two are called תְּרוּמוֹתterumoth', ‘heave-offerings;' the one the ‘heave-offering of the threshing-floor,' the other the ‘heave-offering of the dough.' The words tenuphoth and terumoth both signify ‘shake-offering,' ‘heave-offering,' or  ‘wave-offering;' but with the difference that the terumoth was offered by a waving of elevation, moving the oblation upward and downward, to signify, as we are told, that Jehovah was the God both of the heaven and earth; but the tenuphoth was offered by waving of agitation, to and fro, from the right hand to the left, from east to west, from north to south; which is alleged to have been in the way of an acknowledgment that Jehovah was the Lord of the whole world (see Godwyn, Moses and Aaron, 6:2, p. 214, 215; also, Lewis, Origines, 1:143-146).” SEE FIRST-FRUITS.

## Oblation (Christian)[[@Headword:Oblation (Christian)]]

             designates an offering to God, in certain ecclesiastical senses.

1. In the sacramental service of the Church of England the phrase “alms and oblations” occurs in the prayer for the Church militant, and evidently refers to a very ancient custom. “In the primitive Church, at the administration of the Lord's Supper, communicants were required to bring certain oblations, προσφοραί or presents, δῶρα of bread and wine. These were sometimes presented by persons who did not communicate. The bread and wine were enveloped in a white linen cloth called ‘ fago,' the wine. being contained in a vessel called ‘ama' or ‘amula.' After the deacon had said, ‘Let us pray,' the communicants carried their offerings towards the altar, which were usually taken by a deacon, and, having been delivered or presented to the bishop, were laid upon the altar or upon a separate table provided for their reception. This custom of offering oblation ceased generally during the 12th and 13th centuries” (Riddle).

The rubric at the same time enjoins that if there be a communion, “the priest is then,” just before this prayer, “to place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.” Hence it is clearly evident that by that word we are to understand the elements of bread and wine which the priest is to offer solemnly to God, as an acknowledgment of his sovereignty over his creatures, that from henceforth they may be peculiarly his. In all the Jewish sacrifices, of which the people were partakers, the viands or materials of the feast were first made God's by a solemn oblation, and then afterwards eaten by the communicants, not as man's but as God's provision, who by thus entertaining them at his own table declared himself reconciled and again in covenant with them. Therefore the blessed Savior, when he instituted the sacrament of his body and blood, first gave thanks, and blessed the elements, i.e. offered them up to God as the Lord of the  creatures, as the most ancient fathers expound that passage; who for that reason, whenever they celebrated the Eucharist, always offered the bread and wine for the communion to God upon the altar, by this or some such short ejaculation, “Lord, we offer thine own out of what thou hast bountifully given us.” After this they received them, as it were, from him again, in order to convert them into the sacred banquet of the body and blood of his dear Son. Consonant with this, in the first common prayer of king Edward VI, the priest was ordered in this place to set the bread and wine upon the altar. But at the second review, to conciliate the ultraProtestants, this ancient usage appears to have been thrown out. It was, however, restored at the last review of the Prayer-book in the reign of Charles II, when it was ordered that the bread and wine should be placed solemnly on the table by the priest himself. Hence it appears that the placing of the elements upon the altar before the beginning of the morning service by the hands of a lay-clerk or sexton, as is sometimes the practice, is a breach of the aforesaid rubric.

2. In a more extended sense, the word “oblations” signifies whatever Christians offer to God and the Church, whether in lands or goods. It is probable that the practice of St. Paul incited the primitive Christians to offer these gifts to the Church, for he appointed every one of the Corinthians and Galatians to yield something to God for the saints every Lord's-day; but this being thought to be too often, Tertullian tells us it was afterwards done every month, and then ad libitunm; but it was always the custom for communicants to offer something at receiving the sacrament, as well for holy uses as for the relief of the poor, which custom was, or ought to have been, observed in his day. In the first ages of the Church those depositapietatis which are mentioned by Tertullian were all voluntary oblations, and they were received in lieu of tithes; for the Christians at that time lived chiefly in cities, and gave out of their common stock both to maintain the Church and those who served at the altar. But when their numbers increased, and they were spread abroad in the countries, a more fixed maintenance was necessary for the clergy. Yet oblations were made by the people, of which, if offered in the mother church, the bishop had half, and the other was divided among the clergy; but if they were offered in a parish church, the bishop had a third part, and no more. These oblations, which at first were voluntary, afterwards became due by custom. It is true there are canons which require every one who approaches the altar to make some oblation to it, as a thing convenient to be done. It is  probable that, in obedience to the canons, it became customary for every man who made a will before the Reformation to devise something to the high-altar of the church where he lived, and something likewise to the mother church or cathedral; and those who were to be buried in the church usually gave something towards its repairs. But at the great festivals all people were obliged to offer something, not merely if convenient, but as a duty; but the proportion was left to the discretion of the giver; and we think with great reason, for the bounty of the Christians in those ages was so great that men built churches on their own lands, on purpose that they might have an equal share of those oblations with the clergy. This might be the reason why the emperors Constantine and Valentinian made laws to prohibit excessive gifts, which in those days were kept in storehouses built for that very purpose. But in succeeding ages there was little occasion for such laws, for the zeal of the people was so considerably abated that, instead of those repositories, the clergy had little chests to contain these gifts, till at last they dwindled into so small a portion that now, as a quaint writer observes, they can scarce be felt in the parson's pocket.

In the Church of England whatever is offered at the altar is termed an oblation. They are principally alms, the bread and wine for the Lord's Supper, and prayers. The four days in the year — Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and All-saints' day — on which oblations are more especially made, are called offering-days; and that portion of the Roman Catholic and English Church service at which time the offerings are presented is called the offertory (q.v.). See Hook, Ch. Dict. s.v.; Procter, On Common Prayer, p. 343; Wheatly, On Common Prayer, p. 298; Walcott, Sac. Archaeology, s.v.; Siegel, Christl. Alterth. (see Index in vol. iv); Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v. Oblationen.

## Oblationarium[[@Headword:Oblationarium]]

             a side-table, on which the oblations of the people which had been collected by the deacons were placed, and from which the officiating minister selected what was necessary for the celebration of the Eucharist. SEE OBLATION. The custom of presenting oblations ceased generally during the 12th and 13th centuries. See Martigny, Dict. des Antiquity Chhrt. s.v.; Walcott, Sac. Archaeology, s.v.; Riddle. Christ. Antiquities. SEE CREDENCE-TABLE.

## Obligation[[@Headword:Obligation]]

             (Lat. obligo, “to bind”) is that by which we are bound to the performance of any action. In theological science it holds a place in the doctrinal sphere, for it enters into the justification scheme. It is held that in consequence of original sin (q.v.) man comes into the world a debtor to divine justice, and is therefore under an obligation to punishment, he being deficient in that form of original justice in which he rendered to God all that service of love which the great goodness of God demanded. Hence the terms due and duty to express right conduct (comp. Hampden, Barnpton Lectures, 6:296).

## Obligation (2)[[@Headword:Obligation (2)]]

             as a moral factor, is generally distinguished as internal or rational and external or authoritative, according as the reason for acting arises in the mind of the agent, or from the will of another who has a right or authority to prescribe rules to others. Bishop Warburton (Div. Leg. bk. i, § 4), however, has contended that all obligation necessarily implies an obliger different from the party obliged; i.e. moral obligation, being the obligation of a free agent, implies a law; and a law implies a lawgiver, and that therefore the will of God is the true ground of all obligation, strictly and properly so called. The perception of the difference between right and wrong can be said to oblige only as an indication of the will of God. This seems reasonable indeed when we consider that our sense of rectitude springs out of a regard for and knowledge of him who is perfect. True, moral obligation is that by which we are bound to perform what is right, and to avoid what is wrong. Various, however, have been the opinions concerning the ground of moral obligation, or what it arises from. One says, it is a moral necessity of doing actions or forbearing them; that is, such a necessity as whoever breaks through it is ipso facto worthy of blame for so doing; another regards it as springing from the moral fitness of things; another, from conformity with reason and nature; another, from agreement with truth: and another, from expediency and promotion of the public good. A late writer has defined obligation to be “a state of mind perceiving the reasons for acting, or forbearing to act.”

But we confess this has a difficulty in it to us, because it carries with it an idea that if a man should by his habitual practice of iniquity be so hardened as to lose a sense of duty, and not perceive the reasons why he should act morally, then he is under no obligation. And thus a depraved man might say he is under no obligation to obey the laws of the land, because, through his desire of  living a licentious life, he is led to suppose that there should be none. Evidently a difference should be made between obligation and a sense of it. Moral obligation, we think, arises from the will of God, as revealed in the light and law of nature, and in his Word. This is binding upon all men, because there is no situation in which mankind have not either one or the other of these. We find, however, that the generality of men are so far sunk in depravity that a sense of obligation is nearly or quite lost. Still, however, their losing the sense does not render the obligation less strong. “Obligation to virtue is eternal and immutable, but the sense of it is lost by sin.” Believing this, we do not accept the theory of those thinkers who lose sight altogether of man's perception of rectitude, and give undue, if not exclusive, prominence e.g. Locke (Life, by Lord King, 2:129), Warburton, Horsley, as well as Paley and his followers — to the rewards and punishments of a future life, as prompting to the practice of virtue. For although God, in accommodation to the weakness of our nature and the perils of our condition, has condescended to quicken us in the discharge of our duty by appealing to our hopes and fears, both in regard to the life that now is and that which is to come, it does not follow that self-love, or a concern for our own happiness, should be the only, or even the chief spring of our obedience. On the contrary, obedience to the divine will may spring from veneration and love for the divine character, arising from the most thorough conviction of the rectitude, wisdom, and goodness of the divine arrangements.

That this, more than a regard to the rewards of everlasting life, is the proper spring of virtuous conduct, is as plain as it is important to remark. To do what is right merely for the sake of everlasting life is evidently acting from a motive far inferior, in purity and power, to love and veneration for the character and commands of him who is just and good, in a sense and to an extent to which our most elevated conceptions are inadequate. That which should bind us to the throne of the Eternal is not the iron chain of selfishness, but the golden links of a love for all that is right; and our aspirations to the realms of bliss should be breathings after the prevalence of universal purity, rather than desires for our individual happiness. Self and its little circle are too narrow to hold the heart of man when it is touched with a sense of its true dignity, and enlightened with the knowledge of its lofty destination. It swells with generous admiration of all that is right and good, and expands with a love which refuses to acknowledge any limits but the limits of life and the capacities of enjoyment. In the nature and will of him from whom all being and all happiness proceed, it acknowledges the only proper object of its adoration  and submission; and in surrendering itself to his authority it is purified from all the dross of selfishness, and cheered by the light of a calm and unquenchable love for all that is right and good. Dr. Adams (Sermon on the Nature and Obligation of Virtue) has well said, “Right implies duty in its idea. To perceive that an action is right is to see a reason for doing it in the action itself, abstracted from all other considerations whatever. Now this perception, this acknowledged rectitude in the action, is the very essence of obligation; that which commands the approbation of choice, and binds. the conscience of every rational being.” Mr. Stewart (Act. and Mor. Powers, 2:294) has put. it. in still more powerful and concise form, viz. that “The very notion of virtue implies the notion of obligation.” See Sanderson, De Juramnenti Obligatione, praelect. i, sec. 11; De Obligatione Conscientiae, praelect. v; Whewell, Morality, bk. i, ch. iv, p. 84-89; King, Essay on Evil, Prelim. Dissert. sec.; Dr. Ghalmers, Bridgewater Treatise, 1:78; Warburton, Legation, 1:38, 46, etc.; Paley, Moral Philos. 1:54; Robinson, Pref. to vol. iv of Saurin's Sermons; Mason, Christian Morals, ser. 23, 2:256; Doddridge, Lect. lect. 52; Grove, Philos. 2:66; Cudworth, Intell. System, 2:505, 636, et al.; Dr. Bushnell on the Vicarious Sacrifice, and review thereof in the Christian Examiners, May, 1866, art. v; Krauth's Fleming, Vocab. of Philos. s.v. SEE RIGHT; SEE SANCTION.

## Obligation, Feasts of[[@Headword:Obligation, Feasts of]]

             a name in the Romish Church of holy days on which work is suspended. In 1362 forty-one were cited, including Christmas, Circumcision, Epiphany, Ascension, Pentecost, and Easter (each with the following three days), Good Friday, St. Stephen, John the Evangelist, Holy Innocents, Purification, Annunciation, St. Mark. St. Philip and St. James, John the Baptist, St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Jafnes, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Michael. St. Luke, St. Simeon and St. Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew, St. Thomas the Apostle, Invention of Holy Cross, St. Thomas the Martyr, Corpus Christi, Translation of St. Thomas the Martyr, St. Mary Magdalen, Assumption, St. Lawrence, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, Exaltation of the Holy Cross, St. Nicholas, Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the dedication of the church, the .patron saint of the church, and feasts ordained by the ordinary. In Worcester diocese the labor of the plow only was allowed on seven saints' days, and women's work was forbidden on the feasts of St. Agnes, St. Lucy, St. Margaret, and St. Agatha.  In the United States of America the “holy days of obligation,” though they hold a very prominent place in the estimation and practice of Roman Catholics, have been reduced to the following: The Circumcision of our Lord (January 1), The Epiphany (January 6), The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary (March 25), The Ascension of our Lord (see above), Corpus Christi, The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary (August 15), All Saints (November 1), Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary (December 8), Nativity of our Lord, or Christmas (December 25). (Sundays, and the feasts which fall on them, are not included in this enumeration.) In some Western dioceses the Circumcision, Epiphany, Annunciation, and Corpus Christi are not even regarded as holy days of obligation. See Barnum, Romanism as it is, ch. xvi; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology (Lond. 1868), p. 407.

## Obnaim[[@Headword:Obnaim]]

             SEE STOOLS.

## Oboth[[@Headword:Oboth]]

             (Heb. Oboth', אֹבֹת, water-skins, i.e., according to Furst, hollow passes; Sept. ᾿Ωβώθ v. r. Y Σωβώθ), the forty-sixth station of the Israelites on their way to Canaan, near Moab (Num 21:10-11; Num 33:43-44), between Punon and Ije-abarim; probably south of the Dead Sea, possibly near Wady el-Ghuweit. SEE EXODE.

## Obotrites, Conversion Of The[[@Headword:Obotrites, Conversion Of The]]

             SEE SLAVES; SEE VICELINUS.

## Obrecht, Ulrich[[@Headword:Obrecht, Ulrich]]

             a learned German philosopher and jurist, was descended from a noble family, and was born July 23, 1646, at Strasburg, where he had his first educational training, and then proceeded to learn the elements of the sciences at Montbdliard and Altorf. He inherited both the inclination and taste of his ancestors, who were all distinguished by the posts they held either in the university or in the senate of Strasburg. The study of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew tongues was almost the first amusement of his infancy; and he learned French, Spanish, and Italian by way. of play or diversion. At fifteen he was so good a rhetorician that he was ordered to compose and pronounce a Latin speech in public, which he performed with universal  applause. The method prescribed by his preceptors was to suffer him to read only the ancient authors, that so he might draw the principles of eloquence from Demosthenes, Cicero, Quintilian, Longinus, etc. He also pursued the same plan in his course of philosophy. Plato, Aristotle, with all that we have of Pythagoras, were the authors which they put into his hands. But the principal bent of his studies lay to jurisprudence and history, in both of which he excelled, and filled the chairs of both in the university with great distinction. Yet such a multiplicity of sciences did not render his ideas confused; everything was ranged in exact order in his mind; and he surprised the world not more with the prodigious extent of his knowledge than with his admirable neatness in delivering it. As soon as he had taken his licentiate's degree, he resolved to travel abroad for further improvement.

With this view he went first to Vienna, in Austria, thence he passed to Venice, where his chief pleasure consisted in visiting the libraries and learned men. At his return from Italy his friends induced him to settle at Strasburg, and he gave himself up to authorship and to teaching in the university in law and history. Hitherto Obrecht had professed the Protestant religion; but the king of France having made himself master of Strasburg, and going there in person with the whole court, Mr. Pelisson, who came among them, and who was acquainted with him, made it a business to find Obrecht out, and to discourse with him upon that subject; and his conversion was completed by the Jesuits, who were established at Strasburg by Lewis XIV. Obrecht abjured his religion in 1684 at Paris, and put the instrument into the hands of the bishop of Meaux. Upon his return to Strasburg he resumed his profession in the law; and it was about this time that he wrote the notes which we see in some editions of Grotius, De jure belli ac papis. In 1685 the king of France nominated him to preside, ill his majesty's name, in the senate of Strasburg, with the title of praetor- royal, in imitation of the old Romans; and from that time Obrecht applied himself entirely to public affairs. The judges of Strasburg, according to the principles of the Reformed religion, were empowered to dissolve marriages in case of adultery, and to enable the injured party to marry again. In opposition to. this custom, Obrecht translated into the German tongue St. Austin's book of adulterous marriages, and obtained from the king a' prohibition, upon pain of death, either to tolerate or solemnize the marriage, for the future, of any persons that were separated or divorced for adultery. This edict was made in 1687; and in 1688 Obrecht translated into High-Dutch the treatise of father. Dez Primier, rector of the Jesuits at Strasburg, entitled The Reunion of the Protestants of the Church of  Strasburg to the Catholic Church. For the rest, although by the rights of his praetorship everything done in the senate must necessarily pass through his hands, yet he was so expeditious and so good a manager of time that there was some little left for his studies, which served him as a refreshment from the fatigue of business; and several valuable publications of his was from this period. But as all these things could not be done without even trespassing upon the time for his necessary meals, his health became unavoidably impaired, and his life was suddenly brought to a close in 1701. We have other publications of his, besides those already mentioned, which are of interest to us: De verae philosophiae origine: — De philosophia Celtica. See Niceron, Memoires, vol. 34; Haag, La France Protestante, s.v.

## Obregon, Bernard[[@Headword:Obregon, Bernard]]

             the rounder of the Spanish order of Minorite hospital brethren, was born at Las Huelgasj near Burgos, May 20,1540. He was at first a soldier, but having been converted, he devoted himself to the, care of the poor in the court hospital of Madrid. He soon found followers, and formed a congregation, which was approved by Decio Caraffa, nuncio to Spain in 1569. Several cities demanded members of the new order for their hospitals, and in 1587 they were entrusted with the administration of the general hospital of Madrid. Two years later cardinal Caspar Quiroga, archbishop of Toledo, received their solemn vows, and subjected them to the rules and habit of the third order of St. Francis. SEE MINORITES.

In 1592 Obregon went to Lisbon, where he reformed the numerous abuses existing in the administration of the hospitals of that city, and drew up a set of rules for the guidance of his congregation, which was finally completed in -1594. Upon his return to Madrid he nursed king Philip II through his last illness, in Sept., 1598, and afterwards resumed the directorship of the general hospital. He died at Madrid August 6, 1599. Obregon wrote Instruccion de enfermos, y verdadera practica como se hace de aplicar los remedios que ensenan los medicos (Madrid, 1607, 8vo). The Spaniards call the members of the order Obregons. See Herrera Maldonado, Vida de Bernardino de Obregon; Dom de. Gubernatis, Orbis seraphicus, vol. ii; Helvot, Hist. des ordres monastiques, 7:321326.

## Obregon, Pedro de[[@Headword:Obregon, Pedro de]]

             a Spanish painter, was born at Madrid, according to Bennudez, in 1597. He studied under Vincenzo Carducci, and gained a high reputation in historical painting, especially in works of an easel size. Palomino commends a large picture by him, representing the Trinity, in the refectory of the convent de la Merced, and another of the Immaculate Conception in the church of Santa Cruz. There are some of his easel pictures in the collection at Madrid, where they are highly esteemed. Bennudez says Obregon was also an excellent engraver. He had two sons, Diego and Marcos, whom he instructed in the art. He died in 1659. There was another Pedro de Obregon, who was a' miniaturist, and illuminated books of devotion; he flourished about 1564.

## Obrien, James Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword:Obrien, James Thomas, D.D.]]

             a noted Irish prelate, was born in Ireland' in 1792, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. He took holy orders immediately after graduation, and soon rose to the first appointments in the Church. In 1842 he was made bishop of Ossory. At the time of his death, which occurred January 9, 1875, he was the senior bishop of the Irish Episcopal Church. He is noted as the author, of a work on Justification by Faith only (ten sermons, Lond. 1833, 8vo), which is “one of the best expositions of the cardinal article of the Reformed Church extant” (Lowndes, Brit. Lib. p. 763). He also published several minor works, among them one entitled A Charge (1843, 8vo, and often since).

## Obscene Prints, Books, Or Pictures[[@Headword:Obscene Prints, Books, Or Pictures]]

             so exhibited in public as to damage the general morality, are not only to be preached and prayed against, but also legislated against; and it is the duty of the Christian public to see that the laws now on the statutes be faithfully executed and strengthened, to prevent the demoralization of the masses from this source. In Great Britain the laws are very strict; in the United States they might be greatly improved. In recent years a Mr. Comstock, of New York, has given much time to the suppression of the nefarious traffic in obscene publications of all kinds, and has rendered great service to the general American public.

## Obscurantists[[@Headword:Obscurantists]]

             (Lat. obscurare, “to darken, obscure”) is the term originally applied in derision to a party who are supposed to look with dislike and apprehension on the progress of knowledge, and to regard its general diffusion among men, taken as they are ordinarily found, as prejudicial to their religious welfare, and possibly injurious to their material interests. Of those who avow such a doctrine, and have written to explain and defend it, it is only just to say that they profess earnestly to desire the progress of all true knowledge as a thing good in itself; but they regard the attempt to diffuse it among men, indiscriminately, as perilous and often hurtful, by producing presumption and discontent. They profess but to reduce to practice the motto,

“A little learning is a dangerous thing.”

It cannot be doubted, however, that there are fanatics of ignorance as well as fanatics of science. There are religious, political, scientific, and artistic obscurantists. In the Reformation period the Humanists (q.v.) called those zealots who opposed all innovation Obscurantists.

## Obsequens[[@Headword:Obsequens]]

             JULIUS, an ancient sage who flourished some time in the early Christian period, is principally known as the author of a work entitled De Prodigiis, or Prodigiorum libellus. The work affords no biographical data, and there is not accessible from any other source anything which may reveal a knowledge of him personally, not even as to the place of his birth nor the time when he lived. Vossius thinks him anterior to Paul Orosius, and Scaliger claims that St. Jerome made some use of this work; but these are mere suppositions. Obsequens was not a historian, but a compiler. His work, of which a fragment only remains, is a collection of such phenomena as the Romans called Prodigia, or Ostenta, and which they looked upon as miraculous manifestations of the divine power, and as solemn forebodings of future events. It is chronologically divided, and the fragment we possess extends from the consulate of Scipio and Laelius, in B.C. 190, to that of Fabius and Elius, in B.C. 11. The materials are generally taken from Livy, whom he sometimes copies literally. There is no MS. copy of his work known at present; that which served for the first edition belonged to Jodocus of Verona, and has long been lost. Towards the middle of the 16th century Conrad Woolf hard, a professor at Basle better known by the name  of Conradus Lycosthenes published Obsequens's work, with a supplement. Judging from his introduction, he had a high aim in so doing. He says, “The Romans evinced their religious sentiments by the great attention they paid to marvelous phenomena and to omens, while their blindness was manifested by their worshipping false gods. Had they known the true religion, they would have surpassed in their pious zeal their descendants, who are Christians more in name than in fact, and take no account of the events which Christ predicted should occur as the end of the world approached.” Among the recent omens, Lycosthenes mentions three or four eclipses occurring in one year, comets, earthquakes in Italy, etc., which have made no impression upon the minds of the people. Their neglect of the divine warnings and their impious conduct have brought down upon them the wrath of God, who has given them up to civil war, diseases, and famine. Lycosthenes thinks the publication of Obsequens's work useful, as. showing the importance of the omens which people were neglecting. His supplement contains the phenomena observed since the foundation of Rome to the time when commences Obsequens's fragment, taken from Livy, Orosius, etc. The first edition of Julius Obsequens was published by Aide (Venice, 1508, 8vo; reprinted in 1518), in a volume containing also the letters of the younger Pliny. The second edition is that of Beatus Rhenanus (Strasburg, 1514, 8vo), in a volume containing also the letters of Pliny, the De viris illustribus of Aurelius Victor, and the De claris grammaticis et rhetoribus of Suetonius. Robert Estienne published the third (Paris, 1529, 8vo), together with the letters of Pliny. The first edition, together with the supplement of Lycosthenes, was published at Basle (1558, 8vo). Among subsequent editions, the best are those of Scheffer (Amst. 1679, 8vo); Oudendorp (Leyden, 1720, 8vo); Hase, in Lemaire's collection of Latin classics (Paris, 1823). It was translated into French by Georges de la Bouthiere (Lyons, 1558, 8vo), and by Victor Verger (Paris, 1825, 12mo); and into Italian by Damiano Maraffi (Lione, 1.554, 8vo). See the introductions of Kapp, Lycosthenes, Scheffer,,and Oudendorp, in Hase's edition. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:414; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. 3:1-2. (J. N. P.)

## Obsequies[[@Headword:Obsequies]]

             SEE OBSEQUIUM.

## Obsequium[[@Headword:Obsequium]]

             (Lat. obedience) is the unconditional surrender of one's will to another's authority, as demanded of monks and nuns by their monastic vows. SEE OBEDIENCE. Also the name of the prison in which those who overstep their vows are put; also the office for the departed, and sometimes also the solemn funeral service. SEE BURIAL.

## Observantists[[@Headword:Observantists]]

             (or OBSERVANT FRANCISCANS) are a class of monastics much noted for the extreme conservatism which marks their adherence to Franciscan rule as established by the founder of that order. In the article on FRANCISCANS has been detailed the earlier history of the controversy in that order as to the interpretation of the original rule and practice established by St. Francis for the brethren, and the separate organization of thle'two: parties at the- time of Leo X. The advocates of the primitive rigor were called Observantes, or Strictioris Observantice; but both bodies, although each free to practice its own rule in its own separate houses, were still reputed subject to the general administrator of the order, who, as the rigorists were by far the more numerous, was a member of that school. By degrees a second reform arose among a party in the order, whose zeal the rigor of the Observantists was insufficient to satisfy, and Clement VII permitted two Spanish friars, Stephen Molena and Martin Guzman, to carry out in Spain these views in a distinct branch of the order, who take the name of Reformati, or Reformed. This body has in later times been incorporated with the Observantists under one head. Before the French Revolution they are said to have numbered above 70,000, distributed over more than 3000 convents. Since that time their. number has, of course, been much diminished; but they are still a very powerful and widespread body, as well. in Europe as in the New World, and in the missionary districts of the East. In Ireland and England, and for a considerable time in Scot-land, they maintained themselves throughout all the rigor of the penal times. Several communities. are still found in the first-named kingdom. See Chambers's Cyclopaedia, s.v., and the references to literature in art. FRANCISCANS; also Mrs. Jameson, Monast. Leg. (see Index); Burnet, Hist. of the Reformation (see Index).

## Observer of Times[[@Headword:Observer of Times]]

             is the rendering in the A. V. of the Heb. מְעוֹנֵן, meonen', Deu 18:10; Deu 18:14 [so also the verb, Lev 19:26; 2Ki 21:6; 2Ch 33:6; elsewhere “enchanter,” “Meonenim,” “soothsayer”] (comp. Spencer, Leg. rit. 2:11, 3; and SEE NECROMANCER; SEE SEER ), and the superstition, intimately associated with astrology, and widely spread through the ancient world by the influence of the Oriental Magi, which distinguishes and determines days as lucky or unlucky, seen to be plainly alluded to not only here, but also in the words onenim' (עוֹנְנַים Isa 2:6; Jer 27:9) and osienah' (עֹנְנָה, Isa 57:3), commonly rendered “soothsayers” or “sorcerers” (q.v.). Deyling (Observat. 3:128 sq.) finds it mentioned also in Job 3:5 (יוֹם כַּמְרַירֵי; but see Gesen. Thes. 2:693). In Gal 4:10, Paul censures the same practice. This peculiar regard to days originated at a very early period. It had already become prevalent in Greece in the age of Hesiod (Works and Days, 770; comp. 768; see Ideler, Chronol. 1:88), and is often mentioned by later authors, both Greek and Roman (see, e.g., Sueton. Octav. 94; Nero, 8; Vitell. 8). Single families had their own peculiarly unlucky days (“dies atros,” Sueton. Octav. 92). Even between different divisions and hours of the same day a similar distinction was made (Theodr. 1:15; comp Psa 91:6, in the Sept.; Hesiod. Works and Days 710 sq.; Macrob. Sat. 1:16). The observance of days was not unknown to the ancient Persians (Ideler, Chronol. 2:540) or the early Germans (Caesar, Bell. Galatians i 50; comp. esp. Schwebel, De Superst. ap. vett. die observ. Onold, 1769; Potter, Greek Archaeol. 1:753). The modern Jews make the second and fifth days of the week especially prominent (see Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. p. 279). SEE DIVINATION.

## Obsignatio[[@Headword:Obsignatio]]

             is, like σφραγίς, sigillum, and-signaculum, a term used in ecclesiastical language to designate the baptism, or, better, the sealing by the Holy Spirit, as, e.g., in Eph 1:13, et al. SEE BAPTISM; SEE SPIRIT.

## Ocampo, Florian D[[@Headword:Ocampo, Florian D]]

             a Spanish ecclesiastic, noted as a chronicler, was born in Zamora in the beginning of the 16th century. After finishing his studies in the University of Alcala, where he had as his teacher Antonio de Lebrina, he became an  ecclesiastic, was provided with a canonicate, and obtained the-title of historiographer of Charles V. In order to fulfill his duties he undertook the history of this prince, but he had the ambitious idea of going back to the deluge. “As one might foresee,” says Ticknor, “he lived just long enough to finish a small fragment of so vast an enterprise scarcely one quarter of the first of his four grand divisions; :but he went far enough to show that the time for such writings was past. Not that credulity was wanting-he had too much of it; but it was not the poetical credulity of his predecessors trusting to the old national traditions; it was a too ready faith in the bald impostures which bear the names of Berosus and Manetho, works discredited for half a century already, and which he employed as authorities, if not sufficient, at least probable, for an uninterrupted succession of Spanish kings from Tubal, grandson of Noah. Such credulity has no sort of chance; and, besides, the work of Ocampo is in its form dry and tiresome, and, as it is written in a formal and heavy style, it is almost impossible to read it. It is little to be regretted that he has brought his aninuls, of Spain only to the period of the Scipios.” He died in 1555. The Chronique of Ocampo (Cronica general de Espana) appeared for the first time in Zamora (1544, fol.); it was reprinted at Medina del Campo (1553, fol.); the best edition is that of Madrid (1791, 2 vols. 4to). See his Life in the introductory pages of his works (edition of 1791); Don Josef de Regabal y Ugarte, Biblioteca de los escritores qoue han sido individuos de los seis colegios mayores; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:417; Ticknor, Hist. of Spanish Literature, 1:308.

## Occam (Or Ockham), Nicholas Of[[@Headword:Occam (Or Ockham), Nicholas Of]]

             an English monastic of the Middle Ages, flourished at Oxford in the first half of the 14th century. He was bred a Franciscan, and was the eighteenth public lecturer of his convent in that university. He is highly praised by writers of his order for his learning, but Bale severely criticized him. See Fuller, Worthies (ed. 1840), 3:213; Bale De Scriptoribus )iritannicis, cent. v, No. 17; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s. .

## Occam, William of[[@Headword:Occam, William of]]

             the last of the great scholars in the succession of mediaeval scholasticism, and assuredly one of the most acute, was the notable precursor of John Wickliffe, John Huss, and Martin Luther. His logical perspicacity and dialectical subtlety earned for him the designation of the Invincible and the  Singular (unique) Doctor. He pursued the refinements of eristic disputation so far as to render it impossible to proceed farther in. the same direction. “The force of reason could no farther go.” But, if he “could divide ahair ‘twixt north and north-west side,” he never consented to “change hands and still dispute.” He was earnest and sincere, and concealed a large fund of solid sense under the familiar forms of scholastic logomachy. If the wondrous machine of scholasticism did not actually break down under the strain to which it was subjected by him, it became too complex and rigid for any later Ulysses to bend, and lost its availability with succeeding generations. To this rejection of the great creation of the Middle Ages Occam contributed in another mode; if he should not rather be regarded as himself, in this respect, the creature of the times and of the tendencies of the times. No other schoolman connected dialectics so closely with practical life, or linked speculation and academic disputation so intimately with the pressing questions which agitated contemporaneous society. If he did not succeed in bringing scholasticism home to men's business and bosoms — an achievement incompatible with its nature — he did bring logic and metaphysics from the cloisters and from “the shady spaces of philosophy,” and associated them with the politics and the ecclesiastical transformations of the day. The letters of Eloise and Abelard show how the desiccated members and hardened sinews of technical ratiocination may be adapted to “the poignant expression of frenzied love-quid nion cogit amor? In the writings of Occam the same dry and dreary formulas are rendered applicable to the popular and-instinctive aspirations of the times. Occam thus unconsciously gave predominance to passion, interest, rude instinct, and popular tendency over abstract reasoning and formal controversy, though himself preserving all the externals of his tribe. He maintained himself on the ancient and tottering throne, but a new race was springing around him. When the monarch of the woods had fallen, the undergrowth shot up into tall timber, and filled the forest with an unlike production. The school of Occam survived, and the ranks of the schoolmen still continued to be adorned with illustrious names, such as those of John Gerson, cardinal D'Ailly. and others;. but the age of the great leaders of sects had passed away, and the generation of the Epigoni derives distinction from other qualities than those which had given renown to their precursors.

Life. — The biography of the schoolmen, from the nature of their pursuits, is usually jejune and obscure. It rarely presents the fascination which is  afforded by the romantic story of Abelard, or the calm instruction which is offered by the career of Bonaventura, or the angelical Thomas of Aquino. Until Occam had conquered fame, and had become a power among men, few and trifling are the details of his career that have been transmitted to us, and even the chronology of his fortunes is indistinct and confused. The name of Occam by which he is habitually known, is derived from the humble hamlet of Occam, Ockham, or Okeham, which lay in the wastes of Surrey, and straggled along the southern outskirts of what is now designated as Ockham Heath. The growing population of six centuries. and the proximity of London, have cleared and reclaimed the wilderness, and improved culture has converted sterility into productiveness. At the close of the 13th century, and in the reign of Henry III or of Edward I, when Occam was born, the country around his birthplace must have been a dreary tract, given up to black cattle and hogs, except in scattered patches which had been tamed by the indomitable perseverance and far-reaching hope of monastic fraternities. The exact date of his birth has not been ascertained, but it may be concluded that he first saw the light before the 13th century had entered upon its last quarter, as he had attained distinction, and was regius professor of theology in the University of Paris, in the early years of the 14th century, and died at an advanced age before the century had half expired. His brightness as a boy attracted the attention of the Cordeliers, who induced him to take the vows of the Franciscan Order, and who afforded him the best opportunities for cultivating his precocious talents. He was sent by them to Merton College, Oxford — this great university having been brought into renown under the supervision of Robert Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, and the teachings of Frater Agnellus, Adam de Marisco, and Roger Bacon. It must have been at this time that Duns Scotus, also an alumnus of Merton, and then at the height of his eminent reputation, was attracting to Oxford the thirty thousand pupils whom he is said to have drawn thither. Occam attended his courses, and became the favorite pupil of the Subtle Doctor — but his own mind was of a bold and independent character “nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.” He did not hesitate to assail the positions of his teacher, and to propound keen and embarrassing objections. After attaining his degree he opened a course of lectures, and excited almost as much enthusiasm as his master, winning many hearers from him. Duns Scotus was the acknowledged chief of the Realistic School, which had long been dominant, and was then reigning almost without opposition. Occam revived the doctrine of the Nominalists, which, if not actually dead, had  long been dormant. A violent antagonism thus arose between the Occamists and the Scotists — a discordance which frequently led to blows and wounds between the disputants. The belli etererima causa may appear trivial and ridiculous to us with our changed — habits of thought and dlverse aspirations, but in the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries it was neither a play upon words nor a fantastic difference to contend that abstract notions, or universals, were entia realia, entia intelligibilia, or entia rationalia. The dissension involved the antagonism of the profoundest convictions, and was immediately implicated with the gravest questions, religious, ecclesiastical, political, and intellectual, which were then agitating society, and imperatively demanding a practical solution. SEE NOMINALISM and SEE REALISM.

As Protogenes divided the delicate colored line of Apelles by one still more delicate of different color, according to the anecdote reported by Pliny, so Occam drew still more attenuated distinctions among the fine and intricate lines of the logical propositions of Duns. Nor were these distinctions and divisions merely caprices of dialectical ingenuity. Occam was earnest, sagacious, and ardent for truth and practical results, under all the disguises of the cumbrous machinery of scholastic ratiocination. It has justly been said of him that “his eager, restless, and active mind was always at work acquiring and testing every kind of knowledge that presented itself, and his subdued enthusiasm early marked him out as one who would become a leader of men... The abstract dialect of the times could not veil his powerful, clear, and concrete vision; he must see everything with his own eyes ere he will believe it or teach it. He was full of sturdy self-dependence, which made itself felt on questions both of Church and State policy.” How often has it happened that the speculations of the great thinkers of other days have been slighted or misunderstood because their language has been forgotten and their meaning become indistinct!

Of course the antagonism to the Scotists was only gradually developed. Occam was sent to Paris, and became regius professor of theology in the university. On his return to England he was appointed by the Franciscans one of their professors at Oxford. This office he was compelled to renounce — in consequence of a charge of exciting disturbances among the students. The young collegians of that day were always ready for an uproar — even more so than in our own — whether the question concerned town and gown, battles, or metaphysical quodlibets. Occam's bold doctrines and uncompromising polemics might well occasion controversies and quarrels  among doctors and disciples, especially as the Dominicans and Thomists mustered strong in the cloisters and halls of His. The dates of Occam's scholastic career are exceedingly obscure and uncertain, and cannot be exhibited with any clear consistency. They can be determined only by vague conjecture, or by known synchronism with events historically determined. We cannot undertake their conciliation. Occam is said to have declined the archdeaconry of Stow in 1300. but to have accepted, two years later, a prebend at Bedford, and in 1305 to have been inducted into a living at Stow, which he did not resign till 1319. During much of this period he was certainly in Paris; but benefices and residence were by no means inseparable in that day of papal provisions, non-obstantes, and exemptions. It was in the first years of the 14th century that he engaged in the defense of the civil power, and obtained his earliest notoriety beyond the precincts of the schools by advocating the cause of Philip the Fair of France against the arrogant pretensions of Boniface VIII, and by inclining, through his advocacy, the balance in favor of secular sovereignty. He maintained against the claims of the papacy the independence of princes in all temporal affairs, denied their subordination to the Church, and asserted their responsibility to God alone. It was not the first time that temporal rulers had endeavored to establish a coequal authority with the chiefs of Christendom; it was not the first time that the papal pretensions had been sternly rebuked in formal treatises; but it was the first time that the doctrine had been so explicitly proclaimed within the circle of the ecclesiastical order. For his reply to the bull Unam Sanctam Occam was excommunicated, and he was compelled to leave France in consequence, about twelve years later, on the death of Philip in 1314. In 1322 he was elected provincial general of the English Cordeliers.

In this capacity he attended the general chapter of the order held at Perugia. In that council was discussed the often-debated question between the Fratricelli and the more worldly brethren of the fraternity in regard: to the degree of poverty imposed upon the order by its founder, and the propriety of ecclesiastical endowments. The question had excited furious discords almost ever since the death of Francis of Assisi, and had recently assumed portentous proportions in the revolutionary attempts of the Dolcinists, whose leader, Dolcino, had perished at the stake in 1307. The more ascetic and earnest of the Mendicants denied the right of holding any property at all, and extended the denial to the whole spiritual body. The majority of the brethren, appreciating and enjoying the wealth accumulated from the fanatical admiration of their votaries, had curiously discriminated between  corporate and individual property, between dominium and possessio, between ownership and usufruct. Divisions on this subject had arisen even under the administration of Elias of Bologna, the first general of the order in succession to the founder. During the brief pontificate of Nicholas III, who had himself been a Franciscan, an attempt was made to settle the contention by a papal bull, which authorized the sodality to hold property and enjoy it sub titulo ecclesiae, the actual ownership being considered as vested in the general Church. This decision had not proved satisfactory to the more consistent and extreme Franciscans. Further offense was given when the bull of Nicholas III was revoked by the extravagant Ad Conditorem of John XXII, which condemned the severance of the domain from the use. The whole legal doctrine of uses is connected with these nice ecclesiastical fictions.

The question was brought up for re-discussion in the Chapter of Perugia. Occam in concert with Michele di Cesena, the general of the order, maintained the obligation of absolute poverty — of total abstention from all property — asserting that such had been the practice of Christ and his apostles, and that the whole spiritual community was bound by their example. His positions were so unlimited as to occasion the celebrated query — Whether the dominion, or only the usufruct of things eaten and drunk belonged to the consumer. The peril to the greedy pope and to ecclesiastical wealth was instinctively recognized by the holy court at Avignon. Proximus Ucalegon ardet. John imposed silence on the daring and logical Franciscan; and by the extravagant Cum inter, condemned his dogma regarding the absolute destitution of Christ and his apostles. The impetuous controversialist would not be silenced, and, leaving the narrower field of the divisions in his order, he denounced without measure the avarice, the wealth, the corruption, the luxury, the worldliness, and the arrogance of the pope and the hierarchy. He was sustained by his general, Michele di Cesena. They had returned to France, and had probably been summoned to appear before the pontifical court. They had been thrown into the pontifical dungeons at Avignon. They made their escape by the assistance of the emperor Louis of Bavaria, May 26, 1328, then in the midst of his warfare with the pope. With the emperor they found refuge, and were excommunicated for their flight. Pontifical comminations had few terrors for Occam. His convictions and adhesions were unshaken by spiritual censures, which had lost their force in the wild ravings of Boniface VIII, and in the outrage which had overtaken him. It must have been at this time that he promised the emperor to- defend him with his pen, if he received in return the protection of the imperial sword. He fulfilled his  promise, and the alliance remained unbroken. It marked an aera when letters became a ruling power in the world by the side of the Church and the State. Haudrau may truly remark that Occam “began a revolution.” He lived for years under the shelter afforded by his imperial patron, throwing himself courageously and passionately into the thickest of the strife; indefatigable in his labors, fearless in his opinions, keen in discernment, ingenious in argumentation, honest in motive, and quick in catching the aura popularis of the approaching age. To his indication, or participation, may safely be ascribed the repudiation” of papal jurisdiction in Germany; by the electors at Rense, and by the Diet at Frankfort, 1338 an early anticipation of Huss and Luther. — Little information has been transmitted to us in regard to the later years of Occam. The time and place of his death have both been disputed, as has been the statement of his relief from the sentence of excommunication. Luke Wadding, in history of the Order of the Minorites, represents him as having died at Capua in 1350; but that writer stalids alone in this opinion. The habitual statement is that he died in the monastery of his order at Munich, April 7, 1347. the year in which his protector, Louis of Bavaria, also died. By some authorities, 1343 is given as the year of Occam's death.

Philosophy and Writings. — Occam introduced no new principles into philosophy. He did introduce a new spirit. The tenets on which his system rested had all been advocated before. He recombined previous opinions, and placed them in a new and clearer light. He was not an Eclectic, though there is something of eclecticism in his procedure. He has habitually been represented as the restorer of nominalism. This has recently been denied, and too strenuously denied. Individual Nominalists may, indeed, be found among his immediate predecessors and older contemporaries, but they were few and unnoted among the multitude of Realists — rari nantes in gurgite vasto. Occam rendered nominalism again a power in the realm of speculation: it became dominant in his hands, and thenceforward continued to advance in public regard till it introduced a general tendency to rationalism. The Nominalists who follow him and issue from his school may not blaze as brilliantly as earlier philosophers of the Middle Ages, because scholasticism itself was smitten with a slow decay by the procedure adopted by the Venerabilis Inceptor; and speculation was directed into other and broader channels by his impulse. It is a grave misapprehension to accuse the great schoolmen of wasting their powers over vain and abstract disputations. In their most rarefied abstractions they  comprehended the urgent problems of the time, though it is with difficulty that our hasty glance can now discern, in their dry light, the vital issues of the hour. They clothed them in the costume of the day, and the fashions have entirely changed. We can recognize then more obviously practical discussions of Occam and his successors, and their rapid movement in the direction of modern thought.

If Occam was the last of the great schoolmen, he was the herald of the intellectual revolution which produced the modern world. What was most distinctive in his speculations was his statement of older theses in the language and forms of the Byzantine Logic, lately introduced to the admiration of the West by the Summulae of Petrus Hispanus. With the Byzantines he preceded Locke in recognizing and exhibiting the close coherence between logic and grammar; he preceded Hobbes in regarding words as nothing more than the counters of thought as voces hypothetice reprcesentive, rather than as voces essentialiter siqnificativae; he preceded Hume, though employing different terms and ascending to higher altitudes, in insisting upon the wide difference between impressions and ideas. These anticipations display both the modern habitudes of his mind and his skeptical or antidogmatic tendency. Even a more notable characteristic of his philosophy was his straightforward, unequivocating application of his doctrine and dialectics to the questions which rent the spiritual and the secular society of his century. If he assailed his master, Duns Scotus, and the Realists, he attacked, with less restraint, popes, hierarchs, and synods, and vulgar errors in both theology and government. “In all the struggles, disputes, and controversies, political, ecclesiastical, and theological, with emperor, pope, and universities, Occam was the chief actor. He thrust himself into every European strife; the biggest, burliest figure — a man who never seemed able to get enough of fighting. He has put into clear and authoritative words every great question which men were dumbly or inarticulately striving to express; and the whole life of his age centers in him, and is mirrored in his conduct.” In the opening of his career he stood by the side of the haughty and tyrannical Philip le Bel of France, in the defense of temporal sovereignty, against the usurpations of the more haughty and imperious Boniface VIII. In the closing years, of his life he maintained with equal resolution the cause of the empire, in the fierce duel between Louis of Bavaria and the popes John, XXII, Benedict XII, and Clement VI. In the interval between these congruous extremes he stubbornly insisted upon the strict observance of the vows of his order, advocated apostolical destitution with extravagant vigor, and denounced the immoralities of popes, papal courts, and clergy.  Excommunicated, he disregarded excommunication, and lived under the sternest papal commination, perhaps dying without care for its removal. It will thus be seen how much more prominent and potent was the action of Occam than his theoretical speculations. His public course, however, grew necessarily out of his philosophy and dialectics, in combination with the sincere and unswerving temper of the man.

Unfortunately, Occam's writings are almost inaccessible, and can scarcely be found outside of the rich repositories of mediaeval lore and mediaeval thought in monastic libraries, or in libraries plundered from monastic collections. They have not been revealed to our long research, and we derive our imperfect knowledge, through many successions, from others. Before the middle of the 17th century Naudeeus lamented the prospect that “the followers of Occam would be eternally denied the sight of his works,” and declared that “the hope was almost lost of ever seeing them printed.” They had been printed a century and a half before, but had become as rare as manuscripts. They may have been consumed in the fires and popular excesses of the Reformation; but their character was calculated to consign them to early obscurity. Occam gave an impulse to the times, which enabled ensuing generations to leave him neglected on the strand — “stat nvagni nominis umbra.” We must note, with such second-hand materials as are available, the most striking opinions of Occam.

It has already been mentioned how strenuously he resisted the presumptuous demands of Boniface VIII, and maintained the responsibility of sovereigns to God alone. The papal bull, Clericis Laicos, fulminated against Philip the Fair, was publicly burned at Paris. Boniface, after a council held at Rome, issued his more celebrated bull, Unam Sanctam, claiming for the Church an absolute and unshared supremacy. Occam, then rector of the University of Paris, responded, at the personal request of the king, it is said, in the Disputatio super potestate praelatis ecclesiae atgue principibus terrarum commissa, and absolutely repudiated the papal pretensions. The advocacy of the strict rule of the Mendicants and of apostolical poverty produced Contra Johannern XXII de Paupertate Christi et Apostolorum Apologia, and his Defensorium. The latter has been styled a mediaeval Areopagitica, and declared to be “one of the noblest defenses of the liberty of writing.” It brought the author, however, before the ecclesiastical tribunals, with what result is unknown. In defense of Louis of Bavaria, he wrote his Dialogus contra Johannem XXII pro Imperatore Ludovico IV — one of his most characteristic works; and in  favor of his spiritual superior, Michele di Cesena, Opus nonaginta diesum de civili dominio clericorum atque monachorum. — These tracts, however neglected, can scarcely be deemed antiquated, when the like questions have been revived recently by Le Pere Hyacinthe, Prof. Dollinger, prince Bismarck, and Mr. Gladstone.

More immediately germane to the scope of the present work, though intimately associated with the whole body of Occam's doctrine, is his treatise De Sacramento Altaris, wherein he impugns transubstantiation without positively denying it, and arrives at conclusions kindred with Luther's view of the sacrament. Nominalism will scarcely accord with transubstantiation; and Occam's thesis, Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem, like Newton's Hypotheses non fingo, was fatal to fictitious quiddities and imaginary essences. The skeptical attitude, without express negative of so cardinal a tenet, was peculiarly illustrative of the relations of Occam's theology to his philosophy, and reveals the perilous tendency of his speculations. He maintained the irreconcilability of reason and faith, and advocated their divorce, alleging that knowledge and science were fallacious, and that the intuitions of faith were alone true. It has been intimated that this view sprung from his acceptance and application of the Byzantine Logic. The view itself is in entire consonance with the critical system of Kant, and is an evident prelude to the justification by faith alone of Luther and the Protestant Reformers. In addition to these works of a controversial character, Occam wrote copiously on various departments of the Aristotelian philosophy, and also commentaries on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. How few of the schoolmen refrained from the latter task!

Influence. — In the case of many men, who have occupied a large space in the eyes of the world, “the good they do is buried with their bones;” but in the case of others, and pre-eminently of Occam, all they achieved with their contemporaries constitutes but a small part of their actual service to mankind. This notice would accordingly be incomplete if it neglected to call attention to the relation of its subject to his own and the preceding age, and to illustrate his action on the ages which ensued.

Neglected and misunderstood as the long medieval period has too often been, it cherished the accomplishment of the most stupendous labor ever imposed upon humanity — the transmutation of the ancient into the modern world; the transfiguration of paganism into Christianity; the change from the worship of nature and of the manifestations of nature to the  worship of nature's God. Each century, in its order, seemed to have its own appointed task in the elaboration of this grand palingenesia. The thirteenth. had been the period of premature renovation. It had witnessed the culminating splendors of the Holy Roman Empire, the arrogance and triumph of the papacy, the glory of the schoolmen — Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, and Roger Bacon; it had seen the creation of the modern tongues, and had rocked the cradle of modern literature; it had reanimated society, and reorganized jurisprudence and legislation; but its activity was precocious and premature. The spirit of the past was still too powerful, and the shadow of the past lay too darkly on the nations. The great redintegration demanded other auspices and a fresher inspiration. What the 13th century attempted so brilliantly to reconstruct, the 14th remolded, undermined, or destroyed. It was the transition by which we swept into the later day. Church and empire had been struggling for predominance: Church and empire were to feel each its own scepter sliding from its weakened grasp under ecclesiastical discords and imperial anarchies under secessions, schisms, and domestic feuds. The towering pride of scholasticism was to be shackled and degraded by the issue of her own travail, and the intricate but symmetrical scheme of the scholastic theology was to crumble away under the assaults of emancipated reason and unfettered belief. The toil was long and arduous; the fullness of the portent was not revealed till the 16th century had fairly opened. Occam occupies the central position in this mighty process of four writhing centuries; not merely chronologically, but intellectually and dynamically. He was prominent in all the chief lines of antagonism to the ancient spirit and the ancient forms. In the genius of his philosophy, and in his ecclesiastical and theological views, he was a true creator of a school, a veritable inceptor, and entitled in no slight degree to be regarded as “anticipator mundi quem factcturus erat.” The freedom of Franciscan speculation was almost proverbial. Occam was the front and boldest of Franciscan speculators. He merited in many ways the distinction of being cherished by Luther, notwithstanding Luther's aversion to the schoolmen; and of being affectionately designated by him “Mein Meister Occanz,” “Mein lieber Meiste Occam.” He is said to have been the only schoolman whom the great Reformer habitually read.

Literature. — The Opera Omnia Occami appear never to have been fairly gathered together and printed in collected form. The date of such publication is sometimes and variously given, but none such seems known  to Brucker, to Tennemann, or to Ueberweg. Separate works were printed and reprinted to meet passing demands of theological or imperial controversy. The treatises in defense of temporal sovereignty were inserted by Goldastus in his Monarchia Sancti Imperii Romani. Others were published in other collections, and several were edited separately. A list of his writings is given by the antiquarian John Leland, De Scriptoribus Britannicis, and more completely in the Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ordinis Minoritarum, and in Cave, Scriptores Ecclesiastici. The historians of philosophy are of course compelled to notice Occam, but they do it in a brief and unsatisfactory manner. Ueberweg gives a clear summary of his characteristic positions, but is otherwise very inadequate. The most instructive essay on the Invincible Doctor is contained in the British Quarterly Review, July, 1872, but this regards chiefly his theological aspects. In addition should be consulted Haurdau, Philosophie Scholastique; Caraman, Hist. de la Philosophie en France au Moyen Age; Moreri, Dictionnaire Historique; Raynaldus, Baronii A nnalium Continuatio;. Milman, Hist. Latin Christianity; Rettberg, Occam und Luther, in Theolog. Stud. u. Krit. 1839; Schreiber, Die polit. u. relig. Doctrinen unter Ludcigq dem Baier. (Landshut. 1858); Ritter, Gesch. d. christl. Philosophie, 4:574 sq.; Dorner, Entwickelungsgesch. v. d. Person Christi, 2:447, 457, 607; Baur, Die christl. Lehre v. der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes, 2:866; Kohler, Realismus u. Nominalismus (Gotha, 1858), p. 162; Hallam, Introd. to the Lit. of Europe, vol. i; The Academy, 1872, p. 264; Anmer. Ch. Rev. April, 1873, art. 8:See also the references in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v. (G. F. H.)

## Occasionalism[[@Headword:Occasionalism]]

             or the doctrine of Occasional Causes, is the name of a religious philosophical theory marking an sera in the development of the philosophical doctrine as to the relation between spirit and matter, and especially between the human mind and the human body; or, perhaps better, the synchronous action of mind and body. The presupposition on which the system therefore rests is dualism, i.e. the antagonism between spirit and matter. Christianity, by means of revelation, had solved the question concerning this heathen view of antagonism, by considering matter as the medium and organ of the manifestations of the spirit. Yet in the Middle Ages the remembrance of the heathen dualistic view again got the ascendency, and scholasticism found itself unable to solve the problem of removing that antagonism. While scholastic realism had for a long time  permitted the occasional and material to be absorbed as insignificant in the general notion of the mind, the renewed nominalism (q.v.; SEE OCCAM ) had used spiritual knowledge as the opponent of empiric reality, and the dualistic opposition between spirit and matter is therefore equivalent to that between realism and nominalism. Descartes, the founder of modern philosophy, followed the consequences of this dualism. According to him, the essence of mind is thought; that of matter, extension; and these two counterbalance each other. Hence the mind and the body, taken in themselves, have nothing in common. The life. of the body is a mechanical evolution, entirely distinct from the intellectual evolution of the mind. Yet the soul can modify the evolutions of the body, as God (by a positive act) has connected. it with the body, binding them together, and placing it in the pineal gland, where it is most intimately connected with the body.

Descartes did not solve the problem of the manner in which the mind and the body are united. Arnold Geulinx sought to solve it after the manner of De la Forge (see Sigwart, Gesch. d. Philosophie, 2:198), by saying in his Ethica that mind and body work together through the cooperation of God. In case the will operates, God makes the body act accordingly; and in case the body is affected, God makes the mind to perceive it. Thus in the first case spontaneity, and in the second receptivity are but the reflex of divine actions; man becomes a simple spectator, for the action of his will, as well as that of his body, is a divine action. The causality is God, and therefore to be considered as absolute, “unavoidable. According to this theory, the body ceases to be the mediate cause whenever the mind assumes (though it is only in appearance) this position, and vice versa. The idea is that human receptivity and activity, proceeding sometimes from the mind, sometimes from the body, are only perceptible as divine actions. Geulinx, therefore, draws no distinction between the relative action of the creature and the absolute action of God. His system of occasionalism is consequently incorrect, as his starting-point, the occasio. is fallacious. The system cannot be properly called casulalism, but by its fatalism stands closely allied to pantheism. Malebranche tried to solve the question in a similar manner, yet in his theory the mediate causes on both sides are still more restricted. In Descartes they stand opposed to each other, connected only at one point; in Geulinx, they are alternately appearing and disappearing; in Malebranche, they really exist only in God; finally, according to Spinoza, they are two opposite human modes of representing the always identical action of the unchangeable divine substance. Yet these notions correspond to two infinite attributes of the divine nature, which always reveal  themselves whole; sometimes the all-powerful body, sometimes the all- powerful mind. The opposition between mind and matter is therefore here only an apparent. opposition. Leibnitz, who objected to the occasionalist hypothesis on the ground that it supposes a perpetual action of God upon creatures, and as but a modification of the system of direct assistance, sought to carry out more fully the idea of Geulinx; his monads are all of the same nature, and each represents one and the same universe, thus producing absolute harmony; but as individuals they are all completely distinct from each other, progressing harmoniously, and thus corresponding to each other, and constituting a divinely pre-established harmony. The body and the soul are subject to different laws; but God has so regulated the parallelism of their action that it results in a harmonious whole. Thus the occasionalism of Geulinx is annulled by the theory of a regular system of causes and effects, or harmony, by virtue of which we find in each moment a double series of intermediate causes accompanying an originally combined impulse. Leibnitz perceived a real alternate action of the body and the mind, but rejected it. Sensualism, on the other hand, considers the mind as the reflex of the sensitive faculty, while idealism looks upon the sensitive faculty as the reflex of spiritual spontaneity. From this we may conclude that Descartes had not yet fully reached occasionalism, while Leibnitz had gone farther. The real medium is the system of Geulinx. — Herzog; Real-Encyklopadie, 10:522. See Ueberweg, Hist. Philos. 2:42, 54; Newell, Specul. Philos. 1:99.

## Occom, Sam(p)son[[@Headword:Occom, Sam(p)son]]

             an American Indian preacher, was born at Mohegan, on Thames River, near Norwich, Conn., about the year 1723. When Occom was a boy, Mr. Jewett, the minister of New London, now Montville, was accustomed to preach once a fortnight at Mohegan. During the religious excitement about 1739 and 1740, several ministers visited the Indians, who repaired to the neighboring churches. Occom at this period became the subject of permanent religious impressions, and was soon desirous of becoming the teacher of his tribe. He could then read by spelling, and in a year or two learned to read the Bible. At the age of nineteen he went to the Indian school of Mr. Wheelock, of Lebanon, and remained with him four years. In 1748 he kept a school in New London, but soon went to Montauk, on Long Island, where he taught a school among the Indians ten or eleven years, at the same time being the religious teacher of the Indians in their own language, and preaching also to the Skenecock or Yenecock Indians,  distant thirty miles. During a revival among the Montauks many became Christians. He was ordained by the Suffolk Presbytery Aug. 29,1759, and was from that time a regular member of the presbytery.

In 1766 Mr. Wheelock sent him to England with Mr. Whitaker, the minister of Norwich, to promote the interests of Moor's Indian charity school. He was the first Indian preacher who visited England. The houses in which he preached were thronged. Between Feb. 16, 1766, and July 22, 1767, he preached in various parts of the kingdom between three hundred and four hundred sermons. Large charitable donations were obtained, and the school was soon transplanted to Hanover, N. H., and connected with Dartmouth College. After his return, Occom sometimes resided at Mohegan, and was often employed in missionary labors among distant Indians. In 1786 he removed to Brotherton, near Utica, N. Y., in the neighborhood of the home of the Stockbridge Indians, who were of the Mohegan root, and who had formerly been under the. instruction of Mr. Sergeant and Mr. Edwards. A few of the Mohegans, and other Indians of Connecticut, Long Island, and Rhode Island, removed about the same time. The Oneidas gave them a tract of land. Occom died in July, 1792. Dr. Dwight says, “I heard Mr. Occom twice. His discourses, though not proofs of superior talent, were decent; and his utterance in some degree eloquent. His character at times labored under some imputations; yet there is good reason:to believe that most, if riot all, of them were unfounded; and there is satisfactory evidence that he was a man of piety.” An account of the Montauk Indians, written by Occom, is preserved in the “Historical Collections.” He published a sermon at the execution of Moses Paul, an Indian, at New Haven, Sept. 2, 1772 (London 1789, 4to), with an account of the Montauk Indians which has been published in the Mass. Hist. Soc. Collect. 1st ser. 10:106. See Buel, Ordination Sermon; Historical. Collections, 4:68; 5:13; 9:89, 90; 10:105: Dwight, Travels, 2:112; Allen, Amer. Biog. Dict. s.v.; Gillet, Hist. Presb. Ch. in U. S. A. 1:161, 368, 388, (J. N. P.) Occurrence, a term used in ecclesiastical language to designate a case when two festivals fall on the same day. The lesser is either omitted or anticipated, or translated, that is, deferred to the nearest vacant day. Festivals concur when at vespers the office of one day commences before the other is terminated. The lesser day is then only commemorated.

## Oceanica[[@Headword:Oceanica]]

             the name given to the fifth division of the globe, comprising all the islands which intervene between the south-eastern shores of the continent of Asia  and the western shores of the American continent. It naturally divides itself into three great sections — Malay Archipelago, Australasia (q.v.) or Melanesia, and Polynesia (q.v.).

## Oceanides And Oceanitides[[@Headword:Oceanides And Oceanitides]]

             sea nymphs, daughters of Oceanus, from whom they received their name, and of the goddess Tethys, numbered 3000 according to Apollodorus, who mentions the names of seven of them: Asia, Styx, Electra, Doris, Eurynome. Amphitrite, and Metis. Hesiod speaks of the eldest of them, and reckons forty-one: Pitho, Admete, Prynno, Ianthe, Rhodia, Hippo, Callirrhoe, Urania, Clymene, Idyia, Pasithoe, Clythia, Zeuxo, Galuxaure, Plexaure, Perseis, Pluto, Thoe, Polydora, Melobosis, Dione, Cerceis, Xantha, Acasta, lanira, Telestho, Europa, Menestho, Petrea, Eudora, Calypso, Tyche, Ocyroe, Crisia, Amphiro, with those mentioned by Apollodorus, except Amphitrite. Hyginus mentious sixteen, whose names are almost all different from those of Apollodorus and Hesiod, which difference proceeds from the mutilation of the original text. The Oceanides, as the rest of the inferior deities, were honored with libations and sacrifices. Prayers were offered to them, and they were entreated to protect sailors from storms and dangerous tempests. The Argonauts, before they proceeded on their expedition, made an offering of flour, honey, and oil on the sea-shore to all the deities of the sea, and sacrificed bulls to them, and entreated their protection. When the sacrifice was made on the sea-shore the blood of the victim was received in a vessel, but when it was in the open sea the blood was permitted to run down into the water. When the sea was calm, the sailors generally offered a lamb or a young pig, but if it was agitated by the winds and rough, a black bull was deemed the most acceptable victim (Homer, Od. iii;. Horat. Apollon.; Virg. Georg. 4:341; Hesiod, Theog. 349; Apollod. i). SEE NYMPH.

## Oceanus[[@Headword:Oceanus]]

             in ancient mythology, war the powerful divinity of the sea (hence the nauie Ocean), which was believed to encircle the earth. According to Hesiod he was the son of Uranus and Gae (heaven and earth). He was married to Tethys, by whom he begot the principal rivers, such as the Alpheus, Peneus, Strymon, etc., with a number of daughters who are called from him Oceanides (q.v.). ‘According to Homer, Oceanus was the father of all the gods, and on that account he received frequent visits from the rest of  the deities. He is generally represented as an old man with a long flowing beard, and sitting upon the waves of the sea. He often holds a pike in his hand, while ships under sail appear at a distance, or a sea-monster stands near him. Oceanus presided over every part of the sea, and even the rivers were subjected to his power. The ancients were superstitious in their worship of Oceanus, and revered with great solemnity a deity to whose care they entrusted themselves when going on any voyage (Hesiod, Theog.; Ovid, Fast. v. 81, etc.; Apollod. i; Cicero, De Nat. D. 3:20; Homer, II.).

## Oceda, Samuel Ben-Israel[[@Headword:Oceda, Samuel Ben-Israel]]

             a Jewish savant of note, flourished towards the end of the 16th century, and was a pupil of the famous Cabalists Isaac Loria (q.v.) and ChazimVital. He was a darshan or preacher at Safed, in Upper Galilee, and wrote a very extensive commentary on the treatise Aboth, entitled מַדְרִשׁ שְׁמוּאֵל, with special reference to the commentaries of Gerundi, Abulafia, Maimonides, Abarbanel, Bertinore, Almosino, and others (Venice, 1519, and often): a commentary on Lamentations, entitled לֶחֶם דַּמְעָה, “the Bread of Sorrow,” the Hebrew text and Rashi's commentary (Venice, 1600, and often): — a commentary on Ruth, entitled אַגֶּרֶת שְׁמוּאֵל, “the Letter of Samuel” (Constantinople, 1597, and often; last edition, Zolkiew, 1801). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:44; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:1085; 3:1070 sq.; H. Adams. History of the Jews (Boston, 1812)j ii, 15; Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 254. (B. P.)

## Ocellus, Lucanus[[@Headword:Ocellus, Lucanus]]

             (῎Οκελλος [also ῎Οκελος, ᾿Ωκελλος, Οἴκελλος, Ουκελλος, ῎Ηκελος, ῎Εκκελος, etc.] Λευκανός), a Greek philosopher, was born in Lucania, whence his surname, and, as appears from his works, belonged to the Pythagorean school of philosophers. He flourished probably some five hundred years previous to the Christian aera. Philo, who lived in the 1st century, is the first writer who mentions him; for the letter of Archytas to Plato, and the latter's answer, quoted by Diogenes Laertius, cannot be considered genuine. According to Laertius's statement, Archytas wrote that at Plato's request he had been to Lucania, had found out the descendants of Ocellus, and obtained from them the treatises Περὶ νόμου, Περὶ βασιλεαίς, Περὶ ὁσιότητος, Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς γενέσεως, which he sent to Plato; and that he had been unable to procure any others,  but would send as soon as he had discovered them. Plato thanked Archytas for his invoice, declaring that he had read the works of Ocellus with great pleasure, and that he considered him a worthy descendant of those Trojans who emigrated with Laomedon. These apocryphal documents only show that in the time of Diogenes Laertius, or of the author of the two spurious letters, there were four treatises attributed to Ocellus Lucanus, the Pythagorean philosopher, and that it was supposed he wrote others which were lost. Among the above-mentioned works there exists at present but the last, which is quite short. It is divided into four chapters. The first treats of the universe in general, τὸ πᾶν, or ὁ κόσμος; the second, of the composition of the universe; the third, of the origin of man; the fourth, of his duties, especially in the married state. Ocellus maintains that the universe has had no beginning, and can have no end; that a part of it is eternal and immutable — that is, the heavens, or the whole of the celestial bodies; and another part variable in its form, but immutable in its elements. He maintains also, in accordance with this cosmic theory, that mankind has always existed, and that man, mortal as an individual, is eternal as a species. This immortality of the species, combined with the mortality of the individuals, leads, with individuals, to the necessity of reproduction. Hence the object of sexual intercourse is not pleasure, but the procreation of children and the perpetuity of the human race. Thus in marriage decency and moderation must be observed: fortune and birth are not the only consideration; but suitability of ages, tastes, mind, etc., must be sought, in order that the union may produce healthy children and a happy family; for the families constitute the state, and the welfare of the one includes that of the other. This little treatise of Ocellus, though of no scientific value, is ingeniously conceived, and written with great clearness .

Our short analysis shows that Ocellus did not belong to the old Pythagorean school, whose ideas were more original, but less clear. His system is rather an eclectic mixture of Aristotle's physics with the metaphysics of the Eleates and the morals of the Pythagoreans. Besides this intrinsic proof of its non-authenticity which is very strong, we have another no less convincing in the fact that neither Plato nor Aristotle, nor any other philosopher before Philo, makes any mention of Ocellus or his works. Mr. Mullach supposes that the above treatise was written in the 1st century B.C., a time marked by a sort of revival of the Pythagorean system. Greek philosophy, after traversing the fruitful period of the school of Socrates, had brought forth the schools of the Academicians, the Stoics, and  Epicureans. It is easy to understand how some minds. dissatisfied with the doctrines of these various schools, returned to that of Pythagoras, as more elevated in its dogmas and purer in its morals. Jubaking of Mauritania, favored the revival of the Pythagorean school by collecting. at a great expense the works of Pythagoras and of his disciples, scattered through Greece and Italy. This proceeding, however; gave occasion for frauds, among which we must count the works of Ocellus, and particularly his treatise on the Nature of the Universe. According to Mr. Mullach's opinion, the forger has proved very skillful, and avoided all coarse anachronisms in language; he, nevertheless, copied sometimes textually the expressions of philosophers of the schools of Eleas and Aristotle. Besides, we do not now possess the treatise exactly as it was originally written.

A fragment of the περὶ νὸμου, quoted in Stobaeus and other indices, shows that the works attributed to Ocellus were probably written in the Doric dialect, while the text now extant of the περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς γενέσεως is written in the Attic dialect, which had in course of time become the most generally used in literature. Mr. Mullach thinks that the change was made during the Byzantinet period, perhaps in the 9th century. The treatise of Ocellus was first published by Conrad Neobar (Paris, 1539, 4to), and translated into Latin by Chretien, physician to Francis I of France (Lyons, 1541, 8vo). The edition published, together with a Latin translation, by Nogarola (Venice, 1559, 8vo), and reprinted by Jerome Comelin (1596), is better. Em. Vizzanius, professor at Padua, reprinted that treatise (Bologna, 1646; Amsterdam, 1661, 4to) with a new Latin version, and a useful though diffuse commentary. Gale, who inserted it in his Opuscula mythologica, ethica, etphysica, and:D'Argens, who published it with a French translation, in his Dissertations sur les principales questions de Zla .Metaphysique, de la Physique, et de la Morale des Anciens (Berl. 1762, 8vo), only corrected the text. Batteux. On the contrary, made good use of one of the MSS. of Ocellus, which are contained at the Imperial.Library at Paris, and his edition, together with a French translation, first published in the Recueil de l'Academie des Inscriptions (29:249294), was the best until the appearance of that.of A. F. W. Rudolphi (Leips. 1801, 8vo), which was in turn surpassed by Mr. Mullach's two editions, the first of them bearing the title Aristotelis de Melisso, Xenophane et Gorgiae disputationes, cum Eleaticorum philosophhorumfragmentis,. et Ocelli Lucani, qui fertur, de universa natura libello (Berlin, 1846). The second is included in the Fraqmenta  philosophorlum Groecorum (A. F. Didot's Bibliotheque Groeque, Paris, 1860). Ocellus Lucanus's works were translated into English by Thomas Taylor (1841, 8vo). See Diogenes Laertius, 8:80; Meiners, Gesch. d. Wissensch. in Griech. und Romans vol. i; Bardili. Epochen d. vorziiglichsten philosoph. Begriffe. (Halle, 1788); Filleborn, Beitrage z. Gesch. d. Philos. pt. x, p. 1-77; Mullach, Introduction to the Fragm. philosoph. Graec. p. 383; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1:43; Butler, Anc. Philos. (see Index in vol. ii); Lewes, Hist. of Philos. (see Index in vol. 2); Cocker, Christianity and Greek Philosophy. — Hoefer, Nour. Biog. Gener. 38 428; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth. rol. 3.

## Ochiel[[@Headword:Ochiel]]

             (Ο᾿χιῆλος v. r. Ο᾿ξιῆλος, Vulg. Oziel), a corrupt form (1Es 1:9) of the Heb. name JEIEL (2Ch 25:9).

## Ochiltree, Michael[[@Headword:Ochiltree, Michael]]

             a Scotch prelate, was dean of the Church of Dunblane in 1425, and was made bishop in 1430. He was bishop at Dunblane in 1439 when he appended his seal to a solemn agreement between the queen-dowager and a committee of parliament, about the keeping of the young king, James II. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 177.

## Ochim[[@Headword:Ochim]]

             (אֹחַים, plural of אֹח), a species of animal classed with wild beasts of the desert, and described as haunting ruins (Isa 13:21, A.V. “doleful creatures”). Various identifications have been suggested, such as cuts, weasels, apes, etc. but the view most generally entertained is that a species of owl is intended. The name is oliomatopoetic from the interjection: אח, and denotes some creature that makes a woeful howling or screeching noise. This sound is very characteristic of the cry of the owl, which is sometimes like augh-o SEE DOLEFUL CREATURES.

## Ochino (Or, As He Is Sometimes Called, Ocello), Bernardino[[@Headword:Ochino (Or, As He Is Sometimes Called, Ocello), Bernardino]]

             one of the most noted of Italian reformers, who, in his generation, was reverenced almost as a saint for his piety, and by his eloquence entranced thousands wherever he preached, was born of obscure parents in 1487 at Siena, a city of Tuscany. Feeling from his earliest years a deep sense of religion, he devoted himself, according to the notions of that age, to a monastic life, and joined, while yet a mere youth; the Franciscan Observantines, as the strictest of all the, orders of the regular clergy. For the same reason he left them, and in 1534 became a member of the Capuchin brotherhood, which had been recently established according to the most rigid rules of holy living, or, rather, voluntary humility and mortification. During his monastic retirement he acknowledges that he  escaped those vices with which his life might have been tainted if he had mixed with the world; and from the studies of the cloister, barren and unprofitable as they were, reaped a portion of knowledge which was afterwards of some use to him; but he failed completely in gaining, what was the great thing which induced him to choose that unnatural and irksome mode of life, peace of mind and assurance of salvation; or, as he himself put it, “I remained a stranger to true peace of mind, which at last I found in searching the Scriptures, and such helps for understanding them. as I had access to. I now came to be satisfied of the three following truths:

1, that Christ, by his obedience and death, has made a plenary satisfaction and merited heaven for the elect, which is the only righteousness and ground of salvation;

2, that religious vows of human invention are not only useless, but hurtful and wicked; and,

3, that the Roman Church, though calculated to fascinate the senses by her external pomp and splendor, is unscriptural and abominable in the sight of God.”

In Italy it was not the custom, as in Germany, for the secular clergy to preach: this task was performed exclusively by the monks and friars. The chapters of the different orders chose such of their number as possessed the best pulpit talents, and sent them to preach in the principal cities during the time of Lent, which was almost the only season of the year in which the people enjoyed religious instruction. Ochino attained to the highest distinction in this employment, to which he was chosen by his brethren at an early period. His original talents compensated for his want of erudition. He was a natural orator, and the fervor of his piety and .the sanctity of his life gave an unction and an ardor to his discourses which ravished the hearts of his hearers, and he soon became in the highest degree eminent for his' talents in the pulpit. Never did man preach with so much success, as well as “with so much applause. His extraordinary merit procured him the favor of pope Paul III, who, it is said, made him his father confessor and preacher; in 1538. he was elected general of the Capuchin Order at Florence, and afterwards, while at Naples, in 1541, was re-elected to the same dignity. But ubile thus the favorite of both prince and people, he fell into the company of the Reformer of Spain, Juan Valdes, who had imbibed Luther's doctrine in Germany, and Ochino became a proselyte, He was then at Naples, and began at once to preach in favor of Protestant  doctrines; which being taken notice of, he was summoned to appear at Rome, and, persuaded that he had truth on his side, he at once made preparation to set out for that city. But on his way thither he met at Florence Peter Martyr, with whom it is probable he had contracted an acquaintance at Naples. This friend persuaded him not to put himself into the pope's power; and they both agreed to withdraw into some place of safety. Ochino went first to Ferrara, where he disguised himself in the habit of a soldier, and proceeded thence to Genoa, where he arrived in 1542, and married. But feeling it unsafe to remain in Italy, he set out for Switzerland, and finally passed over to Germany, and settled at Augsburg, where he preached the Reformed doctrines, and also published several sermons, some of which he had brought with — him from Italy (Prediche, s. 1. [1542-44; 2 ed. Basel, 1562, 5.vols.]; twenty of these have been translated into German [Neuburg, 1545], twenty-two into French [Gen., about 1546- 61], and twenty-five into English [Ipswich, 1548]). He remained in charge of a congregation at Augsburg until 1 547, when, the city falling into the hands of the emperor, he was obliged to flee to Strasburg, and thence he passed over into England, together with Peter Martyr (q.v.).

There he preached to the Italian refugees in London, who obtained the use of a church in 1551, and he was in great favor with archbishop Cranmer and the princess Elizabeth. On Mary's accession he fled again to Strasburg, and thence to Geneva, but was obliged to leave that city on account of the opposition he made to the condemnation of Servetus. In 1555 he was in Basle, and shortly after received a call to Zurich. Here he commenced advocating some eccentric views on the doctrine of the Trinity, on marriage, and finally wrote in favor of polygamy, whereupon the authorities expelled him from the city, and in December, 1563, he went to Nuremberg. Here he wrote a justification, which is to be found in Schelhorn's Ergbtzlichkeiten (pt. 3, p. 2007 sq.), to which the inhabitants of Zurich answered, March, 1564, by the Spongia adversus aspergines B. Ochini, qua ver-e causce exponuntur, ob quas ille ab urbe Tigurina fuit relegatus (in the same work, 3:2157 sq., and probably first published in Hottinger's Historia Ecclesiae Novi Testam. 9:479). He fled into Moravia, and there joined the Socinians. Later he went on a visit to Poland, but after king Sigismund's edict, who in 1564 punished with banishment all those that were called Tritheists, Atheists, etc., he quitted that country, and shortly after his entry into Moravia died, in the beginning of 1565, of the plague, at Slakow. Ochino has been considered by some as one of the heads of the Antitrinitarians. SEE SOCINIANS.

The character of Ochino is variously represented by different authors, which is not to lie wondered at, since men like him, undecided, and constantly changing from one phase of doctrine to another, are likely to make many opponents. Bayle observes that the confession he made publicly on the change of his religion is remarkable. He acknowledged in a preface that if he could have continued, without danger of his life, to preach the truth, after the manner he had preached it for some years, he ‘would never have laid down the habit of his order; but as he did not find within himself that courage which is requisite to undergo martyrdom, he took refuge in a Protestant country. Thus to criticize Ochino's conduct is, we think, hardly fair. For the times and circumstances by which Ochino was controlled should be carefully considered. Long before he had been advanced to the highest dignity in his order he had become a Protestant at heart. He did not deny his convictions, but, instead of declaring himself at variance with the Romish views, he simply suffered it to produce a corresponding change in his strain of preaching, which for some time was felt rather than understood by his hearers. He appealed directly to the Scriptures in support of the doctrines which he delivered, and exhorted the people to rest their faith on the infallible authority of the Word of God, and to build their hopes of salvation on the obedience and death of Christ alone. But a prudential regard to his own safety, and to the edification of his hearers, whose minds were not prepared for the discovery, prevented him from exposing the fallacy of Romish superstition.

Only when Valdes encouraged him to take a bolder departure Ochino was led to take the decisive step, and then he was obliged to quit his native land. Besides, no one can question his piety, however greatly the extreme errors into which Ochino fell may be deprecated. He was always great and good, and there is nothing in his life to condemn, though his doctrines were gravely heterodox, and in his last years he much weakened the Protestant cause in Poland, and Southern Europe generally. Certainly his great renown as a pulpit orator was deserved, and should be remembered. “In such reputation was he held,” says the annalist of the Capuchins, after Ochino had brought on them the stigma of heresy, “that he was esteemed incomparably the best preacher of Italy; his powers of elocution, accompanied with the most admirable action, gave him the command of his audience, especially as his life corresponded to his doctrine” (Bzovius apud Bock, Hist. Antitrin. 2:485). His external appearance, after he had passed middle age, contributed to heighten this effect. His snow-white head, and his beard of the same color flowing down to his middle, added to a pale countenance,  which led the spectators to suppose that he was in bad health, rendered his aspect at once venerable and deeply interesting. “As a preacher,” says M'Crie, “he was admired and followed equally by the learned and illiterate, by the great and the vulgar. Charles V, who used to attend his sermons when in Italy, pronounced this.high encomium on him: ‘That man would make the stones weep!' Sadolet and Bembo, who were still better judges than his imperial majesty, assigned to Ochino the palm of popular eloquence. At Perugia he prevailed on the inhabitants by his discourses to bury all their animosities and bring their lawsuits to an amicable settlement; and in Naples he preached to so numerous an assembly, and with such persuasive eloquence, as to collect at one time, for a charitable purpose, the almost incredible sum of five thousand crowns. The fame of the devout and eloquent Capuchin was so great that the most respectable inhabitants of Venice, in the year 1538, employed cardinal Bembo to procure him to preach to them during the ensuing Lent. The cardinal wrote to Vittoria Colonna, marchioness of Pescaro, begging her.to intercede with ‘Ochilio, over whom she had great influence, to visit Venice, where he would find all the inhabitants inflamed with the most passionate desire to hear him. He went accordingly, and was enthusiastically received” (Ref. in Italy, p. 118:sq.).

Ochino's writings are rather numerous than bulky. His principal works are, Dialogi VII:sacri, dove si contiene, nel primo dell inamorarsi di Dio, etc. (1542):Apologi nelli quali si scuoprano gli abwusi, errori, etc., della sinagora del Papa, de suoi preti; monachi e frati (Geneva, 1544;. German, Augsburg,'1559, 4to): — Expositione sopra la epistola di S. Paolo alli Roniani (1545; German, Augsburg, 1546; Latin, ibid. 1546): Expositione sopra la epistola di S. Paolo al-Galati (1546; German, Augsburg, 1546, 4to): — A Tragedy, or Dialogue of the unjust usurped Primacy of the Bishop of Rome (Lond. 1549, 4to): — Dialogo del Purgatorio (Basel, 1556; Latin by Taddeo Duno. Zurich, 1556; French, 1559): — Sincera et verce doctrince de comna Domini defensio contra libros tres J. Westphali (Zurich, 1556):Disputa intorno alla presenza del corpo di Giesu Christo nel sacramento della cena (Basel, 1561; Latin, Liber de sporis Christi prcesentia in cnce sacramento (ibid.): — Prediche del R. Padre Don ‘Serafino da Piagenza, ditte Laberinti del libero over servo arbitrio, etc. (Stampato in Pavia, i.e. Basel; Latin, Labyrinthi, hoc est de libero aut servo arbitrio, de divina prcenotione, destinatione et libertate disputatio, Basel, probably printed in 1562): — II catechismo, o  vero institutione Christiana, infornma di dialogo (Basle, 1561): — 30 Dialogi in duos libros divisi, quorunmprimus est de Messia; secundus est, cum de rebus variis, tumpotissimum de Trinitate (Basel, 1563). In these “Dialogues” Ochino tries to transform the objective satisfaction theory of the Church into an act of subjective reflection, whereby man comes to see - that God is disposed to forgive him when he is penitent (see Schenkel, 2:265 sq.). See Zanchi, De tribus Elohim (Neustadt, 1589, fol.); Sandius, Bibl. — Antitrinitariorum; Bayle, Dictionnaire histor. s.v.; Struve, De vita, religione et fatis B. Ochini (in Observat. select. Halens. 4:409 sq.; v. 1 sq.); Fissli, Beitrage z. Reformationsgesch. d. Schweiz. v. 416 sq.; Treschel, Die protestant. Antitrinitarier, 2:202; Paleario, Life and Times, 1:263, 554; 2:76, 81, 92 sq., 195 sq., 345 sq., 356 sq., 571 sq., 486 sq.;' Wiffen, Life and Writings of Juan de Valdes (Lond. 1865), p. 104 sq.; M'Crie, Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, p. 116-123; Nachlese aus Ochini's Leben u. Schriften, in Schelhorn's “Ergitzlichkeiten,” 3:765, 979,1141, 1219; Bock, Hist. Antitrinit. (1874); Meyer, Essai sur la vie, etc., de B. Ochin (i851); Hook, Eccles. Biogr. 7:448-450; Benrath, Bern. Ochino (Leips. 1875).

## Ochlah[[@Headword:Ochlah]]

             SEE OCLAH.

## Ocidelus[[@Headword:Ocidelus]]

             (Ο᾿κείδηλος v. r. Ο᾿κόδηλος; Vulg. Jussio, Reddus), a corrupt form (1Es 9:22) of the Heb. name JOZABAD (Ezr 10:22).

## Ocina[[@Headword:Ocina]]

             [most Oc'inza] (Ο᾿κεινά v. r. Ο᾿κινά), a city on the sea-coast of Phoenicia or Palestine, only mentioned in connection with Sur (q.v.), in the apocryphal book of Judith (2:28), as being terrified at the approach of Holofernes. “The names seem to occur in a regular order from north to south; and as Ocina is mentioned between Tyre and Jemnaan:(Jabneh),its position agrees with that of the ancient ACCHO, now Akka, and in mediaeval times sometimes called Acon (Brocardus; William of Tyre, etc.)” (Smith). The name may thus be a corruption of Α᾿κωνά ( עָכֹן). On an unfortunate conjecture in Gesenius, see Movers, in the Zeitschrf. Philosophie u. Kath. Theologie, 13:38.

## Ockley, Simon[[@Headword:Ockley, Simon]]

             an English divine and philosopher, eminent for his attainments in Oriental literature and languages, was born of a distinguished family at Exeter in 1678. He studied at Queen's College, in the University of Cambridge, from 1693, and early evinced a peculiar tendency to the study of the Eastern languages. Having entered the Church, he was appointed curate of Swavesey in 1705, through Simon Patrick, bishop of Ely, who had great regard for his talents; and in 1711 he was chosen professor of Arabic in. the University of Cambridge. He was thoroughly acquainted with the Eastern languages, and very zel in promoting their study, which he considered as of theology, declaring that no one could be a great theologian without being more or less actual with them. He died at Swavesey; Aug. 9, 1720. He wrote Introductio ad linguas orientles in qua iis discen's via munitur et earum usus ostendjitr (Cambridge, 1706, 8vo); it contains a chapter odiqihe famous discussion between Buxtorf and:Cappelif n the origin and antiquity of the vowel points in Hebrew. Ockley, who at first sided with the former, changed his opinion afterwards: The History of the present Jews throughout the World (ibid. 1707, 12mo), translated from the Italian of rabbi Leon of Modena, with the addition of a Supplement. concerning the Karaites and Samaritdns, after Richard Simon: — The Improvement of Human Reason exhibited in the Life of Hai-Ebn-Yokdhau, written above five hundred years ago by A biu Jaafar- ebn-Tophail (ibid. 1708, 8vo); the original was published by Pococke as early as 1650: — An Account of South-west Barbary, containing what is most remarkable in the Territories of the King of Fez and Morocco (ibid. 1713, 8vo, with a map): — The History of the Saracens (Lond. 1708-18, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d f.ed. Camb. 1757; 5th ed., augmented, Lond. 1848, royal 8vo; translated into German in 1745, and into French, by Jault, in 1748); this, the most important of Ockley's works, is full of curious information concerning the reigion, habits, customs, and history of the Saracens from the death of Mohammed (632) to 1705. Ockley con sulted a number of Arabic works previously but little known. It may still be read with advantage by those:who are unacquainted with the Oriental languages. Gibb made considerable use of it in his Decline and Fall, and speaks of the author in his autobiography as an original in every sense, who had opened his eyes.” This work, however, does not appear to have brought Ockley much profit; for he complains, in his inaugural oration in 1711, of his straitened circumstances, and dates the second volume of his history from  Cambridge Castle, where he was imprisoned for debt: — The second apocryphal Book of Esdras, translated in 1716 from an Arabic version; and some Sermons, of which one was on The Christian Priesthood, and another on The Necessity ofi Istsucting Children in the Scriptures. See Chalmers, Gen. Biog. Dict. s.v.;. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale,38. 441; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v. (J. N. P.)

## Ockwallists[[@Headword:Ockwallists]]

             SEE UCKWALLISTS.

## Oclah ve-Oclah[[@Headword:Oclah ve-Oclah]]

             (אכלה ואכלה) is the name which, in the course of time, was given by some to one or more redactions of the independent review of the Masorah to distinguish it from the other Great Masorah, which was written above and below the text of the Bible. It obtained its name, Oclah ve-Oclah, from the first two words, אָכְלָה(1Sa 1:9), וְאָכְלָה(Gen 27:19), in the alphabetical list of words occurring twice in the Bible, once without and once with van, 1, with which the Masorah begins. Dr. Steinschneider, who in his Jewish Literature, p. 133 (Lond. 1857), says that “the book אכלה ואכלהis probably so called because it begins with these two words,” is very anxious to claim the originality of this remark, as may be seen from note 31 in Geiger's Jidische Zeitschrinft, 1:316, 317 (Breslau, 1862); but we ‘cannot understand why he should do so, since Elias Levita (q.v.), who made the Oclah ve-Oclah the basis of his masoretic researches, plainly declared that it is so called from its beginning words (Massoreth ha- Massoreth, p. 138, ed. Ginsburg, Lond. 1867). By this appellation (viz. Oclah ve-Oclah) this particular redaction of the Great Masorah was first quoted towards the end of the 12th century by David Kimchi (q.v.) in his Grammar, entitled Michlol (מכלול), 35 b, col. 2; 51 a, Colossians 2 (ed. Levita, Bomberg, 1545, fol.), or 1l6,163 a (ed. Hechin, Ftirth, 1793), and in his Lexicon, ספר השרשים(i.e. the Book of Roots), s.v. קרב, p. 334 a (ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht, Berlin, 1847), and Ibsi-Aknin (q.v.), in his ethical work, טוב אלנפוםand in his Methodology (comp. Steinschneider, inlGeiger's Zeitschrift, 1862, p. 316, note 31); in the middle of the 13th century it: was quoted again by Isaac ben-Jehudah in his ס8 האשל(comp. — Steinschneider'. Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodlej. co]. 1418;-the  same author by Geiger, . c.; Neubauer, Notice. sur flexicographie Hebraique, p. 9, Paris, 1863), and then again by Levita in 1538, who described it as the only separate Masorah (Massoreth ha-,ihassoreth, p. 93, 94, 138, ed. Ginsburg). Henceforth it entirely disappeared. Even R. Solomon-Norzi (q.v.), the great Biblical critic and masoretic authority (cir. 1560-1630), who searched through the Midrashim (q.v.), the Talmud (q.v.), and the whole cycle of rabbinic literature for various readings, could no longer find it (comp. Norzi's Comment.[ii. 27 b] on 1Sa 1:9).

The disappearance of this valuable masoretic work induced many distinguished scholars to believe in its entire loss for Lebrecht says, in his introductory notes to his edition of Kimchi's Lexicon, p. 49 (Berlin, 1847), “Sed postquam tota argumentorum ejus summa in Masoram magnam bibliorum rabbinorum transiit, ipse liber periisse videtur.” The same opinion was held by the late Dr. Fiirst, who, in the introduction to his Concordance expressly states that the masoretic work Oclah seems to be lost for us. Dr. Derenbourg, however, while preparing the catalogue of Hebrew MSS. in the Imperial Library at Paris, had the good fortune to discover an independent “Great Masorah,” commencing with the words Oclah ve- Oclch (Bibliotheque Imperiale, Ancien Fonds Hebreu, No. 56; Ben- Chananja, 1862, No. 7, p. 57 sq.). Shortly after Dr. Frensdorff, who for years has been engaged ‘in masoretic researches, heard of this discovery (January, 1859); in 1862 he went to Paris, copied the MS. and published it, with learned annotations, under the title Das Buch Oclah ve-Oclah (Masorah) Herausgegeben, iibersetzt und mit erlduternden Anmerkungen versehen (Hanover, 1864, 4to). The whole is divided into 374 sections, treating on the most different subjects, which will be best illustrated by two examples, quoted at random. Thus sec. 261, p. 142, gives eleven words which are preceded by אתה, and which in this construction occur only once. Sec. 82, p. 88, gives an alphabetical list of words written in the Hebrew Pentateuch with majuscular letters. After this discovery at Paris it was thought that it was the original Oclah veOclah, which had been lost for nearly three centuries, and that it was the same which Levita made the basis of his masoretic labors. Even Dr. Frensdorff, starting from the false hypothesis that there was only one redaction of the Oclah ve-Oclah, and that his was the unique copy which had survived the ravages of time, was led to this presumption, which, however, is now proved to be incorrect by the discovery of another and much larger redaction of the Oclah ve-Oclah than that published by Dr. Frensdorff. The MS. is in the library of the University of Halle (Y. b. 10), and a description of it by the late Prof.  Hupfeld has been given in the Zeitschrift der deutschen mnorgenldndischen Gesellschaft, 21:201-220 (Leips. 1867). See Ginsburg, Jacob ben-Chajim ibn-Adonijah's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible (Lond. 1867); Kimchi, Liber radicum (ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht), p. 26; Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift fuir Wissenschaft und Leben, p. 104 sq. (Breslau, 1864-5); Frankel, Monatsschrift fur Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, p. 31-37, 75-80, 269-277, 313-318 (ibid. 1865); Oclah ve-Oclah, ed. Frensdorff, p. iii sq. (B. P.)

## Oconnor, Charles[[@Headword:Oconnor, Charles]]

             a learned Irish Roman Catholic divine, who for many years was a resident in the family of the-duke of Buckingham atStowe as chaplain to the duchess and librarian to the duke, is the author of Columbanus's Letters (2 vols.), a Narrative of the most interesting Events in Modern Irish History, and a collection of the ancient Irish chronicles; his studies having been chiefly. directed to the elucidation of the history and antiquities of Ireland. He eld ‘in' 1828 at Balinagar, the seat of his brother, the O'Conor Don. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ocran[[@Headword:Ocran]]

             (Heb. עָכְרָן., afflicted; Sept. Ε᾿χράν), the father of Pagiel, which latter was the chief man of the tribe of Asher about the time of the exode (Num 1:13; Num 2:27; Num 7:72; Num 10:26). B.C. ante 1658.

## Octagonal Chapels Or Churches[[@Headword:Octagonal Chapels Or Churches]]

             occur only at Stony Middleton, Wisby, Milan, Perugia, Ravenna, Hierapolis, and the modern St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, London. There was formerly one at Ayot St. Peter's. The form is mentioned by Eusebius at Antioch in the case of a church built by Constantine, and was a modification of the principle of the round church. There is an octagonal porch at St. Mary's Redcliffe, and a chamber in modern times called the Baptistery, but really connected with the water system, at Canterbury Cathedral.

## Octava Infantium[[@Headword:Octava Infantium]]

             (eighth [day] of the babes) was a frequent designation of the first Sunday after Easter, so called in reference to the newly baptized as born of God.  See Siegel, Christliche Alterthumer, 1:208 sq.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 677.

## Octave[[@Headword:Octave]]

             is, in the ecclesiastical calendar, the period intervening between any of the higher festivals and the eighth day therefrom. The whole of this interval was formerly observed with great solemnity; and the Church of England has retained the notion by directing that the “preface” proper to Christmas- day, Easter-day, Ascension-day, and Whit-Sunday shall be used for the seven days immediately following each of these festivals; except that in the latter case (Whit-Sunday), that preface is to be used for six days only, because the eighth day from it is Trinity Sunday, which has a preface peculiar to itself. Sparrow, on the Common Prayer, says, because our whole life is the revolution .of seven days, the eighth or octave signifies eternity, and this was the mystical reason why octaves were annexed to festivals. Di Cange says, because our Lord rose on the eighth day (including Sunday to Sunday), the octave of the feast was the day on which the whole solemnity closed. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 677, 683.

## Octavian[[@Headword:Octavian]]

             Antipope, was born at Rome about 1095. He was a descendant of the Frascati family, and was made cardinal by Innocent II in 1138. Pope Eugenius III appointed him his legate to Germany, and gave him a mission to the Diet at Ratisbon, which he was prevented from fulfilling by the death of the emperor Conrad III in 1152. Under the pontificate of Adrian IV, Octavian began to show his ambitious views, seeking to create troubles in the Church; and it is said he had great influence in fostering the dispute concerning investitures between Frederick I and the pope. Being sent to that prince to induce him to desist from his attacks against the see of Rome, he betrayed his trust, and sided with the emperor. After the death of Adrian IV, Octavian, who aspired to the papacy, contested the election of cardinal Ronald Rainucci, who had taken the title of Alexander III. Octavian caused himself to be elected by two other opposing cardinals, John of Mercone, archdeacon of Tyre, and Gui of Creme, Sept. 5, 1159, and took the name of Victor IV. Alexander had already assumed the scarlet cope of the office when Octavian tore it from him; a senator who was present seized it, but Octavian, aided by his chaplain, secured it, and in his haste put it on wrong side out. At the same time an armed mob broke into  the church to support Octavian. A few days afterwards cardinal Raymond and Simon Borelli, abbot of Subiaco, went over to his side, and he succeeded in inducing Imar, a French cardinal, bishop of Frascati, to consecrate him, Oct. 1 1159. On the 28th of the same month Octavian wrote to. the emperor Frederick and to members of the nobility, asking them to support his election. Frederick, who knew he could rely on him, answered favorably, and assembled a council at Pavia, Feb. 5, 1160, which acknowledged Octavian as pope. His death, which occurred at Lucca, April 22, 1164, did not end the schism, and Frederick appointed as his successor Gui of Creme, who took the name of Pascal III (q; v.). See Otho de Frisingen, De rebus Friderici; Baronius, Annales, vol. 12; Fleury, Hist. Eccles. 1. 70, ch. 37 sq.; Auberv Hist. des Cardinaux, vol. i; Milman, Hist. Lat. Christ. 4:289, 296; Cartwright, Papal Conclaves, p. 15.

## Octavianus Or Octavius[[@Headword:Octavianus Or Octavius]]

             Roman emperor. SEE AUGUSTUS.

## October-Horse[[@Headword:October-Horse]]

             THE, a horse anciently sacrificed in the month of October to Mars in the Campus Martins at Rome. The blood that dropped from the tail of the animal which was sacrificed was carefully preserved by the vestal virgins in the temple of Vesta, for the purpose of being burned at the festival Palilia (q.v.), in order to produce a public purification by fire and smoke.

## Octoechos[[@Headword:Octoechos]]

             is the name of a service-book used in the Greek Church. It consists of two volumes (folio), and contains the particular hymns and services for every day of the week, a portion of the daily service being appropriated to some saint or festival besides those marked in the calendar. Thus, Sunday is dedicated to the resurrection; Monday, to the angels; Tuesday, to St. John the Baptist; Wednesday, to the Virgin and the cross; Thursday, to the apostles; Friday, to the Savior's passion; and Saturday, to saints and martyrs. The prayers being intoned in the Greek Church, the Octcechus enjoins which of the eight ordinarily in use is to be employed on different occasions and for different services.

## Od[[@Headword:Od]]

             (from the same root as Odin and supposed to mean all-pervading), the name given by baron Reichenbach to a peculiar physical force which he thought he had discovered. This force, according to him, pervades all nature, and manifests itself as a flickering flame or luminous appearance at the poles of magnets, at the poles of crystals, and wherever chemical action is going on. This would account for the luminous figures said to be sometimes seen over recent graves. The od force has positive and negative poles, like magnetism. The human body is od-positive on the left side, and od-negative on the right. Certain persons, called “sensitives,” can see the odic radiation like a luminous vapor in the dark, and can feel it by the touch like a breath. As the meeting of like odic poles causes a disagreeable sensation, while the pairing of unlike poles causes a pleasant sensation, we have thus a sufficient cause for those likings and antipathies hitherto held' unaccountable. Some sensitive persons cannot sleep on ‘their left side (in the northern hemisphere), because the north pole of the earth, which is od- negative, affects unpleasantly the od-negative left side. All motion generates od; why, then, may not a stream running underground affect a sensitive waterfinder, so that the divining-rod in his or her hand shall move without, it may be, any conscious effort of will? All the phenomena of mesmerism are ascribed to the workings of this od-force. Reichenbach does not pretend to have had the evidence of his own senses for any of those manifestations of his assumed od-force; the whole theory rests on the revelations made to him by “sensitives.” It may be added that few if any really scientific men have any belief in the existence of such a force. Those curious in such matters are referred for the details of the subject to Reichenbach's large work, translated into English by Dr. Ashburner, under the title of The Dynamics of Magnetism, or to a briefer account in his Odisch — Magnetische Briefe (Stutt. 1852). See also Lond. Qu. Rev. Oct. 1871, p. 162. SEE ODYLISM.

## Odal Or Udal Right[[@Headword:Odal Or Udal Right]]

             (Celtic od, property) is the title of a tenure of land as absolute, and not dependent on. a superior. The odal right prevailed throughout Northern Europe before the rise of feudalism. It was founded on the tie of blood which connected freeman with freeman, and not on the tie of service. It was the policy of the sovereign authority everywhere to make it advantageous for the freemen to exchange the odal tie for the tie of service  — a change which paved the way for the feudal system. The odallers of Orkney were allowed to retain or resume their ancient privileges on paying a large contribution to the erection of St. Magnus's Cathedral at Kirkwall; and the odal tenure prevails to this day to a large extent in the Orkney and Shetland Islands, the right to land being completed without writing by undisturbed possession proved by witnessess before an inquest.

## Odd-fellows[[@Headword:Odd-fellows]]

             the name assumed by one of the most extensive self-governed provident associations in the world. The institution, though in its secrecy and many usages closely resembling the masonic order, is so largely devoted to philanthropic labors as to deserve a short historical notice here. The order was originated in Manchester in 1812, although isolated “lodges” had existed in various parts of the country for some time previously. These latter were generally secret fraternities, humble imitations of Free-masonry adopting a similar system of initiatory rites, phraseology, and organization — instituted for social and convivial purposes, and only occasionally extending charitable assistance to members. On its institution in Manchester, the main purpose of Odd-fellowship was declared by its laws to be, “To render assistance to every brother who may apply through sickness, distress, or otherwise, if he be well attached to the queen and government, and faithful to the order.” From attempts to abolish its convivial character a schism arose in 1813. The Manchester Unity, which was then founded, still constitutes the principal body of British Odd- fellows. In the United States of America the first lodge was instituted in 1819; and from this country, where the order is by far the largest and most powerful, it has spread into Germany, Switzerland, Australia, South America, and the Hawaiian Islands, working under charters received from the American order. Candidates for admission must be free white males, of good moral character, twenty-one years of age or over, who believe in a Supreme Being, the Creator and Preserver of the universe. Fidelity not only to the laws and obligations of the order, but to the laws of God, the laws of the land, and all the duties of citizenship, is strictly enjoined; but the order is a moral, not a religious organization,

## Oddazzi (Or Odasi), Giovanni[[@Headword:Oddazzi (Or Odasi), Giovanni]]

             an Italian painter noted for his attainments in sacred art, was born at Rome in 1603. He first studied under Ciro Ferri, and on the death of that master became the pupil of Gio. Battista Gaulli, called Baciccio. The liveliness of his genius and his remarkable industry gained him great distinction and a multitude of commissions, not only for the churches and public edifices, but for individuals. He was one of the twelve artists selected to paint the. prophets in fresco in St. John of Lateran. The prophet Hosea, produced by  Oddazzi; was especially much commended for correctness of design and dignity of expression. His most remarkable works, however, are the Fall of Lucifer and his Angels in the church of Santi Apostoli, and St. Bruno in S. Maria degli Angeli. By aiming at the celerity and rapid execution of Baciccio, without possessing his powers, he proved but a feeble imitator of his style; and his design is frequently careless and incorrect, though he had a commanding facility and great freedom of the pencil. He died in 1731.

## Ode[[@Headword:Ode]]

             (ᾠδή, a song) originally meant any lyrical piece adapted to be sung. In the modern use of the word, odes are distinguished from songs by not being necessarily in a form to be sung, and by embodying loftier conceptions and more intense and passionate emotions. The language of the ode is therefore abrupt, concise, and energetic; and the highest art of the poet is called into requisition in adapting the meters and cadences to the varying thoughts and emotions; hence the changes of meter and versification that occur in many odes. The rapt state of inspiration that gives birth to the ode leads the poet to conceive all nature as animated and conscious, and instead of speaking about persons and objects, to address them as present.

Among the highest examples of the ode are the Song of Moses and several of the Psalms. Dryden's Alexander's Feast is reckoned one of the first odes in the English language. We may mention, as additional specimens, Gray's Bard; Collins's Ode to the Passions; Burns's Scots wha hae; Coleridge's Odes to Memory and Despondency; Shelley's Ode to the Skylark; and Wordsworth's Ode on the Recollections of Immortality in Childhood. SEE HYMN; SEE PSALM; SEE SONG.

## Oded[[@Headword:Oded]]

             (Heb. Oded', עוֹדֵד, erecting; Sept. ᾿Ωδήδ v.r. Α᾿δάδ), the name of two Hebrews.

1. The father of Azariah the prophet, who was commissioned to meet and encourage Asa on his return from defeating the Ethiopians (2Ch 15:1-8). B.C. ante 953. It curiously happens that the address which at the commencement is ascribed to Azariah, the son of Oded, is at the end ascribed to Oded himself (15:8). But this is supposed to have been a slip of copyists, and the versions (Sept., Vulg., and Syr.) read the latter verse like the former.

2. A prophet .of Jehovah in Samaria, at the time of Pekah's invasion of Judah. B.C. 739. Josephus (Ant. 9:12, 2) calls him Obedas (᾿Ωβηδάς.). On the return of the victorious army with the 200,000 captives of Judah and Jerusalem, Oded met them and prevailed upon them to let the captives go free (2Ch 28:9). He was supported by the chivalrous feelings of some of the chieftains of Ephraim; and the narrative of the restoration of  the prisoners, fed, clothed, and anointed, to Jericho, the city of palm-trees, is a pleasant episode of the last days of the northern kingdom.

## Odem[[@Headword:Odem]]

             SEE SARDIUS.

## Odenheimer, William Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Odenheimer, William Henry, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 11, 1817. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1835, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1838; was ordained deacon by Bishop Onderdonk, of Pennsylvania, in the same year, and presbyter in 1841. After this he became rector of St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, of which he remained pastor until his election as bishop of the diocese of New Jersey, April 27, 1859. The consecration to this office occurred October 13 of the same year, in Richmond, Virginia. In  1874, when the diocese was divided, Bishop Odenheimer selected the "northern" portion. He died at his residence in Burlington, N.J., August 14, 1879. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1880, page 170.

## Oderic Of Pordenone (Or Portenau)[[@Headword:Oderic Of Pordenone (Or Portenau)]]

             an Italian Franciscan noted as a traveler, was born in 1286 at Cividale, district of Pordenone (Friuli.) After having finished his studies. at Udine, he devoted himself to the labors of the foreign missions, and resolved to carry the Gospel to Asia. During an absence of sixteen years, consecrated to the preaching of Christianity, Oderic administered baptism to more than 20,000 unbelievers. He returned to Pordenone in 1330; but the sufferings of all kinds that he had endured so changed him that he was not easily recognized even by his nearest relatives. His intention was to go to Avignon to pope John XXII, to give him an account of the state of the Oriental missions, and solicit from him new aid for the conversion of the Tartars; but the troubles excited in the Order of the Franciscans by the schismatic election of Peter of Corbiere, one of their number, to the papacy, under the name of Nicolas V, and an illness which surprised Oderic at Pisa prevented him from putting this project in execution. He came to Padua, where, by order of the provincial, he dictated, although sick, the relation of his voyage to one of his brothers, called William de Solagna. Shortly after he entered his convent at Udine, and there died with the reputation of a saint, Supported by a great number of miracles, related by the different authors of his life. His narrative, valuable for the geography of Asia in the 14th century, although we possess but five chapters of it, according to the common opinion was printed for the first time in the Raccolta delle navigazioni et viaggi of Ramnusio (ed. of 1563, 2:245); however, Tiraboschi pretends that Apostolo Zeno makes mention of an anterior edition, published in 1513. Haym does not speak of it in his Bibliotheca Italiansa; but he quotes an Italian translation of it by an anonymous writer (Pesaro, 1573, 4to). The Bollandists have inserted it in the life of Oderic, Jan. 14. Several other authors have given editions of it at different times. They have also placed upon it different titles; the Bollandists call it B. Odorici Peregrinatio, ab ipsomet descripta; Wadding, Historia peregrinationis; and certain others, De rebus incognitis. Oderic is besides the author of several sermons; of a work  entitled De mirabilibus mundi, in which he shows, as in his works, a spirit of observation, but too much credulity; and finally Chronica. abridged, from the commencement of the world to the pontificate of John XXII. See Wadding and Fonseca, Annales Minorumn, 7:123-156; Acta Sanctorum, Jan. 1, 983-992; Asquini, Vita et Viaggi del beato Odorico da Udine (1737, 8vo); Lirutti. Notizie delle cite ed opere scritte da' letterati del Friuli. 1, 274-291; Venni, Elogio istorico del B. Odorico (Venice, 1761, 4to); Jean de Saint-Antoine, Biblioth. univ. Francisc. 2:404; Tiraboschi, Histor. della letteratura Italiana, vol.

## Oderico, Canonico[[@Headword:Oderico, Canonico]]

             an Italian priest, noted as a painter, flourished at Siena in 1213. There is a manuscript book, entitled Ordo officiorum Senensis Ecclesiae, preserved in the library of the Academy at Florence, written on parchment and dated 1213, in which the initial letters are illuminated with little histories, ornaments of animals, etc., by this old painter. There are also other similar books, illustrated on the borders of the parchments by him, preserved at Siena. They are esteemed valuable not only on account of their antiquity, but as showing the state of the arts at that period.

## Odescalchi, Benedetto[[@Headword:Odescalchi, Benedetto]]

             SEE INNOCENT XI.

## Odescalchi, Marc Antoliio[[@Headword:Odescalchi, Marc Antoliio]]

             an Italian of high rank, who devoted his time and fortune to acts of philanthropy. He was cousin to pope Innocent XI, who offered him many high dignities in the Church. Observing that though Rome contained several hospitals for the relief of the poor of different nations, there were many strangers who. could find no asylum in any of them, but were obliged to take shelter in the porches of churches, the porticoes of palaces, or the ancient ruins of the city, he converted his house into a hospital for the reception of. these outcasts, without distinction. Here he fitted up 1000 beds, and employed a number of tailors constantly in making clothes for the objects of his bounty. If in his rides he chanced to observe a forlorn wanderer, he would stop, take him into his carriage, and convey him to his mansion. At his death in 1670, he left all his property to the support of the hospital.

## Odescalchi, Thomas[[@Headword:Odescalchi, Thomas]]

             another member of the same family, who was almoner to pope Innocent XI. In imitation of the preceding, he gave himself up to works of charity. Perceiving that in the hospital of St. Gale there were a number of children destitute of education, he conceived the idea of erecting an asylum for their reception; which he carried into execution, beginning with thirty-eight children, who were instructed and brought up to industry. The number soon increased through the liberality of pope Innocent, to seventy; and in 1686 Thomas Odescalchi laid the foundation of a large hospital for the education and employment of poor children in weaving cloth. This pious prelate died in 1692, and left considerable funds for the support of his institution, to which he gave the name of St. Michael de Ripegrande.

## Odians[[@Headword:Odians]]

             SEE AUDIANS.

## Odilia, St.[[@Headword:Odilia, St.]]

             the patron saint of Alsace, and especially of Strasburg, and protector of all who suffer with diseases of the eye, born about A.D. 650, was the daughter of Ethicot, or Attich, duke of Alsace. Being born blind, and disappointing her father, who expected a male heir, she was turned out of doors. Odilia was first committed to the care of a nurse, and afterwards placed in the monastery of Palma (Beaumne les Nonnes, near BesauoQn) for her education. Here she received her sight, and became very much attached to monastic life. One day one of her brothers, Hugo, came to the monastery without the knowledge of his father, and induced her to return home again, which she did. When her father beheld her approach the castle, and was told that his son was the cause of her return, he became so exasperated at this that he treated his son in the most cruel manner, resulting in his death. The duke, repenting of his deed, now bestowed all his care upon his hitherto neglected daughter, and gave her all his wealth. She built a convent at Hohenburg (q.v.), of which she was the first abbess, and there she gathered about her 130 nuns. For forty years Odilia labored in works of charity, and died Dec. 13, 720. That day is observed by the Romish Church in her honor. See Piper, Evangelisches Kalender- Jahrbuch, 1853, p. 69 sq.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Miss Clemens, Handbook of Legendary and Mythological Art (N. Y. 1872), p.  244 sq.; Mabillon, Acta Sanctorum Bened. 3:2, 496; Rettberg, Kirchengyesch. Deutschlands, 2:76 sq. (B. P.)

## Odilo, De Mercoeur[[@Headword:Odilo, De Mercoeur]]

             Saint, fifth abbot of Clugny, noted as an ante-reformer, was born in Auvergne in 962. Tradition relates that he was brought up in the church of St. Julian at Brioude, and that St. Maieul, passing through that town, induced him to become a monk. However that may be, after he had entered the convent of Clugny, St. Maieul having resigned his charge, Odilo was appointed his successor. Sigebert, Alberic de TroisFontaines, and the authors of the Histoire litteraire, state that he became a monk only in 991. But the authors of the Gallia Christiana quote documents showing that he was already abbot of Clugny in 990. In 1027 Odilo was present at Rheims at the coronation of Henry, son of king Robert. In 1032 his reputation had become so great that pope John XIX appointed him archbishop of Lyons, and sent him the pallium and ring. The regular clergy at the time had a very high opinion of the services they rendered to the Church, and great contempt for the secular clergy. Odilo therefore declined, according to Raoul Glaber, to accept the appointment. Labbe, in his Concil. p. 858, quotes a letter of John XIX to the abbot of Cllngny, which mildly reproves Odilo for this refusal. Odilo was highly esteemed by popes Sylvester II, Benedict VIII, Benedict IX, John XVIII, John XIX, and Clement II, and enjoyed the especial consideration of pope Gregory VI, and stood at the head of the German Reform party. He first introduced the festival of All- souls' day, and gave the real impetus to the so-called treuga Dei (truce of God). Under his administration the abbey of Clugny rose to great prosperity and renown. It is said that three bishops — Sanchez of Pampeluna, Gautier of Macon, and Letbald, see unknown — left their churches, and came to Clugny to live under the direction of Odilo; and that the emperors Otho III, St. Henry, Conrad the Salique, Henry the Black (his son); Hugh Capet and Robert, kings of France; and also Sanchez, Ramir, and Garsias, kings of Spain, showed the greatest veneration for him. Odilo obtained deserved praise on account of his many charitable works, especially among the poor people during a severe famine in France, and was so much thought of by the populace as to be reputed even to have worked miracles. He died at Souvigni Jan. 1, 1049. The Church commemorates him on Jan. 2 and June 21; Baillet indicates April 12 and Nov. 13. Odilo wrote a life of St. Adelaide, the wife of emperor Otho I, which was first published by Canisius (Lectiones Antiquc, vol. iii). Basnage  claims that it is erroneously attributed to Odilo, but his arguments are refuted in the edition accompanied by a preface published by Duchesne and Marrier (Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, p. 353). Odilo wrote also a biography of his predecessor, St. Maieul, published by Surius and the Bollandists under the date of May 11, and in the Bibl. Cliniacensis, p. 279; the latter work contains also fourteen sermons of Odilo, and two others are given by Martene (Anecdota, v. 621). Most of his letters, which according to Jotsaud, one of his biographers, were very numerous, are now lost; there are four given in the Bibl. Cluniacensis, and three others by Luc d'Achery (Spicilegium, 2:386). Finally, the Bibl. Cluniacensis gives under his name some small poems, a writing entitled Credulitas, etc. See Gallia Christiana, vol. 4, col. 1128; Hist. litter. de la France; 7:414; Jotsaud, Vita de eodenr (id.); Mabillon, Acta Sanctorum, 8:680; S. Odilonis (Bibl. Cluniacensis); Basnage, Auctorum Testimonia; Canisius's Lectiones (1725); Baxmann, Politik der Papste, vol. ii; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. 2:176;: Neander, Ch. Hist. 3:418; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 23:35 sq.

## Odilon[[@Headword:Odilon]]

             a French monastic, flourished in the opening of the 10th century. He died about 920. All that is known of the circumstances of his life is that he had intimate relations with Huebald of Saint-Amand and Ingranne, dean of Saint-Medard, who was created bishop of Laon in 932. The writings of Odilon are, a recital of the removal of the bodies of St. Sebastian and St. Gregory the Great from Rome to Saint-Medard de Soissons, published by Bollandus and Mabillon, Acta Sanect. Ord. S. Bened. v. 383: — another history, of the removal of the relics of St. Marcellin, St. Peter the exorcist, and others, in the same volume of the Acta, p. 411: — a letter to Huebald, given to the public by Maartene, Anpliss. Collect. vol. 1. The authors of the hist. litteraire speak of some other works, but they are attributed to the monk Odilon only by simple conjecture. See Hist. litter. de la France, 6:173.

## Odin[[@Headword:Odin]]

             is the name of the principal divinity of Northern mythology. According, to the sagas, Odin and his brothers, Vile and Ve, the sons of Boer, or the firstborn, slew Ymer or Chaos, and from his body created the world, converting his flesh into dry land; his blood, which at first occasioned a flood, into the sea; his bones into mountains; his skull into the vault of  heaven; and his brows into the spot known as Midgaard, the middle part of the earth, intended for the habitation of the sons of men. Odin, as the highest of the gods, the Alfader, rules heaven and earth, and is omniscient. As ruler of heaven, his seat is Valaskjalf, whence his two black ravens, Huginn (Thought) and Muninn (Memory), fly daily forth to gather tidings of all that is done throughout the world. As god of war, he holds his court in Walhalla, whither come all brave warriors. after death to revel in. the tumultuous joys in which they took most pleasure while on earth. His greatest treasures are his eight-footed steed Sleipner, his spear Gungner, and his ring Draupner. As the concentration and source of all greatness, excellence, and activity, Odin is called also by many other names. By drinking from Mimir's fountain he became the wisest of gods and men, but he purchased the distinction at the cost of one eye He is the greatest of sorcerers, and imparts a knowledge of his wondrous arts to his favorites. Frigga is his queen, and -the mother of Baldur, the Scandinavian Apollo; but he has other wives and favorites, and a numerous progeny of sons and. daughters. Although the worship of Odin extended over all the Scandinavian lands, it found its most zealous followers iln Denmark, where he still rides abroad as the wild huntsman, rushing over land and water in the storm-beaten skies of winter.

The historical interpretation of this myth, as given by Snorre Sturleson, the compiler of the Heimskringla, or Chronicles of the Kings of Norway prior to the introduction of Christianity, and followed in recent times by the historian Suhm, is that Odin was a chief of the (Esir, a Scythian tribe, who, fleeing before the ruthless aggressions of the Romans, passed through Germany to Scandinavia, where, by their noble appearance, superior prowess, and higher intelligence, they easily vanquished the inferior races of those lands, and persuaded them that they were of godlike origin. According to one tradition, Odin conquered the country of the Saxons on his way; and leaving one of his sons to rule there and introduce a new religion, in which he, as the chief god Wuotan, received divine honors, advanced on his victorious course, and making himself master of Denmark, placed another son, Skjold, to reign over the land, from whom descended the royal dynasty of the Skjoldingar. He next entered Sweden, where the king, Gylfi, accepted his new religion, and with the whole nation worshipped him as a divinity, and received his son Yugni as their supreme lord and high-priest, from whom descended the royal race of Yuglingars, who long reigned in Sweden. In like manner he founded, through his son  Sceming, a new dynasty in Norway; and besides these many sovereign families of Northern Germany, including the Anglo-Saxon princes, traced theirtdescent to Odin. As it has been found impossible to refer to one individual all the mythical and historical elements which group themselves around the name of Odin, Wodin, or Wuotan, it has been suggested by Suhm and other historians that there may have been two or three ancient northern heroes of the name; but notwithstanding the conjectures which have been advanced since the very dawn of the historical period in the North in regard to the origin and native country of the assumed Odin, or even the time at which he lived, all that relates to him is shrouded in complete obscurity. It is much more probable, however, that the myth of Odin originated in nature-worship. See also Clarke, Ten Great Religions; Thorpe, Northern Mythology, 1:164, 229, .274 sq.; Westminster Rev. Oct. 1854, art. 1; Smith, Ancient Britain; Anderson, Northern Mythology (see Index). SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY.

## Odin, John Mary, D.D[[@Headword:Odin, John Mary, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in the United States, was born at.Ambiere, department of the Loire, France, near the opening of this century, and was educated in his native country. Entering the monastic life as a Lazarist, he was sent to the United States as missionary, and for a time preached in Missouri. In 1842 he was made bishop of Claudiopolis, and vicar apostolic of Texas; was transferred to Galveston in 1847, to New Orleans in 1861, and, finally, was made archbishop of that diocese. He died at New Orleans May 25,1870. See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Odington, Walter[[@Headword:Odington, Walter]]

             called Walter of Evesham, after a monastery in Worcestershire to which he belonged, lived in the reign of Henry VIII. He was a very learned ecclesiastic, and noted as an astronomer, mathematician, and musician, on each of which subjects he wrote treatisesn De Motibus Planetarum et de Mutatione Aeris is attributed to him; and Dr. Burney observes of his treatise entitled Of the Speculation of Music which is preserved in the library of Beie't College, Cambridge, if that if all other musical tracts, from the time of Boethius to Franco and John Cotton were lost, with this MS. our knowledge would not be much diminished.”

## Odo[[@Headword:Odo]]

             ST., second abbot OF CLUGNY, illustrious for his learning and piety, is supposed to have been born about 879. His father, Abbon, one of the most powerful lords at the court of William the Strong, duke of Aquitaine, consecrated him to the Church before his birth by a solemn. vow. Odo was educated in the convent of St. Martini of Tour, under St. Odalric. He afterwards completed his studies at Paris, returned to St. Martin, and not finding the rule sufficiently strict, he entered the Cistercian convent of Baume, in Burgundy, under Bernon, who governed at the same time the other houses of the order, Clugny, Massai, and Bourgdeols. After Bernon's death Odo was elected to succeed him as abbot of.Clugny and of Bourgdeols. He proved a wise and energetic administrator, and under his rule the order made rapid progress, both in wealth and in reputation. The school of Clugny became the most renowned throughout Gaul. Odo himself was entrusted with the reform of a large number of convents. The popes called him to Italy for the purpose of restoring peace between princes, and kings employed him in the most important diplomatic transactions. relying always on his great sagacity and honorable conduct for a successful disposal of their annoyances.

On his return from one of his journeys to Rome, he died in the convent of St. Julian at Tours, Nov. 18, 943. Odo deserves to be remembered especially as a reformer of the monastic institutions. “He was a man deeply penetrated with: the consciousness of the corruption of the Church among the clergy, monks, and laity; a man full of zeal for the renovation of the Christian life, while at the same time he was very far from placing the essence of Christian perfection in a rigid practice of asceticism, though he endeavored to oppose the severity of monasticism to the secularized life of the clergy and monks of his time, and to awaken an enthusiasm in its favor. As contrasted with the prevailing corruption, the example of his pious zeal and of his  integrity of life was so much the more powerful, and he acquired great authority.” Odo left numerous works, among which we notice Excerptio S. Odonis in Moralibus Job (Paris, 1617; 8vo; reprinted in the Bibl. Patr. [Lyons], vol. 17); twelve anthems on St. Martin, published in the Bibl. Cluniacensis and in the Bibl. Patr.; three hymns in the Bibl. Cluniac., besides a poem on the Lord's Supper, and another hymn in Mabillon's Annales, 3:712. The best-known of Odo's hymns is that for St. Mary Magdalene's day (Hymnus de Sancta cilria Magdalena), “Lauda, mater ecclesia” (Engl. transl. by Neale: “Exalt, O mother Church, to-day; “by Chambers, in the People's Hymnal: “O Church, our mother, speak his praise;” Germ. transl. by Rombach, Konigsfeld, Simrock). A dialogue on music, entitled Enchiridion, of which there are several MSS. extant, and published in Martin Gerbert's Scriptores eccles. de nusica, has been ascribed to this Odo, but is by another, as is acknowledged by Gerbert himself. Still it appears proved that this Odo wrote on music; and Martin Gerbert published under his name, from a MS. in Monte Cassino, a treatise entitled Tonora per ordinem, cumn suis differentiis (in his Script. eccl. de musica, 1:247). The Bibl. Clunziac. gives, under his name, a life of St. Gerauld, count of Aurillac, which was repeatedly translated into French, and is full of interpolations. The authentic life of St. Gerauld, by Odo of Clugny, is found among the MSS. of the Imperial Library, Fonds du Roi, Nos. 5301, 3783, and 3809; but the much more extensive text in the Bibl. Cluniac. is spurious, as is also the De Reversione B. Martini a Buryundia Tractatus.

Among the works attributed to Odo, but whose authorship is doubtful, we find a life of St. Gregory of Tours, often reprinted under his name, as in Thierry Ruinart's edition of the Historia Francorum; the Miracula S. Mnauri, attributed to him by Baronius, but written by Odo, abbot of Glanfeuil; an exposition of the canon of the mass, written by Odo of Cambrai; and a treatise entitled Quod B. Martinus par dicitnur apostolis, attributed to Odo by Marrier, and to Adam of Perscigne by Martene. The most important of Odo's works was published under the title of Collationes in the Bibl. Cluniac. In the catalogues and in MSS. that work is also entitled Occupationes, Tractatus de sacerdotio, De virtutibis vitiisque animce, De perversitate pravorum, De hujus vitae qualitate. De institutione divina, De contenpla. mundi, Liber ad cedifcationem sanctc Dedi Ecclesie, In Hiereniam Prophetam, etc., Among some sermons given under the name of Odo of Clugny in Marrier, Bibl. Cluniac., and in  Martene, Thes. Anect. v. 617, the first is by pope St. Leon, and is given in the edition of the latter's works by P. Quesnel, p. 52. See Joannes Trithemius, De viris illustr; lib. ii; Hist. litter. de la France, vol. vi; Veter- zm testimonia de Odone (Bibl. Cluniac. p. 60); Vita S. Odonis a Joanne, monacho (id.); Mabillon, Acta SS. ord. S. Bened. saec. v; B. Haurdau, IHist. litter. du Maine, 1:133; id. Singu.larites hist. et litter. p. 129-179; Vies des SS. de la Franche-Comte; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:487; Bahr, Gesch. der romischen Literatur im Karol. Zeitalter, p. 538; Baxmann, Politik der Papste, vol. ii; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 2:175; Neander, Ch. Hist. 3:417, 444 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 23:25 sq.; Miller, Singers and Songs of the Ch. p. 21; Neale, Mediceval Hymns, p. 46 sq.; Rombach, Anthol. christl. Gesange, 1:217 sq.; KInigsfeld, Lat. Hymnezn u. Gesdnge, i, 39:98 sq.; 2:146,; Simnrock, Lauda Sion (Stuttg. 1868), p. 232 sq.; Edinb, Rev. 30:348; 42:14.

## Odo (St.) Of Kent (Or Cantianus)[[@Headword:Odo (St.) Of Kent (Or Cantianus)]]

             an English prelate, was born in the province of East Anglia about 875. His parents were Danes, who had followed Ingar and Hubba in their expedition. Driven away from the parental home on account of his conversion to the Christian faith, Odo was protected by Athelm, one of the lords of the court of Alfred, king of England, who furnished him means to study and to enter the Church. He took him with him to Rome in 897, and Odo was there ordained priest. After his return to England, he was employed by Alfred and by Edward, his son and successor, on several important missions. King Athelstan appointed him his chaplain, and about 930 made him bishop of Wilton. Edmund I, who succeeded his brother Athelstan in 941, prized so highly the advice of Odo that, in order to have him always near, he appointed him archbishop of Canterbury in 942. Odo now became a Benedictine, as at that time the diocese was always governed by men belonging to: some monastic order. In 955 he crowned at Kingston Edwy, the eldest son of Edmund. This was the time when the first Sacramentarians, who rejected the doctrine of the real presence, appeared in England. Odo strenuously opposed them. He excommunicated king Edwy, some say for holding to these opinions, others say for incest.  The Mercians and Northumbrians, tired of the excesses of Edwy, rose against him, and appointed his brother Edward in his place. Edward governed by the advice of Odo, who is said to have been the originator of many good and useful laws. Odo died at Canterbury July 4, 961, and was buried in the cathedral. He wrote Synodal Constitutions, published in Labbe's Collection, of Councils (vol. ix), together with a letter of the archbishop to his suffragans. Pits considers him the author of some other works, which are not now extant. Wright says: “It would be difficult to clear entirely the writings of Odo of Kent from the confusion in which they have been involved by ascribing to him books written by other persons of the name of Odo; but they seem to have consisted chiefly of commentaries on the Holy Scriptures and of sermons.” See Dom Geillier Hist. des auteurs Ecclesiastes 20:97 sq.; Acta Sanctorum, July 4; Godescard, Vies des Peres, des Martyrs, etc., Mabillon, Annales ordinis S. Benedicti (5th century); Wright, Biog. Britannica Litteraria (A.-S. Period.), p. 428 sq.; Hill, English Monasticisnm, p. 155 sq.; Churton, Early English Ch. Hist. p. 227; Collier, Eccl. Hist. of Britain (see Index in vol. viii); Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 7:452; Bossuet, Variations, 1:158-9.

## Odo Cantianus[[@Headword:Odo Cantianus]]

             SEE ODO OF KENT.

## Odo De Conteville[[@Headword:Odo De Conteville]]

             a French prelate, half-brother of William the Conqueror, was born in Normandy in 1032. He was made deacon at Fecamp by Hugo. Of Eu, bishop of Lisieux,and, although but seventeen years old, was elevated to the bishopric of Bayeux. in 1049 by his brother the duke of Normandy. He at once took a great interest in the construction of the cathedral, to which he gave rich vases of gold and silver. In 1050 and 1054 he granted charters to the abbeys of St. Evrould, St. Wandrille, and Mont St. Michel. In 1055 he took part in the provincial synod of Rouen, dedicated the church of Troarn May 13, 1059, reconstructed in 1066 the abbey of St. Vigor, and appointed over it Robert of Tombelaine. In the states-general at Lillebonne he was one of the chief promoters of the. expedition against England, and furnished his brother one hundred ships for the undertaking. On the day of the battle of Hastings, Oct. 14, 1066, Odo said mass and blessed the armies, and took an active part in the operations. After the conquest, he received as his reward the town of Dover, and distributed the houses among his warriors. When William returned to Normandy, he entrusted the government during his absence to Odo and William Osborn. The Saxons revolted against their despotic rule, and their first attack was against Dover; but Odo won against them the battle of Fagadon, in 1074. On July 14, 1077, he consecrated the cathedral with great splendor.

William was present with a number of bishops, abbots, lords, etc., and gave him the barony and forest of Ellon. On Sept. 13, 1077, Odo was present at the consecration of the church of St. Stephen at Caen, and on Oct. 23 at that  of Notre Dame du Bec. After taking part, in May, 1080, in an assembly held at Lillebonne in presence of the duke, he went with an army through Northumberland, which had risen, putting to death or torturing all who were accused of rebellion. As a reward he was made count of Kent and of Hereford. Not satisfied with this, he conceived the desire of becoming pope, the see of Rome having become vacant by the death of Gregory VII. After trying to corrupt all those who he thought could serve his purpose, he raised troops in England, intending to go with them to Italy, and thus secure the object of his ambition. On hearing of these plans, William at once returned to England. He assembled his barons in the Isle of Wight in 1085, and proposed to them to imprison Odo. As they did not dare to do this, he arrested him himself, Odo claiming that as a priest he was amenable only to the pope; but William answered that he arrested him not as a priest, but as his subject, and answerable to him. He caused him to be kept a prisoner in the tower of the old palace at Rouen until 1087. Liberated at the death of William, he at once took an active part in intrigues to overthrow William II, and to crown Robert. Besieged in Rochester, Odo was obliged to flee from England, and returning to Normandy he regained. his ascendency over the weak-minded Robert, and helped him to preserve his possessions. Odo consecrated, in 1092, the incestuous marriage of Philip I, king of France, with Bertrade, countess of Anjoiu, and as a reward received the income of all the churches of Mantes. Yet he was obliged to go to Dijon to be absolved from this fault by pope Urban III. After taking part in the Council of Clermont in 1095, and in that of Rouen in Feb., 1096, he started with his nephew Robert for the Holy Land, but died on the way at Palermo in Feb., 1097. See Gallica Christ. vol. xi; Ordericus Vitalis, Historia ecclesiastica; Prevost, Hist. de Guillaume le Conquerant; Hermant, Hist. eccles. de Bayeux.

## Odo Of Cambria[[@Headword:Odo Of Cambria]]

             a French ecclesiastic of note, was born at Orleans about the middle of the 11th century. He was first known under the name of Oudard. Having entered the Church at an early age he became professor at Toul, and afterwards superior of the cathedral school at Tournay. His reputation attracted a large number of pupils from various parts, even from Germany and Italy. He was especially renowned for dialectics, in which he followed the method of the Realists. About 1092 he ceased teaching, and with five of his followers retired into the old abbey of St. Martin of Tournay, where they followed at first the rule of St. Augustine. By the advice of Aimery, bishop of Anchin, Odo became a regular monk in 1095, and was appointed abbot. The congregation, composed at that time of some twenty persons, rapidly increased. Odo made them follow the customs of Clugny, and maintained the rule strictly. On July 2, 1105, the Council of Rheims made him bishop of Cambrai in the place of Gaucher, who, nevertheless, protected by the emperor Henry IV, retained his dignity until Henry V ascended the throne, when Odo was installed in his see in 1106. Odo refusing, however, to receive from that prince the investiture which he had already received from his metropolitan, he was expelled from Cambrai, and retired to the abbey of Anchin, where he busied himself in writing religious works. He died there June 19, 1113 His. contemporaries ranked him among the saints; he is honored as such in several churches of the Netherlands, and is mentioned by the Bollandists. Odo had the reputation of being learned in theology, mathematics, and poetry, and Dom Rivet states that he knew Greek and Hebrew. He wrote, Sacri canonis missae expositio (Paris, 1490, 1496, 12mo; several times reprinted):De peccato originali, lib. iii: — Contra Judoeum nomine Leonem de adventu Christi: — De blasphemia in Spiritum Sanctum: — In canones Evangeliosrum: — Homilia de villico iniquitatis; five tracts inserted in Schott, Bibl. (ed. 1618), vol. xv: — :Epistola Lamberta episcopo Atrebatensi, in Baluze, Miscellanea, v. 345. Among the MSS. attributed to him, although their authenticity is not fully established, are a poem on the creation, parables, an introduction to theology, several homilies, conferences, etc. Among the works supposed to be lost, is a poem, De bellis Trojanis, which is quoted with praise in an elegy on Odo written by Godefrey, a pupil of the school of Rheims. See Amand du Chastel, Vita beati Odonis, in Actis SS. Junii, 3:911-916; Tritheim, Scrip. Eccles. c. 370, p. 94 (ed. Fabricius); Molanuls, Natales SS. Belgii, p. 221; Sanders;,-Bibl. Belgica; Mabillon, Annales, v.  650, 651; Gallia Christiana, 3:25-27, 273; Hist. litter. de la France, 9:583606.

## Odo Of Chiteauroux[[@Headword:Odo Of Chiteauroux]]

             a French prelate of distincton, was at first canon of the church of Paris, then chancellor in 1238. Ughelli claims that he afterwards became a monk, and was made abbot of Granselve, but this does not seem proved. On the contrary, it is very, likely that he was still chancellor of Paris in 1243, when he was made cardinal-bishop of Tusculum by Innocent IV. In 1245 he returned to France as papal legate, preached a crusade in the pope's name, and embarked with Louis IX for Palestine towards the close of May, 1248. William of Nangis, Joinville, and other historians agree in praising his courage, zeal, and disinterestedness. In 1255 we find him in Italy, and in 1264 he came again as legate to France. He died at Civita Vecchia in 1273. He wrote, Epistola ad Innocentium papam, published in D'Achery's Spicilegium, 7:213: — Distinctiones super Psalteriumn, in MS. No. 1327, 1328, Sorbonne Collection, 857, St. Victor's: — Sernmones, No. 789, Sorbonne: — Lectio mag. Odonis- de Castro Radulphi, postmodunz episcopi Tusculani, qutando incsepit in Theologia, in the same volume. See Hist. litter. de la France, vol. — xix Gerard de Frachet, Chronique, in the Historiens de France, 21:5; Joinville, Histoire de Sft. Louis, passim.

## Odo Of Deuil[[@Headword:Odo Of Deuil]]

             (Lat. de Diogilo), a French ecclesiastic, was born in Deuil, in the valley of Montmorency. He was a simple monk in the abbey of St. Denys when the abbe Suger gave him for a secretary to Louis le Jeune, departing for Palestine. On his return he was appointed by Suger abbe of St. Corneille de Compiegne. After the death of Suger, in 1151, the monks of St. Denys recalled him, and entrusted to him the government of their congregation. His administration was several times troubled. He had sharp contests with the archbishop of Bourges and the bishop of Beauvais, who disputed with him the possession of some domains; that was in comformity with, the  spirit of the age, when the principal occupation of an a abbe as to create or sustain suits of this kind, Odo died in. 1162. He had the reputation of being a firm and vigilant abbe. He left a good history or the second crusade. This narrative was published for the first time by P. Chifflet, at the head of his work entitled Sancti Bernardi genus illustre asserturn. See Gallia Christiana, t. vii, .col. 337; Histoire litt. de la France, 7:493.

## Odo Of Fosses[[@Headword:Odo Of Fosses]]

             near Paris, was a French monastic. He was a member of the abbey of Fosses, and died after 1058. Nothing is known of his life, except that, after having passed his youth in the abbey des Fosses, he was constrained to flee from that asylum. Only one of his writings has been preserved to us; it is the Vie de St. Burchard, comte de Melun, published by Jacques de Breul, in his supplement to the Antiquites de Paris; by Duchesne, in his Historiens de France; and by the editors of the Bibliotheque de Cluni, etc. This Vie contains interesting details upon the origin of the abbey des Fosses. It has found a place in his Histoire de Melun, which appeared in Paris in 1628. See Histoire litteraire de la France, 7:493.

## Odo Of Morimond[[@Headword:Odo Of Morimond]]

             died, according to his epitaph, Aug. 31, 1200. We possess no definite information concerning his life. It is supposed that he was abbot of Beaupre, another Cistercian abbey, before he was made abbot of Morimond, but this is not proved. It is also difficult to ascertain among the works bearing his name those which are really his and those which are some other Odo's. Among those which are undoubted are five sermons published by Combefis (Biblioth. 1:25, 299, 797). He wrote a large number of others, which were never published. There are three collections of them in the Imperial Library of Paris, under the numbers 3010 fond du Roi. 80 of the Cordeliers, and 839 of the Sorbonne. We find also as 3352 B, 3352 C du Roi, and 606 of St. Victor, a treatise De numerorumn significatione, which in most catalogues is attributed to him. Oudin and the authors of the Histoire litteraire, think that it was written by William, abbot of Auberive, a pupil of Odo, under the latter's inspiration, but this appears doubtful. The work treats on mathematics, theology, philosophy, etc.; and is not of much account, but is well written and full of original though paradoxical errors. The library of Troyes contains a MS.” of this treatise, which is probably the original of the others; it contains also under the No. 868 a MS. coming from Clairvaux, entitled Odonis teractatus -de Analetis ternarii; and under  the No. 450 a MS. entitled Tres gradus quibus penrvenitur ad hcereditatem salutis, which Mr. Harmand considers as the production of Odco. See Hist.; litter. de la France, 12:610; Henriquez, Menologiun Cisterciensis, p. 303; Gallinz Christ. Vol. 9, col. 835; Oudin, De script. Ecclesiastes vol. ii, col. 1418 De Visch, Bibl. Cisterciensis, p. 258; Catal. des manuscrits des Bibl. departementales, 2:202 322, 359.

## Odo Of Soissons[[@Headword:Odo Of Soissons]]

             abbe of Ourcamp, died about 1170. The bibliographers who give him the title of cardinal-bishop of Tusculum confound him with Odo de Chateauroux (q.v.). Those who, with Mr. Daunou, make him bishop of Preneste are equally mistaken; there is in the Italia Sacra of Ughellino bishop of Preneste named Odo. The only work of Odo de Soissons which has been preserved to us has for a title Quaestiones. Quite a large number of manuscripts of this are in existence. We designate here No. 3244 of the old library of the king, and No. 140 of Troyes. The Quaestiones proposed by Odo dle Soissons are all theological, and he treats them, as a faithful disciple of Pierre Lombard, with a delicate prudence. This dogmatic collection is a book little known; it is, however, preferable to many compilations of the same kind composed in the 13th century. As for the two other works inscribed by Mr. Daunou in the catalogue of the works of Odo de Soissons, a Commentary on Jeremiah, and Sentences — the first does not exist, and the second belongs to Hugues de Saint-Victor. See Histoire litter; de la France, tom. 19.

## Odo, Clement[[@Headword:Odo, Clement]]

             (sometimes called Coufier), a noted ecclesiastic who-flourished in France, was born in England about the close of the 12th century. He joined the Benedictines, and had already acquired great reputation. when at the death of Peter d'Anteuil he was appointed abbot of St. Denis, Feb. 10, 1229. He was consecrated on the same day by cardinal Romain, the papal legate in France, and received the investiture from king Louis. One of Odo's first undertakings was the restoration of the apsis and choir of the church of St. Denis, which the monks, claiming that their church was consecrated by God himself, allowed to fall in ruins rather than have it consecrated again. Odo seems to have been as liberal as strong-minded. One of his decrees commands that five hundred poor should every day receive a portion of bread at the expense of the convent, and that moreover a like distribution  should be made to a thousand poor on All-saints' day, on the anniversary of his death, and on the anniversary of the funeral of abbot Peter. He was a man of great activity and influence. In 1244 St. Louis chose him as godfather for his son. Made archbishop of Rouen in March, 1245, Odo took part in the. same year in the council assembled at Lyons. Matthew Paris accuses him of simony, pride, and ambition, but on what grounds does not appear. Odo died May 5, 1247. See Matthew Paris, Hist. maj. Henrici I77, ann. 1247; Gallia Christ. vol. vii, col. 887; vol. xi, col. 61 Hist. litter. de la France. 18:527.

## Odoacer[[@Headword:Odoacer]]

             a Gothic chief who, according to: some authorities, was of the tribe of the Heruli, originally served as a mercenary in the barbarian auxiliary force which the later emperors of the West had taken into their pay for the defense of Italy. After the two rival emperors, Glycerius and Julius Nepos, were both driven from the throne, Orestes, a soldier from Pannonia, clothed his own son Romulus, yet a minor, with the imperial purple, but retained all the substantial authority in his own hands. The barbarian troops now asked for one third of the lands of Italy to be distributed among them as a reward for their services. Orestes having rejected their demand, they chose Odoacer for their leader, and he immediately marched against Orestes, who had shut himself up in Pavia. Odoacer took the city by storm, and gave it up to be plundered by his soldiers. Orestes was taken prisoner  and led to Placentia, where he was publicly executed, in August, A.D. 475, exactly a twelvemonth after he had driven Nepos out of Italy. Romulus, who was called Augustulus by way of derision, was in Ravenna, where he was seized by Odoacer, who stripped him of his imperial ornaments and banished him to a castle of Campania, but allowed him an honorable maintenance. Odoacer now proclaimed himself king of Italy, rejecting the imperial titles of Caesar and Augustus. For this reason the Western empire is considered as having ended with the deposition of Romulus Augustulus, the son of Orestes. Odoacer's authority did not extend beyond the boundaries of Italy. Little is known of the events of his reign until the invasion of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, who, at the instigation, as some historians assert, of Zeno, emperor of the East, marched from the banks of the Danube to dispossess Odoacer of his kingdom. Theodoric, at the head of a large army defeated Odoacer near Aquileia, and entered Verona without opposition. Odoacer shut himself up in Ravenna in 489. The war, however, lasted several years. Odoacer made a brave resistance; but was compelled by famine to surrender Ravenna (March, 493). Theodoric at first spared his life, but in a short time caused him to he killed, and proclaimed himself king of Italy. English Cyclop. s.v. See Jornandes, De Regnorum success. p. 59, 60; De Rebus Gothicis, p. 128- 141; Paul Diacre, De. Gestis Longobard. 1:19; Gregory of Tours, Hist. Franc. 2:118 sq.; Procopius, Bell. Goth. 1:1; 2:6; Ennodius, Vita Epiphanii; Cassiodorus, Chron. ad an. 376; Epist. 1:18; Evagrius,:ii. 16; Le Beau, Hist. du Bas. Empire, vol. 35; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 36; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:481.

## Odollam[[@Headword:Odollam]]

             (Ο᾿δαλλάμ, Vulg. Odollam), the Greek form of the name ADULLAM (2, Maccabees 12:38). Adullam is stated by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. “Adollam”) to have been in their day a large village, about ten miles east of Eleutheropolis; and here (if Beitjibrin be Eleutheropolis) a village with the name of Bet Dula (Tobler, Bethlehem, p. 29; Dritte Wander. p. 151) or Beit Ula (Robinson, 1st ed. App. p. 117) now stands. The obstacle to this identification is not that Adullam, a town of the Shefelah, should be found in the mountains, for that puzzling circumstance is not unfrequent, so much as that in the catalogue of Joshua 15 it is mentioned with a group of towns (Zoreah, Socoh, etc.) which lay at the, N.W. corner of Judah, while Bet Dula is found with those (Nezib, Keilah, etc.) of a separate group farther south. More recently Mr. Ganneau has proposed to identify the site of  Adullam with that of Aid el-Mia, a hill-side near Shuweikeh, burrowed with caves (Quar. Statement of Pal. Expl. Fund,” Jan. 1875, p. 42); but the correspondence in name is not striking; and he afterwards expresses himself doubtful, after a prolonged investigation (ib. July. 1875, p. 168- 177).

Further examination is requisite before we can positively say if there is any cavern in the neighborhood of Bet Dula answering to the “cave of Adullam.” The cavern at Khureitun, three miles south of Bethlehem, usually shown to travelers as Adullam, is so far distant as to make a connection difficult. It is probable that this latter is the cavern, in the wilderness of Engedi, in which the adventure of Saul and David (1 Samuel 24) occurred (see Van de Velde, Syr. and Pal. 2:33). Everything that can be said to identify it with the cave of Adullam has been said by Dr. Bonar (Land of Promise, p. 248-50); but his strongest argument — an inference, from 1Sa 22:1, in favor of its proximity to Bethlehem — comes into direct collision with the statement of Jerome quoted above, which it should be observed is equally opposed to Dr. Robinson's proposal to place it at Deir-Dubban. The conflict, however, would be somewhat obviated by separating the cave from the town. The name of Adullam appears to have been first applied to Khureitull at the time of the Crusades (Will. of Tyre, 15:6)., Dr. Bonar suggests that the name Khureitun Tepresents the ancient Hareth (Khareth). This is ingenious, and may be correct; but Tobler (Umgebungen, etc. p. 522, 3) has made out a strong case for the name being, that of Chareiton, or Kreton, a famous Essene hermit of the 3d or 4th century, who founded a Laura in the cavern in question (Acta Sanct. Sept. 28). Mr. Galnneau reports the present name of the cave as Meghadet el- Mi'sa (Quar. Statement, April, 1874, p, 110). Lieut. Conder at first proposed a different locality as candidate for the honor of representing the cave in question, namely, Moghdaret Un el-Tumaimiyeh (Cave of the Mother of Two Twins), a remarkable cavern in the south side of the ridge bounded northerly by Wady Dilbeh, near Tell Saphieh (Gath) (Quar. Statement, Jan. 1874, p. 18 sq.); but he admits that little if any trace of the ancient name remains; and he afterwards abandoned the position in favor of the above location by Mr. Ganneau, which he defends with much ingenuity and confidence (ib. July, 1875, p. 145-149). That the cave, however, was in the eastern face of the hills of Judah would seem rather probable, from the fact that at the times of David's-adventures there (see especially 1Sa 22:3; 2Sa 23:13) the Philistines had control of all the other  side and center. On the other hand, its situation in the Philistine territory seems to be indicated as opposed to Judah (1Sa 22:5; 1Sa 23:3). It was apparently located between. Engedi and Jerusalem (if we may so interpret “up” from the former, 1Sa 24:22, and “down” from the latter, 2Sa 5:17). But in that case the cave was not in the vicinity of the town, as we should naturally suppose. SEE ADULLAM.

## Odolric Of Saint-Martial[[@Headword:Odolric Of Saint-Martial]]

             a French ecclesiastic, flourished in the first half of the 11th century. He commenced his studies in the monastery of Saint-Martial at Limoges, and finished them at Fleuri-sur-Loire. On his return to Saint-Martial he was elected by the monks, in 1025, successor of the abbe Hugues. Odolric died about 1040. To him is attributed the compilation of the acts of the council assembled in the city of Limoges in 1031 (Labbe, Concilia, 9:870). The principal subject submitted to this council was to know if Saint-Martial had been one of the disciples of Jesus, sent by himself into Gaul. The question was decided in the affirmative; but historical criticism has not adopted this decision. See Gallia Christimaa, tom. ii, col. 558; Histoire littr. de la France, 7:346.

## Odonarkes[[@Headword:Odonarkes]]

             (Ο᾿δομηρά v. r. Ο᾿δοναῤῥής; Vulg. Odares), the name of a chieftain, apparently in the vicinity of “Bethbasi, which is in the wilderness” east of Judaea, who was slain with his tribe by Jonathan Maccabaeus (1Ma 9:66).

## Odontius, Paul[[@Headword:Odontius, Paul]]

             (originally Zahn, but changed into Hontius in accordance with the fashion of the time), a Herman divine of note, was born in 1570 at Werda, in the province of Meissen. Of his parents or earliest childhood nothing is known. In March, 1575, he went to Gratz, in Steiermark, and was received as an alumnus in the institute there, at the same time taking charge of the education of three young noblemen. For three years he remained in that position, preaching at the same time in the Stiftskirche, at Gratz, by the permission of the ecclesiastical authority. One day the countess Hyppolita of Windischgratz attended Odontius's service, and was so deeply impressed with his sermon that she appointed him her court preacher at Waldstein, near Gratz. In the year 1598 he entered upon his duties, and  accompanied the countess to the castle of Trautmannsdorff; in Austria, where she died. About this time the preaching of the Gospel in Steiermark was proscribed. The emperor Ferdinand, a nursling of the Jesuits, who had early taken a vow at Loretto before the picture of the Madonna to extirpate heresy in his dominions, issued his famous, or rather infamous edicts, dated Sept. 13, 23, and 28 of the year, 1598, according to which all evangelical, churches and schools at Gratz, and in the royal cities and market-places, were to be closed; preachers and teaches under penalty of death, were to leave the country within eight days. From 1599 to 1604 a religious commissionwent through the country in order to convert the inhabitants to the Roman Catholic faith. Gallows were erected in the streets, the churches in the villages were destroyed, those in the cities and marketplaces were given over to the Romish clergy; cemeteries were devastated; evangelical books. were burned; the preachers expelled; the inhabitants had to swear allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church and the government; those who refused had to leave the country. Thus Steiermark lost thousands of her most industrious people.

An imperial edict, dated August 1, 1628, was directed against the Protestant nobility, according to which within a year they had to sell their possessions and leave the country. The best of the nobility left the country, while others remained; and up to this day they belong to the Romish Church. Under those circumstances Odontius thought that he would never again preach in his pulpit at Waldstein. But the tutors of the counts of Windischgratz ordered him to come back, and take charge of his ministerial office as before. Finally an edict was issued for his dismission. All protests were in vain, and on April 20, 1602, a body of soldiers appeared before Waldstein, made Odontius: a prisoner, and brought him to Gratz. For ten weeks he was imprisoned there. When all means to convert him to the Romish Church were in vain, he was sentenced to be sent to the galleys. On the way he was fortunate enough to escape from his enemies, and after many perils reached his native place. In April, 1603, Odontius was appointed pastor at Oederan, in Saxony, where he died, Dec. 7, 1605. He has left us a narrative of his imprisonment and deliverance, which was first published at Dresden in 1603, and reprinted at Libeck in 1714, with a preface by Dr. Gotze. See Piper, Evangelischer Kalender, 1864, 15:188 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, supplemented by. Rottermund, s.v.; Willisch, Kirchenhistorie der Stadt Freyberg, 2:480 sq. (B.P.)

## Odor, Sweet[[@Headword:Odor, Sweet]]

             (נַיחוֹחִ, nicho'ach, Lev 26:31; Dan 2:46; elsewhere “sweet savor”), was offered to God and sovereigns as representatives of Deity by all ancient nations. SEE INCENSE. But also in common life, not only the natural odors of flowers. but prepared extracts of plants, are far more used by the Orientals than by the Western nations. The odors of the groves of Lebanon were anciently very famous (Hos 14:7; Son 4:11); flowers, even exotics, were cultivated in pleasure-gardens for this purpose (Son 1:12; Son 4:6; Son 4:14). Odorous extracts were used sometimes in the form of incense, sometimes as ointments (Son 1:3; Son 4:10); sometimes in water, with which clothing, bed- furniture, etc., was sprinkled (Pro 7:17). SEE INCENSE; SEE PERFUME; SEE SPICES.

## Odoran(ne)[[@Headword:Odoran(ne)]]

             a French monastic, was born in 985. Now little known, he enjoyed in his lifetime great celebrity. He cultivated letters with success and excelled even in mechanical arts. He was an inmate of the abbey of Saint-Pierre-le-Vif. in Sens, where he displayed his skill by two works, of which he speaks himself: a crucifix — a remarkable piece of workmanship — and a well, the structure of which, it seems, was original and singular. It is presumed that he was persecuted by envious brothers, because he dared to express himself upon consecrated dogmas in terms of offensive novelty. Obliged to flee from the abbey of Saint-Pierre upon the charge of anthropomorphism, he went to Saint-Denis, near Paris. From thence he was called to Dreux by king Robert, and queen Constance, who commissioned him to execute several shrines of great price. He died some time after 1045. We can appreciate neither the experience nor the merit of the goldsmith or then architect. We know, however, some of his writings. The principal is a Chronica rerum in orbe gestarum, which commences with the year 675, and ends with the year 1032. It is found in the large collection of the Historiensde Freance, vols. 8 and 10. It had already been published by Du Chesne. Odoran is also the author of a narrative of the Translation de Saint-Savinien, inserted by Mabillon in his. Ata, 8:254, and of a manuscript, Histoire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Pierre. See Hist. litter. de la France, v. 356.

## Odylism[[@Headword:Odylism]]

             (Gr. ὁδός, path, and ὕλη, matter) is the doctrine of the supposed material power or influence producing the phenomena of mesmerism (q.v.), called also odylic force. SEE OD.

## Oecolampadius, Johannes[[@Headword:Oecolampadius, Johannes]]

             (more properly Johann Hausschein, for he Latinized his name according to the fashion of the Reformation age, like Melancthon, etc.), was one of the most eminent Reformers in Switzerland, and, as coadjutor of Zwingli, maintained such a relation to that most noted of Swiss Reformers as to liken him to Luther's coadjutor Melancthon. In German Switzerland he and Zwingli performed the. same work that Beza and Calvin effected in the French sections of that mountain country.

Oecolampadius was born at Weinsberg, a small town in the north of Wurtemberg, in 1482. His mother, a pious and devoted woman, was a native of Basle, in Switzerland. His father, a merchant, who destined the boy for the legal profession, sent him at first to the school at Heilbronn, and afterwards to the University of Bologna, and later to Heidelberg, where he yielded to his own strong inclinations, and relinquished jurisprudence for theology. His early proficiency procured him the degree of bachelor of philosophy in his fourteenth year. He continued his theological studies for a while, and then accepted the appointment of tutor to a son of the elector of the Palatinate; but he resigned his office in a short time, and resumed his theological studies. He was next appointed to a benefice founded by his parents, and performed the duties for about six months, preaching with great acceptability. His sermons at this early period evinced a deep spirit of devotion and a close following of Romish doctrines. He especially exalted the efficacy of the Holy Virgin's intercession, and commended the conventual life. But deeming. himself as yet incompetent for the charge, he shortly resigned and visited Tubingen and Stuttgard, where he sought a more thorough acquaintance with the sacred tongues. He acquired Hebrew from a Spaniard, and Greek under Reuchlin, and in a short time wrote a Greek grammar, which was published in 1520. While residing at Heidelberg he formed a friendship with Capito, who was then preacher at Bruchsal, and was afterwards the Reformer at Strasburg.

This association produced its effects on the individuals according to their various characters: the ardent Capito soon became a,  zealous Reformer; the mild and studious Oecolampadius hesitated -he feared the misery which would probably result from a disruption of the Church, and changed not till he felt convinced that the cause of truth should overbalance the fear of transient evils. For a short time Oecolampadius resumed his clerical duties at Weinsberg; but in 1515, Capito, then settled at Basle, induced him to undertake the office of preacher. At this important German-Swiss center Oecolampadius enjoyed the association of many of the most eminent minds of the 16th century. Erasmus was then engaged upon his Commentary of the New Testament, and in this work secured important assistance from the young preacher Oecolampadius, who, even at this early time of his life, — was distinguished all over the Continent for vast erudition and mastery of the Hebrew and Greek tongues. — But it is not only as a student that Oecolampadius's stay at Basle at this time is memorable. In the pulpit he was as distinguished as in the labors of the study. He not only attracted many hearers by his oratorical skill, but also on account of his outspoken condemnation of whatever he saw to condemn. He preached against many of the abuses which had crept into the Church, and held up purity of life as exhibited by Christ in the flesh. Yet he did not at that time cherish any intention of rupture with the Church of Rome. He fought for reform from within, and hoped for a result which he afterwards learned it is impossible to bring about in the corrupt body of Romanism. His health failing him, he was finally obliged to abandon his position at Basle, and he returned to Weinsberg.

But he maintained an active correspondence with Erasmus, and also with Luther and Melancthon, whose views more or less influenced him even in the line of his studies. He devoted himself especially during this season of retirement to the careful study of the Hebrew; he also published a tract, De Paschali risu (1518), in condemnation; of the broad humor with which, the Easter sermons of the day abounded, and, strange to say, he wrote a tragedy containing six thousand lines. His piety during this period of his life was sincere, but so very sombre that his friends often railed him about his superstition; which was to be ascribed in part to his physical distempers, though the main cause of it was his imperfect knowledge of the way of salvation. As soon as his health would permit he went back to Basle, at the earnest request of Erasmus, who was get. ting out the second edition of his New Testament, and wanted his help; but after a sojourn of a few months (1518) Oecolampadius removed to Augsburg, having been appointed one of the principal preachers of that city. Here it was that he first met Luther, who came to Augsburg in May, 1519, to confer with the  papal legate, and by him Oecolampadius was “instructed in the way of the Lord more perfectly.” With true Christian promptitude, he at once placed himself by the side of the Reformer. The Lord had long been training him for a glorious work, but his education was not yet complete. True, he had learned the grand central truth of the Gospel — free justification through the blood and righteousness of the Son of God; and had confirmed the belief of his friends in his conversion to the new doctrines by at once espousing and defending them in the Canonici indocti, which he published anonymously, in connection with the canon Bernh von Adelmannsfelden, about 1518.

Yet such was still his respect for some of the principles of the Roman Catholic Church that, without consulting any one, he entered, April 23, 1520, to the surprise of all his friends and the disgust of many of them, the monastery of St. Bridget, near Augsburg. He was prompted, of course, by no selfish consideration to take this step, but by the sincere though ill- founded hope of being in a more favorable position to cultivate personal holiness. “I had,” he said, “a fair prospect of being something, if I had remained in the world.”' It is thought by some that if Oecolampadius sought the retirement of the convent to give himself to more careful investigation of and reflection upon the new doctrines. Certain it is that he carried with him into this retirement the new views as he had learned them from the lips of the great German Reformer himself, and there was even then a most deep-rooted sympathy in his heart for the cause of the Reformer. “If they condemn Luther,” said he frankly and openly, “they must first condemn Holy Scripture.” His high reputation had induced the fraternity to accede to him liberty for his own opinions and studies; but as his convictions gradually tended towards Lutheranism, his preaching and writing became more and more discordant with the opinions of his fellow- monks, and they soon discovered that the new-comer was a most unsuitable member of their society, with tastes and ideas utterly remote from theirs. In one of his sermons (published at Basle in 1521), he spoke against the adoration of the Virgin and the use of the rosary; in another, on the Eucharist, delivered on Corpus Christi day (Latin, Basle, 1521; German, Augsburg, 1531), he rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation. But his most important work is one on confession, written originally in Latin, and afterwards translated into German, in which he openly declares outward confession unnecessary for the Christian, since God alone has the power to absolve (as had been held until the time of Peter Lombard), and the priest could do no more than proclaim. this absolution. His position in the convent became untenable, his liberty of thinking and weising was  denied him, and he was even threatened with forcible expulsion and imprisoner. He finally left it in February, 1522, went to Heidelberg, and afterwards took refuge at Ebernburg with Franz von Sickingen. In the performance of his ecclesiastical duties at this place, he introduced an innovation by reading the Gospel and Epistles in German instead of Latin. which he aptly compared to the unknown tongues.

On Nov. 16,1522, he left Ebernburg for Frankfort again, and thence went to Basle, and from that time dates his real efficiency as a reformer. He reached Basle at a most critical moment, and he proved just the man needed to guide the movement then in progress; he was not a stranger, he had many warm friends in Basle; he understood the character of the people; he was a ripe scholar and a popular preacher, and his own religious experience fitted him to appreciate and deal with the difficulties encountered by others in their progress from darkness to light. Yet his task was not an easy one. While many of the citizens gave him a cordial welcome, the priests and professors looked with an evil eye on the monk who had cast aside his cowl and his vows; even his old patron the bishop, and his old friend Erasmus, to whom while. yet in the convent he had written of his acceptance of the Reformation doctrines, received him coldly. Under these circumstances his chances of getting a professorship were very small. During the first year he had no office of any kind; yet. it was a memorable year in his history, for in the course of it he was brought into contact with Zwingli, whose influence mightily quickened his progress in the path of reform, and who more than any other person helped to give to the system of faith and worship afterwards established at Basle its peculiar features. After waiting nearly two years for employment, and when just ready to despair of finding it, the door of entrance into the university was ‘suddenly opened for Oecolampadius, in consequence of a dispute between the council and the professors, which resulted in the deposition of two of the latter. Their places were instantly filled by Oecolampadius and Pellican.

The chair of the former was that of Biblical learning-the one of all others for which he was best suited. He began his course of lectures with Isaiah, and long before he had reached the middle of it his lecture-room was unable to hold the crowd of students and citizens who flocked thither, all eager to hear the learned and eloquent expositor. Besides this academic position, Oecolampadius received an appointment as preacher of St. Martin's; but in accepting this pastorate, he frankly told the council and people that he must be allowed to preach the Word with all freedom, and would not consider himself bound to observe useless or pernicious ceremonies. In his lectures he advanced radical views which  offended the conservatives and created. a breach between him and Erasmus. Thus he spoke against the celibacy of the clergy, thinking that it were better for the interest of the Church that they should remain single, but holding with St. Paul that those who could not abstain should marry, instead of giving a bad example to their congregations, as did many priests of that period. In his sermons he became daily more severe against the abuses of the Roman Catholic Church, which he attacked one by one, comparing them with the principles laid down in the Scriptures. In the mean time the discussion on the sacraments broke out; Karlstadt's works were condemned by the Council of Basle in 1525, and the booksellers were forbidden to publish any of Oecolampadius's writings. The Anabaptists also opposed him. Yet, although even his liberty was threatened, he did not flinch, and in 1525 he baptized in German, discontinued the mass, and celebrated for the first time the Lord's Supper in the Reformed manner, having himself composed a liturgy for the purpose. When the dispute arose between Zwingli and Luther respecting the real presence in the Lord's Supper, Oecolampadius supported the opinions of Zwingli, and published in 1525 De vero intellectu verborum Domini, loc est corpus meumt — a work of which Erasmus says that it was written with much skill, good reasoning, and persuasive eloquence. It was answered by the Lutheran party in Synyramma Suevicon, to which he replied in Antisynge-amma. Fryth, one

f the early English martyrs, was burned in 1533, because, as Cranmer writes, “he thought it not necessary to be believed as an article of our faith that there is the very corporeal presence of Christ within the host and sacrament of the altar, and holdeth of this point most after the opinion of Oecolampadius.” This contest with Luther on the subject of the Eucharist was, in many respects, the most painful of any in which Oecolampadius found it necessary to engage. Oecolampadius agreed substantially with Zwilngli's view of the sacrament, and he defended it with a considerable amount of patristic learning and dogmatic skill against the Lutherans, especially Brentius.

But he differed from Zwingli in the interpretation of the words of the institution, by taking the verb in the literal sense, and placing the figure in the predicate: “This is — really, not figuratively, in the sense of signifies, as Zwingli explained it — the symbol of my body” (figura corporis, as Tertullian once says). He attended, in company with Zwingli, Bucer, and Hedio, the religious conference with the Lutheran divines alt Marburg in 1529, and was there confronted with Luther, while the more vehement Zwingli debated with the mild Melancthon. But, although the champions of the Lutheran and Reformed  churches agreed in fourteen fundamental articles, they could not settle their dispute concerning the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Luther even refused the hand of brotherhood which Zwingli offered him, with tears, in spite of the difference of views. Nevertheless Oecolampadius lent his support to Bucer's efforts to bring about an agreement between the German and Swiss Reformers. It seems also that Oecolampadius modified his theory on the Eucharist, and gave up some of his former untenable assertions. His learned biographer, Dr. Herzog (2:230), thinks that the Reformers of Basle held at last firmly to the view that our souls are truly nourished with the true body and the blood of Christ, — and that Christ is present to the believers in the Eucharist, although not in a manner essentially differing from his general presence in the Church.” This is also the view which afterwards prevailed in the churches of Basle, as may be seen from “the Second Confession of Basle,” called too “the First Helvetic Confession,” drawn up by Bullinger, Grynaeus, and Myconius, in 1536, which teaches, in the 22d article, as follows: “Concerning the holy communion. we maintain that the Lord offers and communicates in it truly his own body and blood, i.e. himself, to his members as nourishment, to the effect that he lives in them more and more, and they in him; not that the body and blood of the Lord are naturally united to the bread and wine, and locally included in them, but, rather, that bread and wine, according to the institution of the Lord, are highly significant, sacred, and true signs by which the Lord himself, through the ministry of the Church, offers and bestows the true communion of his body and blood to believers, not as a perishing food of the belly, but as food and nourishment of the spiritual and eternal life,” etc. This is substantially the same theory which was afterwards so ably developed and defended by Calvin.

From Oecolampadius's peculiar position at Basle, and his relation to Wittenberg and Zurich, it seemed for a while as if he were destined to be a mediator between the two parties in that unhappy controversy which destroyed the visible unity of the Church of the Reformation, and arrayed her members in two hostile factions. But with all his excellence, he was not equal to the exigency; perhaps no man, however great his piety, learning, moderation, and tact, could have prevented the split; yet the strife might possibly have been less bitter if the Reformer of Basle had declined to join either side. Unhappily for such a result, he had a lurking tendency to that spurious spirituality which undervalues all external means of grace. Thus he regarded the ordinance of the Supper as per se a hinderance, rather than a means of grace; as a form, from which the Christian should seek to be  freed, rising above it to immediate fellowship with God. “Believers,” said he, “should use the sacraments more for their neighbors' sake than their own. For themselves they are already under the influence of the Holy Spirit, they are free, they are purified, they are justified, and, being one with Christ, the kingdom of God is already within them.” Now, while it is deeply to be regretted that occasion was given for the contest between Switzerland and Germany about the ordinance which is at once the feast of Christian love and the symbol of Christian unity, yet, when we weigh all the circumstances of the discussion, we think that there are not wanting grounds for thankfulness that Luther opposed the doctrine of Zurich. The storm, indeed, left many traces of: its desolating march; yet we are inclined to believe that the atmosphere was thereby rendered purer than .it would have been if no such war of the elements had occurred.

The germ of rationalism thus early developed in the system of Zwingli, if not entirely eradicated, was at least in a measure and for a time repressed. Oecolampadius next took part in the discussion of Baden (May, 1526), where he maintained the tenets of Zwingli against Eck and the old Roman party with great efficiency; yet Zwingli and his followers were condemned as heretics, and strong resolutions were passed against the Reformation. The country, however, was too far advanced towards the. principles of the Reformation for these resolutions to have much effect, and Oecolampadius and his colleagues continued to labor faithfully in its cause. On his return to Basle Oecolampadius published a more extended liturgy, and introduced the practice of singing the Psalms in German. The last was a most popular measure, and greatly helped the cause of the Reformation. The hymns were not as melodious as they might have been, and the Papists made much sport of them; but they supplied a long-felt want of thousands of pious hearts. As dangers thickened, the activity of the Reformer was redoubled; he preached every day, he composed and published a Catechism for children, and during the prevalence of the plague in 1526 he devoted himself with unwearied constancy to the sick and dying. In the mean time the council of Berne introduced the Reformation in that canton. and thus brought on a religious conference (Jan., 1528), in which Zwingli and Oecolampadius took the leading part. This led to the spread of the Reformation through the whole canton, and greatly encouraged its disciples in Basle.

The latter city was gradually divided into two opposite parties. In order to bring matters to a crisis, Oecolampadius induced the evangelically inclined citizens to present a petition to the councils for the uniformity of worship, while at the same time he took such measures with  Zwingli as would prevent an outbreak; all passed well, and it was decided that a conference should be held, to determine on the continuation or the rejection of the mass, on the fourteenth day after Whitsuntide, 1529, until which time mass was to be read only-in three churches throughout the city. On Feb. 8, 1529, the people assembled, and demanded that such members of the council as were opposed to the Reformation should resign their office, and that their places should be filled by appointment from the grand council, instead of by the remaining members, as formerly; the emblems of Roman Catholic worship were removed from the churches. and on the following day the council acceded to all demands. Oecolampadius was immediately appointed to the highest offices, and as such took an active part in procuring the adoption of ordinances in favor of the Reformation, dated April 1, 1529. The university also was reorganized, and received a new impulse in the hands of its former professors. Oecolampadius was universally recognised as the leading spirit, and while he lived he was, by common consent, allowed to exercise a general supervision over all the parishes of the city and suburbs, as well as to control the university affairs. He experienced much annoyance from the Anabaptists, who were not by any means satisfied with the Reformation; he held several conferences with them (in August, 1525, June 10, 1527, and in 1531), but without result, and the sect continued to increase, notwithstanding the stringent measures adopted against them by the council of Basle.

In 1531 he abolished the custom of posting the names of parties under excommunication on the doors of the churches, while at the same time he endeavored to establish a regular system of Church discipline. He differed from Calvin, who wished the absolute union of the Church and State, while Oecolampadius argued that, while moving harmoniously side by side, each should have its distinct sphere and jurisdiction. “The civil power,” he says in a letter to Zwingli, “will become even more insupportable than Antichrist, if it robs the Church of her authority in spiritual things.” He disapproved especially the use of violent means for the propagation of truth, and vainly endeavored to moderate the ardor of his friend Zwingli. Thus be warned the latter at the approach of the catastrophe of the Helvetic Reformation against war; and had Zwingli followed this good advice, he might have saved his own life, which was sacrificed in the unfortunate issue of the battle of Cappel, in October, 1531. After the death of this good but rash Reformer, the ministers of Zurich unanimously chose Oecolampadius as the successor of Zwingli. But he felt it his duty to remain in Basle. Only a few weeks after the death of his friend, he was himself called to pass from the Church  militant to the Church triumphant. His last hours on earth were full of interest. A severe illness suddenly arrested his incessant labors, which had long since undermined his sickly frame. He took the communion with his family; then assembled the magistrates and the ministers of Basle around his dying-bed, and moved their hearts by pious exhortations. Concerning himself he said: “The charge that I committed the crime of adulterating the truth does not affect me. By the grace of God, I approach the judgment- seat of Christ with a good conscience. There it will appear that I have not seduced the Church. I leave you behind as witnesses of this my assurance; and I confirm you as such in these my dying moments.”

He died Nov. 24, 1531, surrounded by ten ministers kneeling in prayer. Shortly before he had fervently recited the penitential psalm of David (Psalms 51), and exclaimed, “I shall soon be with the Lord Jesus. Lord Jesus, help and deliver me!” The whole city mourned his death. His remains were deposited in the cathedral church. The mouth of slander circulated the rumor that he had committed suicide, or was killed by a member of his family. Even Luther, under the influence of strong prejudice, was not ashamed to give credence to the lie. But it had the good effect to bring out a minute description of his last days by two eye-witnesses — his friend Grynseus and his servant Gundelfinger. He left a wife, Wilibrandis Rosenblatt, whom he had married (1528) after the death of his mother; a son, Eusebius, who died the same year; and two daughters, Alitheia and Irene. The widow married afterwards successively two other Reformers — his friends Capito and Bucer of Strasburg, the last of whom she followed to Cambridge, in England. But, in 1564, her body was deposited in the same grave with Oecolampadius. The memory of the first Reformer of Basle is still cherished, and the fruits of his pious labors are seen to this day.

As has been truly said, Oecolampadius was the Lord's chosen instrument of leading on to victory those noble souls who had gathered under the banner of reform at Basle, and though cut down in the prime of manhood, he lived long enough to earn the glorious appellation of the Reformer of that city. But his labors entitle him to an appellation more indicative of the wide sphere in which he worked. In his intellectual and moral qualities, his modesty, gentleness, love of peace, eagerness for union, academic tastes, fondness fbr a meditative rather than an active life, tendency to melancholy. relish for letters, and exquisite scholarship — he bore a striking resemblance to Luther's great friend and ally. Of all positions, that of a revolutionary leader, whether in Church or State, was the last one that  Oecolampadius would have chosen to assume. If he had dared to follow his own inclinations, his life would have been spent in the quietude of the academy rather than amid the turbulence of the arena, in converse with books instead of contests with men. He was inclined to look with profound veneration upon everything that bore the marks of hoary antiquity, and hence the reluctance — we may almost call it — with which he abandoned the Romish Church, and severed one by one the ties which bound him to her communion. Among all the Continental Reformers, none were less disposed than he to cast aside old forms, simply because they were old, or to introduce novelties merely for the purpose of making the Protestant worship as unlike the Popish as possible. In short, his tendencies and tastes, if yielded to. would have repelled him from the rude work and rough ways of the reformer; and his life supplies one of the many illustrations of the fact that the Lord chooses instruments which in human view are most unsuitable for the accomplishment of his designs.

The original works of Oecolampadius were, besides those mentioned above, Annotationes in Genesin; in librum Job exegemata; in Danielem prophetam libri duo (1553, fol.): — Commentarii omnes in libros pr- ophetarum (1558, 2 vols. foL): — Joasznis Oecolampadii et Huldrichi Zuinglii epistolarum libri iv, prcecipua cum religionis a Christo nobis traditce papita, tune ecclesiasticce administrationis officia, nostro maxime sceculo tot erroribus perfurbato, convenientia, ad amussim expirimentes (Basle, 1536, fol.). He also published translations of Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzum, and others of the early fathers. His philological attainments, and his knowledge of the fathers, contributed to give to his exegetical labors a high value. No complete edition of his works has yet been published.

See Hess, Lebensgesch. D J. Oecolampad's (Zurich, 1791); Herzog, Leben J. Oecolampad's u. d. Reform. d. Kirche z. Btsel (Basle, 1843, 2 vols. 8vo); Hagenbach, Leben u. ausgecwiihlte Schrmften der Vater u. Begrunder d. reform. Kirche, vol. ii (Elber. 1859, 8v/o); Register zu Studien u. Krit. 1838-1847; Melchior Adam, Ref. Vit. s.v.; Harburgh. Fathers of the Gernman Ref. Ch. 1:21 sq.; Merle D'Aubignd, Hist. Ref. in Germany and Switzerland, 3:428 sq.; 4:324 sq., 334 sq.; also, Hist. Ref. in Switzerland (see Index in vol. iii); Countess D'lstria, Switzerland, the Pioneer of the Ref. ii, .427; Soames, Hist. Ref. iii 153 sq.; Ruchat, Swiss Ref. Ch. ch. i, iv, and p. 117-136; Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 4:99; Fisher, Hist. Ref. (see Index); Middleton, Evangel. Biogr. 1:85 sq.; Hallam,  Literature, 1:151, 164, 188, 191, 255; Hardwick, Hist. Ref. (see Index); Princeton Review, April, 1851, art. ii.

## Oeconomists[[@Headword:Oeconomists]]

             is the name given to a secret organization of infidel French philosophers, of whom Dr. Duquesnai was the founder. He so ingratiated himself with Louis XV that the latter used to call him his thinker, and gained the affections of the people under pretense of promoting economy in the state. According to abbe Barruel, however, the real object of the majority of the society was to subvert Christianity, by circulating the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, and other infidels. This they did by printing extracts from these popular authors, and circulating them through the kingdom by hawkers and peddlers, who had them for little or nothing, that they might undersell all other literature. Their secret meetings, for preparing and revising these tracts, were held at baron Holbach's (q.v.). ‘In some of these tracts their object was disguised; in others they were so bold as to avow their object under such titles as “Christianity unmasked,” etc. They also attempted schools, for the avowed intention of preparing children for trade and mechanic arts, in which the same writings were read and circulated. Among the members of their secret club were D'Alembert, Turgot, Condorcet, Diderot, La Harpe, and La Moignon, keeper of the seals, who, on his dismissal from that office, shot himself. SEE ILLUMINATI; SEE PHILOSOPHISTS; SEE PHYSIOCRATS.

## Oeconomus[[@Headword:Oeconomus]]

             (steward) was the name of a special officer appointed in the middle of the 5th century to conduct the administration of Church property, in place of the earlier deacons. The steward, from the nature of his office, rose in medieval times to high importance. The bishop, by early law, was not to appoint him, but he was to be chosen by the entire presbytery. The Council of Chalcedon enacted this law, and it was afterwards confirmed by the emperor Justinian, and ratified by later Church councils. The œconomi were always chosen from among the clergy. SEE OICONOMISTS.

## Oeconomy[[@Headword:Oeconomy]]

             (οἰκονομία, stewardship) is a term sometimes used to designate the entire suppression or temporary withholding, in the instruction of the great mass of Christians, of a large portion of the Gospel doctrines which are the most  earnestly set forth in Scripture, as a sort of esoteric mystery of which ordinary believers are unworthy, and which should be dealt out with the managing discretion of a steward οἰκνόμος only as a reward for a long course of pious submission. Those who vindicate this system represent it to themselves and others as the same with the gradual initiation of Christians in the knowledge of their religion, in proportion as they “are able to bear it:” able, that is, and willing to understand each point that is presented to their minds. The opponents of the system, on the other hand, maintain that it confounds things essentially different. While they allow the necessity of gradual teaching, as of reading the first line of a passage before a second; and while they readily admit that care is requisite to avoid teaching anything which though true in itself, would be falsely understood by the hearers, they contend that this necessary caution is not to be confounded with the system of withholding a portion of Gospel truth from those able and willing to receive it, the system of “shunning to set before man all the counsel of God,” and of having one kind of religion for the initiated few, and another for the mass of the Christian world. The opponents of the “œconomical” system assert, moreover, that very different was the apostle Paul's Gospel, which he assures us, “if it was hid, was hid from them that are lost” (men on the road to destruction, ἀπολλυμένοις), “whom the god of this world hath blinded” (2Co 4:4-5). SEE RESERVE.

## Oecumenical (Or Universal) Bishop[[@Headword:Oecumenical (Or Universal) Bishop]]

             is the title now assumed by the popes of Rome. It was stubbornly claimed by John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople, in the end of the 6th century. The assumption of so lofty a title by Constantinopolitan patriarchs was strongly remonstrated against by the rival bishops of Rome, particularly by Gregory the Great, who maintained the title to be profane, antichristian, and infernal; and, in order to make sure of a clear claim of Rome's superiority over Constantinople, he assumed the appellation “Servus servorum Dei,” in reference to Mat 23:10. (See Alzog; Kirchengesch. 1:341 [R. C.]; Soames, The Latin Ch. in Anglo-Saxon Times, p. 19; Neale, Hist. East. Ch. [Introd.], 1:29.) In A.D. 606, however, the Roman pontiff Boniface III obtained this very title from Phocas, the Greek emperor; and from that period down to the present day the pope of Rome claims to be the Oecumenical or Universal Bishop, having authority over the whole Church of Christ upon earth. All other churches except the Roman Catholic Church repudiate such a claim as alike unfunded, antichristian, and blasphemous.

## Oecumenical Council[[@Headword:Oecumenical Council]]

             is the name of an ecclesiastical convention of cardinals, bishops, and dignitaries of the Church of Rome called together by the pope to deliberate really on the interests of the Romish Churclh but, as it claims, on the interests of Christianity at large. The council is called œcumenical (i.e. an imperial gathering) from οἰκουμένη, or empire (technical meaning of the word, even in N.-T. Greek), because originally such councils were convened only by the emperor. Thus the Church of England teaches in its 21st of the Thirty-nine Articles that “general councils may not be gathered together but by the commandment and will of princes.” This was clearly the assumption of the first œcumenical synod held, SEE NICAEAN COUNCIL, and of all the Eastern councils. “Not only no single bishop, but no single prince (unless we take the word in its most ancient sense), was sufficient to convene a general assembly from all parts of that vast territory; a council was part, as it were, of the original constitution of the Christian empire; and however much disputed afterwards — in the entanglements of the civil and ecclesiastical relation in the West, the principle has never been wholly abandoned. When the Western empire fell, the Eastern emperor still retained the inalienable right; and when the Eastern emperor became inaccessible to the needs of European Christendom, and a new holy ‘Roman empire' was erected in the West, then the emperor of Germany (solely, or more properly, conjointly with his Byzantine brother) succeeded to the rights of Constantine” (Stanley, Lect. East. Ch. p. 159).

With the establishment of the temporal power of the papacy the bishop of Rome assumed the prerogative of calling the synods of the Church, as its spiritual head and sovereign lord. In the article COUNCIL SEE COUNCIL we have already considered the general utility of such gatherings and their ecclesiastical authority. The conditions necessary to constitute an œcumenical council are a subject of much controversy among Romanists. As the subject is of less importance in Protestant divinity, it will be enough to explain here that a council is said by Roman Catholic divines to be œcumenical in three different ways, viz., in convocation, in celebration, and in acceptation. For the first, the summons of the pope, direct or indirect, is held to be necessary; this summons must be addressed to all the bishops of the entire Church. For the second, it is necessary that bishops from all parts of the Church should be present, and in sufficient numbers to constitute a really representative assembly: they must be presided over by the pope, or by a delegate or  delegates of the pope; and they must enjoy liberty of discussion and of speech. For the third, the decrees of the council must be accepted by the pope, and by the body of the bishops throughout the Church, at least tacitly. The last of these conditions is absolutely required to entitle the decrees of a council to the character of œcumenical; and even the decrees of provincial or national councils, so accepted, may acquire all the weight of infallible decisions in the eves of Roman Catholics. It remains now only to name the councils regarded as œcumenical. Yet this is by no means an easy task. for Church historians are not agreed as to the total number of such synods hitherto held. The well-known mnemonic hexameter, “Ni Co E, Chal Co Co, Ni Co La, La La La, Ly Ly Vi, Flo Tri,” standing for Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, etc., which counts but seventeen, is not accepted by all. While, e.g., the œcumenical council of Ephesus, in 449, had decided, not without the aid of “swords an sticks, and many monks' heels,” that Eutyches's opinion about the nature of Christ was the orthodox one, another œcumenical council, held eleven years later at Chalcedon, decided that the decision of its predecessor was null and void;and that so far from being an œcumenical council, it was a council of brigands, “Latrocinium Ephesinum.” Even so the Council of Basle was called “Basiliacorum speluncac œcumanumque caterva,” because it rebelled against the pope, its master. (See Deutsch, Literary Reminiscences, ch. 11; McElhinney, The Doctrine of the Ch. p. 81-84.) SEE SYNOD. The Protestants have in recent times given the title œcumenical to their general councils convened by the Evangelical Alliance, but there seems to be no good ground for such a designation.

## Oecumenical Divines[[@Headword:Oecumenical Divines]]

             is the title given by the Greek Church to St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory the Divine, and St. John Chrysostom. A festival in honor of these three œcumenical divines, as they are termed, is held on January 30 every year.

## Oecumenical Judge[[@Headword:Oecumenical Judge]]

             is the title given to the patriarch of Alexandria. It was first applied to Arsenius, who succeeded Philotheus A.D. 1015. It originated as follows: “A dispute having arisen between the emperor Basil and the patriarch of Constantinople, Sergius Il, apparently on the subject of tax, which the former had levied, and to which the latter objected. Philotheus, then at Constantinople, was called in as arbiter of the disagreement. Finding that  both the prelate and the emperor were in the wrong, and unwilling to provoke their indignation by openly saying so, he had recourse to an ingenious and symbolical method of stating his opinion. Having made two figures of wax representing, we may suppose, the contending parties, he carried them before Basil and Sergius, and cut off the right hand of that representing the emperor, and the tongue of that by which the patriarch was imaged, thus reproving the severe actions of the former and the unbridled words of the latter. Sergius placed on him his omophorion, the emperor his crown; and since that period the patriarch of Alexandria wears two omophoria and a double crown on his mitre. This title was afterwards absurdly assumed by the Jacobite patriarchs, who interpret it as proving their authority to settle any dispute which may arise as to the time of Easter.

## Oecumenius[[@Headword:Oecumenius]]

             (οἰκουμένιος), a Byzantine ecclesiastical writer of the 10th century, of whose personal history nothing is known except that he was bishop of Triceca, in Thessaly, and wrote Greek commentaries on various parts of the Gospel. The works attributed to him are, Commentaiia in sacrosancta quatuor Christi Evangelia, . . auctore quiden (ut pluairmi sentiunt) œcumenio, interprete vero Joanne HIentenio (Louvain, 1543, fol.). The Greek text was published by O. F. Matthaei (Leips. 1792, 3 vois. 8vo): — Ε᾿ξηγήσεις εἰς τὰς πράξεις τῶν Α᾿ποστόλων (compiled from the ancient Greek fathers, and especially from St. Chrysostom): Ε᾿ξηγήσεις εἰς τὰς Παύλου ἐπιστολὰς πάσας; Ε᾿ξηγήσεις εἰς τὰς ἑπτὰ καθολικὰς λεγομένας ἐπιστολάς; Εἰς την Ι᾿ωάννου Α᾿ποκάλυψιν. These divers commentaries were several times published; one of the best editions is that of Paris, 1631, 2 vols. fol. The commentary on Revelation was reprinted by Cramer (Oxf. 1840, 8vo). With Oecumenius originated the Catenae (q.v.); his commentaries are chiefly composed of extracts from the writings of the fathers, with a few remarks of his own. “The various explanations are linked together, without regard to their agreement or contrariety, by such words as ‘another' (ἄλλο), ‘otherwise' (ἄλλως), ‘and otherwise' (καὶ ἄλλως); and sometimes they amount to ten in one place. The reader is generally left to choose for himself, for œcumenius seldom prefers one to another. The method of interpretation is grammatical” (Davidson, Hermneneutics, p. 169). It is noticeable that he does not read 1 John v. 7; and that he reads SdEg and not Og (1Ti 3:16). See Hentenius, Praef. ad œcumen. Commentar.; Maatthaei, Proleg. ad  ‘Euthymii Commentar. in Quatuor Evang.; Simon, Hist. critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament, c. xxxii; Possevin, Apparatus sacer; Cave, Hlist. Litti'. ad ann. 990; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 8:343;, Dupin, Bibl. Nouvelle des Auteurs Ecclesiastes cent. xi; Ceillier, Auteurs sacres, 19:742; Oudin, Comment. de Scriptor. eccls. ii, col. 518; Lardner, Credibility, 1:1; Cramer, Preface to his edition; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:508; Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology, s.v.; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biogr. 7:455.

## Oeder, Georg Ludwig[[@Headword:Oeder, Georg Ludwig]]

             a German divine noted for his exegetical labors, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was born in 1694, and after studying at different high schools of his country, entered the ministry, and finally became rector at Anspach and dean of Feuchtwangen. He died in 1760. He was the author of Free Inquiries concerning the Revelation, and several books of the Old Testament, in German: — Animadversiones Sacrae: — Observationum, Sacrarum Syntagma, etc. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Oedmann, Samuel[[@Headword:Oedmann, Samuel]]

             a noted Swedish divine, distinguished for his contributions to exegetical theology, was born in 1750, and flourished as professor of theology at the University of Upsala. He died in 1829. His Miscellaneous Collections from Natural History, for the illustration of Scripture, published originally in Swedish, was translated into German by Grininig (Rostock and Leipsic, 1786-95). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Oegir[[@Headword:Oegir]]

             (from Oya, “to shudder” at, to dread) or Hler (i.e. the stutterer) is the name in Northern mythology of the god of the sea or ocean. Oegir rules over the stormy, raging sea, far from land, where fishing and navigation cannot well be carried on; he is a giant, and in intercourse with the gods, whom he visits, and they in turn visit him. It was once when the gods visited him that his brewing-kettle was found two small, so that Thor had to go to the giant Hvmer, who had a kettle a mile deep. In Oegir's hair the bright gold was used instead of fire, and the ale passed round spontaneously. Some of the old Norse heroes are represented as possessing a terrifying helmet. Odin's helmet is the beaming sky; and as the dwarfs  cover themselves with a helmet of fog, so Oegir wears on his brow a helmet made of dense darkness, and heaven reaching, terrifying breakers. The name of his wife, Ran (to plunder, to rob), denotes the sea, as craving its sacrifice of human life and of treasures. She has a net with which she catches those who venture out upon the sea; with her hand she is able to hold the ship fast. The ancient Norsemen believed that they who perished at sea were seized by Rau. Loke once borrowed Rau's net with which to catch the dwarf Anldvare, who in the guise of a fish dwelt in a waterfall. Oegir and Ran have nine daughters, the waves of the ocean, and their nanies represent the waves in their various magnitudes and appearances. They have pale locks and white veils, and are always angry when the wind blows. Oegir and his family were regarded as mighty beings, whose friendship was sought by the gods themselves. See Thorpe, Northern Mythol. 1:6769; Keyser, Religion of the Northmen; Anderson, Norse Mythology (Chicago, 1875), p. 343-48. ‘

## Oehler, Gustav Friedrich[[@Headword:Oehler, Gustav Friedrich]]

             a very eminent Old Testament scholar of Germany, was born at Ebingen, in Wurtemberg, June 10, 1812. Having finished his theological studies at Tubingen, he was appointed a lecturer at the Missionary Institution at Basle, which position he occupied from 1834 to .1837. After this he became a member of the theological seminary in Tubingen, teaching at the same time in the university there. In 1840 he was appointed vicar in Stuttgard, and in the same year professor of the theological seminary at Schonthal. In 1845 he accepted a call from the theological faculty in Breslau, Silesia, where he lectured until 1852, when he returned to Tiibingen to occupy the same position there, besides having the ephoralty over the higher theological seminary. He died Feb. 20, 1872. He published a great many essays and articles in different reviews, in Herzog's theological and Schmid's pedagogical encyclopaedias; and the following works, Prolegomena zur Theologie des Alten Testamentes (Stuttgard, 1845): — Commentationum ad theologiam pertinentium, pars I (ibid. 1846): — Die Grundziige derAltestamentlichen Weisheit (Tiibingen, 1854): — Ueber das Verhaltniss der Attestamentlichen Prophetie zur Heidnischen Mantik (ibid. 1861): — Zwei Seminarreden (ibid. 1870): — Gesammelte Seminarreden (ibid. 1872); but his main work is Theologie des Alten Testanientes (1873, 1874, 2 vols.), published by his son immediately after the author's death, and giving the substance of his theological lectures delivered from 1839 to 1871, and of his articles  published in different cyclopaedias and reviews. Of the last-mentioned work an English translation has been prepared by E.D. Smith, of which the first volume, entitled Theology of the Old Testament, was published at Edinburgh in 1874. This work, though it is characterized rather by fullness of details than by comprehensiveness of principles, yet exhibits on every page signs of the most conscientious diligence. This is especially the case in all matters connected with Old-Testament exegesis. It is therefore free from the serious blemishes which damage all its predecessors, the valuable work of Schultz not excepted. It is characterized as follows by a writer in the Brit. Qu. Rev. (Jan. 1875). p. 147,-148:

“Oehler was a strong believer in the supernatural, and was imbued with the most profound reverence for Old-Testament Scripture. With regard to the relation of the Old Testament to the New, he held a middle position between the view of Hengstenberg and the older orthodox party, which did not distinguish between the two, and that of Marcion and Schleiermacher, which entirely cuts loose the Old-Testament religion from the New, thereby reducing it to a level with the other pre-Christian religions, and making it of scarcely greater importance for the explanation of the Christian system than the theology of Homer. While Oehler has successfully maintained against Hengstenberg that the Old and New Testaments were so distinct that no New-Testament idea is fully set forth in the Old, he yet holds that the connection between them is so intimate and essential that the genesis of all the ideas of New-Testament salvation lie in the Old, and that both must stand or fall together. He must not be understood, however, as holding the opinion that the growth of religious ideas was owing to a certain religious sense, which became crearer and fuller with the progress of time, for he repudiates altogether this theory of the rationalistic schools. While admiring the author's moderation and devotedness, we cannot help thinking that out of this too decided opposition to the above schools arose two radical defects, which pervade the whole work, viz., a painful and unsuccessful attempt to reconcile all discrepancies between the different religious views and tendencies, e.g. to reduce to complete harmony the different parts of the Old Testament: and an entire exclusion of all side-lights from non- Biblical sources. According to his own principle, God must have gradually, and by means of enlightened leaders, removed his people  more and more from heathenism; and a complete history of the process would necessitate a comparison with heathen views. There must have been a period in which the religious views of Judaism and heathenism were closely allied. Yet we find scarcely an allusion to the latter. The same exclusive tendency caused him, somewhat inconsistently; to limit his investigation to the canonical writings of the Old Testament. This tendency alone would suffice to render his work, though richer in detail, inferior in breadth and comprehensiveness to the valuable volumes of Hermann Schultz', and will cause the readers of Ewald, who lives in a different plane from ordinary men, to feel that they are entering a new world of thought and freedom.”

See Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Kurtz, Church History (Philadelphia, 1875), 2:375; Lehrbuch der Kirchengesehichte (Mitau, 1874), 2:323; Hauck, Theologischer Jahresbericht, 6:259; 8:65, 646 sq.; Worte zum Anidenken an Dr. G.F. v. Oehler (1873), containing the addresses made at his funeral, and also a brief sketch of his life.

## Oehlmuller, Daniel Joseph[[@Headword:Oehlmuller, Daniel Joseph]]

             an eminent German architect, was born at Bamberg in 1791. He studied under Carl Fischer, and then visited Italy and Sicily, where he passed four years in studying and copying the principal edifices, until he was summoned home in 1819 to superintend the erection of the Glyptotheca at Munich, after the designs of Klenze. In 1831 he was commissioned to make designs in the Gothic style for a church in the suburbs of Munich, which gained him great reputation. He erected in the same style the national monument at Wittelsbach, and the Otto chapel at Kiefersfelden. Among his other works is the Church of St. Theresa at Halbergmoos, in the Italian style, commenced in 1833. At the death of Domenico Quaglio, in 1837, OehlMüller was employed to complete the works at the castle of Hohenschwangau. He died in 1839. In 1823 and 1825 he published a book containing designs for funeral monuments.

## Oelreich, Bernhard[[@Headword:Oelreich, Bernhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Itzehoe in 1626. He studied at different universities, was in 1664 court-preacher at Stockholm, in 1665 doctor of theology, and in 1668 pro-chancellor and professor of theology of the academy at Lunden. He then went to Bremen as superintendent and pastor, and died March 30, 1686. He wrote, De Testamento Christi non Violando: — De Angelo: — De Sacra Scriptura: — De Ecclesia Lutherana. See Witte, Diariunm Biographicum; Moller, Cimbria Literata; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Oelrichs, Johann Georg Arnold[[@Headword:Oelrichs, Johann Georg Arnold]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hanover, June 8, 1767. He studied at Gottingen, Marburg, and Erlangen, was promoted as doctor of philosophy in 1787, and died at Gottingen, March 7, 1791. He is the author of, De Ratione sive Relatione Filii cum Patre Sententia (Gottingen, 1787), a prize essay: — De Doctrina Platonis de Deo, etc. (Marburg, 1788): — Commentarii de Scriptoribus Ecclesim Latina Priorum VI Saeculorum, etc. (Leipsic, 1791). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:596, 597; 854; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands,. s.v. (B.P.)

## Oemler, Christian Wilhelm[[@Headword:Oemler, Christian Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Dennstadt, near Weimar, September 20, 1728. He studied at Jena, acted for some time as private tutor, and was in 1755 preacher at Dennstadt. In 1764 he was called to Neumark, was in 1766 archdeacon at Jena, in 1776 superintendent arid first preacher, and died June 2, 1802. He published, Der Prediger an dem Krankenbette ( Jena, 1770 ): — Repertorium fiur Pastoraltheologie und Casuistik (1786-89, 4 parts): — and a number of other ascetical works, for which see Doring, Die deutschen Kanzelredner, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:33, 40, 49, 50, 54. (B.P.)

## Oenisteria[[@Headword:Oenisteria]]

             (οἰνιστήρια), a name for the libations of wine poured out to Hercules by the youth of Athens on reaching the age of manhood.

## Oenoatis[[@Headword:Oenoatis]]

             is a surname of Artemis, under which she was worshipped at Oenoe, in Argolis.

## Oenomancy[[@Headword:Oenomancy]]

             (Gr. οινος, winze, and μαντεία, divination), a species of divination practiced by ancient Greeks, in which they drew conjectures from the color, motion, and other circumstances connected with the wine used in libations to the gods.

## Oenomania[[@Headword:Oenomania]]

             (οινος, wine, and μανία, madness) [usually Anglicized Oinomania] is a term of modern invention to denote an irresistible or insane craving for alcoholic stimulants, when occurring in a habitual or confirmed form, and requiring confinement or restraint of the person for its cure. Much discussion has taken place in regard to this and other forms of what is often called Moral Insanity; the most recent views of physicians, however, tend to show that the drinking insanity, or furor bibendi, as it was called by an early writer on the subject, is often associated with other forms of mental derangement, and is very apt to be, in connection with one or more of these forms, hereditarily transmitted, even through several generations; so that the really physical or insane character of the craving for stimulants, at least in some cases, may be regarded as a wellestablished fact in medicine. SEE MONOMANIA. Many of the considerations adduced under the art. KLEPTOMANIA SEE KLEPTOMANIA (q.v.) apply to the moral responsibility of persons laboring under this disease, and perhaps with increased force, as it has a peculiarly physical relation. Other questions relate to the general subject of temperance (q.v.).

## Oenomaus[[@Headword:Oenomaus]]

             (Οἰνόμαος), of Gadara, a cynic philosopher, flourished in the reign of Hadrian, or somewhat later, but before Porphyry (Syncell. p. 349 b; Suid. s.v.). He was one of those later Cynics whose philosophy consists not so much in any definite system of doctrine as in a free and unrestrained tone of thought and life. Thus the emperor Julian charges him with sensuality and profaneness; and his sarcasms upon the old cynic doctrines have led some to believe, but without reason, that he belonged to some other sect  (Julian, Orat. 6:199; 7:209, ed. Spanheim). Suidas mentions as his works, Περὶ Κυνισμοῦ; Πολιτεία: — Περί τῆς καθ᾿ ῞Ομηρον Φιλοσοφίας: Περὶ Κράτητος καὶ Διογένους καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν. This list, however, does not include the work which is best known to us, namely, his exposure of the oracles, which is sometimes entitled Κατὰ τῶν Χρηστηρίων; but the proper title seems to have been Γοήτων Φωρά, i.e. Delectio Praes stigiatorum. Considerable extracts from this work are preserved by Eusebius, who tells us that (Enomaus was provoked to write it in consequence of having been deceived himself by an oracle (Eusebius, Praep. Evang. v. 18 sq.; 6:1; Socrates, H. E. 4:13; Niceph. 10:36; Theodorel. Therap. 6:36; 10:141 a). Julian also speaks of tragedies by (Enomaus (Orat. 7:210).

## Oertel, Euchlin Friedrich Christian[[@Headword:Oertel, Euchlin Friedrich Christian]]

             a German divine of note, was born at Streitberg in 1765, and flourished at Anspach as professor at the gymnasium. He died about 1845. He is the author of Christologie, or results of the latest exegetical expositions concerning the divinity of Christ, in which subordinationistic views are held by him (Hamburg, 1792); and a version of the Bible from the original languages, with annotations (Anspach, 1817, vol. i), all in German.

## Oertel, Philipp Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Oertel, Philipp Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             (better known by his nom-de plume, W. O. von HORN), a German author, was born at Horn, near Simmern, Aug. 15, 1798. He was the son of a clergyman; studied theology at Heidelberg; was in the charge of a parish at Mannebach from 1820 to 1835, was ecclesiastical superintendent at Sobernheim from 1835 to 1863, and subsequently resided at Wiesbaden. He died Oct. 14, 1867. He was a voluminous writer of popular stories, and his Gesammelte Erzihlungen (Wiesbaden, 1850-1809, 13 vols.) has passed through numerous editions.

## Oetinger, Friedrich Christoph[[@Headword:Oetinger, Friedrich Christoph]]

             a noted German theosophist and religious psychologist, celebrated as a mystical exponent of the sacred writings, was born of pious parentage at Goppingen, in Wiirtemberg, May 6, 1702. He studied at the University of Tubingen, where he came in contact with some of the Inspired; and his studies thereupon took a decidedly mystical turn. He also devoted himself to the study of the philosophical writings of Leibnitz and Wolf, and was  “altogether immersed in the doctrine of the monads.” He studied Malebraiche, too. After the completion of his course at the university he became intimately related to Bengel, corresponding with him and visiting him frequently. His whole object now was to impregnate the Wolfian philosophy with a deeper Biblical element, and to ascertain therein the final principles, and highest unity of all thought. He read the Church fathers industriously, especially Augustine, and pored over the Rabbins and their cabalistic speculations. He visited Jena and Leipsic, and there made the acquaintance of Francke, Spangenberg, and Zinzendorf, with the last of whom he spent some time in Herrnhut. He also made many other journeys. He saw Leipsic, Berlin, and the large places of the Low Countries. He finally returned to Tilbingen; and after having acted awhile as tutor there, and assisted count Zinzendorf in his project for translating the Scriptures, he was appointed reader in theology in the University of Halle. This post he resigned however in order to travel, and especially to consult some of the eminent theologians of Holland. Returning to Wurtemberg, he was, in 1738, appointed pastor at Hirschau. He had now fully adopted the views of the Pietists, whose sentiments were then obtaining the approval of many of the most learned and pious men in Germany, while they found very general acceptance among persons of a devotional temperament, with whom Oetinger's purity of life, earnestness of manner, extensive theological acquirements, and perhaps his mysticism of style, all combined to give him great influence, so that he soon came to be regarded as the Pietistic leader in that part of Germany. Oetinger was an earnest student of the writings of Jacob Bohme; and he became an ardent disciple of Emmanuel Swedenborg, some of whose works he translated into German. His teaching of these mystic doctrines having called forth some remonstrances from his ecclesiastical superiors, he announced his resolve not to publish any more of his writings. but he continued to furnish such of his followers as applied for spiritual advice with his written instructions. He was nominated in 1752 to the superintendence of the churches in the district of Weinsberg, and afterwards in that of Herrenberg, and subsequently bishop of Murrhard. He died February 10, 1782.

During his life Oetinger was regarded with respect approaching to reverence by his co-religionists as a philosopher and theologian, and he is still held in some estimation. He sought to elucidate the Christian system by the speculations of Bohme and Swedenborg; and he was fond of comparing and contrasting the received systems of secular philosophy with  Christian philosophy, as so explained. It is only recently that attention has been excited towards his almost forgotten works. He was the theosophist of his age. His contemporaries called him the Magus of the South. He says: “I have made the idea of life which prevails in the Bible the chief feature of my theology. The Bible treats of life: 1, God as the source of life; 2, man as the conservatory of the breath of life; 3, sin as the estrangement of life from God; 4, grace as the communication of new life; 5, the Church as the society where the spirit of life works; 6. the last things as the end and issue of life.” ‘Magic,' says the fantastic old man, “is the science of the friends of God. It is of secret wisdom. But it is the sublimest magic to separate yourself from yourself by means of the cross of Jesus Christ, and to bring the multitude of your thoughts into harmony with the love of Christ.' “In antagonism to the sceptical and volatilizing tendency, he sought,” says Hagenbach, “to old firm the concrete individual, the real and the vigorous in all their picturesqueness, vividness, and sensuousness, so as to make the deeper and stronger impression upon the mind. Instead therefore of regarding scriptural descriptions of the kingdom of God and of the new birth as mere figures, and of dissolving them into abstract conceptions, as was done by the later translators of the Bible,... Oetinger regarded them as realities and facts; and while skepticism believed that it must translate the Biblical language into Western form, which could not easily happen without a diminution of the original meaning, Oetinger believed, on the other hand, that we must return to that Biblical view of things, and live in the very heart of it. His language is therefore sometimes dark, mysterious, and not comprehensible by every mind. He strives by it to represent everything in a new and original light, and in this effort he confesses that by the confusion of philosophic language it would be hard for one who is illuminated as by lightning to speak with new tongues. Men must sometimes be satisfied with only small and weak beginnings, until the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waves of the sea” (1:39, 1, 39).

Oetinger was very fruitful as a mystical author. His works amount to seventy in number, the titles of which betray his effort to combine supernatural and natural things in their higher unity; or, as he himself expresses it, “metaphysics in connection with chemistry.” Of these numerous works we notice Die unerforschlichen Wege der Herunterlassung Gottes (Leips. 1734): — A briss d. evangelischen Ordnung z. Wiedergeburt (ibid. 1735, 8vo): — Erklrung d. Psalmen nach  dem historischen Wortverstande (Esslingen, 1748, and Heilbronn, 1756, 8vo): — Inquisitio in sensum comnunem et rationern pro judicandis philosophorum theoris ad normam Scripturce Sacrce (Tiibingen, 1753, 8vo): — Dreyfache Sittenlehre nach der Natur, nach der heiligen Sclhrft, nach Jesu Christo (Heilbronn, 1753, 8vo): — Die Eulerische u. Frickische Philosophie uber die Musik-:(Neuwied, 1761): — Die Philosophie der Alten wiederkommend in der g.iidenen Zeit (Francf. 1762, 8vo): — Swedenborg's u. anderer irdisce u. hinmlische Philosophie (ibid. 1765, 8vo): — Theologia ex idea vitce deducta (ibid. 1765, 8vo; transl. into German, Stuttg. 1852, 8vo); it is the best work of the author:Beurtheilung der Lehre von dem Zustande nach dem Tode (1771, 8vo): — Liber aurece catenae Homner-i de transmutatione metallorum (1771, 8vo): — Inbegrig'der Grundweisheit aus den Schriften Jcakob Bohms (Francf. 1774, 8vo): — Gedanken von den Fdhigqkeiten zu enmpfinden u. zu er- kennen (ibid. 1775, 8vo): — Biblisches u. emnblematisches Worterbuch dem Tellerischen entgegengesetzt (Francf. 1776; Stuttg. 1849). He translated also into German and annotated the work of Swedenberg on the inhabitants of the earth, planets, and other stars (1771, 8vo). Oetinger's complete works were published at Reutlingen in 1852 sq., and his theosophical writings have been brought out at Stuttgard as follows: Simnmtl. theosophische Schrifte-u, Theologie a. d. Idee des Lebens (1865).

See Neues Gelehrtes Europa, vol. xv; Moser, Wiirtembergisches Geleh- ten-Lexikon, s.v.; Hirsching, Handb.; Meusel, Lexikon, s.v.; Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:388-39, 481 sq.; Kahnis, Hist. German Protestantism, p. 108; Selbstbiographie, published by Hamberger (Stuttg. 1845); Auberlen, Die Theosophie Fr. Ch. Oetinger's nach ihren Grundzugen (Tubing. 1848).

## Oetosynus[[@Headword:Oetosynus]]

             (Οἰτόσυρος), the name of a divinity worshipped by the ancient Scythians, and identified with Apollo by Herodotus (4:59).

## Oettinger, Edward Maria[[@Headword:Oettinger, Edward Maria]]

             a German bibliographer, was born Nov. 19, 1808, at Breslau, in Silesia, of Jewish parents. Having studied at the gymnasium of his native place, he went to Vienna, and joined the Roman Catholic Church. After 1829 he edited different periodicals at Berlin, Hamburg, Manheim, and Leipsic, and  wrote several dramas, novels, and romances. His poems, which he published under the title Buch der Liebe, were published at Leipsic in a fifth edition in 1850. Besides a historical work- Geschichte des danischen Hofs von Christian II, bis Friedrich VII (Hamburg, 1859, 8 vols.) — he published his famous bibliographical work, Bibliographie biographique, ou dictionnaire de 26,000 ouvrages, relatifs a l'histoire de la vie publique et privee des hommes celebres de tons les temps et de toutes les nations (Leips. 1850; the same in 2 vols. Paris, 1866): — Historisches Archiv, enthaltend ein systematisch - chronologisch geordnetes Verzeichniss von 17,000 der brauchbarsten Quellenzum Studium der Geschichte (Carlsruhe, 1841): — Moniteur des dates, contenant un million de renseignements biographiques, geneal. et historiques (Dresden, 1866-1868, 6 vols. 4to) — a work which, as a biographicogenealogico-historical lexicon, is not only indispensable to librarians, historians, and bibliographers, but which at its first appearance was unanimously praised as a gigantic work of German industry and scholarship. Oettinger died June 26, 1872. A supplement to his Monitelur des dates is now published by Dr. H. Schramm, the biographer of Oettinger. See Literarischer Handweiser (1872), p. 368; Kurz, Literaturgeschichte, vol. iv (see Index); Dr. K. Schutze, Deutschland's Dichter und Dichterinnen, s.v. (B. P.)

## Ofarri[[@Headword:Ofarri]]

             an indulgence-box, a sort of charm purchased from the Japanese priests by the pilgrims who go to Life.

## Offa[[@Headword:Offa]]

             an Anglo-Saxon prince, who flourished as king of MERCIA for about forty years, in the second half of the 8th century, is noted in ecclesiastical history for the dependent relation in which he placed his part of Britain to the papal see. He was a valiant soldier and ambitious ruler; and as he extended his possessions largely, his negotiations with Rome become of importance to every student of English ecclesiastical history. He compelled the king of Kent to acknowledge his authority, and at the instigation of Cynedrida, his wife, he put to death Ethelbert, king of East Anglia, and seized his states. Charlemagne called him the most powerful of the Christian kings of the West, and maintained friendly relations with him, except during a short period when traders in Offa's dominions committed depredations upon Frankish merchants. But though Offa was successful in his acquisition of temporal power, he lost much by ecclesiastical relations with Rome, upon the good-will of which he finally came to be very dependent. Anxious to establish the ecclesiastical independence of his kingdom from other British territory, he appealed to pope Adrian — the same pontiff who wrote in defense of image-worship — to send an archbishop's pall to Higbert, bishop of Lichfield, making the six other bishoprics between the Thames and Humber subject to him instead of archbishop Eanbert of Canterbury. It is no great credit to pope Adrian that he consented so easily to this project, for which there was no reason but the worldly ambition of Offa; and his honesty is somewhat impeached by it, inasmuch as Offa began a practice, which was long afterwards continued, of sending a yearly present in money, called “Peterpence,” to Rome. The Saxon law speaks of this present as “the king's alms.” It was not a tax paid to the pope, but to the king's officers; it led, however, afterwards to further encroachments of the bishop of Rome. A council of the English Church, held at Cliff's-hoe, A.D. 803, censured this royal act as surreptitious and deceitful. King Offa was also the first prince since the days of St. Augustine to receive a papal legate for the ordering of British ecclesiastical affairs. The legates came ostensibly to renew the faith and peace that had connected England with Rome ever since Augustine's mission. Their object was, however, to give  public papal countenance to Offa's ecclesiastical departures. Offa died soon after his cruel slaughter of king Ethelbert, overcome with remorse. He was succeeded by his son Egferth, who reigned only a few months. Offa is commended by the learned Alcuin as a prince of engaging manners, and studious to promote good Christian morals among his people. At the same time the prelate does not disguise that these better qualities were tarnished by deeds of avarice and cruelty; and he mentions it as a probable mark of divine vengeance that his only son Egferth, whom he had made the sharer of his throne, died a few days after his father, in the flower of his age. Among the oppressive acts of Offa towards the Church, he seems to have usurped the property of bishops and abbots in the monasteries; not suppressing the religious houses, but giving them as preferments to his friends, particularly one at March, in Cambridgeshire, and the abbey at Bath, which he made bishop Heathored of Worcester surrender to him. To establish his power the more, he enriched the abbeys of Bredon and Evesham, founded by his grandfather, with lands taken from the same bishopric or its dependent monasteries. But at a late period of his life he was led, by remorse of conscience, to found the famous abbey of St. Alban's, which he endowed with large estates in Hertfordshire, and which became one of the most splendid of the old Benedictine houses in early Norman times. Offa compiled laws which are mostly included in the Anglo- Saxon code of Alfred the Great. See Churton, Early Engl. Ch. ch. x; Soames, Anglo-Saxon Ch. (Lond. 1856, 12mo), p. 101104; ejusd. Latin Ch. during Anglo-Saxon Times (ibid. 1848, 8vo), p. 146 sq.; Inett. Origines Anglicanoe (see Index in pt. ii of vol. ii).

## Offa Of Essex[[@Headword:Offa Of Essex]]

             a pious and valiant Saxon prince, deserves a place here for his great devotion to Christianity. He flourished near the opening of the 8th century. He was a youth of great personal beauty, says Bede, and his pleasing manners made him most acceptable to the people, who looked forward with hopes to the time when he should be called to govern them. He was also honorably affianced to a princess of Mercia; but he left all the wealth and power and pleasure that courted him for Christ's sake and the Gospel's:

“He gave his honors to the world again,

His better part to heaven.”

We must confess, though a mistaken sense of duty ruled his choice, that it was no common power of religion which could take him at such an early age from all the advantages of birth and state, to live in a foreign land, in unknown society and an obscure position, and to give himself up to a life of prayer and fasting and almsgiving.

## Offence[[@Headword:Offence]]

             may be either active or passive. We may give offense by our conduct, or we may receive of peace from the conduct of others. The original word (σκανδαλίζω), in our version usually rendered “offend,” literally signifies to cause to stumble, and by an easy metaphor, to occasion afall into sin (Mat 5:29). It may, therefore, apply to ourselves as well as to others (Mat 18:6-14). Hence the noun σκάνδαλον signifies not only “an offense,” in our common use of that word, but also a stumbling- stone, a trap, a snare, or whatever impedes our path to heaven (Mat 18:17; Rom 14:13; 1Co 10:32). Sometimes offense is taken unreasonably; men, as Peter says, “stumble at the word, being disobedient.” Hence we read of “the offense of the cross” (Gal 5:11; Gal 6:12). To positive truth or duty we must adhere, even  at the hazard of giving' offense; but a woe is on us if we give it unnecessarily (Rom 14:13-21; 1Co 8:9-13). We should be very careful to avoid giving just cause of offense, lest we prove impediments to others in their reception of the truth, in their progress in sanctification, in their peace of mind, or in their general bourse towards heaven. We should abridge or deny ourselves in some things, rather than, by exercising our liberty to the utmost, give uneasiness to Christians weaker in mind or weaker in the faith than ourselves (1Co 10:32). On the other hand, we should not take offense without ample cause, but endeavor by our exercise of charity, and perhaps by our increase of knowledge, to think favorably of what is dubious, as well as honorably of what is laudable.

It was foretold of the Messiah that he should be “a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense” (Isa 8:14; Rom 9:32-33; 1Pe 2:8). Perhaps predictions of this kind are among the most valuable which Providence has preserved to us, as we see by them that we ought not to be discouraged because the Jews, the natural people of the Messiah, rejected him, and still reject him; since the very offense they take at his humiliation, death, etc., is in perfect conformity to and fulfillment of those prophecies which foretold that, however they might profess to wish for the great Deliverer, yet when he came they would overlook him, and stumble at him.

## Offence, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Offence, Ecclesiastical]]

             SEE PENANCE; SEE POLITY; SEE RECONCILIATION; SEE TRIAL.

## Offenhausen, Salomon Zebi[[@Headword:Offenhausen, Salomon Zebi]]

             a polemic who lived about the beginning of the 16th century. We know nothing of him beyond the fact that he wrote an apologetical work against the Jewish convert S. Fr. Brenz, and his work, Judischer abgestreifter Schlangenbalg (Nuremberg, 1614), entitled. צְרַי הִיְהוּדַים(Hanover, 1615), written in Judaeo-German and in rabbinical letters, which was translated into Latin by Jo. Wulfer, under the title Theriaca ad examen revocata (Nuremberg, 1681), of which some excerpts are found in Eisenmenger's Neuentdecktes Judenthum, 1:134 sq. See Finrst, Bibl. Jud. 3:46; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:358; 3:245; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 213; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, 4:2194 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 250 sq. (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); by the same author, Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana. p.  126 (Parma. 1800); Eisenmenger, Neuentdecktes Judenthum, vol. i (index of the Germano-Hebrew books referred to in his work); Fabricius, Delectus argumentorum et syllabus Scriptorum, etc. (Hamburg, 1725, p. 588 sq.). (B.P.)

## Offering[[@Headword:Offering]]

             (the general name for which in Hebrew is קָרְבָן, korban', although several other words are so rendered) is anything presented to God as a means of conciliating his favor; which being in the Jewish, as well as in all other religions, considered as the one thing needful, has always constituted an essential part of public worship and private piety. In the treatment of this topic we bring together. the ancient information with whatever light modern research has thrown upon it.

Offerings have been divided into three kinds: 1. Impletratoria, denoting those which are designed to procure some favor or benefit; 2. Eucharistica, those which are expressive of gratitude for bounties or mercies received; 3. Piacularia, those which are meant to. atone for sins and propitiate the Deity. Porphyry also gives three reasons for making offerings to the gods (Abstinentia, 2:24) — in order to do them honor, to acknowledge a favor, or to procure a supply for human needs. Among the Hebrews we find a complex and multiform system of offerings extending through the entire circle of divine worship, and prescribing the minutest details. A leading distinction separates their offerings into unbloody (מַנְחָה, minchah, προσφορά, δῶρον) and bloody (זֶבח, zebach, θυσία). Used in its widest sense, the term offering, or oblation, indicates in the Hebrew ritual a very great number of things — as the firstlings of the flock, first-fruits, tithes, incense, the shewbread, the wood for burning in the Temple (Neh 10:34).

The objects offered were salt, meal, baked and roasted grain, olive-oil, clean animals, such as oxen, goats, doves, but not fish. The animals were required to be spotless (Lev 22:20; Mal 1:8), and, with the exception of the doves, not under eight days old (Lev 22:27), younger animals being tasteless and innutritious. The smaller beasts, such as sheep, goats, and calves, were commonly one year old (Exo 29:38; Lev 9:3; Lev 12:6; Lev 14:10; Num 15:27; Num 28:9 sq.). Oxen were offered at three years of age; in Judges (Jdg 6:25) one is offered which is seven years old. As to sex, an option was sometimes left to the offerer, especially in peace and sin offerings (Lev 3:1; Lev 3:6; Lev 12:5-6); at other times males were required,  as in burnt sacrifices, for, contrary to classical usage, the male was considered the more perfect. In burnt-offerings and in thank-offerings the kind of animal was left to the choice of the worshipper (Lev 1:3), but in trespass and sin offerings it was regulated by law (Lev 4:5). If the desire of the worshipper was to express his gratitude, he offered a peace or thank offering; if to obtain forgiveness, he offered a trespass or sin offering. Burnt-offerings were of a general kind (Num 15:3; Deu 12:6; Jer 17:26). Hecatombs or large numbers of cattle were sacrificed on special occasions. In 1Ki 8:5; 1Ki 8:63, Solomon is said to have “sacrificed sheep and oxen that could not be told or numbered for multitude,” “two and twenty thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep” (see also 2Ch 29:32 sq.; 2Ch 30:24; 2Ch 35:7 sq.; comp. Herod. 7:43; Xenoph. Hellen. 6:4; Sueton. Calig. 14). Offerings were also either public or private, prescribed or free-will. Sometimes they were presented by an individual, sometimes by a family; once, or at regular and periodic intervals (1Sa 1:24; Job 1:5 2Ma 3:32). Foreigners were permitted to make offerings on the national altar (Num 15:14; 2Ma 3:35; 2Ma 13:23; Philo, Legat. p. 1014: Joseph. Apion, 2:5). Offerings were made by Jews fir heathen princes (1Ma 7:33; Joseph. Ant. 12:2, 5). In the case of bloody- offerings, the possessor, after he had sanctified himself (1Sa 16:5), brought the victim, in case of.thank-offerings, with its horns gilded and with garlands, etc. (Joseph. Ant. 13:8, 2), to the altar (Lev 3:1; Lev 12:4; Lev 14:17), where, laying his hand on the head of the animal (Lev 1:4; Lev 3:2; Lev 4:4), he thus, in a clear and pointed way, devoted it to God. Having so done, he proceeded to slay the victim himself (Lev 3:2; Lev 4:4); which act might be, and in later times was done by the priests (2Ch 29:24), and probably by the Levites. (Hottinger, De Functionibus Sacerdot. circa iictinmam, Marb. 1706). The blood was taken, and, according to the kind of offering, sprinkled upon the altar, or brought into the Temple and there shed upon the ark of the covenant and smeared upon the horns of the altar of incense, and then the remainder poured forth at the foot of the altar of burnt-offerings. Having slain the animal, the offerer struck off its head (Lev 1:6), which, when not burned (Lev 4:11), belonged either to the priest (Lev 7:8) or to the offerer (comp. Mishna, Zebach, 12:2). The victim was then cut into pieces (Lev 1:6; Lev 8:20), which were either all, or only the best and most tasty, set on fire on the altar by the priests or the offerer, or must be burned without the precincts of the holy city. The  treatment of doves may be seen in Lev 1:14 sq.; v. 8 (see Hottinger, De Sacrificiis Avium, Marb. 1706). In some sacrifices heaving (תרומה) and waving (תבוכה) were usual either before or after the slaying.

The annual expense of offerings, including those made by individuals as well as the nation, must have been considerable. It may, however, be said that the country produced on all sides in great abundance most of the required' objects, and that there were numerous forests whence. wood for use in sacrifice was procured. At later periods of the nation foreign princes, desirous of conciliating the good-will of the Jews, made large contributions both of natural objects and of money towards the support of the ceremonial of public worship (Ezr 6:9; 1Ma 10:39, 2Ma 3:3; 2Ma 9:16; Joseph. Ant. 12:3, 3). The place where offerings were exclusively to be presented was the outer court of the national sanctuary, at first the Tabernacle, afterwards the Temple. Every offering made elsewhere was forbidden under penalty of death (Lev 17:4 sq.; Deu 12:5 sq.; comp. 1Ki 12:27). The precise spot is laid down in Lev 1:3; Lev 3:2, “At the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord.” According to the Mishna (Zebach, ch. 5), offerings were to be slain partly on the north side of the altar, and, if they were inconsiderable, at any part of the outer court. The object of these regulations was to prevent any secret idolatrous rites from taking place under the mask of the national ritual; and a common place of worship must have tended considerably to preserve the unity of the people, whose constant disagreements required precautions of a special kind (1Ki 12:27). The oneness, however, of the place of sacrifice was not strictly preserved in the troubled period of the Judges, nor indeed till the time of David (1Ki 3:2-3). Offerings were made in other places besides the door of the Tabernacle (1Sa 7:17; Jdg 2:5). High places, which had long been used by the Canaanites, retained a certain sanctity, and were honored with offerings (Jdg 6:26; Jdg 13:19). Even the loyal Samuel followed this practice (1 Samuel), and David tolerated it (1Ki 3:2). After Solomon these offerings on high places still continued. In the kingdom of Israel, cut off as its subjects were from the holy city, the national temple was neglected.

Offerings being regarded as an expression of gratitude and piety, and required as a necessary part of ordinary private life, were diligently and abundantly presented, failure in this point being held as a sign of irreligion  (Psa 66:15; Psa 110:3; Jer 38:11; Mat 8:4; Act 21:26; Isa 43:23). Offerings were sworn by, as being something in themselves holy, from the purpose to which they were consecrated (Mat 23:18). In the glowing pictures of religious happiness and national prosperity which the poets drew, there is found an ideal perfection of this essential element of Israelitish worship (Isa 19:21; Isa 56:7; Isa 60:7; Zec 14:21; Jer 17:26; Jer 33:18); and deprivation of this privilege was among the calamities of the period of exile (Hos 3:4).

Under the load and the multiplicity of these outward oblations, however, the Hebrews forgot the substance, lost the thought in the symbol, the thing signified in the sign; and, failing in those devotional sentiments and that practical obedience which offerings were intended to prefigure and cultivate, sank into the practice of mere dead works. Thereupon the prophets began to utter their admonitory lessons, to which the world is indebted for so many graphic descriptions of the real nature of religion and the only true worship of Almighty God (Isa 1:11; Jer 6:20; Jer 7:21 sq.; Hos 6:6; Amo 5:22; Mic 6:6 sq.; comp. Psa 40:6; Psa 51:17 sq.; Pro 21:3). Thus the failures of one Church prepared the way for the higher privileges of another, and the law proved a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ (Mat 5:23; Gal 3:24). Even before the advent of our Lord pious and reflecting men, like the Essenes, discovered the lamentable abuses of the national ritual, and were led to abstain altogether from the customary forms of a mere outward worship (Joseph. Ant. 18:1, 5).

The 50th Psalm must have had great influence in preparing the minds of thinking men for a pure and spiritual form of worship, the rather because some of its principles strike at the very root of all offerings of a mere outward kind: thus, “I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds; for every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. If I were hungry I would not tell thee; for the world is mine, and the fullness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God thanksgiving.” Indeed, the conception and composition of such a noble piece show what great progress the best-cultivated minds had made from the rudimental notions of primitive times; and may serve of themselves to prove that with all the abuses which had ensued, the Mosaic ritual and institutions were admirably fitted to carry forward the education of the mind of the people. Thus was the Hebrew nation, and through them the world, led on so as to be in some measure prepared for receiving the Gospel of the Lord Jesus, in which all  outward offerings are done away, the one great offering being made, and all those who are members of the Church are required, to offer themselves, body, soul, and spirit, a holy offering to the Lord (Hebrews 10; Romans 12). “By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit' of our lips, giving thanks to his name. But to do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased” (Heb 13:15-16; Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7; Rom 15:16; Php 2:17; 2Ti 4:6). SEE MOSAISM.

Lightfoot's work, De Ministerio Templi, is especially to be recommended on this subject. See also — Outram, De Sacrif.; Reland, Ant. Sacr. 3:1; Bauer,-Gottesdiensil. Verjass. 1:80 sq.; Rosenmüller, Excurs. I ad Leviticus The Jewish doctrines on offerings may be found in the treatises Zebachim, Menachoth, and Temura, a selection from which, as well as from the Rabbins, is given in that useful little works Othon. Lex. Talnud. p. 621 sq.; see Ugolin. Thesaur. tom. 19. For a general view of the subject, SEE SACRIFICE; and for its different kinds, SEE BURNT-OFFERING; SEE CONSECRATION-OFFERING; SEE DAILY-OFFERING; SEE DRINK-OFFERING; SEE HEAVE-OFFERING; SEE JEALOUSY- OFFERING; SEE MEAT-OFFERING; SEE OBLATION; SEE PROPITIATORY-OFFERING; SEE PURIFICATION-OFFERING; SEE SIN-OFFERING; SEE WAVE-OFFERING.

OFFERING denotes whatever is sacrificed or consumed in the worship of God. In the Christian community there appears to have existed, from the earliest times, a practice of making voluntary offerings for purposes not directly connected with public worship. SEE OBLATION; SEE OFFERTORY.

## Offering-days[[@Headword:Offering-days]]

             namely, Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and the feast for the dedication of the Church, or, as Beleth says, All-saints', when the alms were allotted for the priests' stipend and the purchase of the paschal. By Henry VIII.'s injunction, 1538, the four general offering-days were changed to Christmas, Easter, Nativity of John the Baptist, and Michaelmas, when money-offerings at the altar were given for the support of the clergy. In the last century, the king, attended by the Knights of the Garter and heralds in their tabards, offered, at Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and All-Saints', a  bezant in his private chapel; on six other days gold; and on Circumcision and Epiphany gold, frankincense, and myrrh, in three purses.

## Offerings[[@Headword:Offerings]]

             SEE OFFERING.

I. Waving before Jehovah ( הֵנַי לַפְנֵי יְהוֹהor תְּנוּפָה) occurs as a special ceremony by the priests in the Jewish ritual not only in connection with meat-offerings (Exo 29:24 [Lev 8:27]; Num 5:25), in the case of the first-fruits and the first-born (Lev 23:11 sq.), but also of bloody offerings, whether (especially in thank- offerings) of single pieces only, as the breast or right shoulder or fore-leg (Exo 29:26 sq.; Lev 7:30; Lev 7:34; Lev 9:21; Lev 10:14; Num 6:20), or of the whole animal (a lamb, Lev 19:12; Lev 19:24; Lev 23:23),  which was waved before Jehovah in token of presentation; and this principle extended even to the persons of the Levites as an initiatory rite to their office (Num 8:11; Num 8:15). The waving in case of meat-offerings or pieces of animals was performed upon (with) the hands (Exo 29:24; Lev 8:27; according to the rabbins, it was held upon the hands of the offerers, beneath which were placed those of the priest [Tosi4phta, Menach. 7:17], so as to fiulfil the requirement of Exo 29:24; Num 6:19-20; while whole animals were waved by the hands of the priest alone [Mishna, Menach. 5:6]); each having previously been laid upon the altar; in the case of whole animals this was done before slaughtering them (Lev 14:12; Leviticus cf., 24 sq.). It consisted, according to the rabbins (Mishna, Meienach. 5:6), like the porricere of the Romans (Macrob. Sat. 3:2), also the obmovere or commovere (Cato, Res Rust. 134) in certain respects (Zorn, Biblioth. Antiq. 1:74), of a forward and backward motion upward of the articles; while living objects were simply moved to and fro. Whether the motion was ever to the right and left is uncertain, although the import of the word הֵנַי(see Isa 30:28; Deuteronomy 20:25) would justify such an opinion, which, moreover, would be highly significant. The act, at all events, indicates a festive surrender to Jehovah as a personal service like the peace-offering; beyond this all is speculation (Bahr, Symbol. 2:376 sq.; see Reland, Antiq. Sacr. page 276). See WAVE- OFFERING.

II. Heaving ( הֵרַיםor תְּרוּמָה) is associated with the tossing (Exo 29:27), as the heave-shoulder (הִתְּרוּמָה שׁוֹק) occurs almor, with the wave-breast (Exo 29:27; Lev 7:30; Lev 7:32; Lev 7:34), and what is called (Exo 38:24) wave-gold is also called heave-gold (Num 31:52). Indeed, the Jews scarcely distinguish between the two ( תְּרוּמֶהand תְּנוּפָה) as ritualistic acts, but explain each as an upward and downward motion (Mishna, Menach. 5:6), a sort of elevatio. Both would thus stand as generally expressive of supreme consecration to God as the universal Owner and Giver (see Gesenius, Thesaur. page 866; Bahr, Symbolik, 2:355 sq.; 377). Some moderns incorrectly regard the two acts as identical (Jahn, Archaol. 3:38), or take "heaving" (הֵרַים) in the vague sense of offerre or auferre (like Gesenius, Thesaur. page 1277), and connect הוּרִם, Exo 29:27, with מֵאֵיל הִמַּלּאַים, contrary to the accents and the parallelism; but see Kurtz, Mos. Opfer, page 146 sq. SEE HEAVE-OFFERING.

## Offertorium[[@Headword:Offertorium]]

             SEE OFFERTORY.

## Offertory[[@Headword:Offertory]]

             (Lat. offertorium, from offero, I offer) is the name given to that portion of the Romish Liturgy with which the eucharistic service, strictly so called, commences. In the Roman Liturgy it consists of one or two verses from some book of Scripture, generally from the Old Testament, but sometimes from the Epistles. In the Ambrosian Liturgy it consists of a prayer, similar in form to the collect or secret of the mass; and in both this recital is followed by the preparatory offering up of the bread and wine, accompanied by certain ceremonies and forms of prayer.

This offering of the bread and wine in the public service became, from a very early period of the Christian Church, the occasion of a voluntary offering on the part of the faithful; originally, it would seem, of the bread and wine designed for the eucharistic celebration and for the communion of the priest and the congregation, sometimes even including the absent members, and also for the agape, or common sacred feast, which accompanied it. That portion of the offerings which remained in excess of what was requisite for these purposes was applied to the relief of the poor and to the support of the clergy. These offerings were ordinarily made by the faithful in person, and were laid upon the altar; and the Ambrosian rite still preserves this usage in a ceremonial which may be witnessed in the cathedral of Milan. By degrees, other gifts were superadded to those of bread and wine — as of corn, oil, wax, honey, eggs, butter, fruits, lambs, fowl, and other animals; and eventually of equivalents in money or other objects of value. The last-named class of offerings, however, was not so commonly made upon the altar and during the public liturgy as in the form of free gifts presented on the occasion of other ministerial services, as of baptism, marriages, funerals, etc.; and from this has arisen the practice in the Roman Catholic Church of the mass-offering, or honorarium, which is given to a priest with the understanding that he shall offer the mass for the intention (whence the honorarium itself is often called an “intention”) of  the offerent. In some places, however, and among them in some parts of Ireland, offerings “in kind” are still in use, not indeed in the form of the ancient offertory, but in the shape of contributions of corn, hay, etc., at stated seasons, for the use of the parochial clergy. At weddings also, and in some places at funerals, offerings in money are made by the relations and friends of the newly married or of the deceased (Chambers).

The offertory in the mass

(1) commences with the Dominus vobiscum, after the Creed. ending with the Preface. It contains the oblation of the bread and wine by the celebrant, the censing of the oblation, altar, and attendants, the washing of the fingers, the subsequent prayers, the invitation to pray, and the secret prayer. Originally it was usual for the faithful to bring to church the provisions which they contributed to the support of the clergy, and the necessaries for the holy communion and church use. The offering was made at this time. The deacon selected what was required for the altar, and the residue was taken to the bishop's house for distribution to the clergy at his discretion. The candles given at ordinations and the bread and wine at the consecration of a bishop are remnants of the ancient practice. Walifrid Strabo says that it was lawful to offer new wheat-ears, grapes, oil for lamps, and incense at the time of celebration. The name is also given

(2) to the anthem sung after the Gospel or Creed, during which the people formerly offered their alms and oblations. Such was the custom in Africa (c. 400) in St. Augustine's time. Hugo de St. Victor and Honorius of Autin attribute the introduction and arrangement of the offertories to pope Gregory the Great, but it has. also been referred to Eutychius, c. 180; Celestine I, c. 430; or Adrian I. Singing is used in allusion to Sir 1:12-18. Pope Gregory caused oblations to be made as God had directed by Moses (Exo 23:15). In the first four centuries the offering was made in silence. When a bishop celebrates he goes to the altar after the offertory, and, taking off his gloves, makes the ablution of his fingers. It is, besides, customary to give the name offertory to

(3) a silk napkin in which the deacon wraps the chalice when offered to him by the priest. The subdeacon now has a large scarf placed upon his shoulders, and takes the chalice, over which an attendant spreads the end of the scarf. He then carries the offerings to the deacon, presents the water-cruet, and receives the paten from the celebrant, which he holds  enveloped in his scarf, standing behind him since the custom of consecrating upon the corporal was introduced.

The word “offertorium” is sometimes used (as in the Sarum Missal) for the anthems sung during the collecting and making of these offerings? and sometimes, improperly, for the offerings themselves. Thus Freeman (Principles of Divine Service, ii 345, note g) writes, “The offertory, it need hardly be said-whether we mean thereby the words used or the contributions of the people is but a department of the oblation.” Boner, on the other hand (Rerum Liturg. II, 8:3), shows from Amalarius and others that the offertory was the whole portion of the service, from the end of the creed to the end of the Oratio Secreta, thus making it include the oblation. But the extent of the offertory in one particular liturgy is not a definition; and an, explanation is perhaps given by Tertullian's words, “Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus?” (De exhort. Castit. p. 668).

In the English liturgy the word “oblations” is reserved for the offering of that which is designed for the eucharistic service, and the more general term “offerings” includes both the alms and oblations, as in the definition given above. The practice of a weekly offertory-collection is now revived in some churches in England (for in Ireland it has always been so), and it is the opinion of many that it is highly desirable it should become universal. Others who are not insensible to some of the advantages which would attend such a practice, yet deem it wrong to make collections for all charitable objects indiscriminately through the medium of the offertory, which (they consider) was originally designed for purposes immediately connected with the parish or congregation from which the alms are collected. They think also that this, with all other practices that have fallen into general disuse, however apparently expedient the readoption of them may seem, should not be revived without a recommendation to that effect from the diocesan; certainly not without a careful consideration of the local effect which is likely to be produced by a return to such practice.

The custom of making oblations at the communion is certainly apostolical, as appears from 1Co 16:2 : “On the first day of the week let every one lay by him in store as God hath prospered him.” This custom continued down to the following ages, as appears from different passages in Justin Martyr, Tertullian. St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, and other ancient writers. See Coleman, Ancient Christianity, p. 93, 244; Walcott, Sacred  Archceol s.v.; Hook, Ch. Dict. s.v.; Siegel, Christl. Alterhumer, s.v. Offertorium; Barnum, Romanism, p. 432; Palmer, Orig. Lit. 2:73 sq.

## Office[[@Headword:Office]]

             is a term for an administration without precedence in choir or chapter. The financial provost and procurator; the precentor, chancellor, and treasurer of Beverly; monks elected by the prior and seniors, and confirmed in authority by the bishop in a conventual cathedral, were called officers, the term designating now the vice-dean, treasurer, and receiver-general of the new foundations.

## Office of the Church[[@Headword:Office of the Church]]

             It is the opinion of some persons that God designed his Church to be an authoritative expositor of the sense of Scripture; that while the precedence, indeed, is to be given to Scripture, in point of dignity, as the foundation on which human interpretations are to be built, the superstructure reared by the Church is to be regarded as no less firm than the foundation on which it is fairly built; that supposing any of us fully to believe the truth of a given exposition, it answers to us the purpose of Scripture, since we must fully believe that. Others, on the contrary, conceive that it is not the will of God that any human statement of doctrines should be employed as the standard to be habitually appealed to; for if it had been his design that there should be any such regular system of doctrine for habitual reference, -from which there should be in ordinary practice no appeal, they consider that he would surely have enjoined, or at least permitted, the framing of some such confession of faith or catechism by his inspired servants themselves, since such a system would fully have answered the purpose in question, with the great additional advantage that it must have commanded the assent of all who acknowledge the Christian Scriptures. No Church, therefore (they consider), is empowered to do that which God, for wise reasons, evidently designed should not be done. They maintain that a Church is authorized to prescribe terms of communion to its own members, but not terms of salvation. They assert that God has left to the Church the office of preserving the Scriptures and introducing them to the knowledge of her members as the sole standard of faith, as not merely the first step and foundation of proof, like the elementary propositions of mathematics, but as the only source of proof; and that he has left her also the office of teaching the Christian doctrines from the Scriptures: that a Church is  authorized (1) to set forth for this purpose catechisms, homilies — in short, whatever may be needful for systematic elementary teaching; that it is authorized, again (2), to draw up creeds as a test or symbol to preserve uniformity of faith in her members; and that it is also authorized (3) to frame offices for public worship and administration of the sacraments. But all these human compositions (they maintain) must be kept to their own proper uses; and that, however wisely framed they may be-however confident, and justly confident, we may feel of their truth and scriptural character-we must never put them in the place of Scripture, by making them the standard of habitual appeal; that works of Christian instruction should be employed for instruction; works of devotion for devotion; symbolical works, such as creeds and articles, for their proper purpose of furnishing a test for any person's fitness to be acknowledged a member or a minister of our Church, but that never, if we would in deed and in spirit avoid the errors of Romanism, never should we appeal to creeds, liturgy, or catechisms for the proof of any doctrine or the refutation of any error: never must we admit as decisive such a syllogism as this: The doctrines of our Church are scriptural; this is a doctrine of the Church; therefore it is a scriptural doctrine: this must never be admitted without immediately proceeding to the proof of the first premise. SEE CHURCH.

## Office, (The) Divine[[@Headword:Office, (The) Divine]]

             (Lat. officium divinum), is the name popularly given since the 9th century to the collection of services enjoined for the canonical hours (q.v.). It is called by St. Basil and the Greek Church the Canon; by SS. Jerome and Benedict God's Work; the Cursus or Course in the Roman rites; the Collecta by St. Pachomius; Synaxis by Cassian; and Missa, in 506, by the Council of Agde. These services are prescribed to be read each day by bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons in the Roman Catholic Church. Under the head BREVIARY SEE BREVIARY may be found a general description of the contents and the arrangement of that great service-book. The special portions assigned for any particular day constitute what is called the divine office for that day; and each person who is bound in virtue of his order to recite the Breviary is obliged, under pain of sin, to read, not merely with the eye, but with distinct, although it may be silent, articulation. each and all these portions. The adjustment of the portions of the office of each day, the combination of the “ordinary” portions which are read every day in common with; the parts “proper” for each particular day, is a matter of considerable difficulty, and is regulated by a complicated  system of rubrics (q.v.). Treatises De Divinis Officinis (on divine offices) appeared in the Middle Ages from the pens of some able writers of those times, particularly Amalarius, John Scotus, Walifrid Strabo, and others. The term “Divine Office” is also applied to the Introit (q.v.) and Vespers (q.v.). (J.H.W.)

## Office, Holy, Congregation Of The[[@Headword:Office, Holy, Congregation Of The]]

             In the article INQUISITION SEE INQUISITION (q.v.) it has been explained that that tribunal is sometimes called by the name Holy Office This title, however, properly belongs to the “Congregation” at Rome, to which the direction of the Roman tribunal of the Inquisition is subject. This Congregation was established by Paul III in 1542, and its organization was completed by Sixtus V. It consists of twelve cardinals, a commissary a number of “theologians” and canonists who are styled “consulters,” and of another class of officials styled “qualifiers,” whose duty it is to report on each case for the information of the cardinals. In the most solemn sessions of the Holy Office the pope himself presides in person. The action of the Holy Office, in addition to the questions of heresy and crimes against faith, also extends to ecclesiastical offenses, especially in ‘connection with the administration of the sacraments.

## Office, Ministerial[[@Headword:Office, Ministerial]]

             i.e. of the Christian Ministry. The ministers whom Christ and his apostles, and their successors, appointed, are completely distinct from priests, such as those of the Jews and of the pagans, in office, as well as in name. Among the former it was not so much the family of Aaron as the whole tribe of Levi that seems to have been set apart for the purpose of teaching the law; and, indeed, even persons of any tribe might teach publicly in the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, whereas an intrusion into the priest's office would have been vehemently resented. As for pagan priests, their business was rather to conceal than to explain the mysteries of their religion; to keep the people in darkness, rather than to enlighten them. Of the office of Christian ministers, on the contrary, one principal part is that it belongs to them' (not exclusively indeed, but principally and especially) to give religious instruction and admonition; while another, and that a peculiar and exclusive office, is to administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. But this administration does not at all assimilate the Christian priesthood to the pagan or Jewish; the former of those rites being an  admission into the visible Church, and therefore very suitably received at the hands of those whose especial business it is to instruct and. examine candidates for baptism; while the latter is not, as the Romanists pretend, a fresh sacrifice, but manifestly in celebration of the one already made, and dependent for its efficacy on the personal holiness of the communicant, not of the minister; he, so far from offering any sacrifice himself, refers them to the sacrifice already made by another, the rite of the Lord's Supper seeming plainly to have been ordained for the express purpose (among others) of fixing our minds on the great and single oblation of himself, made by the only high-priest once for all-that great high-priest who has no earthly successor. SEE FUNCTIONARIES; SEE MINISTRY; SEE PRIESTHOOD.

## Officer[[@Headword:Officer]]

             Most, if not all, of the Hebrew and Greek words so rendered in the A. V. are either of an indefinite character, or are synonymous terms for functionaries known under other and more specific names. They are the following:

1. סָרַיס, saris (Gen 37:36; Gen 39:1; Gen 40:2). The word usually designates a eunuch; and probably it ought always to be so understood. It is no valid objection to this that Potiphar had a wife, for eunuchs are not all strangers to the sexual passion, and sometimes live in matrimony (Sir 20:4; Mishna, Jebamoth, 8:4; Juvenal, Sat. 1:22; Terence, Eun. 4:3, 23; Chardin, Voyages, 3:397). SEE EUNUCH.

2. שֹׁטֵר, shoter, part. of שָׁטִר, to cut, to grave, properly a writer (Sept. γραμματεύς), and, from the use of writing in judicial administration, a magistrate or praecet. It is used of the officers who were set over the Israelites in Egypt (Exodus v. 6-19); of the officers who were appointed along with the elders to administer the public affairs of the Israelites (Num 11:16; Deu 20:5; Deu 20:8-9; Deu 29:10; Deu 31:28; Jos 1:10; Jos 3:2; Jos 8:33, etc.); of magistrates in the cities and towns of Palestine (Deu 16:18; Sept. γραμματοεισαγωγεῖς; 1Ch 23:4; 1Ch 26:29; 2Ch 19:11; Pro 6:7 [A. V. “overseer”], etc.); and apparently also of a military chief (2Ch 26:11 [A. V. “ruler”]). See below.

3. נַצָּב, nitstsab, part. Niph. of נָצִב, to set orplace,a praefect or director (1Ki 4:5; 1Ki 4:7; 5:30 [A.V. 1Ki 5:16]; 1Ki 9:23, etc.); and נְצַיב, netsib (1Ki 4:7; 1Ki 4:19). SEE GOVERNOR.

4. רִב, rab (Est 1:8; Dan 1:3 [A. V. “master”]); Sept. οἰκόνομος. SEE RAB.

5. פָּקַיד, pakid, from פָּקִד, to visit, Hiph. to set over, an overseer or magistrate (Gen 41:34, Sept. τοπάρχης; Jdg 9:28, Sept. ἐπίσκοπος; Est 2:3, Sept. κωμάρχης; 2Ch 24:11, Sept. προστάτης); and פְּקֻדָּה, pekuddah, properly office, but used collectively for a body of officers (Isa 60:17, Sept. ἄρχοντας; also 2Ch 24:11 [A. V. “office”], Sept. προστάτας).

6. עֹשֵׂי הִמְּלָאכָה, “those who did the business,” marg. A.V., Sept. γραμματεῖς (Est 9:3). SEE MONARCHY, HEBREW.

In the N.T. the words translated “officer” are both employed of legal functionaries. They are: 1. ὑπηρέτης, a word of general significance, denoting one who renders service of any kind; it is used, with this rendering, of a functionary whose duty it was to apprehend offenders, or to exact legal penalties from those who had incurred them (Mat 5:25 [for which Luke uses πράκτωρ, 12:58]; Joh 7:32; Joh 7:46; Joh 18:3; Joh 18:12; Act 5:22); a messenger or bailiff; like the Roman viator or lictor. Josephus uses the word ὑπηρέτης of an officer two of whom, being Levites, were attached to each magistrate (Ant. 4:8, 14); but it is probable that these were rather clerks or assessors of the court than servants of the class above described. The Mishna also mentions the crier and other officials, but whether these answered to the officers of Josephus and the N.T. cannot be determined. Selden, from Maimonides, mentions the high estimation in which such officials were held (Sanhedr. 4:4; 6:1; Selden, De Synedr. 2:13, 11). 2. The πράκτωρ was properly the exactor of the penalty assigned by the judge, and so the word is correctly used by Luke (Luk 12:58). There were at Athens officers bearing this name, whose business it was to register and collect fines imposed by courts of justice; and “deliver to the officer” means, give in the name of the debtor to the officer of the court (Demosthenes [or Dinarchus] c. Theocr. p. 1218, Reiske; Smith, Dict. of Antiq. “Practores,” “Hyperetes;” Jul. Poll. 8:114;  Demosth. c. Arist. p. 778; AEsch. c. Timarch. p. 5; Grotius, on Luk 12:58). SEE PUNISHMENT.

The most usual and specific of the above Hebrew words is shoterim' (שֹׁטְרַים), which is best explained as the participle of an old verb, shatar' (שָׁטִר), that still appears in the Arabic, meaning to engrave, to mark upon anything; hence to write, and from the common use of scribes in the East, and especially in Egypt (see Wilkinson, Anc.' Egypt. 2:176 sq., Harper's ed.), in all matters of agency, superintendence, and public business, the word naturally passes into the more general meaning of agent or officer (comp. Hengstenberg, Pentat. 1:449 sq.). In English, and other Western languages, words of kindred signification originally have acquired the same latitude of meaning. SEE CLERK; SEE WRITING. These scribes or officers first appear in Egypt as Hebrews appointed to supervise the task of their brethren, and made responsible for its full completion (Exo 5:6; Exo 5:14-15; Exo 5:19). Those only were adapted to this task who, by their skill in writing, were competent to keep lists and tables of persons and their work. Their duties are well illustrated by many groups on the extant Egyptian monuments, in which the scribe is seen registering the workmen engaged in various employments (see Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2:282 sq.). The elders of the people, while in the wilderness, were appointed officers (Num 11:16; Deu 29:10; Deu 31:28), and at the exode each tribe had its own “officers” (Deu 1:15; comp. 20:5), who, under Joshua, were the medium of communication between the commander-in-chief and their respective tribes (Jos 1:10; Jos 3:2), and at different times several classes of functionaries are enumerated, the officers (שֹׁטְרַים) being generally the last mentioned (Jos 8:33; Jos 23:2; Jos 24:1). The law indeed had already ordained (Deu 16:18) that on the settlement in the promised land “officers and judges” should be appointed in every city; and David seems to have appointed them from among the Levites (1Ch 23:4; 1Ch 26:29; comp. 2Ch 19:11). Other “officers” are mentioned under David (1Ch 27:1) as engaged in the services of the court, perhaps a kind of chamberlains; but in connection with the army (2Ch 26:11) not only scribes ( סֹפְרַים SEE SCRIBE ), but also rulers or officers (שֹׁטְרַים) were employed. None of these, however, are mentioned in the books of Kings. It is clear that although in these passages the Hebrew term shoterim' in no case refers to mere subordinates engaged in menial duties, as lictors, beadles, etc. (the view of  Fuller, Misc. Sacr. 3:19; Selden, De Synedr. 1:15), yet officers of various kinds are denoted by it, especially those whose duties required the keeping of registers and tables. It answers well, accordingly, to the Greek term for a scribe, γραμματεύς, and to the English word clerk (comp. Wachsmuth, Hellen. Alterthumnsk. 1:829 sq.). It cannot, however, be proved that these officers among the Hebrews had the peculiar charge of the genealogical tables (as Michaelis, Mos. R. p. 281; Jahn, Archaeol. II, 1:62; Hengstenberg, ut sup.), although this duty accords well with the proper meaning of the term. Scribes must, of course, have enrolled the army; but it remains uncertain whether these enlisting officers were permanently connected with the army. SEE CENSUS; SEE SECRETARY.

## Officers of the Church[[@Headword:Officers of the Church]]

             those who are appointed as ministers of the Church, and who therefore exist for its sake, and not the Church for theirs. Some persons are accustomed to think and speak of the spiritual community as if it consisted only of its officers. Hence the error which confounds the Church with the ministry, and which is partly kept up, perhaps, by men's neglecting to notice one peculiarity belonging to Christ's kingdom at its first establishment; viz. that it did then consist of ministers only, though it was by no means designed so to continue. All the disciples who constituted the infant Church were those destined to be employed in various offices therein; so that an inattentive reader is liable to confound together what our Lord said to them as ministers, and what as members; as rulers of a Church, and as the Church itself. SEE BISHOP; SEE CHURCH; SEE DEACON; SEE ELDER.

## Offices[[@Headword:Offices]]

             the forms of prayer used in Romish and Episcopal churches. Before the Reformation the offices of the Church consisted in missals, breviaries, psalteries, graduals, and pontificals. See under the respective titles, and also the article SEE OFFICE, THE DIVINE.

## Offices of Christ[[@Headword:Offices of Christ]]

             SEE CHRIST, OFFICES OF.

## Official[[@Headword:Official]]

             is the title given to an episcopal ecclesiastic who is entrusted with the trial of offenses in a diocese. The official originated in the 12th century. as if to check the power of the archdeacon. The official of an archdeacon stands to him as a chancellor to a bishop. But there was a practice in very early times in the Church which gave rise to such appointment. The bishops, as far back as the days of St. Gregory and St. Basil, employed assistants; and pope Damasus sent the priest Simplicius to assist St. Ambrose. The Council of Lateran contented itself with suggesting the employment of “fitting men” to assist bishops; and it appears that at first the titles of vicar- general and official were tenable together, as now in Italy, for the administration by one person both of voluntary and contentious jurisdiction. A bishop, when absent from his diocese, or when ill or incapable, was obliged to appoint a vicar. He was sometimes called a “missus dominicus.” The principal officials and vicar-general in temporals and spirituals hold the consistory court as the bishop's representatives as if he sat in person. The official has a territory or district, and holds his' office by commission, for hearing causes in a whole diocese, but without the power of inquiry, correction, or punishment of offenses; he can only deprive of a benefice, or give admission to it by special commission. A vicar-general holds all these powers except collation to a benefice. A commissary-general is a special deputy. An official's powers terminate with the death of him by whose appointment he acts, and he may also be recalled. An appeal lies from his sentence, not to the bishop, but to him to whom an appeal would be made from the bishop himself. The official principal resides in the chief place, and is an ordinary; others are deputies, “officiales foranei” (i.e. living out of it), and from them appeal lies to the bishop. The official principal is the assistant of the bishop in matters of a civil or criminal nature, to aid him in points of law and to defend the rights of the Church. These officers were not at first deputed and assigned to any certain place, but supplied the office of the bishops at' large in hearing ecclesiastical causes which were of a contentious jurisdiction. They were called “judices,” or “officiales foranei,” viz. “officiales astricti cuidam foro dioceseos tantum.” To them. the cognizance of causes is generally committed by such as have ecclesiastical jurisdiction throughout all the diocese, but not the power of inquisition, nor the correction of crimes, nor can they remove persons from the benefices or collate to benefices without a special commission. The archdeacon's official exercises jurisdiction in  certain parts of a diocese for cognizance and hearing of causes transferred, in virtue of the office itself, by some general commission made to him for that purpose, and he may visit in the right of the archdeacon when the latter himself is hindered.

## Officium Divinum[[@Headword:Officium Divinum]]

             SEE OFFICE, THE DIVINE.

## Og[[@Headword:Og]]

             (Heb. id. עוֹג, probabsly a shortened form of עֹנֶג. i.e. עֹנֶק, giant, lit. long- necked [but from a statement of Manetho that Hyk (Lsc) in the word Hyksos is the Rephaite name for King, it has been inferred that Og (עֹג) is but an attempt to represent the same in Hebrew letters (see Jour. Sac. Lit.  Jan. 1852, p. 363); some, but without any probability, would connect the name with the Greek Ogyges (Ewald, Gesch. 1:306; 2:269)1; Sept. ῎Ωγ; Joseph. ῎Ωγυς. Ant. 4:5, 3), an Amoritish king of Bashan (Num 21:33; Num 32:33; Deu 4:47; Deu 31:4), reigning over sixty cities, of which the chief were Ashtaroth and Edrei (Jos 13:12), in the time of the entrance into Canaan, B.C. 1618. SEE AMORITE.

We find from Scripture that he was, with his children and his people, defeated and exterminated by the Israelites under Moses at Edrei (Num 21:33; Deu 1:4; Deu 3:3; Deu 29:7; Jos 2:10), immediately after the conquest of Sihon, who is represented by Josephus as his friend and ally (Joseph. Ant. 4:5,3). His many walled cities were taken (Deu 3:4-10), and his kingdom assigned, with its capital Ashtaroth, to the transjordanic tribes, especially the half-tribe of Manasseh (Deu 3:1-13; Jos 9:10; Jos 13:12; Jos 13:30). SEE BASHAN. “In form he was a giant, so that his bedstead was preserved as a memorial of his huge stature — (Deu 3:11; Jos 13:12.) SEE GIANT.

How it got in ‘Rabbath of the children of Ammon' we are not told; perhaps the Ammonites had taken it in some victory over Og. The verse itself has the air of a later edition (Dathe), although it is of course possible that the Hebrews may have heard of so curious a relic as this long before they conquered the city where it was treasured. Rabbath was first subdued in the reign of David (2Sa 12:26); but it does not therefore follow that Deu 3:11 was not written till that time (Havernick. ad loc.). Some have supposed that this was one of the common flat beds, SEE BED, sometimes used on the housetops of Eastern cities, but made of iron instead of palm-branches, which would not have supported the giant's weight. It has been conjectured by some (Michaelis, Vater, and others) that the words עֶרֶשׂ בִּרְזֶל, eires barzel, mean a ‘sarcophagus of black basalt'- a rendering of which they, however, hardly admit. The Arabs still regard black basalt as iron, because it is a stone ‘ferrei coloris atque duritia'. (Pliny, 36:11), and ‘contains a large percentage of iron.' SEE IRON.

It is most abundant in the Hauran; and indeed is probably the cause of the name Argob (the stony) given to a part of Og's kingdom. This receptacle was 9 cubits long and 4 cubits broad. It does not of course follow that Og was 15½ feet high. Maimonides (More Nebochim, 2:48) sensibly remarks that a bed (supposing ‘a bed' to be intended) is usually one third longer than the sleeper; and Sir J. Chardin, as well as other travelers, have observed the ancient tendency to make mummies and tombs far larger than the natural size of men, in order to leave an impression of wonder.” The giant stature  of Og. and the power and bravery of his people, excited a dread which God himself alleviated by his encouragement to Moses before the battle; and the impression of this victory lingered long in the national memory (Psa 135:11; Psa 136:20). He was one of the last representatives of the giant-race of Rephaim. According to Eastern traditions, he escaped the Deluge by wading beside the ark (Sale, Koran, ch. v, p. 86). He was supposed to be the largest of the sons of Anak, and a descendant of Ad. He is said to have lived no less than 3000 years, and to have refused the warnings of Jethro (Shoaib), who was sent as a prophet to him and his people (D'Herbelot, s.v. Falasthin, Anak). Soiuthi wrote a long book about him and his race, chiefly taken from Rabbinic traditions, and called Aug fi khaber Aug (ib. s.v. Aug). See, too, the Journal Asiatique for 1841, and Chronique de Tabari, trad. du Persan par Dubeux, 1:48, f. Other legends about'Og may be found in Ben-Uzziel on Num 21:33; Midrash Jalkft, fol. 13 (quoted by Ewald), and in Mohammedan writers: as that one of his bones long served for a bridge over a river; that he roasted at the sun a fish freshly caught, etc. An apocryphal book of king Og, which probably contained these and other traditions, was condemned by pope Gelasius (Decref. 6:13; Sixt. Senensis, Bibl. Sanct. p. 86). SEE REPHAIM.

## Ogden, Benjamin[[@Headword:Ogden, Benjamin]]

             a pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Jersey in 1764. In youth he served in the Revolutionary war, and had great influence over his fellow-soldiers. He afterwards moved to Kentucky, then a hunting-ground for Indian tribes, to engage in missionary labors, and for many years thereafter he penetrated the valley of the Mississippi in laborious toil, and in spite of many hardships gave the Gospel-tidings to the much-neglected Indians. He was greatly comforted and cheered in his work by the kindly assistance rendered him by Thomas Stevenson and his wife, those saintly pioneer workers in the Southern Methodist field, who organized the first Methodist Church in Kentucky. In 1788 Ogden located on account of poor health. He died in 1834. He was a man of talent, and was deeply imbued with the spirit of his vocation as a primitive Methodist preacher. See Stevens, Hist. of the M. E. Church, 2:360; Redford, Hist. of Methodism in Kentucky, 2:385; McFerrin, Hist. of Methodisnm in Tennessee, 1:36, 40, 44, 45.

## Ogden, John W[[@Headword:Ogden, John W]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Bardstown, Ky., Dec. 24, 1793. His education was obtained under the immediate superintendence of his father. During the war of 1812 with Great Britain he was in the army under General Jackson. On leaving the army he was licensed to preach, and he was ordained in 1817 as an evangelist. In 1844 he changed his Church relation by joining the Presbytery of Nashville, and soon after entered upon the work of a missionary, under a commission from the Board of Domestic Missions. He continued to labor thus, preaching from place to place, until called to his rest, April 5,1858. Mr. Ogden was a man of large frame and vigorous constitution; as a minister, he ever labored faithfully and zealously. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 77. (J. L. S.)

## Ogden, Joseph Meeker, D.D[[@Headword:Ogden, Joseph Meeker, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was. born at Elizabethtown, N.J., September 21, 1804. He graduated from Princeton College in 1823, and from the  Theological Seminary there in 1826; spent two years in evangelistic work in Pennsylvania; was pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Chatham in 1828, of which he became pastor emeritus in 1873, but continued to reside there until his sudden death, February 13, 1884. See Necro. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1884, page 9.

## Ogden, Samuel[[@Headword:Ogden, Samuel]]

             D.D., an English divine of note, was born at Manchester in 1716, and was educated at the free school there. In 1733 he was admitted to King's College, Cambridge; and removed to St. John's in 1736, where in the following year he took the degree of B.A., and in 1739 was elected fellow. He was ordained deacon at Chester in 1740. In 1741 he took his degree of M.A., and shortly after was ordained to the ministry by the bishop of Lincoln. In 1744 he was elected master of the free school at Halifax, in Yorkshire. In 1753 he resigned the position, and went to reside at Cambridge. The chancellor of the university, the duke of Newcastle, who was present at the exercise Ogden performed for the degree of D.D., was so much satisfied with it that he soon after presented him with the vicarage of Damesham, in Wiltshire, which was tenable with his fellowship. In 1764 he was appointed Woodwardian professor at Cambridge University, and in June, 1766, was presented also with the rectorship of Lawford, in Essex, and in the following month with that of Stansfield. During the latter part of his life Dr. Ogden labored under much ill health. About a year before he died he was seized with a paralytic fit as he was stepping into his coach, and was judged to be in immediate and extreme danger. The cheerfulness with which he sustained this shock, and the indifference with which he gave the necessary orders in the event of his dissolution, that seemed to be then so near, was such as could only be ascribed to a mind properly resigned to the disposals of Providence, and full of the hopes of future happiness. His death occurred March 24, 1778. He published a number of Sermons (1758- 1777) — and after his death two additional volumes of sermons, treating of  Prayer, the Christian Faith, the Ten Commandments, etc., were brought out, together with a life of the Doctor, under the editorship of bishop Halifax (1780, 2 vols. cr. 8vo; 5th ed. 1814, 8vo). Bickersteth says that these sermons are “terse and forcible, but deficient in evangelical statement” (Christian Students' Assistant, s.v.).

## Ogden, Thomas Spencer[[@Headword:Ogden, Thomas Spencer]]

             a Presbyterian minister and missionary, was the son of the Rev. Benjamin Ogden, and was born in Pennington, N. J., in 1832. He graduated at the University of Michigan in 1853; then passed through the theological course of Princeton. On Aug. 18,1857, he was ordained in New Brunswick, N. J. as a missionary to Africa; sailed Oct. 6, 1857, for Corisco Island, where he arrived Jan. 14, 1858. He entered upon his work with ardor, but fell ill of fever in June, 1859, and again in March, 1860. Recovering, he resumed his labors, entered, on a translation of Luke, and taught school, besides his regular duties. He fell at his post, May 12, 1861. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 114.

## Ogden, Uzal, D.D.[[@Headword:Ogden, Uzal, D.D.]]

             an American divine, was born at Newark (one authority has it Newton, Sussex Co.), N. J., about 1744. He studied to become a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and, having gone to England, received both deacon's and priest's orders from the bishop of London, Sept. 21, 1773. Having returned to this country, he labored as a missionary chiefly in Sussex County, N. J., but in 1788 finally became rector of Trinity Parish in Newark. From 1799 to 1805 Dr. Ogden's relations to the Protestant Episcopal Church were of a somewhat equivocal character, and a controversy ensued which resulted in his joining the Presbyterian body. After this he had no stated charge, but preached occasionally in different places as he found the opportunity. He died Nov. 4,1822. Among his publications we notice, Letter to the Unconverted (1768): — The Theological Preceptor (1772): — An Address to the Youth of America (1772): — Antidote to Deism: the Deist Unmasked, a refutation of “The Age of Reason” (1795, 2 vols. 12mo): — and occasional Sermons and Pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:364.

## Ogee Or Ogyve[[@Headword:Ogee Or Ogyve]]

             is a term used in architecture, both ecclesiastic and secular, to designate a molding formed by the combination of a round and hollow, part being concave and part convex. Ogees are extensively used in the classical style of architecture, also in the Gothic, but they are, quite as often as not, used with the hollow part upwards, and in such cases might in strictness be called ocyma recta; they are almost invariably quirked: in Norman work they are very rarely found, and are less common in the Early English than in either of the later styles. This molding assumed different forms at different periods, and the variations, although not sufficiently constant to afford conclusive evidence of the date of a building, often impart very great assistance towards ascertaining its age: fig. 1 is Early English; fig. 2 is used at all periods, but less frequently in the Early English than in the other styles; fig. 3 is Decorated; fig. 4 is late Perpendicular.

The term Ogee is also applied to a pointed arch, the sides of which are each formed of two contrasted curves.

## Oggel, Pieter John[[@Headword:Oggel, Pieter John]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister of considerable distinction, was born and educated at one of the universities in Holland. After a brief pastorate in his native land, he emigrated to this country in 1856, and settled immediately in the colony of Hollanders located in Michigan as pastor of the Reformed Church at Grand Haven (1856). Thence he removed in 1860 to another flourishing colony of his countrvmen at Pella, Iowa, when, after three years of successful service, he was elected to the professorship of sacred literature in Hope College, at Holland, Michigan. He also gave instruction in the theological school in the harmony of the Gospels, the introduction to the Scriptures, and in pastoral theology. He threw his whole force into his academic duties, and also secured much money from the self-denying Hollanders for the endowment of the institution. He likewise edited a periodical, published in the Dutch language, called De Hope. He was a cultivated, able, and devoted man, a superior preacher, a thorough and beloved professor, and a conspicuous leader of the ecclesiastical and educational movements of the important colony which was founded by the  Rev. Dr. Albertus C. Van Raalte. His early death in November, 1869, was a public calamity. His personal character was. amiable and- attractive, his piety shone clearly through his daily life, and his memory will long be cherished among the founders and builders of the State and the Church in the West. (W. J. R. T.)

## Oggione (Or Uggione), Marco Da[[@Headword:Oggione (Or Uggione), Marco Da]]

             a noted Italian painter, and a distinguished scholar of Leonardo da Vinci at Milan about 1490, was born probably about 1470 at, as his name imports, Oggione, in the Milanese. He painted in oil and in fresco, and is on the whole one of the best of the Milanese painters. His frescos of the church Della Pace at Milan, which are much praised by Lanzi, are now in the Brera at Milan; they were removed from the wall by Barezzi. Oggione is, however, now chiefly known for his copy of the Last Supper of Leonardo da Vinci, now in the Academy of Arts in London. This copy is painted in oil, and was executed about 1510 for the refectory of the Certosa di Pavia; and as it was copied when the original was in a perfect state, the present almost total decay of the latter renders it very valuable. The opinions regarding its merits are various. Oggione made two large copies, both, it is said, from a small copy made by himself for the purpose-that in oil, in the Royal Academy, and one in. fresco for the refectory of the convent of Castellazzo, which was copied by the Cav. Guiseppe Bossi, though Bossi's picture was taken chiefly from a copy in the Ambrosian Library made by Andrea Bianchi, called Vespino, in 1612, when the original was already much decayoe. There is an older copy at Ponte Capriasca, made in 1565, and attributed to Pietro Luini. Bossi's copy was made in 1807 for Eugene Beauharnais, viceroy of Italy, to be worked in mosaic; the cartoon is now at Munich, and the mosaic is at Vienna. But this work, made partly from one copy, partly from another, from studying other works of Da Vinci, and from the artist's own feeling of Da Vinci's style, is essentially a restoration or translation, and not a copy: it may have no resemblance to the original beyond size and composition; and to the true lover of art can have little value, compared with the old unassuming copy of Oggione. Marco da Oggione died in 1530.

## Ogilby, Frederick, D.D[[@Headword:Ogilby, Frederick, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in. Ireland, December 27, 1813. He graduated from Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N.J., in 1834, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1837; officiated successively in Grace Church, New York city, and in Burlington, N.J., under bishop Doane; then became rector of the Church of the Ascension, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, from 1842 to 1858; and for the last twenty-three years of his life he was an assistant minister in Trinity Parish, New York city. He died March 25, 1878. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1879, page 170.

## Ogilby, John David, D.D.[[@Headword:Ogilby, John David, D.D.]]

             an Episcopal minister in America, was born in Dublin Dec. 30, 1810. He graduated in 1829 at Columbia College, New York, where he evinced  distinguished talents, and became first rector of the Grammar School. He then engaged in teaching, and contributed as a writer to the advancement of classical learning. In 1832 he was professor of languages in Rutgers College. He was ordained in 1838 to the ministry. In 1841 he held the chair of ecclesiastical history in the General Theological Seminary, New York, and adorned his lectures by the brilliancy of his genius and the extent of his knowledge. He made three voyages to Europe for his health, and died in Paris Feb. 2, 1851, in the hope of a glorious resurrection. He published many works on the classical languages and their study, especially the Latin, and the following are noteworthy of his theological productions: Argument against the Validity of Lay Baptism (1842): — Lectures on the Catholic Church in England and America (1844): — besides several Addresses and Sermons. See Sprague, Annals. of the Amer. Pulpit, v. 760.

## Ogilvie (Or Ogilby), John (2), D.D., F.R.S.[[@Headword:Ogilvie (Or Ogilby), John (2), D.D., F.R.S.]]

             a noted Scotch divine and writer, was born in 1733. He studied at the University of Aberdeen. He became pastor of Midmar in 1759, and retained that office until his death, which occurred in 1814. He wrote, Poems on several Subjects (1762, 4to): — Providence, a poem (1764, 4to): — Sermons (1767, 8vo) — Paradise, a poem (1769, 4to): — Philosophical and Critical Observations on Compositions (1774, 2 vols. 8vo): — Rona, a poem (1777, 4to): — An Inquiry into the Causes of Infidelity and Scepticism (1783, 8vo): — Theology of Plato, compared with the Principles of Oriental and Grecian Philosophers (1793, 8vo).: — Britannia, an epic poem (1801, 4to): — Examination of the Evidence of Prophecy in Behalf of the Christian Religion (1803, 8vo). See Gorton, Genesis Biog. Diet. s.v.' Darling, Cycl. Bibliog. 2:2231; Chambers, Biog. Diet. of Eminent Scotsmen, 4:85. (J. N. P.)

## Ogilvie, John (1), D.D.[[@Headword:Ogilvie, John (1), D.D.]]

             an early Episcopal minister in America, was born in New York in 1722, and passed A.B. in Yale College in 1748. Soon after he went on a mission to the Mohawks, and to the Episcopal Church at Albany; and for more than ten years prosecuted his efforts in behalf of the Indians. On the breaking out of the war with France he became chaplain to the Royal American Regiment, and in 1764 was appointed assistant minister to Trinity Church, New York. He died Nov. 26, 1774. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v. 134.

## Oglesby, Joseph[[@Headword:Oglesby, Joseph]]

             a pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who flourished near the opening of this century, was appointed a missionary in Illinois in 1804. He was the first Methodist who ever preached in that part of the country. He traveled over the vast territory, as it was at that time, to the extreme settlements, and was always greeted with pleasure by the pioneer settlers. See Stevens, Hist. of the 2. E. Church, 4:358.

## Ogoa[[@Headword:Ogoa]]

             a name applied to Zeus by the Carians at Mysala, in whose temple a sea- wave was occasionally seen. The Athenians alleged the same thing in regard to their own citadel.

## Ohad[[@Headword:Ohad]]

             (Heb. id. אֹהִד', power; Sept. Α᾿ώδ v. r. Ι᾿αίοδ), the third named of the six sons of Simeon, and head of a family in Israel (Gen 46:10; Exo 6:15). B.C. cir. 1870. His name is omitted from the lists in 1Ch 4:24, Num 26:14, though in the former passage the Syriac has Ohor.

## Ohaloth [[@Headword:Ohaloth ]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Ohel[[@Headword:Ohel]]

             (Heb. id. אֹהֶל, a tent, as very often; Sept. Ο᾿όλ v. r. Ο᾿σά), the fifth named of the seven children of Zerubbabel, of the tribe of Judah and house of  David (1Ch 3:20). B.C. post 600. See Strong's Harmony and Exposition, p. 17.

## Ohmacht, Landelin[[@Headword:Ohmacht, Landelin]]

             an eminent German sculptor, was born at Dunningen, near Rottweil, in Wirtemberg, in 1760. He studied under J. P. Melchior, and during his earlier years executed a good bust of Lavater, and several sculptures for the Kreuzkirche at Rottweil. In 1790 he visited Rome for improvement, and remained two years in that city, studying and copying the antique and the works of the great masters. On returning to Germany he soon gained reputation, and was employed on several important monumental works. His abilities were highly esteemed by the celebrated sculptor David, who is reported to have said that Ohmacht was the Correggio of sculpture, and that his works could not be sufficiently admired. He executed four monuments in the church of St. Thomas, of which that of Prof. Oberlin is greatly admired. Ohmacht was an intimate friend of Klopstock, and executed several busts of that celebrated poet. Among his classical sculptures are the statues of Hebe, Flora, Venus, Psyche, and the Judgment of Paris. The latter work is at Nymphenburg. Ohmacht practiced the art at Strasburg for many years, and died there in 1834.

## Oiconomists[[@Headword:Oiconomists]]

             (Greek, Οἰκονόμοι) was the name in the early Church of persons appointed by the bishop and archdeacon to assist in managing the possessions of the Church. This became in the Middle Ages an office of great influence, and was in a good degree independent of the bishop. The office was originally created to check the insatiable cupidity of the bishops, and to restrain their independent control of the revenues of the Church. But they soon found means to defeat this salutary expedient by taking the appointment of such officers into their own hands, and thus securing men who were in their interests. See Coleman Anc Christianity, p. 188. SEE OECONOMOS.

## Oiconomos, Constantin[[@Headword:Oiconomos, Constantin]]

             a learned Greek priest and writer of note, was born in Thessaly in 1770. He taught Greek at Smyrna for ten years, and afterwards preached at St. Petersburg and at Athens. He died in 1857. He wrote, several works on language, and De la Version des Septante (1843-50, 4 vols.).

## Oikoi Basileioi[[@Headword:Oikoi Basileioi]]

             (οϊvκοι βασίλειοι, royal houses), a term applied in the early Church to the houses allotted to the bishops and clergy for their residences, corresponding, therefore, in a large measure to our parsonage (q.v.). The οϊvκοι βασίλειοι were always adjacent to the church.

## Oil[[@Headword:Oil]]

             liquid fat, but chiefly vegetable, was far more extensively used among the ancient Hebrews for a variety of purposes than in Occidental and Northern climates. In the following account we follow largely the ancient information with modern illustrations. SEE BUTTER; SEE FAT; SEE GREASE.

I. Name. — The following are the words so rendered in the A. V.:

1. Usually שֶׁמֶן, she'men, prop. pressed juice (Sept. ἔλαιον; Vulg. oleum), from . שָׁמִן, “to become fat” (Gesen. Thes. p. 1437); sometimes joined with זִיַת(ἔλαιον ἐξ ἐλαιῶν, oleum de. olivetis), distinguishing olive-juice from oil produced from other sources. Also sometimes in A. V. “ointment” (Celsius, Hierob. 2:279).

2. Yitshar, יַצְהָר(πιότης, ἔλαιον, oleum), from צָהִר, “to shine” (Gesenius, p. 1152), clear olive-oil (Num 18:12; Deu 7:13; Deu 11:14; Deu 12:17; Deu 14:23; Deu 18:4; Deu 28:51; 2Ki 18:32; 2Ch 31:5; Neh 5:11; Neh 10:37; Neh 10:39; Neh 13:5; Neh 13:12; Jer 31:12; Hos 2:8; Hos 2:22; Joe 1:10; Joe 2:19; Joe 2:24; Hag 1:11; Zec 4:14).

3. Chald. מְשִׁח, meshach' (ἔλαιον, oleumn), an unguent (only in Ezr 6:9; Ezr 7:22).

II. Manufacture. — Of the different substances, animal and vegetable, which were known to the ancients as yielding oil, the olive-berry is the one of which most frequent mention is made in the Scriptures. The numerois olive-plantations in Palestine made olive-oil one of the chief and one of the most lucrative products of the country: it supplied an article of extensive and profitable traffic with the Tyrians (Eze 27:17; comp. 1Ki 5:11); and presents of the finer sorts of olive-oil were deemed suitable for kings. There is, in fact, no other kind of oil distinctly mentioned in Scripture; and the best, middling, and inferior oils appear to have been merely different qualities of olive-oil. It is well known that both the quality and the value of olive-oil differ according to the time of gathering the fruit, and the amount of pressure used in the course of preparation. These processes, which do not essentially differ from the modern, are described minutely by the Roman writers on agriculture, and with their descriptions the few notices occurring both in Scripture and the Rabbinical writings which throw light on the ancient Oriental method nearly correspond. Of these descriptions the following may be taken as an abstract: The best oil is made from fruit gathered about November or December, when it has begun to change color, but before it has become black. The berry in the more advanced state yields more oil, but of inferior quality. Oil was also made from unripe fruit by a special process as early as September or October, while the harder sorts of fruit were sometimes delayed till February or March (Virg. Georg. 2:519; Palladius, R. R. 12:4; Columella, R. R. 12:47, 50; Cato, R. R. p. 65; Pliny, N. H. 15:1-8; Varro, R. R. 1:55; Hor. 2 Sat. 2:46). SEE OLIVE.

Of the substances which yield oil, besides the olivetree, myrrh is the only one specially mentioned in Scripture. Oil of myrrh is the juice which exudes from the tree Balsamodendron Myrrha, but olive-oil was an ingredient in many compounds which passed under the general name of oil (Est 2:12; comp. Celsius, u. s. 3:10, 18, 19; Pliny, 12:26; 13:1, 2; 15:7; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:23; Balfour, Plants of Bible, p. 52). SEE MYRRH.

1. Harvesting the Oil-crop. — Great care is necessary in gathering the olive not to injure either the fruit itself or the boughs of the tree, and with this view it was either gathered by hand or shaken off carefully with a light reed or stick. The “boughing” of Deu 24:20 (פָּאִר) probably corresponds to the “shaking” (נֹקֶŠ) of Isa 17:6; Isa 24:13, i.e. a subsequent beating for the use of the poor (see Mishna, Shebiith, 4:2; Peah, 7:2: 8:3). After gathering and careful cleansing, the fruit was either carried at once to the press, which is recommended as the best course, or, if necessary, laid on tables with hollow trays made sloping, so as to allow the first juice (amurca) to flow into other receptacles beneath, care being taken not to heap the fruit too much, and so prevent the free escape of the juice, which is injurious to the oil, though itself useful in other ways  (Colum. u.s. 12:50; Aug. Civ. Dei, 1:8, 2). If while the berries were yet green, instead of being thrown into the press, they were only beaten or squeezed, they yielded the best kind of oil. It was called ophacinum, or the oil of unripe olives.

2. Pressing. — In order, however, to make oil in general, the fruit was either bruised in a mortar, crushed in a press loaded with wood or stones, ground in a mill, or trodden with the feet. Special buildings used for grapepressing were used also for the purpose of olive-pressing, and contained both the press and the receptacle for the pressed juice. ‘Of these processes, the one least expedient was the last (treading), which perhaps answers to the “canalis et solea” mentioned by Columella, and was probably the one usually adopted by the poor. The “beaten” oil of Exo 27:20; Lev 24:2; Exo 29:40, and Num 28:5, was probably made by bruising in a mortar. There were presses of a peculiar kind for preparing oil called גת שׁמן, gath-shemen (whence the name Gethsemane, or “oil-press,” Mat 26:36 : Joh 18:1), in which the oil was trodden out by the feet (Mic 6:15). SEE GETHSEMANE.

The first expression of the oil was better than the second, and the second than the third. Ripe olives yielded the least valuable kind of oil, but the quantity was more abundant. These processes, and also the place and the machine for pressing, are mentioned in the Mishna. Oilmills are often made of stone, and turned by hand. Others consist of cylinders enclosing a beam, which is turned by a camel or other animal. An Egyptian olivepress is described by Niebuhr, in which the pressure exerted on the fruit is given by means of weights of wood and stone placed in a sort of box above. Besides the above-cited Scripture references, the following passages mention either the places, the processes, or the machines used in olive-pressing (Joe 2:24; Joe 3:13; Isa 63:3; Lam 1:15; Hag 2:16; comp. the Talmud, Menach. 8:4; Shebuth, 4:9; 7:6; Terum. 10:7; Shabb. 1:9; Baba Bathra, 4:5; Vitruvius, 10:1; Cato. R. R. p. 3; Celsius, Hierob. 2:346, 350; Niebuhr, Voy. 1:122, pl. 17; Arundell, Asia Minor, 2:196; Wellsted, Trav. 2:430). SEE OIL-PRESS.

3. Keeping. — Both olives and oil were preserved in jars carefully cleansed; and oil was drawn out for use in horns or other small vessels. SEE CRUSE. These vessels for keeping oil were stored in cellars or storehouses; special mention of such repositories is made in the inventories of royal property and revenue (1Sa 10:1; 1Sa 16:1; 1Sa 16:13; 1Ki 1:39; 1Ki 17:16; 2Ki 4:2; 2Ki 4:6; 2Ki 9:1; 2Ki 9:3; 1Ch 27:28; 1 Chronicles 2  Chronicles 11:11 32:28; Pro 21:20; comp. Shebiith, v. 7; Celim, 2:5; 17:12; Colum. 1. c.). A supply of oil was always kept at hand in the Temple (see Josephus, War, v. 13, 6), and an oil treasury was among the stores of the Jewish kings (2Ki 20:13; comp. 2Ch 32:28).

Oil of Tekoa was reckoned the best (Menach. 8:8). Trade in oil was carried on with the Tyrians, by whom it was probably often re-exported to Egypt, whose olives do not for the most part produce good oil. Oil to the amount of 20,000 baths (2Ch 2:10; Joseph. Ant. 8:2, 9), or 20 measures (cors, 1. Kings 5:11), was among the supplies furnished by Solomon to Hiram. Direct trade in oil was carried on between Egypt and Palestine (1Ki 5:11; 2Ch 2:10; 2Ch 2:15; Ezr 3:7; Isa 30:6; Isa 57:9; Eze 27:17; Hos 12:1; comp. Jerome, Com. in Osee, iii,.12; Joseph. Ant. 8:2, 9, War, 2:21, 2; Strabo, 17, p. 809; Pliny, 15:4, 13; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:28, sm. ed.; Hasselquist, Trav. p. 53, 117). SEE COMMERCE.

III. Use. — Besides the consumption of olives themselves as food, common to all olive-producing countries (Horace, 1 Od. 31:15; Martial, 13:36; Arvieux, Trav. p. 209; Terumoth, 1:9, 2:6), the principal uses of olive-oil may be thus stated:

1. As food. — The use of oil is general throughout Western Asia at the present time, as it was in primitive ages. Oil was much used instead of butter and animal fat at meals and in various preparations of food (comp. Eze 16:13). SEE FOOD.

In such uses oil, when fresh and sweet, is more agreeable than animal fat. The Orientals think so, and Europeans soon acquire the same preference. The Hebrews must have reckoned oil one of the prime necessities of life (Sir 39:31; comp. Jer 31:12; Jer 41:8; Luk 16:6 sq.). It is often mentioned in connection with honey (Eze 16:13; Eze 16:19; Eze 27:17), and its abundance was a chief mark of prosperity (comp. Joe 2:19). Dried wheat, boiled with either butter or oil, but more commonly the former, is a common dish for all classes in Syria. Hasselquist speaks of bread, baked in oil as being particularly sustaining; and Faber, in his Pilgrimage, mentions eggs fried in oil as Saracen and Arabian dishes (comp. Jerome, Vit. S. Hilarion, ch. 11, vol. ii, p. 32; Ibn-Batuta, Trav. p. 60, ed. Lee; Volney, Trav. 1:362, 406; Russell, A leppo, 1:80, 119; Harmer, Obs. 1:471, 474; Shaw, Trav. p. 232; Bertrandon de la Brocquiere, Early Trav. p. 332; Burckhardt, Trav. in A  rab. 1:54; Notes on Bed. 1:59; Arvieux. 50:c.; Chardin, Voy. 4:84; Niebuhr, Voy. 2:302; Hasselquist, Trav. p. 132; Faber, Evagatorium, i' 197; 2:752, 415).

It was probably on account of the common use of oil in food that the “meat-offerings” prescribed by the Law were so frequently mixed with oil (Lev 2:4; Lev 2:7; Lev 2:15; Lev 8:26; Lev 8:31; Num 7:19 sq.; Deu 12:17; Deu 32:13; 1Ki 17:12; 1Ki 17:15; 1Ch 12:40; Ezra 16:19). This was certainly not for the purpose of aiding the burning of the sacrifice; nor is it likely that any symbolic idea was connected with the oil. SEE SACRIFICE. The rite of sprinkling with oil, as a libation, does not occur in the Law, but seems to be alluded to in Mic 6:7. SEE OFFERING.

2. Cosmetic. — As is the case generally in hot climates, oil was used by the Jews for anointing the body, e.g. after the bath, and giving to the skin and hair a smooth and comely appearance, e.g. before an entertainment. Whether for luxury or ceremony, the head and beard were the parts usually anointed (Deu 28:40; 2Sa 14:2; Psa 23:5; Psa 92:11; Psa 104:15; Luk 7:46); and this use of oil, which was especially frequent at banquets, became at length proverbially common among the Israelites (Pro 21:17; comp. Catull. 6:8; Curt. 9:7, 20). To be deprived of the use of oil was thus a serious privation, assumed voluntarily in the time of mourning or of calamity (Rth 3:3; 2Sa 12:20; Dan 10:3; Isa 61:3; Amo 6:6; Sus. 17). At Egyptian entertainments it was usual for a servant to anoint the head of each guest as he took his seat. Strabo mentions the Egyptian use of castor-oil for this purpose (18:824). The Greek and Roman usage will be found mentioned in the following passages: Homer, II. 10:577; 18:596; 23:281; Od. 7:107; 6:96; 10:364; Horace, 3 Od. 13:6; 1 Sat. 6:123; 2 Sat. 1:8; Pliny, 14:22; Aristoph. Wasps, 608; Clouds, 816; Roberts, pl. 164. Butter, as is noticed by Pliny, is used by the negroes and the lower class of Arabs for the like purposes (Pliny, 11:41; Burckhardt; Trav. 1:53; Nubia, p. 215; Lightfoot,. Hor. Hebr. 2:375; see Deu 33:24; Job 29:6; Psa 109:18). SEE OINTMENT.

The use of oil preparatory to athletic exercises customary among the Greeks and Romans can scarcely have had place to any extent among the Jews, who in their earlier times had no such contests, though some are mentioned by Josephus with censure as taking place at Jerusalem and Caesarea under Herod (Horace, 1 Od. 8:8; Pliny. 15:4; Athenaeus, 15:34,  p. 686; Horner, Od. 6:79. 215; Joseph. Ant. 15:8, 1; 16:5, 1; see Smith, Diet. of Antig. s.v. — Aliptae). SEE GAME.

3. Funereal. — The bodies of the dead were anointed with oil by the Greeks and Romans, probably as a partial antiseptic, and a similar custom appears to have prevailed among the Jews (Homer, II. 24:587; Virgil, En. 6:219). SEE BURIAL.

4. Medicinal. — As oil is in use in many cases in modern medicine, so it is not surprising that it should have been much used among the Jews and other nations of antiquity for medicinal purposes. Celsus repeatedly speaks of the use of oil, especially old oil, applied externally with friction in fevers, and in many other cases. Pliny says that olive-oil is good to warm the body and fortify it against cold, and also to cool heat in the head, and for various other purposes. It was thus used previously to taking cold baths, and also mixed with water for bathing the body. Josephus mentions that among the remedies employed in the case of Herod, he was put into a sort of oil-bath. Oil mixed with wine is also mentioned as a remedy used both inwardly and outwardly in the disease with which the soldiers of the army of AElius Gallus were affected, a circumstance which recalls the use of a similar remedy in the parable of the good Samaritan. The prophet Isaiah alludes to the use of oil as ointment in medical treatment; and it thus furnished a fitting symbol, perhaps also an efficient remedy, when used by our Lord's disciples in the miraculous cures which they were enabled to perform. With a similar intention, no doubt, its use was enjoined by St. James, and, as it appears, practiced by the early Christian Church in general. Nothing is said in the Bible of the internal use of oil mingled with wine (comp. e.g. Dio Cass. 53:29). An instance of cure through the medium of oil is mentioned by Tertullian. The medicinal use of oil is also mentioned in the Mishna, which thus exhibits the Jewish practice of that day. See, for the various instances above named, Isa 1:6; Mar 6:13; Luk 10:34; Jam 5:14; Josephus, Ant. 17:6, 5; War, 1:33, 5; Talm. Shabb. 13:4; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 11, 526; Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. 4:9; Corn. a Lap. on James 5; Tertull. Ad Scap. c. iv; Celsus, De Med. 2:14, 17; 3:6, 9, 19, 22; 4:2; Horace, 2 Sat. 1:7; Pliny, 15:4, 7; 23:3, 4; Dio Cass. 53:29; Lightfoot, I. H. 2:304, 444; Jerome, 1. c. SEE UNCTION.

5. For light. — The oil for “the light” was expressly ordered to be olive-oil, beaten, i.e.made from olives bruised in a mortar (Exo 25:6; Exo 27:20-21; Exo 35:8; Lev 24:2; 2Ch 13:11; 1Sa 3:3;  Zec 4:3; Zec 4:12; Mishna, Demai, 1:3; Menach. 8:4). The quantity required for the longest night is said to have been .5 log (13.79 cubic in. = .4166 of a pint [Menach. 9:3; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 159]). SEE CANDLESTICK. In the same manner the great lamps used at the Feast of Tabernacles were fed (Succth, v. 2). Oil was used in general for lamps; it is used in Egypt with cotton wicks twisted round a piece of straw; the receptacle being a glass vessel, into which. water is first poured (Mat 25:1-8; Luk 12:35; comp. Lane, Modern Egyptians, 1:201).

6. Ritual. —

a. Oil was poured on or mixed with the flour or meal used in offerings.

1. The consecration offering of priests (Exo 29:2; Exo 29:23; Lev 6:15; Lev 6:21).

2. The offering of “beaten oil” with flour, which accompanied the daily sacrifice (Exo 29:40).

3. The leper's purification offering (Lev 14:10-57; Lev 14:24; Lev 14:28), where it is to be observed that the quantity of oil (1 log =.833 of a pint) was invariable, while the other objects varied in quantity according to the means of the person offering. The cleansed leper was also to be touched with oil on various parts of his body (Lev 14:15-18).

4. The Nazarite, on completion of his vow, was to offer unleavened bread anointed with oil, and cakes of fine bread mingled with oil (Num 6:15).

5. After the erection of the Tabernacle, the offerings of the “princes” included flour mingled with oil (Numbers 7).

6. At the consecration of the Levites, fine flour mingled with oil was offered (Num 8:8).

7. Meat-offerings in general were mingled or anointed with oil (Lev 7:10; Lev 7:12).

On the other hand, certain offerings were to be devoid of oil: the sin- offering (Lev 5:11) and the offering of jealousy (Num 5:15).  The principle on which both the presence and the absence of oil were prescribed is, clearly, that as oil is indicative of gladness, so its absence denoted sorrow or humiliation (Isa 61:3; Joe 2:19; Rev 6:6). It is on this principle that oil is so often used in Scripture as symbolical of nourishment and comfort (Deu 32:13; Deu 33:24; Job 29:6; Psa 45:7; Psa 109:18; Isa 61:3).

b. Kings, priests, and prophets were anointed with oil or ointment. SEE ANOINT.

7. As so important a necessary of life, the Jew was required

a to include oil among his first-fruit offerings (Eze 22:29; Eze 23:16; Num 18:12; Deu 18:4; 2Ch 31:5; Terum. 11:3). In the Mishna various limitations are laid down; but they are of little importance except as illustrating the processes to which the olive-berry was subjected in the production of oil, and the degrees of estimation in which their results were held.

b. Tithes of oil were also required (Deu 12:17; 2Ch 31:5; Neh 10:37; Neh 10:39; Neh 13:12; Eze 45:14).

8. Shields, if covered with hide, were anointed with oil or grease previous to use. Shields of metal were perhaps rubbed over in like manner to polish them. See Thenius on 2Sa 1:21; Virgil, AEn. 7:625; Plautus, Mil. 1:1, 2; and Gesenius, Thes. p. 825. SEE SHIELD.

9. Oil of inferior quality was used in the composition of soap.

OIL, which is the purest lighting material obtained from the innocent vegetable kingdom, has ever been a sacred symbol, possessing healing properties and ameliorating all suffering from wounds. Oil represents in Christian symbolism the divine mercy. There seems however, to have entered also into its use in the Christian cultus the ancient practice of the pagan gladiators, who anointed themselves with oil before entering upon a contest. Thus oil came to be used for anointings at baptism and confirmation, and on the death-bed (the last anointing), at ordination of priests, and the consecration of kings. SEE ANOINT.

The double sense of the performance was probably that it secures to the subject, first, a share of divine mercy, and, secondly, a strengthening for life's severe combats. In the Romish Church there are three kinds of holy oils: (1) holy oils strictly so called; (2) chrism oil; and (3) sick men's oil. These oils are consecrated  by the bishop on Maundy-Thursday annually for all the churches of his diocese. Pure olive-oil only is used, with balsam ( balm) for the chrism. Three metal vases are usually provided and covered with silk, on one of which are engraved the words “Oleum, Infirmourum” (=oil of the infirm) or the initials “O .I.;” on another, “Oleum Catechumenorum” (=oil of the catechumens) or “O. C.;” on the third, which is larger than the others, and is covered with white silk, ‘Sanctum Chrisma” (-holy chrism) or “S.C.” Some balsam is mixed with a little of the oil from the third vase, and this compound the bishop puts into the vase and stirs up with the rest of the oil there. The ceremony, which consists of exorcisms, prayers, chantings, making the sign of the cross with the hand and with the breath, etc., occupies sixteen pages of the Pontificale Romanum, and eight or ten in the “Ceremonial of the Church.” The old oils, consecrated the year before, if any have remained in the vases, are put in the church-lamps before the holy: sacrament, to be burned; and those which remain in pyxes and boxes are burned with the old silk. Every priest must obtain from the bishop a supply of these consecrated oils for his church. The oil of the infirm is used in extreme unction; the oil of catechumens in baptism; the holy chrism in baptism, confirmation, etc. SEE HOLY OIL; SEE PYX. The ceremony of oil consecration as recently witnessed in a Romish church in New York City is thus narrated in the New York Tribune:

“In the sacristy three large jars were filled with the purest oil and set apart, carefully covered with veils. When the archbishop descended from the altar, and took his seat at the table, the archdeacon cried aloud, ‘Oleum Informorum.' Then one of the seven acting as subdeacons went, with two acolytes, to the sacristy, and returned with the Oil for the Sick, which he delivered to the archdeacon, saying ‘Oleum Informorum.' The archdeacon, repeating the same words, presented it to the archbishop, who, rising up, first solemnly exorcised the oil, and then blessed it in the solemn words of the Church. The oil was then removed to the sacristy and carefully guarded. The archbishop, after washing his hands, reascended the altar and continued the mass as usual, until that part of it known as the Ablutions, when he again descended to the table to consecrate the remaining oils. A procession of all the clergymen, acting as deacons and subdeacons, was formed and proceeded to the sacristy. They returned in the same manner, bearing the oils and chanting the verses of the hymn ‘O  Redemptor.' Much the same ceremony as already described was then gone through. The archbishop breathed over the oil, in the form of a cross, and all the priests taking part in the consecration did the same. On his knees he saluted the chrism with the words Ave Sanctum Chrisma, pronounced three times with increasing emphasis. The priests did the same, and the consecration of the Oil of the Catechumens followed in the same manner.”

The Church of Constantinople has likewise three different kinds of oil: (1) the oil of catechumens, which is simply blessed by the priest in the baptismal office; (2) the εὐχέλαιον, or prayer-oil, for the visitation of the sick, blessed in the sick man's house by seven priests; (3) the ἃγιον μύρον, solemnly consecrated by the bishop on Thursday in Holy Week. Of these two latter kinds there is enough said in the article CHRISM SEE CHRISM ; on the first, SEE CATECHUMENS. The Greeks have besides two other kinds of holy oil:

(1) that which is used for the lamps before the images of saints, and which is blessed by the priest in the office of benediction of the loaves. “It was the custom that in certain festivals the brethren in monasteries should be anointed with this oil; and it was in some instances mixed with the water blessed on the Epiphany, and used for sprinkling olive-yards or vineyards, for the purpose of freeing them from blight.

(2) Oil of the holy cross, which appears, for the matter is doubtful, to have been originally taken from the lamps which burned in the Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem before the true cross, and afterwards to have been consecrated by the immersion in it of a piece of the same cross.” See Barnum, Romanisnm, p. 473 sq.; Neale, Hist. Eastern Church, Introd. p. 966; Siegel, Christl. Alterthumer, 4:125; Menzel, Symbolik, 2:166 sq.; Burnet, The Thirty-nine Articles, p. 353, 378, 379, 381, 382, 384; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, p. 369, 371,432. .

## Oil-press[[@Headword:Oil-press]]

             No specific name for this occurs in the Bible, except in the name Gethsemane (q.v.); but the machine must have been of common use among the Hebrews, and remains of them are still of frequent occurrence in Palestine (see Thomson, Land and Book, 1:307). The upright posts stand  in pairs about two feet apart, having a deep groove in the inner-faces, running from top to bottom. In this groove moved the plank on the top of the olive “cheeses,” forced down by a beam, as a lever, acting against the huge stone on the. top of the columns. There is also traceable the stone trough into which the oil ran, and close by are immense basins in which the olives were ground to a pulp by the stone wheel that was rolled over them. Other basins, smaller and more concave, may have served for treading out the olives with the feet (Mic 6:15), a process now never employed in Palestine. SEE MILL.

The modern machines for oil-making are thus described by Thomson (Land and Book, 1:523): “The ma'serah is worked by hand, and is only used for the olives which fall first in autumn, before the rains of winter raise the brooks which drive the mutruf. The olives for the ma'serah are ground to a pulp in circular stone basins by rolling a large stone wheel over them. The mass is then put into small baskets, of straw-worl, which are placed one upon another, between two upright posts, and pressed by a screw which moves in the beam or entablature from above, like the screw in the standing-press of a bookbinder, or else by a beam-lever. After this first pressing the pulp is taken out of the. baskets, put into large copper pans, and, being sprinkled with water, is heated over a fire, and again pressed as before. This finishes the process, and the oil is put away in jars to use, or in cisterns, to be kept for future market. The mutruf is driven like an ordinary mill, except that the apparatus for beating up the olives is an upright cylinder, with iron cross-bars at the lowerend. This cylinder turns rapidly in a hollow tube of stone work, into which the olives are thrown from above, and beaten to a pulp by the revolving cross-bars.

The interior of the tube is kept hot, so that the mass is taken out below sufficiently heated to cause the oil to run freely. The same baskets are used as in the ma'serah, but the press is a beam-lever, with heavy weights at the end. This process is repeated a second time, as in the ma'serah, and then the refuse is thrown away.”' He adds, “Beam-presses are also employed in the ma'serah to this day, and I think that the use of screws is quite modern. No process is employed for clarifying the oil, except to let it gradually settle on the lees in the cisterns or large jars in which it is kept. Certain villages are celebrated all over the country for producing oil particularly clear and sweet, and it commands a. high price for table use; Berjah, for example, above Nebi Yiinas, also Deir Mimas in the Merj Ayfin, and at Ttreh on Carmel; but the process is there very different. The olives are first mashed as in the mutrml;  and then stirred rapidly in a large kettle of hot water. The oil is thus separated, and rises to the top, when it is skimmed off without pressing. The refuse is then thrown into vats of cold water, and an inferior oil is gathered from the surface, which is only fit for making soap.” SEE OIL.

## Oil-tree[[@Headword:Oil-tree]]

             (עֵוֹ שֶׁמֶן, ets-shemen; Sept. κυπάρισσος, ξύλα κυπαρίσσινα; Vulg. lignum olivse, frondes ligni pulcherrimi; A. V. “oil-tree” in Isa 41:19, but in 1Ki 11:23, “olive-tree,” and in Neh 13:15, “pine-branches”). From the passage in Nehemiah, where it is mentionedas distinct from the zaith or “olive-tree,” writers have sought to identify it with the Elceagnus angustifoliuzs, Linn., sometimes called “the wildolivetree,” or “narrow-leaved oleaster,” on the supposition that this is the zucckun-tree of the Arabs. But Dr. Hooker has shown that the properties and characteristics of the elceagnus do not accord with what travelers have related of the famed zuckum-tree of Palestine, and that the latter is the Balanites AEgyptiaca, a well-known and abundant shrub or small tree in the plain of Jordan. It is found all the way from the peninsula of India and the Ganges to Syria, Abyssinia, and the Niger. The zuckum-oil is held in high repute by the Arabs for its medicinal properties. It is said to be very valuable against wounds and contusions. Comp. Maundrell (Journ. p. 86) and Robinson (Bib. Res. 1:560). SEE BALM. Celsius (Hierob. 1:309) understood by the Hebrew words any “fat or resinous tree;” but the passage in Nehemiah clearly points to some specific tree.

Several other trees have been adduced, as the different kinds of pine, including the cedar of Lebanon, the cypress, the citrus, the balsam-tree; but there is no special proof in favor of any of these. In the passage in Isaiah the tree in question is mentioned in distinction from the pine; but it is possible that the latter word does not correctly represent the תַּדְהָרDr. Post, in the Amer. ed. of Smith's Dict. of the Bible, objects to the zuckum- tree that it is too small to furnish wood for carved figures, as required by the passage in Kings, or to be classed with the other magnificent trees mentioned in the passage in Isaiah; and that it is only found in the plain of the Jordan, whereas the tree in question is spoken of in the passage in  Nehemiah as growing on the mountains. He therefore proposes the “stone- pine” of Palestine, or Pinus pinea, called snodbar by the Arabs, as fulfilling the required conditions. Dr. Thomson, however, who describes this latter tree, expressly says, “It is not found on the mountains of Palestine, because that peculiar sandy formation [required for its growth] is not found there” (Land and Book, 2:265). SEE PINE.

## Oinomania[[@Headword:Oinomania]]

             SEE OENOMANIA.

## Ointment[[@Headword:Ointment]]

             is the representative in the Bible of the following words in the original: 1.

שֶׁמֶן, she'men (so rendered in 2Ki 20:13; Psa 133:2; Pro 27:16; Ecc 7:1; Ecc 9:8; Ecc 10:1; Son 1:3; Son 4:10; Isa 1:6; Isa 39:2; Isa 57:9; Amo 6:6; “anointing,” Isa 10:27), probably oil (as elsewhere rendered, except “olive” in 1Ki 6:23; 1Ki 6:31-33; “pine” in Neh 8:15; “fatness” in Psa 109:24; “fat things” in Isa 25:6; “fat” in Isa 28:1; Isa 28:4; “fruitful” in Isa 5:1). 2. מַשְׂחָה, mishchah (in Exo 30:25), properly anointing (as elsewhere rendered). 3. Usually and distinctively some form of the root רָקִח, denoting perfume; either the simpler noun רֹקֵח, 2rokach (Exo 30:25), an odorous compound'(“‘confection,” Exo 30:35); or the concrete מַרַקִחִת, mirkach'ath (1Ch 9:30; “compound,” Exo 30:25; “prepared by the apothecaries' art,” 2Ch 16:14); מֶרְקָחָה, merkachah (“pot of ointment,” Job 41:31; “well” spiced, Eze 24:10; plur. “sweet” flowers, Son 5:13), which probably signify the vessel in which perfumery was prepared. Cognate is מָרוּק, mark. something rubbed in. (“things for purifying,” Est 2:12). 3. In the Apocrypha and N.T. ,ivpov, myrrh (invariably rendered “ointment”). In the following sketch we follow the ancient information with modern additions. SEE OIL.

The ointments and oils used by the Israelites were rarely simple, but were composed of various ingredients (Job 41:22; comp. Pliny, Hist. Nat. 29:8). Oliveoil, the valued product of Palestine (Deu 28:40; Mic 6:15), was combined with sundry aromatics, chiefly foreign (1Ki 10:10; Eze 27:22), particularly spices, myrrh, and nard [see these words]. Such ointments were for the most part costly (Amo 6:6), and formed a much-coveted luxury. The ingredients, and often the prepared oils and resins in a state fit for use, were obtained chiefly in traffic from the Phoenicians, who imported them in small alabaster boxes, in which the delicious aroma was best preserved. A description of the more costly unguents is given by Pliny (Hist. Nat. 13:2). The preparation of these required .peculiar skill, and therefore formed a particular profession. The רֹקְחַים, rokechim, of Exo 30:25; Exo 30:35; Neh 3:8; Ecc 10:1, called “apothecary” in the A. V., denotes no other than a maker of perfumes. The work was sometimes carried on by women “confectionaries” (1Sa 8:13). So strong were the better kinds of ointments, and so perfectly were the different component substances amalgamated, that they have been known to retain their scent several hundred years. One of the alabaster vases in the museum at Alnwick Castle contains some of the ancient Egyptian ointment, between two and three thousand years Old, and yet its odor remains (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians, 2:314). SEE ALABASTER.

The practice of producing an agreeable odor by fumigation, or burning incense, as well as that of anointing the person with odoriferous oils and ointments, and of sprinkling the dress with fragrant waters, originated in, and is confined to, warm climates. In such climates perspiration is profuse, and much care is needful to prevent the effects of it from being offensive. It is in this necessity we may find the reason for the use of perfumes, particularly at weddings and feasts, and on visits to persons of rank; and in fact. on most of the occasions which bring people together with the intention of being agreeable to one another. SEE PERFUME.

The following are the uses of ointments referred to in the Scriptures.

1. Cosmetic. — The Greek and Roman practice of anointing the head and clothes on festive occasions prevailed also among the Egyptians, and appears to have had place among the Jews (Rth 3:3; Ecc 7:1; Ecc 9:8; Pro 27:9; Pro 27:16; Son 1:3; Son 4:10; Amo 6:6; Psa 45:7; Isa 57:9; Mat 26:7; Luk 7:46; Rev 18:13; Yoma, 8:1; Shabb. 9:4; Plato, Symp. 1:6, p. 123; see authorities in Hofmann, Lex. s.v. Unguendi ritus). Oil of myrrh, for like purposes, is mentioned in Est 2:12. Strabo says that the inhabitants of Mesopotamia use oil of sesame, and the Egyptians castor-oil (kiki), both for burning, and the lower classes for anointing the body. Chardin and other travelers confirm this statement as regards the Persians, and show  that they made little use of olive-oil, but used other oils, and among them oil of sesame and castor-oil. Chardin also describes the Indian and Persian custom of presenting perfumes to guests at banquets (Strabo, 16:746; 17:824; Chardin, Voy. 4:43, 84, 86; Marco Polo, Trav. [Early Trav.] p. 85; Olearius, Trav. p. 305). Egyptian paintings represent servants anointing guests on their arrival at their entertainer's house, and alabaster vases exist which retain the traces of the ointment which they formerly contained. Atheneus speaks of the extravagance of Antiochus Epiphanes in the use of ointments for guests, as well as of ointments of various kinds (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1:78, pl. 89; 1:157; Atheneus, 10:53; 15:41). SEE ANOINT.

2. Funeral. — Ointments as well as oil were used to anoint dead bodies and the clothes in which they were wrapped. Our Lord thus spoke of his own body being anointed by anticipation (Mat 26:12; Mar 14:38; Luk 23:56; Joh 12:3; Joh 12:7; Joh 19:40; see also Plutarch, Consol. p. 611; 8:413, ed. Reiske). SEE BURIAL.

3. Medicinal. — Ointment formed an important feature in ancient medical treatment (Celsus, De Med. 3:19; v. 27; Pliny, 24:10; 29:3, 8, 9). The prophet Isaiah alludes to this in a figure of speech; and our Lord, in his cure of a blind man, adopted as the outward sign one which represented the usual method of cure. The mention of balm of Gilead and of eye-salve (collyrium) point to the same method (Isa 1:6; Joh 9:6; Jer 8:22; Jer 46:11; Jer 51:8; Rev 3:18; Tob 6:8; Tob 11:8; Tob 11:13; Tertull. De Idololatr. 11). SEE MEDICINE.

4. Ritual. — Besides the oil used in many ceremonial observances, a special ointment was appointed to be used in consecration (Exo 30:23; Exo 30:33; Exo 29:7; Exo 37:29; Exo 10:9; Exo 10:15). It was first compounded by, Bezaleel, and its ingredients and proportions are precisely specified: viz. of pure myrrh and cassia 500 shekels (250 ounces) each; sweet cinnamon and sweet calamus 250 shekels (125 ounces) each; and of olive-oil 1 hin (about 5 quarts, 330.96 cubic inches). These were to be compounded according to the art of the apothecary into an oil of holy ointment (Exo 30:25). It was to be used for anointing

1, the Tabernacle itself;

2, the table and its vessels;

3, the candlestick and its furniture;

4, the altar of incense;

5, the altar of burnt-offering and its vessels;

6, the laver and its foot;

7, Aaron and his sons.

Strict-prohibition was issued against using this unguent for any secular purpose, or on the person of a foreigner, and against imitating it in any way whatsoever (Exo 30:32-33). The composition was not preserved as a secret, but was publicly declared and described, with a plain prohibition to make any like it. Maimonides says that doubtless the cause of this prohibition was that there might be no such perfume found elsewhere, and consequently that a greater attachment might be induced to the sanctuary; and also to prevent the great evils which might arise from men esteeming themselves more excellent than others, if allowed to anoint themselves with a similar oil (More Nebochim, ch. 20). The reasons for attaching such distinction to objects consecrated by their holy appropriations are too obvious to need much elucidation. These ingredients, exclusive of the oil, must have amounted in weight to about 47 lbs. 8 oz.

Now oliveoil weighs at the rate of 10 lbs. to the gallon. The weight therefore of the oil in the mixture would be 12 lbs. 8 oz. English. A question arises, in what form were the other ingredients, and what degree of solidity did the whole attain? Myrrh, “pure” (derosr), free-flowing (Gesen. Thes. p. 355), would seem to imply the juice which flows from the tree at the first incision, perhaps the “bordorato sudantia ligno balsama” (Georg. 2:118), which Pliny says is called “stacte,” and is the best (12:15 Dioscorides, 1:73, 74; quoted by Celsus, 1 159; and Knobel on Exodus , 1. c.). This juice, which at its first flow is soft and oily, becomes harder on exposure to the air. According to Maimonides, Moses (not Bezaleel). having reduced the solid ingredients to powder, steeped them in water till all the aromatic qualities were drawn forth. He then poured in the oil, and boiled the whole till the water was evaporated. The residuum thus obtained was preserved in a vessel for use (Otho, Lex. Rabb. s.v. Oleum). This account is perhaps favored by the. expression” powders of the merchant,” in reference to myrrh (Son 3:6; Keil, Arch. d. Hebr. p. 173). Another theory supposes all the ingredients to have been in the form of oil or ointment, and the measurement by weight of all except the oil seems to imply that they were in some solid-form, but whether in an unctuous state or in that of powder cannot be ascertained. A process of making ointment, consisting, in part at least, in boiling, is alluded to in Job 41:31. The charge of preserving the anointing oil, as well as the oil for the light, was given to Eleazar (Num 4:16).: The quantity of ointment made in the  first instance seems to imply that it was intended to last a long time. The Rabbinical writers say that it lasted 900 years, i.e. till the captivity, because it was said, “Ye shall not make any like it” (Exo 30:32); but it seems clear from 1Ch 9:30 that the ointment was renewed from time to time (Cheriith, 1:1). The prodigious quantity of this holy ointment made on the occasion which the text describes, being no less than 750 ounces of solids compounded with five quarts of oil, may give some idea of the profuse use of perfumes among the Hebrews. The ointment with which Aaron was anointed is said to have flowed down over his garments (Exo 29:21; Psa 133:2 : “skirts,” in the latter passage, is literally “mouth,” i.e.the opening of the robe at the neck; Exo 28:32). This circumstance may give some interest to the following anecdote, which we translate from Chardin (Voyages, 4:43, ed. Langles). After remarking how prodigal the eastern females are of perfumes, he gives this instance:

“I remember that, at the solemnization of the nuptials of the three princesses royal of Golconda, whom the king, their father, who had no other children, married in one day, in the year 1679, perfumes were lavished on every invited guest as he arrived. They sprinkled them upon those who were clad in white; but gave them into the hands of those who wore colored raiment, because their garments would have been spoiled by throwing it over them, which was done in the following manner. They threw over the body a bottle of rose- water, containing about half a pint, and then a larger bottle of water tinted with saffron, in such a manner that the clothes would have been stained with it. After this, they rubbed the arms and the body with a liquid perfume of ladanumn and ambergris and they put round the throat a thick cord of jasmine. I was thus perfumed with saffron in many great houses of this country, and in other places. This attention and honor is a universal custom among the women who have the means of obtaining this luxury.”

SEE UNGUENT.

Kings, and also in some cases prophets, were, as well as priests, anointed with oil or ointment; but Scripture only mentions the fact as actually taking place in the cases of Saul, David, Solomon, Jehu, and Joash. The Rabbins say that Saul, Jehu, and Joash were only anointed with common oil, while for David and Solomon the holy oil was used (1Sa 10:1; 1Sa 16:1; 1Sa 16:13;  1Ki 1:39; 2Ki 9:1; 2Ki 9:3; 2Ki 9:6; 2Ki 11:12; Godwyn, Moses and Aaron, 1:4; Carpzov, Apparatus, p. 56, 57; Hofmann, Lex. s.v. Unguendi ritus; Jerome, Com. in Osee, 3:134). It is evident that the sacred oil was used in the case of Solomon, and probably in the cases of Saul and David. In the case of Saul (1Sa 10:1) the article is used, “the oil,” as it is also in the case of Jehu (2Ki 9:1); and it seems unlikely that the anointing of Joash, performed by the high-priest, should have been defective in this respect. SEE CONSECRATION.

In the Christian Church the ancient usage of anointing the bodies of the dead was long retained, as is noticed by Chrysostom and other writers quoted by Suicer, s.v. ἔλαιον. The ceremony of chrism or anointing was also added to baptism. See authorities quoted by Suicer, l. c., and under Βάπτισμα and Χρῖσμα. SEE CHRISM; SEE UNCTION.

## Oiot[[@Headword:Oiot]]

             a great god among the Indians of California.

## Oisel, Philip[[@Headword:Oisel, Philip]]

             a German Protestant minister, was born at Dantzic in 1671. He was an excellent Hebrew scholar, and published several theological works. He died at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1724.

## Ojibway Version[[@Headword:Ojibway Version]]

             SEE CHIPPEWA.

## Okely, Francis[[@Headword:Okely, Francis]]

             a learned English theologian, was born in 1718. His adherence to the Moravians prevented his being. ordained a minister in the Anglican Church. He died at Bedford May 9,1794. He wrote, The Nature and Necessity of the New Creature in Christ (1772, 8vo), translated from the German: — The divine Visions of John Englebrecht (1781, 2 vols. 8vo); the works of this German visionary, had been published in German in 1658, some years after his death: — A faithful Narrative of God's gracious Dealings with Hiel (1781, 8vo): — Dawnings of the everlasting Gospel Light, glimmering out of a private Heart's epistolary Correspondence (Northampton, 1775, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generae, 38:577; Darling, Cycl. Bibliog. 2:2232. (J. N. P.)

## Oken, Lorenz[[@Headword:Oken, Lorenz]]

             a celebrated Swiss naturalist, was born at Offenberg Aug. 2, 1779. He studied medicine and natural history at Gottingen, and held the position of privat-docent in that university. In 1807 he became extraordinary professor of medicine in the University of Jena; thence he removed to Zurich, where he held the post of professor of natural history till his death, which occurred in August, 1847. At the time when Oken .began to study natural science, the writings of Kant, Fichte, and, Schelling were producing a deep impression on the minds of the students of natural history. Schelling,s who had studied medicine, had applied the principles of the transcendental philosophy to the facts of the natural World, and had by a process of thought endeavored to give an explanation of the phenomena of nature. It was in this school that Oken studied, and the principles of the transcendental philosophy more or less guided his researches as a naturalist throughout his long life. His first work was published in 1802, and was entitled Elemente der Natur-Plilosophie. This was followed in 1805 by a work on Die Zeugung. In these books he endeavored to apply a general theory of nature to the facts presented by the forms and the development of animals. In his classification he took for his basis the presence of the senses, making each class of animals to represent an organ of sense. In his work on Generation he first suggested that all animals are built up of vesicles or cells.

The formation of seminal matter is described as taking  place by the decomposition of the organism into infusoria, and propagation is described as the flight of the occupant from his falling house. In 1806 he published his Contributions to Comparative Anatomy and Physiology, and pointed out the origin of the intestines in the umbilical vesicle. In this year he made an excursion to the Harz Mountains, which resulted in an important thought. — This may be described in his own language: “In- Auggst, 1806,” he says, “I made a journey over the Harz. I slid down through the wood on the south side; and straight before me, at my feet, lay a most beautiful bleached skull of a hind. I picked it up, turned it round, regarded it intensely: the thing was done. “It is a vertebral column!' struck me as a flash of lightning to the marrow and bone; and since that time the skull has been regarded as a vertebral column.” This discovery was published in an essay on the “Signification of the Bones of the Skull.” The essay, although it attracted little attention at first, laid the foundation of those inquiries which, in the hands of Carus, Geoffroy St. Hilaire, and Owen, have led to the establishment of those laws of homology in the vertebrate skeleton that are now a universally received branch of anatomical science. It was by the persevering use of the idea that flashed across his mind in the Harz that Oken has earned for himself the title of “the father of morphological science.”

While still a young man, and deeply convinced of the importance of an ideal philosophy in explaining the phenomena of the external world, he wrote his Lehrbuch der Natur-Philosophie (Jenla, 1809; 3d ed. Zurich, 1843), translated into English by Mr. Fulke, and published in 1847 by the Ray Society, entitled Elements of Physio-Philosophy. In this work the author takes the widest possible view of natural science, and classifies the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms according to his philosophical views. “The animal kingdom,” says Oken, “is man resolved into his constituent elements; what in the lower stages of animal life are independent antagonisms reappear in the higher as attributes.” In 1817 Oken started a natural-history journal entitled his, which he conducted for thirty years. See English Cyclop. s.v.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 2:227; Tinnemann, Manual of Philos. (see Index); Morell, Hist. of Philos. in the 19th Century (see Index).

## Oketsim[[@Headword:Oketsim]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Okki[[@Headword:Okki]]

             is the name of the Great Spirit worshipped by the Huron Indians of North America.

## Oklah[[@Headword:Oklah]]

             SEE OCLAH.

## Okszi, Stanislas[[@Headword:Okszi, Stanislas]]

             (Lat. Orichovius), a Polish polemical writer, noted especially as a pulpit orator, was born in the diocese of Premislau in the early part of the 16th century. He studied theology at Wittenberg, under Luther and Melancthon; then at Venice, under Egnatius. On his return to his own land he entered the ecclesiastic life, and became canon of Premislau. His attachment to the opinions of Luther having drawn upon him the reprimands of the chapter, he renounced his benefice and married. “Anathematized by his prelate,” says Bayle, “he not only used his pen against the ecclesiastics, but he troubled them also in the possession of their wealth, and placed himself at the head of their antagonists; by the volubility of his wit and his tongue he caused' great commotion.” He entered again the pale of the Church at the synod held in 1561 at Warsaw, and from that time displayed great zeal against the Protestants. The force of his eloquence has given to Orichovius the surname of the Polish Demosthenes. He left a large number of works; those written to obtain for the priests the liberty of marrying are the most sought after. We quote of his works; Oratio funebris in funere Sigismondi Magellonis, Polonice regis (Cracow, 1548, 8vo); reproduced by different historical bodies of Poland: — De ccelibatus lege (Basle, 1551, 8vo); — Oratio pro dignitate sacerdotali (Cracow, 1561, 8vo): — De Stancari secta (Cologne, 1563, 8vo): — De bello adversus Turcas suscipiendo (Cracow, 1583, 8vo): — Annales Polonice ab excessu Sigismundi, cum vita Petri Knithae (Dabromii. 1611; Dantzic, 1843, 12mo). See Stauvolscius, Elogia centum Polonorum. p. 78, 79; Bayle, Dict. Hist. s.v.

## Olaf, Engelbrechtson[[@Headword:Olaf, Engelbrechtson]]

             a noted Norwegian prelate of the Roman Catholic branch of the Church, flourished as archbishop of Trondhjem from 1523 to 1537. He was a zealous adherent to king Christian the First's party. He clung to the Roman Catholic faith to the last, but his endeavors to re-establish it in Norway  proved unsuccessful. After having suffered imprisonment, and having been forced to pay a large sum of money as a ransom for his life, he was set free in 1532; but in 1537 he was compelled to leave the country. He died in exile in Brabant. See Petersen, Norges Sveriges og Danmariks Historie; Nordisk Conversations lexikon, s.v. (R. B. A.)

## Olaf, Haraldson[[@Headword:Olaf, Haraldson]]

             the Saint, one of the most revered of the early Norwegian kings, ruled from 1015 to 1030. He was born in 995. When a child he was baptized by Olaf Tryggveson (q.v.), who visited his mother in Ringsric. But how little the Norsemen cared about an involuntary baptism is illustrated by the youthful career of this Olaf. When he was only twelve years old his step- father, Sigurd Syr, had to furnish him with ships for viking expeditions, and for many years he gathered plunder in the Baltic and in England and France. In the Christian countries he and his followers were called heathens; and it is related that Olaf finally was rebaptized in Rouen. Certain it is that he became converted, and henceforth he followed the precepts of the Christian religion according to the views of his time, and worked for the spreading of the Gospel with marvelous zeal and unimpeachable integrity. He was destined to complete the work that had been begun twenty years before him by Olaf Tryggveson. Glowing with enthusiasm for the cause of Christ, and crowned with success as a warrior, Olaf came to Norway in 1015, and soon made himself the undisputed master of the kingdom. Olaf Haraldson employed the same means in converting the heathens that had been employed by his namesake, Olaf Tryggveson; but the period of his reign was longer, and the way had been paved for him partly by the cruelty of his predecessor and partly by the work of patient missionaries, so that he accomplished his great undertaking, although he became its martyr. He not only overthrew heathenism in every one of his provinces, but by the appointment of teachers and the building of churches he also succeeded in establishing the Christian religion as the national faith. His name occurs in many folk-songs, and he is still regarded by the peasantry of Norway as their great benefactor. In addition to his apostolic mission, he completed the work begun in 872 by Harald Fairfax of firmly uniting the several provinces of Norway into one kingdom.

By various stratagems king Canute the Great succeeded in alienating the people of Norway from Olaf, and in 1028 Canute was actually elected king of Norway, Olaf having fled to Russia. The latter returned with about 3000 Norse and Swedish warriors, whom he had carefully gathered. All of them  were Christians. He put on their helmets and shields the sign of the cross, and gave them as his watchword, “Onward, soldiers of Christ, for the cross and the king.” A battle was finally fought near Stikle Stad, where he fell, on Aug. 31, 1030. The date is fixed by an eclipse of the sun occurring during the battle. The body of Olaf was disinterred after it had been buried about a year, and it was found that the face was unchanged, and that his hair and nails had grown; it was also said to possess healing qualities. Olaf was canonized as the guardian saint of Norway, and miraculous powers are attributed to him. Although the elevation of Olaf to saintship at first led to purely political results, it was the means of stamping the country forever with the seal of Christianity. The cathedral of Trondhjem, where his ashes were for a long time preserved, was regarded down to the time of the Reformation as the most sacred sanctuary of Norway, and was the chief resort of pilgrims in the North. See Munch, Det norske Folks Historie, 2:488-813; Keyser, Norges Historic, 1:347-415; Dahlmann, Geschichte von Danemark; Carlyle, Early Kings of Norway; Tordisk Conversationslexikon, s.v. Neander, Church Hist. 3:297 sq.; Piper, Evangel. Jahrbuch, 1852, p. 113 sq.; Maurer, Die Bekehrung des Norweg. Stammes zunm Ch istenthum (Munich, 1855-56, 2 vols.); Munter, Kirchengesch. ‘on Ddnemark u. Norwegen, vol. i; Maclear, Hist. of Christian Missions in the Mid. Ages (see Index); Keyser, Den norske Kirkes Hist. under Katholicismen (see Index). (R. B. A.)

## Olaf, Tryggveson[[@Headword:Olaf, Tryggveson]]

             king of Norway from 995 to 1000, noted as one of the most devoted of the early Norwegian rulers to the Christian faith, was the great-grandson of Harald Fairfax, and the son of Trggve, who was a sub-king in the south- eastern part of Norway. The latter had been murdered by Gudrod, son of Erik Blood-axe. The widow of Tryggve and her infant son Olaf were eagerly pursued, and fled through Sweden into Russia. Here the boy was brought up, and hence he was frequently called the Russian. Many wonderful tales are told of his youthful exploits, but a large number of them are, of course, nothing but Romish legends, which have been invented to embellish the life of this royal apostle. It is, however, a fact that Olaf, while yet a young man, had become famous for being one of the most warlike chiefs of his time, and for possessing extraordinary strength and agility. Olaf went on viking expeditions inn the Baltic and in the British waters. In England he became converted to Christianity, and married a powerful English or Irish woman, by name Gyda.

In the year 995 he  returned to Norway, where he arrived at the most opportune time, for Hakon Jarl, who was so much hated for his vices, had just been put to flight by the peasantry, and was killed by his thrall Karker. Olaf found no difficulty in securing the rulership of Norway. He devoted all the. energy of his five years' reign to the introduction of Christianity among his subjects. He made a journey along the whole coast of Norway, destroying the idols and baptizing the most distinguished men. The means whereby he sought to establish the Christian religion were the same as those he had previously practiced as a viking. His reign is stained with murder and bloodshed, and he practiced both cunning and deceit for the good of the cause. He founded Nidaros (the present Trondhjem), where he maintained a splendid court, and thereby he not only made the people acquainted with Christian ceremonies and ways of living, but also gave Norway a governmental center. Upon the whole, the introduction of religious ideas served to strengthen and increase the power of the king, and to put down the anarchical spirit which had characterized the reign of the previous kings. Olaf also worked successfully for the introduction of Christianity into the Orkneys, Faroes, Iceland, and Greenland. Finally he made an expedition to Pomerania, for the purpose of getting certain possessions that belonged to his queen Thyra, the sister of Svend Forkbeard of Denmark, But at the same time a conspiracy was formed against him by Svend, king of Denmark, Olof, king of Sweden, and the Norse jarl Erik. By these Olaf was attacked at the island Svolder (near Greifswalde) on Sept. 9, 1000, where he fell after a most desperate struggle, being then only thirty-six years old. See NordiskConverisationslexikon, s.v.; Munch, Det norske Folks Historie, 2:20-635; Keyser, Norges Historie, 1:294-329; Carlyle, Early Kings of Norway (see Index); Neander, Ch. list. 3:297-99; 302 sq.; Munter, Kirchengesch. v. Danemark u. Norwegen, pt. i (Leips. 1823), 322 sq.; Maclear, Eist. of Christian Missions in the M. A. (see Index); Maurer, Bekehrung des Norweg. Stammes (Munich, 1855-56, 2 vols. 8vo); Keyser, Den norske Kirkes Historie under Katholicismen (see Index). (R. B. A.)

## Olahus, Nicholas[[@Headword:Olahus, Nicholas]]

             a learned Hungarian prelate of Wallachian origin, was born Jan. 9, 1493, at Hermanstadt. He passed his youth in the court of king Ladislas, and became (1524) secretary of king Louis, whose widow, Maria, brought him in 1530 to the Netherlands, which she had just been called to govern. In 1543 he was appointed bishop of Agram and chancellor of the kingdom. In 1547 he accompanied to the war of Smalcald king Ferdinand, whose  confidence he possessed. Later he became archbishop of Gran and primate of Hungary, and exercised the most happy influence over the establishment of discipline and the amelioration of ecclesiastical studies. Having become satisfied that the only way to stay the decline of Romanism in Hungary was to preserve it among the common people, who had not at that time become altogether alienated, Olahus raised up a new class of teachers to propagate Roman Catholic sentiments, and in 1561, therefore, founded a college of Jesuits in Tyrnau, which he supported largely by his own revenues, until the emperor came to his relief. Thus the Jesuits were afforded their principal hold in Hungary. Of course they did not long retain it; the Reformation made its way, notwithstanding their efforts to stop its progress, and the archbishop was defeated in his purpose. Yet it must be confessed that Olahus was a liberal prelate, and did much to elevate the priests who were in his diocese. He died Jan. 14, 1568. We have of his works, Catholicae ac Christianae religionis prceipua capita (Vienna, 1560, 4to), and in vol. ii of the Concilia of Peterfy; one of the best resum4s of the Catholic doctrine: — Hungaria, seu de originibus gentis, regionis situ, divisione, habitu et opportunitatibus, in the Ad paratus of M. Bel: — Compendiarium suce cetatis chronicon, in the same collection: — Ephemerides astrononicce ab anno 1552-1559, in vol. i of Scriptores minores of Kovachich: — Attila, sive de rebus, bello paceque ab eo gestis, in the series of several editions of Bonfinius: — Processus universalis, an alchemical treatise published under the pseudonym of Nicolaus Melchior. in the Museum hermeticum, printed at Frankfort, 1525. See Horanyi, Memoria Hungarorum, tom. ii; Bel, Hungaria nova Cisdanubiazna tom. i; Lehrmann, Hist. diplom. de statu Rel. Evang. in Hung. p. 710 sq.; Ranke, Hist. Papacy, 1:396 sq.; Alzog [R. C.], Kirchengesch. 2:336.

## Olamus[[@Headword:Olamus]]

             (᾿Ωλαμός), a corrupt Graecized form (1Es 9:30) for MESHULLAM SEE MESHULLAM (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 10:29).

## Olaus, John[[@Headword:Olaus, John]]

             SEE OLAUS MAGNUS.

## Olaus, Magnus[[@Headword:Olaus, Magnus]]

             a Swedish Roman Catholic, divine of note, was brother of John Olaus, archbishop of Upsala, and was an archdeacon in the Swedish Church when  the Reformation, supported by Gustavus Vasa, gained the ascendency in Sweden. In consequence of this change the two brothers, who remained attached to the Roman Catholic faith, left their country and retired to Rome, where Olaus Magnus passed the remainder of his life in the enjoyment of a small pension from the pope. At Rome he wrote his work, Historia de Gentibus Septentrionalibus, earumque diversis Statibzs, Conditionibus, Moribus, itidemque Superstitionibus, Disciplinis, etc. (Rome, 1555; fol., and Basle, 1567). Other editions of this work have been published, which, as well as a French translation in 1561, are all incomplete. The work is minute, and contains some curious information, but is uncritically written. Olaus died at Rome in 1568. His brother John wrote a work entitled Gothorum Suevorumque Historia, probatissimis Antiquorum monumentis collecta (Rome, 1554, fol.), which is a still more uncritical performance than that of his brother Magnus.

## Old[[@Headword:Old]]

             A fine description of the decrepitude of old age is contained in Ecc 12:5 sq., The ancient Hebrews, in obedience to a natural feeling, and because of their superior moral discipline, entertained the highest regard for the aged (Job 12:12; Job 15:10); and this sentiment still prevails throughout the East (Rosenmüller, Morgenland, 2:208 sq.; Descript. de ‘Egypte,. 18:174 sq.), as it did among all ancient nations (Homer, I. 23:788; Isocr. A rop. p. 354,355; Diog. Laert. 1:3, 2; 8:1, 19; Herod. 2:80; Juvenal, Sat. 13:54; Aul. Gell. 2:15; Strabo, 11:503; Justin, 3:3, 9; Doughteei Analect. 1:84; see C. Kretzschmar, De Senectute Priscis Ionorata [Dresd. 1784]), although in Europe, as the power of.education has increased, and the circumstances of life have become more complicated. the honor given to age has decreased. (But comp. Ebert, Ueberliefer, 2:1, p. 90 sq.) The young were accustomed to rise and give place modestly, whenever an old person approached (Lev 19:32; AElian, Anim. 6:61. Herod. ut sup.; comp. also Job 29:8; Otho, Lex. Rabbin. — p. 686). Want of reverence for the aged was severely rebuked (Deu 28:50; Lam 5:12; Wis 2:10), and moralists often inculcated peculiar, obligations to the old (Pro 23:22; Sir 3:13; Sir 6:35; Sir 8:7; Sir 32:13). The Essenes were especially zealous in their regard for the old (Philo, Opp. 2:459, 633). The salutation “father” was frequently addressed to aged men among the Hebrews, as also among the Greeks and Romans (comp. Heindorf, On Horat. Sat. 2:1, 12); but it appears in the Bible rather as an expression of respect, or as applied to holy men (2Ki 6:21; 2Ki 13:14). From the earliest times the Hebrews chose their officers and judges from the old men of the nation. While yet in Egypt they had elders to represent the people (Exo 3:16; Exo 4:29; Exo 12:21; comp. Exo 17:5; Exo 18:12), and Moses himself appointed a college of seventy “elders” (Num 6:16; but comp. Exo 24:1; Exo 24:9) to aid him in ruling. From this time the Israelites always had “elders,” sometimes of the whole nation (Jos 7:6; Jos 23:2; 1Sa 4:3; 1Sa 8:4; 2Sa 3:17; 2Sa 5:3; 2Sa 17:4; 1Ki 8:1; 1Ki 8:3; Jer 19:1; Jer 29:1), sometimes of single tribes (Deu 31:28; 2Sa 19:11; 2Ch 34:29), who however were distinct from the princes and officers of tribes and provinces (Deu 29:10; Jdg 11:5), and sometimes only of cities (Deu 19:12; Deu 21:3; Deu 21:6; Deu 22:15; 1Sa 11:3; 1Sa 16:4; 1Ki 21:8; 1Ki 21:11; Ezr 10:14; 2Ma 14:37; comp. Jdg 8:14). In the ceremonial order of sacrifice, also, they were representatives of the people for certain purposes (Lev 4:15; Lev 9:1).

The elders of the city formed a council, with judicial and police authority (Deu 22:15 sq.; Deu 25:7 sq.; Rth 4:2 sq.; Jdt 10:7), which held its sessions at the gates (Job 29:7). Yet other judges .are sometimes mentioned (Ezr 10:14; comp. Susan. 5; and SEE JUDGE ). The elders of the people and of the tribes were the constitutional representatives of the people under the kings (1Ki 8:1; 1Ki 20:7; 2 Kings 28:1). They still retained their functions during the Captivity (Eze 14:1; Eze 20:7), and after the restoration to Palestine were the medium of communication between the people and their foreign rulers (Ezr 5:9; Ezr 6:7), and even until the time of the Maccabees were a tribunal of general resort in the internal affairs of the nation (Ezr 6:14; Ezr 10:8; 1Ma 12:6; 1Ma 12:35; 1Ma 13:36; 1Ma 14:9). It does not appear, however, that the “elders” were always in reality the oldest men; superior ability and personal influence were qualifications for this position, even apart from advanced age, so that gradually the word elder ( זָקֵןzaken) passed into a mere title, belonging of course to the office (comp. Philo, Opp. 1:393), just as the word γέρων in the Grecian states (as in Sparta, Wachsmuth, Hel. Alt. 1:463), senator in Rome, and elder in the Protestant churches (comp. Gesen. Thesaur. p. 427 sq.). In the New Testament the elders of the people (Mat 26:47; Luk 7:3; called “the senate of the children of Israel” [γερπισία τῶν υἱῶν Ι᾿σραήλ], Act 5:21) usually appear as composing, in connection with the high-priests and scribes. the Jewish Sanhedrim (Mat 26:3; Mat 26:47; Mat 27:1 sq.; Mar 14:43; Mar 15:1; Luk 22:66; Act 4:5; Act 5:21). SEE SANHEDRIM. After the model of the  Jewish synagogue, at the head of which stood the elders, the apostles appointed elders also in the several churches (called the “presbytery,” 1Ti 4:14; see Act 11:30; Act 14:23; Act 15:2 sq.; Act 16:4). SEE AGE; SEE ELDERS; SEE PRESBYTERY.

## Old Believers[[@Headword:Old Believers]]

             SEE STAROVERTZI.

## Old Calabar[[@Headword:Old Calabar]]

             an African kingdom, is situated in the Bight of Biafra, near the 6th deg. of north latitude. and between the 8th and 9th deg. of east longitude, and has a population of nearly 100,000, ruled by a king, who resides at Creek Town, the principal place in Old Calabar, and delegates the power of government to his head-man in each town. The population — divided into two classes, freemen and slaves, the latter being the great majority — is either employed on the provision grounds, which are at some distance from the towns, or in the operations of trade. The freemen are all engaged in trade, and are mainly dependent upon it for their support and influence. Even the king, who has no revenue from his subjects, carries on trade to a great extent, is of active business habits, keeps regular accounts, and owes all his power to the weight of his character, and the wealth which he has acquired from trading. The slaves are generally treated with kindness; and there seems to be a process of internal emancipation, the children of the third generation generally becoming free. Persons have ceased to be exported as slaves from this district for a considerable number of years. This suppression of the slave trade in the Bight of Biafra is to be ascribed to the beneficial influence of a growing trade, and to the treaties made with the chiefs by the British government. The trade carried on at Old Calabar is chiefly in palm-oil, which is brought from the interior, and is exchanged for British goods. The humanizing influence of legitimate commerce is becoming every year more obvious. Not only has it enlarged the views of the people, and to a certain degree improved their manners; enabled them to have comfortable houses, and to furnish them in many instances with costly articles of European manufacture; but it has taught them that it is for their interest to live at peace with their neighbors.

“The mode of government at Old Calabar is, in the case of freemen, by common consultation and agreement. They meet together in the palaver- house, talk over the matter, and no measure can become law that has not a  majority of votes. The great difficulty which they feel is to keep in subjection their numerous slaves. This seems to be managed chiefly by the aid of superstition. — They have a secret institution, called Eybo, much resembling the Oro of the Yorubas.

“Religion. — The natives believe in the existence of God and of the devil. in a future state, and in the immortality of the soul; but their ideas on these subjects are dim and confused, and have, by the wickedness of the heart and the malignant teaching of Satan, been framed into a system of superstition — dark, cruel, and sanguinary. They regard one day of the week as a Sabbath; they all practice circumcision; on festival days they sprinkle the blood of the Egbo goat, and they make a covenant of friendship between parties that were at variance, by putting on them the blood of a slain goat mixed with certain ingredients — things which indicate the remains of the patriarchal religion. Their personal worship, so far as it has been ascertained, may be divided into two parts; that which is observed within the house, and that which takes place in the court-yard. The worship within the house consists in adoring a human skull stuck upon the top of a stick, around the handle of which a bunch of feathers is tied. This disgusting object — their domestic idol — is said to exist in every house in Old Calabar. The worship in the court-yard is of this kind: in the middle of the yard there is a basin of water placed at the foot of a small tree, which is planted for the purpose. This basin is never emptied of its contents, but is once a week filled with a fresh supply of water; and on the day when this is done, the second day of the week, called God's day, they ‘offer a fowl, or some other small thing of that sort, which is tied by the foot to the tree,' and then they ‘pray to Basi Ebum, the great God, but without confession of sin, and solely for temporal benefits.' Witchcraft exerts the same terrible influence here as in other parts of Western Africa.

“But the most desolating and sanguinary of all their customs is the practice of sacrificing human victims for the benefit of deceased persons of rank. This horrible custom arises from the belief that the future world corresponds to the present — that the same wants are felt, the same relationships sustained, and the same pursuits followed; and, therefore, that the station and happiness of a person depend upon the number of followers and slaves who are killed and sent after him. The effect of this belief is that in proportion to the dignity of the departed, the rank and power of the survivors, and the warmth of affection which they cherish for the deceased, is the number of victims that are seized and immolated. Acquaintances also  testify their respect for the dead and sympathy with the sorrowing relations by destroying a few of their slaves. The agents in this wholesale system of murder are the nearest relatives of the deceased, who evince their affection and their grief by exerting themselves to catch by force, by stratagem, and by all manner of ways, and to destroy as many of their fellow-creatures as they can. It is a season of terror. The slaves, from whose ranks the victims are usually taken, flee to the bush for shelter, the doors of the houses are fastened, and every one is afraid to go abroad. When it is borne in mind that the funeral ceremonies continue for four months, and that at the beginning, and especially at the close of this period, when the grand carnival, or make-devil, as they call it, takes place, great exertions are made to obtain victims, it will at once be obvious that this is a practice which spreads terror and mourning through every part of the community. It prevails in the greater part of Western Central Africa, and is drenching the land with blood” (Newcomb).

Missionary Labors. — The work of converting the natives of Old Calabar to Christianity was begun in 1846 by the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and has continued under its control. The first mission stations were Creek Town; Duke Town, and Old Town. At the beginning of the mission-work provision was made for the education of the natives, and schools were opened in large numbers, and they were well patronized. The language of the country, which had never been systematized, was given a more permanent form, and soon a Bible in that tongue gave general circulation to the Christian's Gospel. At present there are six stations, and native workers are employed in large numbers in many places besides at these stations. See Grundemann, Missions-Atlas, No. 1; Aikman, Cyclop. of Christian Missions, p. 206, 207; Missionary Yearbook, 1:109.

## Old Catholics[[@Headword:Old Catholics]]

             a name adopted in 1870 by those members of the Roman Catholic Church who refused to recognize the validity of the decrees of the Vatican Council (q.v.), especially that concerning the infallibility of the pope; and who, when the bishops, by means of excommunication, tried to enforce submission to the Vatican decrees, organized independent congregations, and gradually advanced, by the election of bishops, to the organization of an independent religious denomination.

1. The bishops of Germany and Austro-Hungary, who during the proceedings of the Vatican Council opposed the proclamation of papal infallibility as inopportune, not only expected such a movement, but expressly warned the majority of the council not to provoke it by a measure which was intensely disliked by a very large number in the Church. The opposition of several bishops of the minority to the doctrine of infallibility had been so determined that they were expected to favor and join the secession movement. This expectation was, however, disappointed. After the promulgation of the doctrine of infallibility all the  bishops, one after another, submitted, though some — as bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, in Germany, and bishop Strossmayer, of Sirmium, in Hungary — with unfeigned reluctance. At length only a few bishops of the United Armenian Church, who, even before the convocation of the council, had fallen out with the pope on questions relating to the former privileges of the Armenian Church, remained in opposition to the Vatican Council. In Germany, the center of the opposition to the Vatican decrees, the bishops, soon after their return from Italy, had held a meeting at Fulda, and drawn up a joint pastoral letter to the Catholics of Germany, in which they announced their own submission to the Vatican decrees, and advised all faithful Catholics to follow their example. This advice was, however, in a signal manner disregarded by a large number of Catholic scholars of Germany. Only a few days after July 18, the day when the Vatican Council formally sanctioned the doctrine of infallibility, Prof. F. Michelis, of the Lyceum of Braunsberg, Eastern Prussia, issued a declaration in which he accused the pope of being a heretic, and of devastating the Church. At Mtunich, forty-four professors of the university, under the leadership of Dollinger and Friedrich, signed a protest against the binding authority of the Vatican Council and the validity of its resolutions. Similar protests were numerously signed by professors of the universities of Bonn, Breslau, Freiburg, and Giessen. In August the theological leaders of the movement met in conference at Nuremberg to concert further action.

A joint declaration against the Vatican decrees was agreed upon and signed, among others, by Dollinger and Friedrich, of Munich; Michelis, of Braunsberg; Reinkens and Baltzer, of Breslau; Knoodt, of Bonn; and Schulte, of Prague all of whom had thus far been regarded as among the most prominent scholars of the Catholic Church. The bishops now demanded from all the professors of theology an express declaration that they recognised the œcumenical character of the council. A few, like Prof. Haneberg, of Munich, who was soon after appointed bishop of Spires, and Prof. Dieringer, of Bonn, yielded to the pressure brought to bear upon them; but the majority remained firm in their opposition. The laity appeared, however, at first to take but little interest in the movement. Only a few isolated protests were published, the most noted of them being the so-called “protest of the Old Catholics” of Munich, a name which was subsequently adopted by the entire party. The leaders appeared to be at a loss as to the further steps to be taken, and the most prominent among them, Prof. Dollinger, emphatically dissuaded the organization of independent Old-Catholic congregations, in order not to make the breach  in the Church incurable. For some time only two Catholic congregations in all Germany, one in Bavaria and one in Prussia, assumed an attitude of open opposition; but in a number of other towns, especially in Bavaria and on the Rhine, the sympathizers with the movement kept up a kind of organization by means of local committees.” A decisive step towards an independent Church organization was taken by the first Old-Catholic Congress, held at Munich from Sept. 20 to 24, 1871.

Notwithstanding the continuing opposition of Dollinger, this congress, which was numerously attended by the Old Catholics of Germany, Switzerland, and Austria, resolved to provide for the religious wants of the Old Catholics in all places where it seemed to be needed, and for this purpose to organize congregations and churches. It was also resolved to enter into communion with the “Church of Utrecht,” or the so-called Jansenists, SEE JANSENISTS, who for about two centuries had maintained principles similar to those of the Roman Catholics, and insisted on remaining members of the Catholic Church in spite of the continuous:anathemas hurled against them by the pope. The connection with this Church, which still has an archbishop and two bishops, was of vital importance for the perpetuation of the Old-Catholic community as long as it intended to claim a doctrinal agreement with the Catholic Church as it existed before 1870; for two of the Catholic sacraments, Holy Orders and Confirmation, can only be dispensed by bishops.

The Congress of Munich appeared to be very intent upon avoiding everything that might involve an open breach with the Catholic Church before 1870, and endanger the claim of the Old Catholics to being regarded by the state governments as the only true representatives of the Catholic Church, and the owners of the Church property. The introduction of more radical reforms, which was chiefly urged by Austrians and Swiss, was postponed to a future period, when the participation of the Catholic people in Church legislation would be fully regulated by a new Church constitution. One of the resolutions, however, adopted by the Congress, declaring that even for the doctrinal decisions of an œcumenical council validity could only be claimed if they agreed with the original and traditional faith of the Church as witnessed by the faith of the people and traditional science, involved a principle cutting deep into the traditional theories of the infallibility of the Church.

At the same time a hope was expressed for a reunion with the Oriental and Anglican churches, and the doctrinal differences were not important enough to be regarded as insurmountable obstacles to a reunion. In consequence of the resolutions passed by the congress Old-Catholic congregations were organized at  Munich, Passau, Cologne, Bonn, Heidelberg, and a number of other cities. In some places, as in Munich and in Cologne, the municipal and state authorities gave to the Old Catholics the simultaneous use of one of the Catholic churches, a permission which was regularly followed by the voluntary abandonment of such a church by the ultramontane members of the congregation, who were exhorted to shun all communion with the new heretics. When the Catholic army bishop, Namszanowski, declared the soldiers' church of Cologne, which the military authorities had allowed the Old Catholics for simultaneous use to have been desecrated by the “sacrilegious” mass, the minister of war suspended him from his office. A regulation of the legal affairs of Old Catholics by the state governments was found to present unexpected difficulties. The demand expressed by Prof. Schulte, the president of the Old-Catholic Congress of Munich, and one of the foremost lay leaders of the movement, that the Old Catholics alone be regarded as the legal successors of the Catholic Church prior to 1870, and that they be put by the state in possession of the entire property of the Church, could not be complied with, as the number of avowed Old Catholics was insignificant in comparison with the infallibilists, and as the' state governments were unwilling to interfere in a matter of a strictly ecclesiastical character. For the latter reason they equally refused to comply with the request of the bishops no longer to regard the Old Catholics as members of the Catholic Church. Thus no course was left open to the state authorities but to recognize both parties as members of the Catholic Church, with equal rights. This point of view was gradually adopted by the governments of all the German states. Considerable difference of opinion showed itself, however, in the execution of the principle.

The Prussian government exempted the Old Catholics of Wiesbaden from the duty of contributing for the expenses of the Catholic parish; but, on the other hand, excused the Catholic children of the Gymnasium of Braunsberg from attending the religious instruction of the teacher, who had joined the Old Catholics. On the other hand, the Old- Catholic children in Bavarian schools were excused from attending the religious instruction given by infallibilist teachers. At the beginning of 1872 the number of priests who had identified themselves with the movement was about thirty. A new impulse was given to it in the spring of that year by lectures which several leaders, like Dollinger, Reinkens, Michelis, Huber, and Friedrich, delivered in various places. In some parts of Germany, as in the Bavarian palatinate and the grand-duchy of Baden, the Old-Catholic societies perfected their organization by meeting in district  conferences. In July, 1872, the archbishop of Utrecht accepted an invitation from several Old-Catholic congregations of Germany to administer the sacrament of confirmation to their children, and to this end visited the congregations of Cologne, Munich, Spires, and other towns. Considerable progress in the further organization of the. new Church was made at the second Old-Catholic Congress, which was held in September, 1872, at Cologne, and, like the first, was presided over by Prof. Schulte.

The Congress declared that the adherents of papal infallibility had separated from the true Catholic Church, and organized an ultramontane and-church (Gegenkirche); that the “New-Catholic” bishops had forfeited their rights of jurisdiction over those Catholics who remained faithful to the Old Church, and that the state authorities were in duty bound to protect the Old Catholics in the possession of all their ecclesiastical rights, to recognize their bishops and priests, to grant to their congregations corporate rights, to exempt them from the duty of contributing to the expenses of the New-Catholic worship, to secure them the simultaneous use of the ecclesiastical edifices, .and a share in the Church property; and, finally, to provide in the public expenditures for Catholic Church purposes an endowment for Old-Catholic bishops, priests, and churches. The election of an Old-Catholic bishop by the clergy and delegates of the congregations was taken into consideration, and it was provided that as long. as the Old Catholics had no bishops of their own, the bishops of the Old Catholics of Holland, and those bishops of the United Armenian Church who occupied a similar position with regard to the papacy as the Old Catholics, should be invited to perform those functions which the usage of the Catholic Church reserves to bishops. All other reforms were postponed to the time when a regular Church synod should meet under the presidency of a bishop; but the Congress applauded a declaration of Prof. Friedrich, of the University of Munich, one of the prominent theological scholars of the Church, that the Old-Catholic Church had already grown beyond the bounds originally observed, and that it was no longer exclusively directed against papal in infallibility, but against an entire system of errors of one thousand years, which had its climax in this novel doctrine of infallibility. “By the compulsion of the bishops,” the speaker remarked, “we are pushed forward on the road to reforms.”

The Congress, on the other hand, decidedly disapproved the arbitrary advances in this direction by individual congregations and priests, like father Hyacinthe, who, without waiting for the abolition of priestly celibacy by the proper Church authorities, had entered the state of marriage. A special interest  was shown in the project of a reunion of the large, divisions of Christendom, and a special committee was appointed, with Dr. Dollinger as chairman, to enter into negotiations with the Eastern and Anglican churches on this subject. On June 4, 1873, the hierarchical structure of the new Church was completed by the election of Prof. Reinkens. of the University of Breslau, as the first Old-Catholic bishop. The electoral body, which met at Cologne, consisted of all the Old-Catholic priests of the German empire, and delegates of the Old-Catholic congregations and societies. The bishop elect was on Aug. 11 consecrated by bishop Heykamp, of Deventer, of the Old-Catholic Church of Holland, and was recognized as a bishop of the Catholic body by the governments of Prussia, Baden, and Hesse. The government of Bavaria, however, in accordance with a report made on the subject by a committee of jurists, refused to recognize him, although, on the other hand, it also declined to grant the request of the bishop of Augsburg to forbid bishop Reinkens from administering the sacrament of confirmation in Bavaria. The third Old- Catholic Congress, held in September, 1873, at Constance, adopted a synodal constitution of the Church, which, however, was expressly designated as provisional, in order to reserve all the rights of the Old Catholics to the property of the Catholic Church in Germany. The synodal constitution, in many points, resembles that of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The diocesan, provincial, and general synods consist of priests and lay delegates. At the head of the diocese stands the bishop, who is assisted by a vicar-general and a synodal committee (Synodal reprasentanz), consisting of four priests and five laymen.

The diocesan synod, which meets annually under the presidency of the bishop, consists of all the priests of the diocese and of lay delegates, each delegate representing two hundred constituents. The work of the synod is prepared by the synodal committee; amendments are admitted when signed by at least twelve members; resolutions, petitions, remonstrances, etc., can only be discussed when notice of them has been given at least fourteen days before the opening of the synod. The resolutions are passed by an absolute majority of votes; but all resolutions not passed by a two-thirds majority are suspended at the request of either the minority of the synod or the synodal committee, until their discussion and readoption by the next synod. In regard to affairs strictly religious, the congregation is administered by the pastor and by the bishops; in all other matters it is represented by the Church Council and the Congregational Assembly. The Church Council, which consists of from six to eighteen members, administers the property  of the congregation, represents it in all legal questions, establishes the budget, appoints the sexton and organist, makes the necessary preparations for the care of the poor, convokes the Congregational Assembly, and carries on correspondence with other congregations. The Church Council chooses its own president. The Congregational Assembly, in which all the adult male members of the congregation who are in possession of their civic rights take part, ratifies the budget, apportions the taxes, elects the pastor, the Church Council, and the delegates to the synod.

The pastor is confirmed by the bishop, in conformity with the existing state laws, and installed in his office. He can only be removed for a legal reason, and after a formal proceeding by the synod. Besides the adoption of the Church constitution, the Congress discussed the subject of the reunion of the Christian churches; and, to carry out its views the more efficiently, appointed special committees for negotiations with the Greek and with the Anglican churches. In accordance with the new constitution of the Church. the first Old-Catholic Synod met at Bonn in August, 1874. It was attended by thirty priests and fifty-nine lay delegates. The synod adopted the Church constitution which had been agreed upon by the Congress of Constance, passed resolutions on Church reforms in general, and issued a series of declarations on auricular confession, on fasting and abstinence, and on the use of the native tongue in divine service. The synod pointed out a number of desirable reforms which might be carried out without any change of Church legislation, as the abolition of abusive practices in connection with indulgences and the veneration:of saints, the administration of the sacrament of penance, etc. It appeared to be the unanimous sentiment that all reforms in the Church should proceed from the synod, and that individual clergymen and congregations should abstain from arbitrary changes. In regard to confession, it was resolved that the practice of private confession should be retained, but that it should be freed from Romish corruptions, and brought back to the purity of the ancient Christian Church. Similar resolutions were passed with regard to fasting and abstinence. No action was taken on the abolition of priestly celibacy, which was proposed by several congregations, but it was postponed to a later synod. Two committees. were appointed to prepare, the one a draft for a new ritual in the native tongue, the other a catechism and a Biblical history.

The synod also elected six synodal examiners, four of whom were priests and two laymen. From a statistical report made to this synod it appears that in May, 1874, there were in Prussia 31 congregations fully organized and 16 in the course of organization; in Bavaria, 51 congregations; in Baden,  31 congregations and societies. The number of Old-Catholic priests was 41, and that of students of theology 12. The latter studied at the University of Bonn, where a majority of the professors of the theological faculty had joined the movement. The fourth Old-Catholic Congress, which was held in September, 1874, at Freiburg, devoted its attention chiefly to the subject of Church property, demanding that wherever a formal separation between the adherents of the Vaticah Council and the Old Catholics should take place, the latter should receive a proportionate part of the Church property. One of the favorite projects of the Old-Catholic leaders, the holding of a Union Conference between Old Catholic, the Eastern Church, and Anglican theologians, for the purpose of discussing the best means for reuniting these large divisions of the Christian Church, was carried out in September, 1874. The first Union Conference of these theologians met at Bonn, under the presidency of Dr. Dollinger. The theologians of all the three churches agreed that the differences on doctrinal points which divided the three churches were not insuperable.

The Old Catholics and Anglicans conceded to the Eastern theologians that the words Filioque (q.v.) were added to the Nicene Creed in an illegal manner, and that, with a view to fiuture peace and unity, it is desirable to examine the question whether the creed can be restored to its original form without sacrificing a doctrine expressed in the form at present used by the Occidental churches. The agreement by the Old Catholics to several doctrinal theses adopted by this conference indicates a further progress in the departure of the Old Catholic movement from the doctrinal system of the Church of Rome. Among the most important of these theses were the following: The apocryphal books of the Old Testament are declared to be not canonical in the same sense as the books contained in the Hebrew canon; no translation of Holy Writ can claim a higher authority than the original text; divine service should be celebrated in a language understood by the people, the doctrine that superabundant merits of the saints can be transferred to others, either by the heads of the Church or by the authors of the good works, is untenable; the number of sacraments was for the first time fixed at seven in the 12th century, and this became a doctrine of the Church, not as a tradition of the Church received from the apostles or earliest times, but as the result of theological speculation; the new Rorpan doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin is at variance with the tradition of the first thirteen centuries; indulgence can only refer to penances which have really been imposed by the Church herself. The second Old-Catholic Synod, which was held at Bonn in January, 1875, adopted the draft of a  German liturgy, and recommended its introduction to the congregations. Most of the resolutions passed by this synod aimed at completing the organization of the Church. In regard to the abolition of priestly celibacy, opinions still differed very widely, and action on the subject was again postponed. From the statistical reports made to the synod it appeared that on March 31, 1875, the number of Old-Catholic congregations was 98, with 14,766 adult members, and a total population of 44,886. The number of Old-Catholic priests was 53, and of Old-Catholic students of theology at the University of Bonn 11.

Of the congregations, 32 belonged to Prussia, 35 to Baden, 26 to Bavaria, 3 to Hesse, 1 to Wurtemberg, and 1 to Oldenburg. These figures were, however, far from exhibiting the total strength of the Old Catholics, for a number of societies had not sent in the lists of membership in time. A second Union Conference of theologians of the Old-Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican churches, again presided over by Dr. Dollinger, was held at Bonn in August, 1875. After long and animated discussions, a resolution was adopted that the three churches agreed in receiving the œcumenical symbols and the doctrinal decisions of the ancient undivided Church, and in acknowledging the representations of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost as set forth by the fathers of the undivided Church. The third Old-Catholic Synod was held at Bonn in June, 1876. From the statistical report it appears that the greatest progress during the year had been made in the grand-duchy of Baden, where there had been an increase of 10 congregations, 6 ministers, 1182 men, and 2210 persons. In Prussia 2 new congregations had been organized, 1 new parish had been established, and 6 societies had been recognised by the government. The increase in the number of clergymen was 3, in that of men 263, and in total population 1759. In the grand-duchy of Hesse 2, and in Oldenburg 1 new congregation had been formed. The reports from Bavaria were incomplete and unsatisfactory. In some places there had been a decline, and on the whole there had been no progress. . Without Bavaria there were 87 congregations (last year 72), and an increase of 1624 men and 4434 souls. The number of priests has increased since 1873 from 30 to 60.

2. The first German state which regulated by law the affairs of the Old Catholics, and particularly their claim to a proportionate share of the property of the Catholic Church, was the grand-duchy of Baden. The law, which was sanctioned by the grand-duke in May, recognises the equal rights of Old Catholics to the property of the Catholic Church. protects Old-Catholic holders of Catholic benefices, provides for the organization of  independent Old-Catholic congregations, and secures to them the simultaneous use of ecclesiastical edifices and utensils. Wherever the majority of any Catholic congregation declares in favor of Old Catholicism, it is to remain in possession of the Catholic church and its property, but must concede to the other party a simultaneous use of the church. A similar law was promulgated in Prussia in July, 1875.

In the Austro-Hungarian monarchy the organization of Old-Catholic congregations Was attempted at many places, and in Austria Proper the Liberal majority of the Lower House of Parliament favored the recognition of their rights by a special law. But the government refused to recognize them in any way, and the Upper House of Parliament. in 1875, refused to concur in the favoring resolutions passed by the other branch. One of the ministers declared, however, on this occasion, that the government would no longer oppose the establishment of Old-Catholic congregations. Accordingly, in February, 1876, delegates of five congregations met at Vienna and drew up a synodal constitution of the Church, similar to that adopted in Germany, and presented it to the government for approval.

In Switzerland the governments of most of the cantons took at once a decided stand in supporting the parish priests who refused to submit to the Vatican Council against their bishops. A central committee was formed to organize the movement throughout Switzerland, and most of the prominent leaders of the Liberal Catholics took an active part in it. The committee drew up a “Constitution for the Christian Catholic churches in Switzerland,” which was similar to the one that had been adopted in Constance for the Old Catholics of Germany. A convention of the societies of Liberal Catholics, held at Olten, in the canton of Solothurn, on June 15, 1874, adopted the main points of this draft; a second convention held in the same town on Sept. 21 sanctioned the entire organization. The first synod of the Church, for which the name Christian Catholic (Christkatholisch) was preferred to Old Catholic, was held at Olten on June 14,1875. It finally adopted the Church constitution which had been drawn up by the central committee, and made all the necessary arrangements for the appointment of a synodal council, but postponed the election of a bishop. The synodal council was appointed on Aug. 30, 1875. At its first meeting, held at Olten Sept. 2, the synodal council resolved to arrange the proper manner of examining the candidates for the priesthood, and to appoint two committees, one for drafting a ritual and missal on the basis of those prepared by Hirscher (q.v.), and the other for defining the attitude to be  observed by Old-Catholic priests with regard to the new federal laws on civil marriage. The congregations were permitted to make their own selection among the different Church vestments used in the Catholic Church, and to introduce the native tongue into divine service; it also declared the Church commandment to go to confession at least once a year no' longer obligatory.

Further legislation on these and other proposed reforms was reserved for the next meeting of the synod. In regard to the election of a bishop, it appeared desirable to obtain previously the consent of the Federal Council of Switzerland, as the new constitution of Switzerland provides that new bishoprics are only to be established with the consent of the federal council. This consent was given in April, 1876, and the election of the first bishop of the Christian-Catholic Church accordingly took place in June, 1876. The progress of the Old-Catholic movement has been especially favored by the cantonal governments of Berne and Geneva, which by new laws regulated the legal condition of the Catholic Church; and when the Ultramontane party refused to recognize the new laws, deposed all the refractory priests, and turned the churches and the Church property over to the Old Catholics. The government of Berne also founded a faculty of Old-Catholic theology in connection with the University of Berne. In Geneva serious difficulties arose among the Old Catholics themselves, in consequence of which abbe Loyson — better known under his former monastic name of father Hyacinthe — resigned the position of president of the Old-Catholic Church Council. In March, 1876, the Old Catholics in all Switzerland numbered 54 congregations, and 26 societies not yet organized, with an aggregate population of 72,880 persons.

In Italy the Old-Catholic movement found many sympathizers, and among them some very prominent names, like father Passaglia, a celebrated Jesuit author, and the marchese Guerrini-Gonzage. A committee of agitation was established' in Rome, and in 1875 the delegates of a number of congregations met in Naples and elected a bishop.

In all other countries the movement has as yet not gained any firm footing. In Madrid an Old-Catholic committee was constituted, and a large number of priests were reported to have joined it; but nothing has been heard of it since the restoration of the Bourbons. In France two distinguished priests, father Hyacinthe and abbe Michaud, took a very active interest in the movement, but no congregations could be formed. England was represented at some of the Old-Catholic congresses of Germany by lord  Acton and others; but up to May, 1876, no congregations had been formed.

3. The leaders of the Old-Catholic movement express themselves hopeful in regard to the future. Inclusive of the Church of Utrecht, in the Netherlands, with which they entirely agree, they had in June, 1876, six bishops, and a population of about 140,000. But the number of those who, while fully sympathizing with them, have not yet severed their connection with the papal Church they believe to be immensely larger, and they expect a rapid increase as soon as they obtain from the state governments the same efficient protection which is accorded to them in Baden, Prussia, and some of the Swiss cantons. They have in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria a number of periodicals, the most important of which are the Deutsche Merkur (a weekly), in Munich, and the Theologische Literaturblatt, of Bonn. See Reinkens, Ueber den Ursprung der jetzigen Kirchenbewegung (Cologne, 1872); Nippold, Ursprung, Umfung, Hemninisse und Aussichten der altkatholischen Bewegung (Berlin, 1873); PBre Hyacinthe, De laReforme Catholique (Paris, 1872); Michaud, P rogramne de Ref orme de l'Eglise d'Occident (ibid. 1872); Frommann, Gesch. u. Kritik. d Vat. Concil. v. 1869-70 (Gotha, 1872); Whettle, Cathoiicism and the Vatican (Dublin, 1872); Theodorus. The New ReJbrmation (Lond. 1874, 8vo). The most valuable sources for the history of the movement are the official report on the Old-Catholic congresses, the synods, and the union conferences. Quite fill extracts and a trustworthy synopsis have been regularly given in the Meth. Qu. Rev. (from 1869 to 1876). See also Amer. Ch. Rev. July, 1873, art. i; (Lond.) Qu. Rev. July, 1872. art. iii; Brit. Qu. Rev. July, 1873, art. iii; Contemp. Rev. Dec. 1871, art. viii; Nov. 1872; New Englander, April, 1874, art. viii; Christian Qu. Oct. 1872, art. 4:(A. J. S.)

## Old Dissenters[[@Headword:Old Dissenters]]

             SEE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

## Old Flemings[[@Headword:Old Flemings]]

             SEE MENNONITES.

## Old Lutherans[[@Headword:Old Lutherans]]

             SEE LUTHERANS.

## Old Man Of Obi[[@Headword:Old Man Of Obi]]

             a remarkable idol of the Ostiac Tartars, who live near the river Obi. It consists of wood, and has a nose resembling the snout of a hog, in which is a hook of iron. The eyes are made of glass, and the head is embellished with a large pair of horns. Its devotees oblige it to change its place of residence every three years, transporting it over the Obi from one station to  another with great solemnity, in a vessel made for that purpose. When the ice dissolves, and the river overflows its banks, the Ostiacs flock to this idol in a body and beseech it to prove propitious to their fishery. If the season fails to answer their expectations they load the god with a myriad of reproaches, and insult him as an old, impotent, and despicable deity; but if they prove successful in fishing, the god is allowed part of the booty.

## Old Man of the Mountain[[@Headword:Old Man of the Mountain]]

             SEE ASSASSINS.

## Old Testament[[@Headword:Old Testament]]

             (ἡ παλαία διαθήκη, Fetus Testamentum) is the popular designation of the books of the Hebrew Bible, in distinction from “the New Testament,” or the Christian Scriptures, which has been borrowed from the title in the Septuagint and Latin Vulgate. SEE TESTAMENT.

I. History of the Text. — Under this head we shall consider only the successive steps by which the text seems to have reached its present form and condition according to the best light which modern criticism has thrown upon the subject. For the subdivisions into books, etc., SEE BIBLE; for the contents, see the several books (also SEE PENTATEUCH; SEE PROPHETS; SEE HAGIOGRAPHA etc.); and for the hermeneutical principles applied in different ages, SEE INTERPRETATION. The apparent or real citations from one part of the O.T. in another, and in the N.T., will be discussed under the head of QUOTATIONS.

1. Ante-Rabbinical Period — A history of the text of the O.T. should properly commence from the date of the completion of the Canon; from which time we must assume that no additions to any part of it could be legitimately made, the sole object of those who transmitted and watched over it being thenceforth to preserve that which was already written. Of the care, however, with which the text was transmitted we have to judge, almost entirely, by the phenomena which it and the versions derived from it now present, rather than by any recorded facts respecting it. That much scrupulous pains would be bestowed by Ezra, the “ready scribe in the law of Moses,” and by his companions, on the correct transmission of those Scriptures which passed through their hands is indeed antecedently probable. The best evidence of such pains, and of the respect with which the text of the sacred books was consequently regarded, is to be found in the jealous accuracy with which the discrepancies of various parallel passages have been preserved, notwithstanding the temptation which must have existed to assimilate them to each other. Such is the case with Psalms xiv and liii, two recensions of the same hymn, both proceeding from David, where the reasons of the several variations may on examination be traced. Such also is the case with Psalms 18 and 2 Samuel 22, where the variations between the two copies are more than sixty in number, excluding those  which merely consist in the use or absence of the matres lectionis; and where. therefore, even though the design of all the variations be not perceived, the hypothesis of their having originated through accident would imply a carelessness in transcribing far beyond what even the rashest critics have in other places contemplated.

As regards the form in which the sacred writings were preserved, there can be little doubt that the text was ordinarily written on skins, rolled up into volumes, like the modern synagogue rolls (Psa 40:7; Jer 36:14; Zec 5:1; Eze 2:9). Josephus relates that the copy sent from Jerusalem as a present to Ptolemy in Egypt was written with letters of gold on skins of admirable thinness, the joints of which could not be detected (Ant. 12:2,11).

The original character in which the text was expressed is that still preserved to us, with the exception of four letters, on the Maccabeaan coins, and having a strong affinity to the Samaritan character, which seems to have been treated by the later Jews as identical with it, being styled by them כתב עברי. At what date this was exchanged for the present Aramaic or square character, כתב אשורית, or כתב מרבע, is- still as undetermined as it is at what date the use of the Aramaic language in Palestine superseded that of the Hebrew. The old Jewish tradition, repeated by Origen and Jerome, ascribed the change to Ezra. But the Maccabeean coins supply us with a date at which the older character was still in use; and even though we should allow that both may have been simultaneously employed, the one for sacred, the other for more ordinary purposes, we can hardly suppose that they existed side by side for any lengthened period. Hassencamp and Gesenius are at variance as to whether such errors of the Septuagint as arose from confusion of letters in the original text are in favor of the Greek interpreters having had the older or the more modern character before them. It is sufficiently clear that the use of the square writing must have been well established before the time of those authors who attributed the introduction of it to Ezra. Nor could the allusion in Mat 5:18 to the yod as the smallest letter have well been made except in reference to the more modern character. We forbear here all investigation of the manner in which this character was formed, or of the precise locality whence it was derived. Whatever modification it may have undergone in the hands of the Jewish scribes, it was in the first instance introduced from abroad; and this its name, אשורית כתב, i.e.  Assyrian writing, implies, though it may geographically require to be interpreted with some latitude. (The suggestion of Hupfeld that אשוריתmay be an appellative, denoting not Assyrian, but firm, writing, is improbable.) On the whole, we may best suppose, with Ewald, that the adoption of the new character was coeval with the rise of the earliest Targums, which would naturally be written in the Aramaic style. It would thus he shortly anterior to the Christian aera; and with this date all the evidence would well accord. It may be right, however, to mention that while of late years Keil has striven anew to throw back the introduction of the square writing towards the time of Ezra, Bleek also, though not generally imbued with the conservative views of Keil, maintains not only that the use of the square writing for the sacred books owed its origin to Ezra, but also that the later books of the O.T. were never expressed in any other character. SEE HEBREW LANGUAGE.

No vowel-points were attached to the text: they were, through all the early period of its history, entirely unknown. Convenience had indeed, at the time when the later books of the O.T. were written, suggested a larger use of the matres lectionis: it is thus that in those books we find them introduced into many words that had previously been spelled without them: קודשtakes the place of דויד קדש of דוד. An elaborate endeavor has recently been made by Dr. Wall to prove that up to the early part of the 2d century of the Christian sera the Hebrew text was free from vowel-letters as well as from vowels. His theory is that they were then interpolated by the Jews, with a view to altering rather than perpetuating the former pronunciation of the words: their object being, according to him, to pervert thereby the sense of the prophecies, as also to throw discredit on the Septuagint, and thereby weaken or evade the force of arguments drawn from that version in support of Christian doctrines. Improbable as such a theory is, it is yet more astonishing that its author should not have been deterred from prosecuting it by the palpable objections to it which he himself discerned. Who can believe, with him, that the Samaritans, notwithstanding the mutual hatred existing between them and the Jews, borrowed the interpolation from the Jews, and conspired with them to keep it a secret? or that among other words to which by this interpolation the Jews ventured to impart a new sound were some of the best-known proper names; e.g. Isaiah, Jeremiah? or that it was merely through a blunder that in Gen 1:24 the substantive חיה in its construct state acquired its final י, when the same anomaly occurs in no fewer than three passages of  the Psalms? Such views and arguments refute themselves; and while the high position occupied by its author commends his book to notice, it can only be lamented that industry, learning, and ingenuity should have been so misspent in the vain attempt to give substance to shadow. SEE VOWEL- POINTS.

There is reason to think that in the text of the O.T., as originally written, the words were generally, though not uniformly, divided. Of the Phoenician inscriptions, though the majority proceed continuously, some have a point' after each word, except when the words are closely connected. The same point is used in the Samaritan manuscripts; and it is observed by Gesenius (a high authority in respect to the Samaritan Pentateuch) that the Samaritan and Jewish divisions of the words generally coincide. The discrepancy between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint in this respect is sufficiently explained by the circumstance that the Jewish scribes did not separate the words which were closely connected: it is in the case of such that the discrepancy is almost exclusively found. The practice of separating words by spaces instead of points probably came in with the square writing. In the synagogue rolls, which are written in conformity with the ancient rules, the words are regularly divided from each other; and indeed the Talmud minutely prescribes the space which should be left (Gesenius, Gesch. der Heb. Sprache, § 45).

Of ancient date, probably, are also the separations between the lesser Parshioth or sections; whether made, in the case of the more important divisions, by the commencement of a new line, or, in the case of the less important. by a blank space within the line. SEE PARSHIOTH.

The use of the letters פ and ס, however, to indicate these divisions is of more recent origin: they are not employed in the synagogue-rolls. These lesser and earlier Parshioth, of which there are in the Pentateuch 669, must not be confounded with the greater and later Parshioth, or Sabbath-lessons, which are first mentioned in the Masorah. The name Parshioth is in the Mishna (Megill. 4:4) applied to the divisions in the Prophets as well as to those in the Pentateuch; e.g. to Isa 52:3-5 (to the greater Parshioth here correspond the Haphtaroth). Even the separate psalms are in the Gemara also called Parshioth (Berach. Bab. fol. 9, 2; 10, 1) Some indication of the antiquity of the divisions between the Parshioth may be found in the circumstance that the Gemara holds them to be as old as Moses (Berach. fol. 12. 2). Of their real age we know but little. Hupfeld has found that they do not always coincide with the capitula of Jerome. That they are,  nevertheless, more ancient than his time is shown by the mention of them in the Mishna. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, their want of accordance with the Kazin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which are 966 in number, seems to indicate that they had a historical origin; and it is possible that they also may date from the period when the O.T. was first transcribed in the square character. Our present chapters, it may be remarked, spring from a Christian source. SEE CHAPTER.

Of any logical division, in the written text, of the prose of the O.T. into Pesukiin, or verses, we find in the Talmud no mention; and even in the existing synagogue-rolls such division is generally ignored. While, therefore, we may admit the early currency of such a logical division, we must assume, with Hupfeld, that it was merely a traditional observance. It has indeed, on the other hand, been argued that such numerations of the verses as the Talmud records could not well have been made unless the written text distinguished them. But to this we may reply by observing that the verses of the numbering of which the Talmud speaks could not have thoroughly accorded with those of modern times, Of the former there were in the Pentateuch 5888 (or, as some read, 8888); it now contains but 5845: the middle verse was computed to be Lev 13:33; with our present verses it is Lev 8:5. Had the verses been distinguished in the written text at the time that the Talmudic enumeration was made, it is not easily explicable how they should since have been so much altered: whereas, were the logical division merely traditional, tradition would naturally preserve a more accurate knowledge of the places of the various logical breaks than of their relative importance, and thus, without any disturbance of the syntax, the number of computed verses would be liable to continual increase or diminution, by separation or aggregation. An uncertainty in the versual division is even now indicated by the double accentuation and consequent vocalization of the Decalogue. In the poetical books, the Pesukim mentioned in the Talmud correspond to the poetical lines, not to our modern verses; and it is probable, both from some expressions of Jerome, and from the analogous practice of other nations, that the poetical text was written stichometrically. It is still so written in our manuscripts in the poetical pieces in the Pentateuch and historical books; and even, generally, in our oldest manuscripts. Its partial discontinuance may be due, first, to the desire to save space, and, secondly, to the diminution of the necessity for it by the .introduction of the accents. SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

2. Early Christian Period. — While great freedom in dealing with the sacred text was exercised at Samaria and Alexandria, SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH; SEE SEPTUAGINT VERSION, there is every reason to believe that in Palestine the text was both carefully preserved and scrupulously respected. The boast of Josephus (c. Apion. 1:8) that through all the ages that had passed none had ventured to add to or to take away from, or to transpose aught of the sacred writings, may well represent the spirit in which in his day his own country menacted. In the translations of Aquila and the other Greek interpreters, the fragments of whose works remain to us in the Hexapla, we have evidence of the existence of a text differing but little from our own: so also in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan. A few centuries later we have, in the Hexapla, additional evidence to the same effect in Origen's transcriptions of the Hebrew text. And yet more important are the proofs of the firm establishment of the text, and of its substantial identity with our own, supplied by the translation of Jerome, who was instructed by the Palestinian Jews, and mainly relied upon their authority for acquaintance not only with the text itself, but also with the traditional unwritten vocalization of it.

This brings us to the middle of the Talmudic age. The learning of the schools which had been formed in Jerusalem about the time of our Savior by Iillel and Shammai was preserved, after the destruction of the city, in the academies of Jabneh, Sepphoris. Cesarea, and Tiberias. The great pillar of the Jewish literature of this period was R. Judah the Holy, to whom, is ascribed the compilation, of the Mishna, the text of the Talmud, and who died about A.D. 220. After his death there grew into repute the Jewish academies of Sura, Nahardea, and Pum-Beditha, on the Euphrates. The twofold Gemara, or commentary, was now appended to the Mishna, thus .completing the Talmud. The Jerusalem Gemara proceeded from the Jews of Tiberias probably towards the end of the 4th century: the Babylonian from the academies on the Euphrates, perhaps by the end of the 5th. That, along with the task of collecting and commenting on their various legal traditions, the Jews of these several academies would occupy themselves with the text of the sacred writings is in every way probable, and is indeed shown by various Talmudic notices. SEE MASORAH.

It is after the Talmudic period that Hupfeld places the introduction into the text of the two large points (in Hebrew סוŠ פסוק,. Soph-pasuk) to mark the end of each verse. They are manifestly of older date than the accents, by which they are, in effect, supplemented (Stud. und Krit. 1837, p. 857).  Coeval, perhaps, with the use of the Soph-pasuk is that of the lakkeph, or hyphen, to unite words that are so closely conjoined as to have but one accent between them. It must be older than the accentual marks, the presence or absence of which is determined by it. It doubtless indicates the way in which the text was traditionally read, and therefore embodies traditional authority for the conjunction or separation of words. Internal evidence shows this to be the case in such passages as Psa 45:5, וענוהאּצדק. But the use of it cannot be relied on, as it often in the poetical books conflicts with the rhythm; e.g. in Psa 19:9-10 (comp. Mason and Bernard's Grammar, 2:187).

3. Masoretic Period. — Such modifications of the text as these were the precursors of the new method of dealing with it which constitutes the work of the Masoretes. It is evident from the notices of the Talmud that a number of oral traditions had been gradually accumulating respecting both the integrity of particular passages of the text itself, and also the manner in which it was to be read. The time at length arrived when it became desirable to secure the permanence of all such traditions by committing them to writing. The very process of collecting them would add greatly to their number; the traditions of various academies would be superadded the one upon the other; and with these would be gradually incorporated the various critical observations of the collectors themselves, and the results of their comparisons of different manuscripts. The vast heterogeneous mass of traditions and criticisms thus compiled and embodied in writing forms what is known as the , מסרה, Masorah, i.e. Tradition. A similar name had been applied in the Mishna to the oral tradition before it was committed to writing, where it had been described as the hedge or fence, סייגof the law (Pirke Aboth, 3:13).

Buxtorf, in his Tiberias, which is devoted to an account of the Masorah, ranges its contents under the three heads of observations respecting the verses, words, and letters of the sacred text. With regard to the verses, the Masoretes recorded how many there were in each book, and the middle verse in each; also how many verses began with particular. letters, or began and ended with the same word, or contained a particular number of words and letters, or particular words a certain number of times, etc. With regard to the words, they recorded the Keris and Kethibs, where different words were to be read from those contained in the text, or where words were to be omitted or supplied. They noted that certain words were to be found so  many times in the beginning, middle, or end of a verse, or with a particular construction or meaning. They noted also of particular words, and this especially in cases where mistakes in transcription were likely to arise, whether they were to be written plene or defective, i.e. with or without the matres lectionis; also their vocalization and accentuation, and how many times they occurred so vocalized and accented. With regard to the letters, they computed how often each letter of the alphabet occurred in the O.T.: they noted fifteen instances of letters stigmatized with the extraordinary points: they commented also on all the unusual letters, viz. the majuscule, which they variously computed; the minusculs, of which they reckoned thirty-three; the suspensce. four in number; and the inversae, of which, the letter being in each case נ, there are eight or nine.

The compilation of the Masorah did not meet with universal approval among the Jews, of whom some regretted the consequent cessation of oral traditions. Others condemned the frivolous character of many of its remarks. The formation of the written Masorah may have extended from the 6th or 7th to the 10th or 11th century. It is essentially an incomplete work; and the labors of the Jewish doctors upon the sacred text might have unendingly furnished materials for the enlargement of the older traditions, the preservation of which had been the primary object in view. Nor must it be implicitly relied on. Its computations of the number of letters in the Bible are said to be far from correct; and its observations, as is remarked by Jacob ben-Chayim, do not always agree with those of the Talmud, nor yet with each other; though we have no means of distinguishing between its earlier and its later portions.

The most valuable feature of the Masorah is undoubtedly its collection of Keris. The first rudiments of this collection meet us in the Talmud. Of those subsequently collected, it is probable that many were derived from the collation of MSS., others from the unsupported judgment of the Masoretes themselves. They often rest on plausible but superficial grounds, originating in the desire to substitute an easier for a more difficult reading; and to us it is of little consequence whether it were a transcriber or a Masoretic doctor by whom the substitution was first suggested. It seems clear that the Keris in all cases represent the readings which the Masoretes themselves approved as correct; and there would be the less hesitation in sanctioning them could we assume that they were always preserved in documents separate from the text, and that the written text itself had remained intact. In effect, however, our MSS. often exhibit the text with  the Keri readings incorporated. The number of Keris is, according to Elias Levita, who spent twenty years in the study of the Masorah, 848; but the Bomberg Bible contains 1171. the Plantin Bible 793. Two lists of the Keristhe one exhibiting the variations of the printed Bibles with respect to them, the other distributing them into classes-are given in the beginning of Walton's Polyglot, vol. 6. SEE KERI.

The Masorah furnishes also eighteen instances of what it calls סופרים תקון, “Correction of the scribes.” The real import of this is doubtful; but the recent view of Bleek, that it relates to alterations made in the text by the scribes, because of something there offensive to them, and that therefore the rejected reading is in each case the true reading, is not borne out by the Septuagint, which in all the instances save one (Job 7:20) confirms the present Masoretic text.

Furthermore, the Masorah contains certain סבירין, “Conjectures,” which it does not raise to the dignity of Keris, respecting the true reading in difficult passages. Thus at Gen 19:23, for יצאwas conjectured יצאה, because the word שמשis usually feminine.

The Masorah was originally preserved in distinct books by itself. A plan then arose of transferring it to the margins of the MSS. of the Bible. For this purpose large curtailments were necessary; and various transcribers inserted in their margins only as much as they had room for, or strove to give it an ornamental character by reducing it into fanciful shapes. R. Jacob ben-Chayim, editor of the Bomberg Bible, complains much of the confusion into which it had fallen; and the service which, he rendered in bringing it into order is honorably acknowledged by Buxtorf. Further improvements in the arrangement of it were made by Buxtorf himself in his Rabbinical Bible. The Masorah is now distinguished into the Masora magna and the Masora parva, the latter being an abridgment of the former, including all the Keris and other compendious observations, and usually printed in Hebrew Bibles at the. foot of the page. The Masora magna, when accompanying the Bible, is disposed partly at the side of the text, against the passages to which its several observations refer, partly at the end, where the observations are ranged in alphabetical order: it is thus divided into the Masora textualis and the Masora finalis.

The Masorah itself was but one of the fruits of the labors of the Jewish doctors in the Masoretic period. A far more important work was the  furnishing of the text with vowel-marks, by which the traditional pronunciation of it was imperishably recorded. That the insertion of the Hebrew vowel-points was post-Talmudic is shown by the absence in the Talmud of all reference to them. Jerome also, in recording the true pronunciation of any word, speaks only of the way in which it was read; and occasionally mentions the ambiguity arising from the variety of words represented by the same letters (Hupfeld; Stud. und Krit. 1830, p. 549 sq.). The system was gradually elaborated, having been molded in the first instance in imitation of the Arabian, which was itself the daughter. of the Syrian. (So Hupfeld. Ewald maintains that the Hebrew system was derived immediately from the Syrian.) The history of the Syrian anid Arabian vocalization renders it probable that the elaboration of the system commenced not earlier than the 7th or 8th century. The vowel-marks are referred to in the Masorah; and as they are all mentioned by R. Judah Chiyug in the beginning of the 11th century, they must have been perfected before that date. The Spanish rabbins of the 11th and 12th centuries knew nothing of their recent origin. That the system of punctuation with which we are familiar was fashioned in Palestine is shown by its difference from the Assyrian or Persian system displayed in one of the Eastern MSS. collated by Pinner at Odessa.

Contemporaneous with the written vocalization was the accentuation of the text. The import of the accents was, as Hupfeld has shown, essentially rhythmical (Stud. und Krit. 1837): hence they had from the first both a logical and a musical significance. With respect to the former they were called טעמים, “senses;” with respect to the latter, נגינות, “tones.” Like the vowel-marks, they are mentioned in the Masorah, but not in the Talmud.

The controversies of the 16th century respecting the late origin of the vowel-marks and' accents are well known. Both are with the Jews the authoritative exponents of the manner in. which the text is to be read: “Any interpretation,” says Aben-Ezra, “which is not in accordance with the arrangement of the accents, thou shalt not consent to it, nor listen to it.” If in the books of Job, Psalms, and Proverbs the accents are held by some Jewish scholars to be irregularly placed (Mason and Bernard's Grammar, ii, 235; Delitzsch's Com. on the Psalter, vol. ii), the explanation is probably that in those books the rhythm of the poetry has afforded the means of testing the value of the accentuation, and has consequently disclosed its occasional imperfections. Making allowance for these, we must yet on the  whole admire the marvelous correctness in the Hebrew Bible of both the vocalization and accentuation. The difficulties which, both occasionally present, and which a superficial criticism would, by overriding them, so easily remove, furnish the best evidence that both faithfully embody, not the private judgments of the punetuators, but the traditions which had descended ton them from previous generations.

Besides the evidences of various readings contained in the Keris of the Masorah, we have two lists of different readings purporting or presumed to be those adopted by the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews respectively. Both are given in Walton's Polyglot, vol. 7. The first of these recensions was printed by R. Jacob ben-Chavim in the Bomberg Bible edited by him, without any mention of the source whence he had derived it. The different readings are 216 in number: all relate to the consonants, except two, which relate to the Mappik in the ה. They are generally of but little importance: many of the differences are orthographical, many identical with those indicated by the Keris and Kethibs. The list does not extend to the Pentateuch. It is supposed to be ancient, but post-Talmudic. The other recension is the result of a collation of MSS. made in the 11th century by two Jews, R. Aaron ben-Asher, a Palestinian, and R. Jacob ben-Naphtali, a Babylonian. The differences, 864 in number, relate to the vowels, the accents, the Makkeph, and in one instance (Son 8:6) to the division of one word into two. The list helps to furnish evidence of the date by which the punctuation and accentuation of the text must have been completed. The readings of our MSS. commonly accord with those of Ben-Asher.

It is possible that even the separate Jewish academies may in some instances have had their own' distinctive standard texts. Traces of minor Variations between the standards of the two Babylonian academies of Sura and Nahardea are mentioned by De Rossi (Proleg. § 35).

From the end, however, of the Masoretic period onward, the Masorah became the great authority by which the text given in all the Jewish MSS. was settled. It may thus be said that all our MSS. are Masoretic: those of older date were either suffered to perish, or, as some think, were intentionally consigned to destruction as incorrect. Various standard copies are mentioned by the Jews, by which, in the subsequent transcriptions, their MSS. were tested and corrected, but of which none are now known. Such were the Codex Hillel in Spain; the Codex Egyptius, or Hierosolymitanus,  of Ben-Asher; and the Codex Babylonius of Ben-Naphtali. Of the Pentateuch there were the Codex Sinaiticus, of which the authority stood high with regard to its accentuation; and the Codex Hierichuntinus, which was valued with regard to its use of the mates lectionis; also the Codex Ezra, or Azarah, at Toledo, ransomed from the Black Prince for a large sum at his capture of the city in 1367, but destroyed in a subsequent siege (Scott Porter, Princ. of Text. Crit. p. 74).

The subsequent history of the O.T.text is discussed under SEE CRITICISM, SACRED.

II. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the entire O.T. exclusively (in addition to the Rabbinical Bibles [q.v.]), the most important of which we designate by an asterisk prefixed: — Augustine, Exegetica (in Opp. iii); Damianus, Collectanea (in Opp. 4:74 sq.); Antonius, Expositio [mystical] (in Opp. St. Francis, p. 464); Sol. ibn- helek, מַכְלִל יֹפַי(Constantinople, 1533, fol.; ed. Abendana, n. d.; ed. Uri ben-Ap., Amst. 1661, fol.; ed. D. Tartas, ib. 1685, fol.); Munster, Biblia Latina [chiefly Rabbinical] (Basil. 1546, fol.; also in the. Critici Sacri); Broughton, Treatises [on various parts] (in Works); \*Osiander, Expositio (Tilb. 1578-86, 7 vols. 4to, and often afterwards); Drusius, Commentarii [on most of the books] (at various places in parts, 1595 sq., mostly 4to); also, Vet. interpret. Grcecorum filagmenta (Arnob. 1622, 4to); Pareus, Commentarii (in Opp. i); Althing, Commentarii [on certain parts] (in Opp. ii); Maldonatus, Comnentarii [on most of the books] (Par. 1643, fol.); Abram Nicolai, Pharus [dissertations] (Par. 1648, fol.); Malvenda, Commentarii (Lugd. 1650, 5 vols. fol.); Anon., Adnotationes (Cantab. 1653; Amst. 1703, 8vo); Richardson, Observations (Lond. 1655, fol.); Cappel, Commentarii (Amst. 1689, fol.); Burmann, Erkldrung [Genesis to Job] (Frankf. 1709, fol.; earlier in Dutch in parts); Jarchi (i.e.Rashi), Commentarius (ed. Breithaupt, Gotha, 1710, 5 vols. 4to); Le Clerc, Commentarius (Amst. 1710 sq., 4 vols. fol.); Pyle, Paraphrase (Lond. 1717' sq.; 1738, 4 vols. 8vo); Patrick and Lowth, Commentary (Lond. 1738,4 vols. fol.; earlier in parts separately); \*Michaelis, Annotationes (Hal. 1745, 3 vols. 4to); Menoche, Commentarii (Vienna, 1755, 4to); Houbigant, Notce (Franc. 1777, 2 vols. 4to); Alfonso Nicolai, Dissertazioni (Ven. 1781-2, 12 vols. 8vo); Schulze, Scholia (Norimb. 1783-90, 9 vols. 8vo); Kennicot, Remarks [on certain passages] (Oxf. 1787, 8vo); Digbv, Lectures (Dubl. 1787, 8vo); Orton, Exposition  [practical] (Shrewsb. 1788; Lond. 1822, 6 vols. 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, Scholia (Lips. 1788 sq., and several times since, 23 vols. 8vo); Paulus, Clavis (Jen. 1791-1827, 2 vols. 8vo); Augusti and Hopfne. Exeq. Handb. (Lpz. 17971800, 9 pts. 8vo); De Rossi, Scholia (Parm. 1799. 8vo); Boothroyd, Notes (Pontef. 1810-16, 2 vols. 4to); \*Hitzig, Knobel, Thenius, and others, Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb. (Lpz. 1833 sq. 17 pts. 8vo); Bottcher, Aehrsenlese (Lpz. 1833-5, 3 vols. 8vo); Holden, Expositor (Lond. 1834, 12mo); \*Maurer, Commentarius (Lips. 1835-8. 4 vols. 8vo); Philippson, Erldut. [Jewish] (Lpz. 1839-56,1858, 3 vols. 4to); \*Keil and Delitzsch, Commezntar (Lpz. 1861 sq., and several editions, to be completed in about 20 vols. 8vo; tr. in Clark's For. Library, Edinb. 1866 sq.). SEE COMMENTARY.

## Old and New Light Controversy[[@Headword:Old and New Light Controversy]]

             SEE ANTIBURGHERS; SEE ORIGINAL ANTIBURGHER SYNOD; SEE ORIGINAL BURGHER SYNOD.

## Old-Light Antiburghers[[@Headword:Old-Light Antiburghers]]

             SEE ORIGINAL ANTIBURGHER SYNOD.

## Old-Light Burghers[[@Headword:Old-Light Burghers]]

             SEE ORIGINAL BURGHER SYNOD.

## Old-School Baptists[[@Headword:Old-School Baptists]]

             SEE BAPTISTS.

## Old-School Presbyterians[[@Headword:Old-School Presbyterians]]

             SEE PRESBYTERIANS.

## Oldcastle, Sir John[[@Headword:Oldcastle, Sir John]]

             (Lord Cobham), called “the good,” was the first martyr and the first author among the nobility of England. He was born in the 14th century, in the reign of Edward III, and married to the heiress of lord Cobham, by whom he obtained that title. He gained military distinction in the French wars under Henry IV and V, and was a domestic and a favored attendant of the latter sovereign. Lord Cobham was a man of extensive talents, qualified for the cabinet or the field, of ready wit in conversation, and of great learning. He examined the writings of Wickliffe as a philosopher, and in the course of his study became a convert to the doctrines of that Reformer, and  thereupon most zealously labored for the propagation of the new opinions. He not only collected and transcribed the works of Wickliffe, but also maintained preachers of that persuasion, and in every sense of the word became a leader of the Ante-Reformers. In the convocation assembled during the first year of the reign of Henry V, the principal subject of debate was the growth of heresy. Thomas Arundel, a prelate equally remarkable for zeal and bigotry, was at that time archbishop of Canterbury. Lord Cobham being considered the head of the Wickliffites, it was presumed that if his destruction could be effected it would strike a salutary terror into his adherents; but as he was known to be in favor with the king, and also highly popular, it was deemed prudent to dissemble for a while.

The archbishop, therefore, contented himself, for. the present, by requesting his majesty to send commissioners to Oxford to inquire into the growth of heresy, with which the king complied. The commissioners having made inquiry, reported to the archbishop, who informed the convocation that the increase of heresy was especially owing to lord Cobham, who encouraged scholars from Oxford and other places to propagate heretical opinions throughout the country. The archbishop, accompanied by a large body of the clergy, waited upon Henry, and having laid before him the offense of lord Cobham, begged, in all humility and charity, that his majesty would suffer them, for Christ's sake, to put him to death. To this meek and humane request the king replied that he thought such violence more destructive of truth than of error; that he himself would reason with lord Cobham; and, if that should prove ineffectual, he would leave him to the censure of the Church. Henry, having sent for lord Cobham, endeavored to persuade him to retract his errors; but to the reasoning and exhortation of the king he returned the following answer: “I ever was a dutiful subject to your majesty, and I hope ever shall be.

Next to God, I profess obedience to my king. But as for the spiritual dominion of the pope; I never could see on what foundation it is claimed, nor can I pay him any obedience. As sure as God's Word is true, to me it is fully evident that he is the great Antichrist foretold in Holy Writ.” This answer so exceedingly displeased the king that he gave the archbishop leave to proceed against lord Cobham with the utmost extremity; or, as Baile says, “according to the devilish decrees which they call the laws of the Holy Church.” On September 11, the day fixed for his appearance, the primate and his associates sat in consistory; lord Cobham not appearing, the archbishop excommunicated him, and called in the civil power to assist him, agreeably to the late enacted law. Conceiving himself to be now in danger, Cobham drew up a confession of  his faith, which he presented to the king, who coldly ordered it to be given to the archbishop. Being again cited to appear before the archbishop, and refusing compliance, he was committed to the Tower, from which he escaped into Wales. The clergy then got up a report of a pretended conspiracy of the Lollards, headed by lord Cobham, whereupon a bill of attainder was passed against him, a price of 1000 marks set upon his head, and exemption from taxes was promised to any person who should secure him. At the expiration of four years he was taken, and without much form of trial executed in the most barbarous manner: he was hung in chains on a gallows in St. Giles's Fields, London, and a fire kindled under him, by which he was roasted to death, December 25, 1417. He wrote Twelve Conclusions addressed to the Parliament of England; he also edited the works of Wickliffe, and was the author of several religious tracts and discourses. See Bayle, A brefe Chronycle concernynge the Examynacyon and Death of the blessed martyr of Christ, surJohan Oldecastell (reprinted 1729); Gilpin, Lives of Lgtimer, Wickliffe, etc.; Fox, Acts and Monunments; Walpole, Royal and Noble Authors; Milner, Church History, vol. iv, ch. i; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Jones, Religious Biography, s.v.; Milman, History. Lat. Christianity (see Index); British Quarterly, April, 1874. SEE LOLLARDS.

## Oldenburg[[@Headword:Oldenburg]]

             a grand-duchy of Germany, consists of three distinct and widely separated territories, viz. Oldenburg Proper, the principality of Lubeck, and the principality of Birkenfeld, and has a collective area of nearly 2469 square miles, and a population of 341,525 (in 1885). Oldenburg Proper, which comprises seven eighths of this area and four fifths of the entire population,  is bounded on the north by the German Ocean, on the east, south, and west by the territory formerly the kingdom of Hanover. The principal rivers of Oldenburg are the Weser, the Jahde, the Haase, the Leda, and other tributaries of the Ems.

The grand-duchy of Oldenburg Proper is divided into eight circles. The country is flat, belonging to the great sandy plain of Northern Germany, and consists for the most part of moors, heaths, marsh or fens, and uncultivated sandy tracts; but here and there, on the banks of the rivers, the uniform level is broken by gentle acclivities, covered with wood, or by picturesque lakes surrounded by fruitful pasture-lands. Agriculture and the rearing of cattle constitute the chief sources of wealth. The scarcity of wood for fuel, and the absence of coal, are compensated for by the existence of turfbeds of enormous extent. With the exception of some linen and stocking looms, and a few tobacco-works, there are no manufactories. Oldenburg has principally a coasting-trade, but there are exports of horses, cattle, linen, thread, hides, and rags, which find their way chiefly to Holland and the Hanseatic cities.

The principality of Lubeck, consisting of the secularized territories of the former bishopric of the same name, is surrounded by the Prussian province of Sleswick Holstein, and is situated on the banks of the rivers Schwartau and Trave. It contributes 140 square miles to the general area of the grand- duchy, and 34,721 inhabitants to the collective population. It is divided into four administrative districts. It has several large lakes, as those of Plon — noted for its picturesque beauty — Keller, Uklei, and Gross-Eutin; while in regard to climate, soil, and natural products it participates in the general physical characteristics of Holstein.

The principality of Birkenfeld, lying south-west of the Rhine, among the Hundsrtick Mountains, and between Rhenish Prussia and Lichtenberg, is an outlying territory, situated in lat. 49° 30'-49° 52' N., and in long. 7°-7° 30' E. Its area is 194 square miles, and its population 39,693. The soil of Birkenfeld is not generally productive; but in the lower and more sheltered valleys it yields wheat, flax, and hemp. Wood is abundant. The mineral products, which are of considerable importance, comprise iron, copper, lead, coal, and building-stone; while in addition to the rearing of cattle, sheep, and swine, the polishing of stones, more especially agates, constitutes the principal source of industry. The principality is divided into three governmental districts.  Oldenburg is a constitutional ducal monarchy, hereditary in the male line of the reigning family. The constitution, which is based upon that of 1849, revised in 1852, is common to the three provinces, which are represented in one joint chamber, composed of thirty-three members, chosen by free voters. Each principality has, however, its special provincial council, the members of which are likewise elected by votes; while each governmental district within the provinces has its local board of counselors, and its several courts of law, police, finance, etc.; although the highest judicial court of appeal, and the ecclesiastical and ministerial offices, are located at Oldenburg. Perfect liberty of conscience was guaranteed by the constitution of 1849. The Lutheran is the predominant Church, upwards of 2610,000 of the population belonging to that denomination, while about 75, 000 persons profess the Roman Catholic religion. There are two gymnasia, one higher provincial college, several secondary, and over 500 elementary schools; but in consequence of the scarcity of villages in: the duchy, and the isolated position of many of the houses of the peasantry, schools are not common in the country districts, and the standard of education of the lower classes is, from these causes, scarcely equal to that existing in other parts of Northern Germany.

History. — The territory now included in the grandduchy of Oldenburg was in ancient times occupied by the Teutonic race of the Chauci, who were subsequently merged with the more generally known Frisii, or Frisians; and the land, under the names of Ammergau and Lerigau, was for a long period included among the dominions of the dukes of Saxony. In 1180, the counts of Oldenburg and Delmenhorst succeeded in establishing independent states from the territories of Henry the Lion, which fell into a condition of disorganization after his downfall. This family has continued to rule Oldenburg. On the death, in 1667, of count Anthony Gunther, the wisest and best of the Oldenburg rulers, his dominions, in default of nearer heirs, fell to the Danish reigning family, a branch of the house of Oldenburg, and continued for a century to be ruled by viceroys nominated by the kings of Denmark. In 1773, by a family compact, Christian VII made over his Oldenburg territories to the grand-duke Paul of Russia, who represented the Holstein-Gottorp branch of the Oldenburg family. Paul having renounced the joint countships of Delmenhorst and Oldenburg in favor of his cousin, Frederick Augustus, of the younger or Keil line of the house of Oldenburg, who was prince-bishop of Lilbeck, the emperor raised the united Oldenburg territories to the rank of a duchy. The present  reigning family is descended from duke Peter Friedrich Ludwig, cousin to the prince-bishop, Friedrich Augustus. For a time the duke was a member of Napoleon's Rhenish Confederation; but French troops having, in spite of this bond of alliance, taken forcible possession of the duchy in 1811, and incorporated it with the French empire, the ejected prince joined the ranks of the allies. In recognition of this adhesion, the Congress of Vienna transferred certain portions of territory, with 5000 Hanoverians and 20,000, inhabitants of the quondam French district of the Saar, to the Oldenburg allegiance, and it was raised to the dignity of a grand-duchy. The revolutionary movement of 1848 was quite as productive of violent and compulsory political changes in this as in other German states; and in 1849. after having existed for centuries without even a show of constitutional or legislative freedom, it entered suddenly into possession of the most extreme of liberal constitutions. The reaction in favor of absolutism, which the license and want of purpose of the popular party naturally induced all over Germany, led in 1852 to a revision and modification of the constitution, giving it the essential principles of popular liberty and security. See Halem Geschichte des Grossherzogthums Oldenburg (Oldenburg, 1794, 3 vols.); Runde, Oldenburgische Chronik (ibid. 1863).

## Oldendorp, Christian George Andreas[[@Headword:Oldendorp, Christian George Andreas]]

             a German Moravian missionary, was born March 8, 1721, at Hildesheim, in Hanover, and was a graduate of the University of Jena. In 1743 he entered the service of the Moravian Church as a teacher, and was subsequently ordained to the ministry, having charge of various parishes both in Germany and Holland. In 1767 he visited the islands of Santa Cruz, St. Thomas, and St. John. In 1768 he went through several cities of North America Where the Moravians had settlements. Returning to Europe in 1769, he became successively minister at Marienborn, Neuwied, and Ebersdorf, where he died March 9, 1787. He is distinguished as the author of a voluminous and important work on the Moravian Mission in the Danish West Indies, including a complete account of the geography and of the natural and political history of those islands as they were known about the middle of the last century. It bears the following title: C. G. A. Oldendorp's Geschichte der Mission der Evangelischen Bruder auf den Caraibischenz Inseln, S. Thomas, S. Croix, u. S. Juan (Barby, 1777,2 vols. 8vo). It was so highly esteemed that it was translated into the Swedish (1786-88, 8vo). (E. de S.)

## Oldermann, Johann[[@Headword:Oldermann, Johann]]

             a noted German student of philosophy and the natural sciences, was born in Saxony in 1686. After laying the foundation of his studies in the school of Osuaburg, he went to Helmstadt, where Mr. Van der Hardt, his maternal uncle, instructed him in the Oriental languages and the Jewish antiquities, so that he took the degree of M.A. in 1707, became Greek professor in 1717, and was appointed assistant library-keeper to his-uncle. He was aided in his studies by other learned men; and, by genius and industry, made an extraordinary progress in everything he applied himself to. Astronomy was his favorite study; he passed whole nights in viewing and contemplating the stars. He was hindered by a weak constitution, which, through a sedentary life, sank into a dropsy that carried him off in 1723. The titles of several of his dissertations are, De imperfectione sermonis humani:De Phraatefluvio: — De maria lgoyro: — De Ophir: — De festivitate AEncceniorum: — De specularibus Veterum: — De origine natalitiorum Jesu Christi.

## Oldfield, Joshua, D.D.[[@Headword:Oldfield, Joshua, D.D.]]

             a noted English Presbyterian divine, flourished near the opening of the last century. He was probably born in 1656. He took a prominent part in the disputes which arose in his day regarding the Trinitarian question, and was present at the Salter's Hall Convocation, which had been called February, 1718 or 1719, to bring about, if possible, a harmonious orthodox profession on the basis of the first article of the Church of England, and the answers to the fifth and sixth questions in the Westminster Catechism. Among those who refused to subscribe, Dr. Oldfield was most prominent. He was at that time minister of the Presbyterian Church in Maiden Lane, Globe Alley, close to the spot where the Globe Theatre formerly stood. He was universally conceded to be “a man of great learning and sound judgment, and one of the most eminent of the tutors connected with the Presbyterian body.” He died in 1729. He published several of his Sermons (1699-1721), and an essay on the Improvement of Reason (1707, 8vo), from which Paine is believed to have borrowed some ideas for his Age of Reason. See Skeats, History of the Free Churches of England, p. 306-7. (J. H. W.)

## Oldham, Hugh[[@Headword:Oldham, Hugh]]

             an English prelate of great learning, was born near Manchester in the 15th century. He became bishop of Exeter in 1504. He founded a free school in Manchester, and added to the endowment of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He died in 1519., See Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 8:457.

## Oldoni, Boniforte And Ercole[[@Headword:Oldoni, Boniforte And Ercole]]

             two old painters of the Milanese school, flourished, according to Della Valle, at Vercelli about 1466, and executed some works for the churches. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:626.

## Oldrin, Edward[[@Headword:Oldrin, Edward]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Wessell, Suffolk County, England, Feb. 13, 1802. Ill his youth he became a member of the Wesleyan Methodist Society. He was early licensed as a local preacher, and he. labored successfully in the home work. In 1829 he came to this country, and began his labors on the Stamford Circuit. In 1830 he was received on trial in the New York Conference, and appointed to the Suffolk Circuit. From that time till the conference of 1863 — a period of thirty-three years — he was uninterruptedly engaged in ministerial work in  the following pastoral appointments: 1830-1, Suffolk Circuit; 1832-3, Hempstead Circuit; 1834-5, Westhampton; 1836-7, King's Bridge and Yonkers; 1838-9, Stamford Circuit; 1840-1, Marlborough Circuit, N.Y.; 1842-3, Paltz and Plattekill; 1844-5, Sugar Loaf; 1846-7, Montgomery Circuit; 1848-9, Marlborough Circuit; 1850-1, Marbletown Circuit; 1852- 3, Bloomingburg Circuit; 1854-5, Southold; 1856-7, Pound Ridge; 1858, Greenwich; 1859-60, Eastchester; 1861-2, Newtown and East Village. In 1863 poor health obliged him to desist from the pastoral relation, but he continued preaching until near the time of his death, which took place at Stamford, Conn., Feb. 22, 1874. He was an earnest, faithful, and successful minister of Christ. He was a man of great faith and much prayer. “During the active portion of his life he was emphatically a man of one work. Whatever his text, his theme always was Christ. His sermons were like huge blocks of rugged truth quarried from the Book of God. His gifts were varied and of marked character” (W. C. Hoyt, in Christ. Adv. March 5, 1874).

## Olds, Gamaliel Smith[[@Headword:Olds, Gamaliel Smith]]

             a Congregational minister, was born Feb. 11, 1777, in Tolland, Mass. He graduated at Williams College in 1801; held the position of tutor from 1803 to 1805; and in 1806 was elected professor of mathematics and natural philosophy, but resigned in 1808, and studied theology, and was ordained co-pastor in Greenfield, Mass., Nov. 19, 1813, where he remained until 1816. In 1819 he was chosen professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the University of Vermont; and in 1821 professor of the same studies in Amherst College. Some years afterwards he filled the same chair in the University of Georgia. He died from the effects of an accident at Circleville, Ohio, June 13, 1848. Mr. Olds published an Inaugural Oration at Williams College (1806): — The Substance of several Sermons upon the subjects of Episcopacy and Presbyterian Purity (1815): — Statement of Facts relative to the Appointment to the Office of Professor of Chemistry in Middlebury College (1818). See Sprague, Annals of the Ame. Pulpit 2:586.

## Olearius[[@Headword:Olearius]]

             the name of a German family, renowned for having produced several generations of learned Protestant theologians. Thus we find,

1. JOHANN OLEARIUS (1), born at Wesel Sept. 17; 1546. His family name was Kupfermann, but his father being an oil-manufacturer, he changed it to Olearius. He studied at Dusseldorf, Marburg, and Jena. In 1573 he followed Heshusius, who was, on account of his zeal against Calvinism, obliged to retire to Prussia. Olearius became professor at the University of Konigsberg. In 1577 he went to that of Helmstadt, where he was in 1579 appointed professor of Hebrew. About that time he married the daughter of Heshusius. In 1601 he became superintendent at Halle, and taught Hebrew for some time in the gymnasium of that city. He died there Jan. 26, 1623. He wrote, Disputationum theologicarum partes II: — Verzeichniss 200 Calvinischer Irrthiimer in den Anhaltischen Buchern.

2. GOTTFRIED OLEARIUS (1), second son of the preceding, was born at Halle Jan. 1,1604. He became successively adjunct professor of philosophy at Wittenberg, pastor at Halle, and superintendent of that city, where he died, Feb. 20; 1685. He wrote, Erklarung des Buches Hiob in 55 Predigten (Lips. 1633, 1645, 1672, 4to): — Biblica theoretico-practica adnotata (Halle, 1676, 4to): — Homiliarum catecheticarumplus quam 700 delineatio (ibid. 1680, 8vo).

3. JOHANN OLEARIUS (2), brother of Gottfried, was born at Halle Sept. 17, 1611. He was first pastor at Halle, and afterwards general superintendent at Weissenfels, where he died, April 14,1684. His most important works  are, Oratoria ecclesiastica methodice adornata (Halle, 1665, 8vo): — Adsertionum philologicarum heptas ex historia Magorum (Leips. 1671, 4to): — Theologia exegetica (ibid. 1674, 8vo): — Geistliches Handbuch der Kinder Gottes (ibid. 1674, 8vo): — Biblische Erklarung (ibid. 1678- 81, 5 vols. fol.).

4. JOHANN GOTTFRIED OLEARIUS, son of Gottfried, was born at Halle Sept. 28, 1635. After being for a while pastor at Halle he was appointed superintendent at Arnstadt, where he became very popular, and was so attached to the people that he declined the appointment of first preacher to the court at Gotha, which was offered him in 1689. He died at Arnstadt May 20 1711. Besides a number of dissertations on various subjects, he wrote several works, the most important of which is entitled Abacus patrologicus (Jena, 1673, 8vo). The 2d edition was published by his son, Johann Gottlieb, under the title Bibliotheca scriptorum ecclesiasticorum (ibid. 1711. 2 vols. 4to), with an introduction by J. F. Buddaeus.

5. JOHANN OLEARIUS (3), a philologist and theologian, brother of the preceding, was born at Halle May 5, 1639. He became professor of Greek at Leipsic in 1664, and of theology in 1677. He endeavored to soften the theological dissensions so common at that time, which were often making trouble in the university. He died at Leipsic Aug. 6, 1713. Among his theological works we notice Elementa herneneuticae sacrae (Leips. 1698, 8vo): — De stylo Novi Testamenti (ibid. 1668, 4to; four editions, the latest in 1699): — Exercitationes philologicae Graecum epistolarum dominicaliumr textum concernentes (ibid. 1672, 4to): — Synopsis controversiarum selectiorum (ibid., 1710, 8vo): — Doctrina theologice moralis (ibid. 1688); reprinted with the following work: — Introductio in theologiam casualenm (ibid. 1703, fol.). He was also one of the most active contributors to the Acta Eruditorum during the first years of its publication.

6. JOHANN CHRISTOPHER OLEARIUS, son of Johann Gottfried, was born at Halle Sept. 17,1668. He studied theology at Jena, and in 1693 came to Arnstadt, where, on account of his numismatic learning, he was intrusted with the classification of the valuable collection of coins of the prince of Schwarzburg. In 1736 he became superintendent of Arnstadt. He died March 31, 1747. Among his works we notice Historie der Stadt Arnstadt (Jena, 1701, 8vo): — Clericatus Schwarzburgicus (ibid. 1701, 12mo): — Clericatus. Thuringice prodromus (ibid. 1704, 8vo): — Evangelischer  Liederschatz (ibid. 1705-1706, 4 pts. 8vo): — Prefamen de Johanna papissa (Arnst. 1722 8vo). He published also several editions of the - Arnstddtisches Gesangbuch (ibid. 1701, 1703, 1706, 12mo; 1737, 8vo), etc.

7. JOHANN GOTTLIEB OLEARIUS, a German jurist and biographer, brother of the preceding, was born at Halle June 22, 1684. He was professor of law at Konigsberg, and assessor of the criminal court. He died July 12, 1734. He wrote, De Luthero exjuris studioso theoloqo et Zieglero ex theologo jurisconsulto facto (Jena, 1710): — De variis atheos convincendi methodis (ibid. 1711), etc.

8. GOTTFRIED OLEARIUS (2), a German theologian and philologist, son of Johann Olearius (3), was born at Leipsic July 23, 1672. After studying at Leipsic, he made in 1693 a journey through England and Holland, and after, his return was appointed, in 1709, professor of theology at Leipsic. He died there Nov. 13, 1715. Among his works we notice Analysis logica epistolae ad Ebrceos, cumn observationibus philologicis (Leips. 1706, 4to): — Observationes sacrae inEvangelium Matthaei (ibid. 1713, 1734, 4to): — Collegium pastorale (ibid. 1718, 4to); it is a series of instructions for young pastors, written in German. He published also a Latin translation of Stanley's History of Philosophy, to which he added a dissertation, De Philosophia Eclectica; and a highly esteemed edition of Philostratus (ibid. 1709, fol.), with notes, a preface, and a Latin translation. This volume contains all that remains of the Greek writers who bore that name. See Acta Erudiforum, 1711, p. 419-424; 1713, p. 428 sq.; Jocher, A 1. Gelehrten-Lexikon; Hunnius, Apologia J. G. Oleaiii (Dresden, 1717, 8vo); Walch, Bibl. Theolog.; Otto, In exsequias Olearii (1747, fol.); Gotten, Das jetztlebende gelehrte Europa, vol. ii; Becker, Kurze Fragen aus der Kirchenhistorie (Jena, 1751), p. 9735; Wetzel, Auserlesene Theologische Bibliothek, vol. 33; Hirschinlg, Handbuch; Lipsius, Bibl. Numaria (Leips. 1801), vol. ii; Ersch u. Gruber, Encyklopidie; Arnoldt, HIistorie d. Konigsberger Univ. vol. ii; Chauffepi, Dict.' Hist.; Niceron; Memoires, vol. vii; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:603. sq. See also Hallam, Literature, 2:266; Mosheim. Ecclesiastes Hist. vol. 3; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 7:458 sq.; Genesis Biog. Diet. s.v. (J. N. P.)

## Oleaster, Geronimo[[@Headword:Oleaster, Geronimo]]

             a Portuguese Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Lisbon. Some Portuguese writers call him Geronimo de Azambuja, because they regard him as a native of that place. About 1520 he joined the Dominicans, and acquired great reputation for his proficiency in philosophy, theology, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. In 1545he went to Italy, and was one of the theologians appointed by Juan III of Portugal to take part in the Council of Trent. After his return he was appointed bishop of St. Thomas, in Africa, but declined, preferring to continue his literary labors. He, however, filled the office of inquisitor, and several others in his order, He died in 1663. Oleaster wrote Commentaria in Pentateuchum Moysi (Lisbon, 1556. fol. Antwerp, 1568, and Lyons, 1586,1589, fol.): — In Esaiam Commentaria (Paris, 1623, 1658, fol.). See Antoine de Sienne, Bibl. Donzin.; N. Antonio, Bibl. ispana Nova; Echard, Scriptores ord. Prcedicat.; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 7:460.

## Olesnicki, Nicholaus[[@Headword:Olesnicki, Nicholaus]]

             lord of Pinagom, a noted Polish nobleman, who figured prominently in the Reformation movement, and decidedly leaned towards Protestantism, deserves a place here. In 1549 Olesnicki boldly defended the right of priests to marry; and a short time after he turned out the monks from a convent in his town, ejected the images from the church, and established there a public Protestant worship, according to the tenets and rites of Geneva. Of course Olesnicki was persecuted by the ecclesiastical authorities, but his influence at court prevented severe punishment for a long time. Three Roman Catholic writers assert that the king and senate favored the punishment of Olesnicki, but it seems unreasonable to suppose that Romish ecclesiastics would have suffered the offender to pass unmolested if they had dared to chastise him. Olesnicki died soon after, and thus the trouble came to a precipitate close. See Krasinski, History of the Reformation in Poland, 1:160-171. (J. H-. W.)

## Olevianus, Caspar[[@Headword:Olevianus, Caspar]]

             one of. the founders of the Reformed Church of Germany, the co-laborer of Ursinus (q.v.), and one of the compilers of the Heidelberg Catechismn, was born Aug. 10, 1536, near Treves. His family name was derived from Olewig, his native village. His father was a baker, but a man highly esteemed by his contemporaries. Thus they honored him with the dignity of mayor and senator. Caspar's early education was obtained in his native town. In his fifteenth year he was sent to Paris to study law. At the schools of that city and of Orleans and Bourges he spent seven .years. In 1557 he obtained the degree, of doctor of laws at Bourges. During his studies in France he became acquainted with the Reformed theology, and imbibed both its principles and spirit. In 1558 he went to Geneva to study theology, and while in Switzerland entered into intimate association with the celebrated Reformers Calvin, Beza, Farel, Bullinger, and Martyr, enjoying the privilege of sitting with them at the table; and, what was much more important to him, he became acquainted, by personal knowledge and experience, with the condition and workings of the Presbyterial Church at Geneva, then in an extraordinarily flourishing state.

He spoke warmly to his esteemed teacher, Calvin, concerning the quiet desire of many in Treves towards the Reformation, and induced Calvin, in 1558, to write to two members of the council, Otto Seeie and Peter Sierk, who were known to be secretly well disposed towards the. evangelical movement, to exhort and  encourage them to take a more open and decided stand in favor of the spread of their faith, without heeding too much the unavoidable danger which such a course seemed necessarily to involve. True to his former vow, the fiery youth, Olevianus, then only twenty-three years of age, returned to Treves, and commenced his ministry there early in the year 1559. He was greeted in the most friendly manner, and immediately received an appointment as teacher of Latin in a school which had at that time become almost extinct. His province was to explain the dialectics of Melancthon, then in vogue over the whole of Germany. In the course of his duties he took occasion frequently to make use of such examples as would serve quietly, and without awakening suspicion or prejudice, to instill evangelical truth into the minds of his pupils. Owing to the limited knowledge of his scholars, he could make but poor progress by teaching in Latin; but he began, with more success, in the German language to- teach them from the catechism. Although not then an ecclesiastic, but only a layman, he ventured even publicly in his schoolroom to deliver an earnest and decidedly evangelical sermon on justification by faith alone, in which he indulged in strictures especially upon the prominence given to saints, and also in reference to the mass and processions. In this he met with the approbation of many in the town; yet there were also numerous and strong voices raised against it.

He was immediately forbidden to preach in his school, but he nevertheless continued to preach in the Jacob's church, with ever increasing attendance upon his discourses; and before long nearly half of the town declared themselves decidedly in favor of the Reformation. The elector Frederick, of the Palatinate, and the count palatine Wolfgang, of Zweibrucken, sent superintendent Freisberg, of Zweibrucken, to Tours for a short time to sustain Olevianus, and assist in carrying forward the quickly formed young congregation; but very soon the archbishop of Treves succeeded in forcing the inhabitants into submission. The Lutheran citizens, as they were called, were glad to escape punishment, in body and soul, as “seditious traitors, instigators of incendiary movements and murder,” and to obtain permission to emigrate to the nearest evangelical Palatinate districts, Trarbach and Beldenz, on the Mosel. The twelve principal movers in reformatory interests, among them Olevianus, were sent to prison, from which they were only delivered, after a confinement of ten weeks, through the influence of the neighboring evangelical princes and the city of Strasburg, under the condition of a heavy fine and immediate banishment from the city. Still there were left in Treves, after the first emigration and banishment, three hundred evangelical Christians. These,  however, refusing to recant, were also soon after driven from the town. Not until 1817 (consequently only after a space of 248 years) was an evangelical service held in Treves. Latterly its population has somewhat increased, though there is little probability that it will ever recover its ancient fame and importance.

Olevianus, of course, did not find it very difficult to occupy his time elsewhere. He was asked for from many quarters, but he preferred the university town of Heidelberg, whither he went as court preacher and professor of philosophy, and where he rendered, in 1560 and in the following years, great services to the Reformed theology. In connection with Ursinus, he prepared the Heidelberg Catechism, and afterwards the Palatinate Liturgy. Indeed, Olevianus labored with the greatest zeal for the complete organization of the Church in the Palatinate, entertaining well- grounded hopes that it might become a nursery of pure doctrine for the whole of Germany. He turned his attention especially to the calling of competent preachers and teachers, of whom there was yet a pressing need; and. scarcely was he a quarter of a year in Heidelberg when he wrote to Calvin, requesting him to send over the Order and Discipline of the Church at Geneva, that he might lay them before the consistory for examination and adoption, which; in regard to Church government, favored his views. Calvin with great cheerfulness sent him the outlines of the Genevan Church polity, together with many valuable suggestions in regard to it. The Genevan Reformer especially recommended to Olevianus the temperate and prudent introduction of this Church order, because he as well as Beza feared the impetuosity and enthusiasm of this spirited youth.

Olevianus, however, did not at once succeed in introducing a fully self-sustaining order of discipline, entirely independent of the civil power. Rather, he had to be satisfied with constituting synods of ministers, without elders, and arranging matters so that — agreeably to the questions eighty-one to eighty-five of the Heidelberg Catechism, and in accordance with the Palatinate Church, of which he was, without doubt, the principal author — the necessity of ecclesiastical Christian discipline, to be administered by the congregation, or those ordained and authorized for that purpose, was meantime at least acknowledged; while as yet, however, no independent presbyters or boards of elders were actually established for the administration of discipline. The power of discipline, for the time being, remained entirely in the hands of the civil authorities, as a kind of politico- moral regulation. In 1567 a circumstance occurred which became the  occasion of materially advancing into favor the views of Olevianus in regard to Church government. A man of the name of Withers, an Englishman, and a rigid Calvinist, excited a discussion about the necessity of the exercise of Church discipline by the ministry and presbytery, “even against the prince,” and thus occasioned a vehement controversy on this vital question of the Reformed Church. In this discussion Olevianus took sides against his dear friend, professor Erastus, a learned and pious Swiss physician, who adhered to the Zwinglian doctrine of the union of Church and State. Still, after a while the views and demands of Olevianus prevailed with the elector; and in 1570, though not without violent protest from the opposing party, the elector instituted presbyters in every congregation, entrusting to them expressly and independently the administration of the Church government and exercise of discipline, in which arrangement, however, the individual members of the presbytery, who, from their principal vocation, were called censors, were in no case to be elected by single congregations, but were appointed for life by the higher judicatories. Thus were the desires of Olevianus in regard to this important matter realized, and his labors crowned with success. The fruits which this arrangement yielded are thus stated in a funeral sermon by Tossanus: “Every one must acknowledge that there now exists in Heidelberg and in the entire Palatinate order, quietness, and a Christian-like state of things very different from what has been prevailing during several years past.” After the death of the elector (1576), and the immediate reinstatement into the Palatinate, by force, of the Lutheran doctrine and customs by his son Ludwig, Olevialius was suspended from his office of pastor and professor, forbidden all conversation and correspondence with the learned, and prohibited from holding any private assemblies in his own house, and was put under arrest. The great reformer now removed to Berleburg, and in 1584 took up his abode at Herborn.

Yet these years, spent away from the centers of theological controversy and discussion, were by no means years of recreation and rest to the hoary Christian. Most earnestly and zealously was he all these years occupied in the propagation of the Reformed doctrine, especially in Wittgenstein and Nassau, until death put an end to his labors of love, March 15, 1587. As a reformer, the efficiency of Olevianus consisted principally in his successful preaching, and in the excellent and well-adapted order and government which he introduced into the Church. His talents and his taste indicated that his vocation was rather in this sphere than in that of author, or even theological professor. It was his labor and influence that accomplished the introduction of the  presbyterian form of Church government and discipline into the Palatinate, first applied by Calvin to the Church in Geneva; extending and perfecting the system, however, so as to include the government of the Church by synods. Thus Olevianus exerted a most important influence in giving shape and character to the Reformation; receiving and introducing ideas of government which have not only since been widely adopted by Scotch, English, and Irish Presbyterians, but which have confessedly entered into the peculiar republican principles of our American civil government. What writings he has left belong principally to preparations for the Heidelberg Catechism (q.v.), and such as were published in its defense or explanation. Around it, as in the case of Ursinus, his laurels will be perennially green; and, as being one of its authors, he will be longest and most gratefully remembered by the Reformed Church. See Sudhoff, Olevianus' und Ursinus' Lebel und Schriften (Elberfeld, 1857); Adam, Vitce Germ. Theol. p. 596 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 10:604; Harbaugh, Fathers of the German RejR Ch. 1:246-261; Hagenbach, Vater u. Begriinder der Ref. Kirche, vol. viii (Elberf. 1857, 8vo); id. Kirchengesch. vol. iii; Amer. Presbyt. Rev. July, 1863, p. 375; Corwin, Man. Ref. Ch. p. 171 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. seit der Ref. v. 182 sq. (H. H.)

## Oley, Barnabas[[@Headword:Oley, Barnabas]]

             a learned English divine of considerable note, was born at Thorp, near Wakefield, about the opening of the 17th century. He was educated at Cambridge; was proctor of the university in 1635, and afterwards president of Clare Hall. He was vicar of Great Gransden, in Huntingdonshire, fifty- three years, and a considerable benefactor to the parish, as appears from an inscription in that church. After suffering much by the Rebellion, he was in 1660 restored to his fellowship and vicarage, and on Sept. 4 of that year was installed prebendary of Worcester. In 1679 he was promoted to the archdeaconry of Ely. This dignity he afterwards voluntarily resigned, in his great humility not thinking himself sufficient to discharge the duty of it; which corrects a mistake of Mr. Woods (Fast. Oxon. vol. ii, col. 850, 1st ed.) that Dr. Taywell succeeded in the archdeaconry on Mr. Oley's decease; for it was on his resignation. Oley died Feb. 20,1685. He published the works of Dr. Thomas Jackson, and Herbert's Country Parson.

## Olga, St.[[@Headword:Olga, St.]]

             a noted saint of the Russian Church, was by birth of very humble descent, but became grand princess of Russia as the wife of the duke Igor of Kiev. This prince, having undertaken an expedition against Constantinople, which proved unsuccessful, was slain on his return to his own dominions, and his widow Olga thereupon assumed the government in his stead, and for many years governed with much prudence and success. Having resigned the government to her son, Vratislav, about the year 952, she repaired to Constantinople, where she was baptized by the patriarch Theophilaktes, and received into the Church, assuming at baptism the name of Helena, in honor of St. Helena, mother of Constantine. She returned to Russia, and labored with much zeal for the propagation of her new creed; but she failed in her attempt to induce her son, Swiintoslav, to embrace Christianity. Her grandson, Vladimir, having married Chrysoberga, the sister of the emperors of Constantinople, Basil and Constantine, was baptized in the year 988; but Olga did not live to enjoy this gratification, having died in 978, or, according to other authorities, as early as 970. As the first Christian grand princess, she was canonized after her death, and she has come to be held in high veneration in the Russian Church. Her festival falls on July 21. The practice of venerating her appears to date from the early period of the Russian Church, before the schism between the Eastern and Western churches. In the Latin Church her name is not to be found in the catalogue of the saints. How important is her relation to Russian Church history Gibbon (Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,. v. 435 sq.) has well pointed out. A female, perhaps of the basest origin, who could revenge the death and assume the scepter of her husband Igor, must have been endowed with those active virtues which command the fear and obedience of barbarism. In a moment of foreign and domestic peace she sailed from Kiev for Constantinople, where in the sacrament of baptism she received the venerable name of the empress Helena. After her return to Kiev and Novgorod, she firmly persisted in her new religion; but her labors in the propagation of the Gospel were not attended with success, and both her family and nation adhered with obstinacy or indifference to the religion of their fathers. Yet the lessons and:examples of the pious Olga had made a deep though secret impression on the minds of her son and people. See Neander, Church History, 3:328; Gieseler, Church History, 2:231; Kurtz, Lehbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 1:211; Strahl, Gesch. d. Russ. Kirche, p.  51 sq.; Nestor, Annals.(in Schlozer's transL), v. 58 sq.; Karamsin, Gesch. d. Russ. Reichs, in 136 sq.; Duncan, Hist. of Russia, p. 46, 47.

## Oliba Of Vic[[@Headword:Oliba Of Vic]]

             a French prelate, was born in the latter part of the 10th century. His father, who was also called Oliba or Oliva, was count of Cerdagne and Besalu. Abandoning to his older brothers. Bernard and Guifroi, the estates of Besalu and Cerdagne, young Oliba became a monk, and in 1009 was appointed abbe of Ripol, as well as of St. Michel de Cusan, in the diocese of Elne. In 1019 we see him at the same time abbe of Ripol, of Lusan, and bishop of Ausone, or of Vie, then belonging to the see of Narbonne. in Spain. Oliba died in 1047. All agree in praising his conduct as a bishop and an abbe. He was a powerful prelate; learned, discreet, a skillful .and vigilant administrator. Several years before his death he abdicated the bishopric of Vie. The Histoire Litteraire, which counts him among the number of French writers, mentions several letters of Oliba. published by Baluze in his Appendice to the Marca Hispanica, upon statutes, and a treatise upon the Cycle Pascal, which is unpublished. See Gallia Christ. vol. vi, col. 1098, Hist. Litter. de la France, 7:566.

## Olibanum[[@Headword:Olibanum]]

             SEE FRANKINCENSE.

## Olier, Jean Jacques[[@Headword:Olier, Jean Jacques]]

             a distinguished French Roman Catholic theologian, noted as a Lazarist, was born at Paris Sept. 20, 1608. He studied in his native city, and in the Jesuit college of Lyons, the College of Harcourt, and the Sorbonne. He became successively prior of the Trinity of Clisson, in the diocese of Nantes, abbot of Pebrac, and honorary canon of Brioude in 1626; and finally prior of Bazainville, in the diocese of Chartres. On his return from a journey to Rome he became intimately acquainted with Vincent de Paul. Ordained priest, March 21, 1633, Olier associated himself with other priests, and they went as missionaries through the provinces of Auvergne and Velay. While he was traveling through Brittany, his reputation was so great that Louis XIII, at the request of cardinal Richelieu, appointed him coadjutor of Henry Clausse bishop of Chalons-sur-Marme; but Olier, who contemplated forming a seminary for the education of priests, declined the office. Guided by the advice of Coudren, he founded a first establishment  at Vaugirard, near Paris, in Jan., 1642, in which he was assisted by able clerical teachers.

This little community, numbering at first but three members, soon increased to twenty, and many of these associates rose in due time to the highest stations in the Church. But this was not his only labor. The parish of St. Sulpice, in Paris, subject to the abbot of St. Germain des Pros, was then a center of immorality and licentiousness; Olier was chosen to reform it, and, although he had but little hope of success, he assumed the charge Aug. 10, 1642, still continuing to direct the seminary. Aided by some of his priests from Vaugirard, he succeeded in his undertaking in Paris, and his parish became one of the most regular in the city. Duelling was then a common practice. Olier undertook to form an association of the bravest among the nobles who would bind themselves never to give or accept a challenge, and never to act as seconds in an encounter. This bold plan succeeded, and at the head of those who took the vow on the day of Pentecost, 1651, were marshal de Fabert and the marqais of Fenelon, both renowned duellists. This step created great excitement, and was warmly approved by marshals d'Estrees, Schomberg, de Plessis-Praslin, and de Villeroy. In the mean time the number of priests in his seminary having greatly increased, Olier divided them into two societies — the Congregation of St. Sulpice, who retained charge of the seminary, for which they received a charter in Nov., 1645, and the Community of the Priests of the Parish, who governed the Church affairs; the two divisions, however, continued to form but One body. In 1655 Olier, together with his successor, Le Ragois de Bretonvilliers, laid the corner-stone of the church of St. Sulpice, which still exists. Besides this chief establishment of his, Olier became the founder of provincial seminaries at Clermont, Le Puy, Viviers, and Bourg St. Andeol; and an offshoot of his congregation was planted even in the French colony of Montreal, in Canada, He also organized a number of charitable societies, schools, and orphan asylums. His labors and austerities brought on severe infirmities, which abridged his life. He died April 2, 1657. Bossuet calls him “virum praestantissimum ac sanctitatis odore florentem.” He is eulogized by F'nelon as “vir traditus gratise Dei, et plane apostolicus;” and in a letter from the assembly of the clergy to pope Clement XII we find him extolled as “eximium sacerdotem, insigne cleri nostri decus et ornamentum.” Olier left a number of writings, chiefly practical, which have often been reprinted. See Vie de M. Olier, Fondateur du Seminazire de St. Sulpice (Paris, 1853, 8vo); Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 1:330- 332; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38, 615-617.

## Olin, Stephen, D.D., LL.D.[[@Headword:Olin, Stephen, D.D., LL.D.]]

             one of the most noted of American divines, and an educator highly esteemed in his day, was a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was born in Leicester,Vermont, March 2, 1797, and was the oldest son of Henry Olin, who was at different times judge of the supreme court of Vermont, member of Congress, and lieutenant-governor. Stephen Olin graduated at Middlebury College, the valedictorian of his class, and was pronounced by one of the professors “the ripest scholar who had ever come before him to be examined for a degree.” As his health was injured by severe study, he was advised to go to South Carolina, where he was elected principal of Tabernacle Academy, Abbeville District. There he was converted, and soon after began to preach the Gospel. In 1824 he was admitted to the South Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and stationed in Charleston, where he ministered during the summer months, in connection with another preacher, to four large congregations, including three thousand slaves. He had the happiness of receiving two hundred of these into the Church, and between forty and fifty white persons. His coadjutor being absent, these excessive labors proved too exhausting, and he was obliged to go to the North. In July, 1826, he was appointed professor of English literature in the University of Georgia. He entered upon the duties of his chair Jan. 1, 1827, and retained his position for seven years, in bad health most of the time; “nevertheless he was a brilliant professor, and has left the impress of his mode of instruction on the institution to this day.” In 1827 he was married to Miss Bostick, of Milledgeville, Ga., who died in Naples, Italy. in 1839. In 1832 he was elected president of Randolph Macon College, Virginia.

He at first declined, but was subsequently induced to accept the position, upon which he entered March 5, 1834, when he delivered his inaugural address, and it was said that the prosperity the college enjoyed during his administration was mainly due to his exertions and controlling influence. The years from 1837 to 1841 he passed in an extended tour in Europe and the East; and the fruits of his observation in the latter region have appeared in two excellent volumes, Travels in Egypt, Petrea, and the Holy Land (N. Y. 1843), and a posthumous work, entitled Greece and the Golden Horn. This account of Egypt was said to be “the best, on the whole, in the language.” In Petra he discovered some very interesting monuments of the ancient civilization of that wonderful city, which had been overlooked by all previous travelers.  In his Travels Dr. Olin spoke of “a broken arch, supposed to be the remains of an ancient bridge connecting the Temple with Mount Zion, as having been known to Mr. Catherwood and other travelers and residents.” For this he was charged (in the North American Review for October, 1843) with plagiarism, and with doing great injustice to Dr. Robinson, who in his Biblical Researches, the Bibliotheca Sacra, and elsewhere, claimed to have been the discoverer of this interesting monument, and especially to have been, so far as he knew and believed, the first to recognize in this fragment of an arch the remains of the bridge spoken of by Josephus. The controversy with Dr. Robinson which ensued, and which appeared in the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser and in the Christian Advocate for 1844- 1845, contained an unqualified denial of the charge of plagiarism, sustained in the most important point by the testimony of two missionaries of the American Board, whose letters made all further words superfluous. The Rev. Cyrus Hamlin wrote from Bebek, near Constantinople: “I read Dr. Robinson's note in the North Anmerican of July with profound surprise, being confident that I had heard Mr. Homes affirm that he informed Dr. Robinson of the existence. of that arch as a remnant of the bridge spoken of by Josephus. I immediately addressed a note to Mr. Homes, which with the reply I forward to you.” Mr. Homes wrote: “In 1837, while residing several months at Jerusalem, I discovered one day with surprise in the obscure part of the city where it is situated the remains of the arch, and fancied that it had never obtained, so far as I knew, the notice of any traveler. . . . In the spring of 1838, at the time of a missionary council in Jerusalem, I had the pleasure of meeting Dr. Robinson. We were all anxious to show Dr. Robinson all the noticeable places in Jerusalem which might possibly suggest to him facts regarding its ancient topography. One forenoon I eagerly told Dr. Robinson of the existence of this now famous arch, and from his surprise and awakened interest it was evident he had never heard of it before. And before he went to see it, I remarked to him on the probability that it was the bridge mentioned in history as going from the Temple to Mount Zion.” Mr. Hamlin further writes: “Mr. Homes has shown me the journal of his residence in Syria, and under date of May, 1837, among a number of things noted as worthy of special examination is this brief minute, ‘The bridge crossing from Mount Zion to Mount Moriah.' The entry was made at the time when he first: began to regard the arch as a remnant of that bridge, and that was nearly one year previous to Dr. Robinson's visit to Jerusalem. He afterwards visited it repeatedly, sometimes in connection with travelers; and when Dr. Robinson arrived in  Jerusalem, he brought it to his notice as a remnant of the bridge spoken of by Josephus.” An incorrect allusion to this controversy in Allibone's Biographical Dictionary renders a full statement of the facts important.

In 1842 Dr. Olin was elected president of the Wesleyan University, which office he continued to fill until his death. This high school became under Dr. Olin's administration the best of the Methodist connection, and at once took its place beside the foremost and oldest of the New England colleges. True it lacked the money which the others had to supply all their wants, but so untiring was Dr. Olin in his efforts to make the Wesleyan University a power in the land that, notwithstanding all the embarrassments surrounding him and all the opposition facing him, he yet gathered about him a faculty inferior to none other in the country. Indeed, while Dr. Olin was a wonderful preacher, combining affluence of thought, overwhelming earnestness of feeling, and physical power of delivery to a degree unrivaled in his time; and while his intellect was of extraordinary sweep and power; while morally his life was a perpetual struggle after the highest ordeal — he longed to be like Christ; and while his printed sermons have the grand reach of Chalmers, with the practical directness of application which has recently been so much admired in Robertson; it is nevertheless to be insisted upon that it was not as a preacher and philosopher that Dr. Olin should take first rank, but rather as an educator. As the head of a university he was truly in his own place — a veritable king of men; none who came near him failed to acknowledge the supremacy of his great nature; none of his students, whose conceptions of the powers and duties of humanity were elevated by their personal contact with him, failed to be impressed with their duty towards the world into which they launched out from college. In 1843 Dr. Olin married Miss Julia M. Lynch, daughter of Judge Lynch, of New York. Dr. Olin was elected delegate to the General Conferences of 1844 and 1852, and delegate from the New York and New England Conferences to the first meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in London, 1846. He was a contributor to the Wesleyan Journal, the Christian Advocate and Journal, and the Methodist Quarterly Review, He died at Middletown, Conn., Aug. 16, 1851. Two volumes of Sermons, Lectures, and Addresses were published at New York in 1852. In 1853 these were followed by his Life and Letters. edited by Mrs. Olin, and enriched by the valuable contributions of his friends.

“Dr. Olin was a man of remarkable organization. His physical and mental proportions were alike gigantic. His intellect was of that imperial rank to  which but few of the sons of men can lay claim. At once acute, penetrating, and profound, it lacked none of the elements of true mental greatness. We have known many men far superior to him in acquired learning; but for breadth and comprehensiveness of range, for vigor and richness of thought, for fertility and abundance of invention, we have never met his equal. But grand as was Dr. Olin's intellectual being, his moral life was still grander. So overshadowing, indeed, was its majesty, that we can hardly contemplate any portion of his nature apart from it. With such qualities of mind and heart, is not wonderful that he was pre-eminent as a preacher. In overmastering power in the pulpit, we doubt whether living he had a rival, or dying has left his like among men” (Rev. Dr. McClintock, in Methodist Quarterly, Oct. 1851, p. 652). “He had the real celestial fire of sacred oratory. He had great power of insight and logic; but his chief strength lay in the enkindling and electric energy of his sympathetic and emotional nature. The great truths which his intellect issued were effective because they were borne on the glowing and irresistible stream of his sensibilities” (New-Englander, 12:124-151). “His character-moral, social, and intellectual — was throughout of the noblest style. In the first respect he was pre-eminent for, the two chief virtues of true religion-charity and humility. The original powers of his mind were, however, his great distinction. These, like his person, were all colossal in grasp and strength, with the dignity which usually attends them; a comprehensive faculty of generalization, which felt independent of details, but presented in overwhelming logic grand summaries of thought. This comprehensiveness, combined with energy of thought, was the chief mental characteristic of the man. Under the inspiration of the pulpit it often, and indeed usually became sublime. Ever and anon passages of overwhelming force were uttered, before which the whole assembly seemed to bow, not so much in admiration of the man, as in homage to the mighty truth. Such passages were usually not poetic, for he was remarkably chary of his imagery; but they were ponderous with thought; they were often stupendous conceptions, such as you would imagine a Sanhedrim of archangels might listen to uncovered of their golden crowns” (Rev. Dr. Stevens, in the Methodist Quarterly for July, 1852). “We do not hesitate,” says the Rev. Dr. Wightman, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, “to express our conviction that, with the pre-eminent qualifications he possessed for influencing young men, for wielding aright the potent instrumentalities belonging to the professor's chair, aided by the power which gave his sermons a baptism of fire when occasionally he was able to preach, Dr.  Olin did more for the Church than if he had even worn the mitre. We never knew a professor or president half so idolized by his students, one half so fitted to impress the great lineaments of his own character on the susceptible minds of young men, or so qualified to bring the vital spirit of religion into all the agencies and appliances of education. His work was marked out by Providence; he was sustained in it until the mission of his life closed.” “In the intimate blending of logical argument with fiery feeling, he was more like what we know Demosthenes to have been than any speaker we have ever listened to; and his power (as was the case with the great Athenian orator) did not consist in any single quality — in force of reasoning, or fire of imagination, or heat of declamation — but in all combined. The printed sermons are vigorous, massive, and powerful to a degree unsurpassed in modern literature, unless perhaps by Chalmers and Robert Hall; but they are yet a very inadequate representation of the living preacher” (Rev. Dr. McClintock, in Meth. Quar. Rev. 36:9, 33). See, besides his Life and Letters mentioned above, Fish, Pulpit Eloquence, ii, 5, 27; Biographical Sketches of Methodists; Gorrie, Lives of Methodist Ministers, p. 383; Southern Literary Messenger, 1:15; Sherman, Sketches of New England Methodism, p. 414; Meth. Qu. Rev. July, 1852, p. 430, 477; Jan. 1854, p. 9; Oct. 1853, p. 600.

## Olindo, Martino De[[@Headword:Olindo, Martino De]]

             a Spanish architect, flourished in the 16th century. According to Milizia, he erected the parochial church of Liria, of which the lower story has four Doric columns on pedestals, with niches, statues, and bas-reliefs; the second story has the same number of Corinthian columns; the third story has two ,fluted twisted columns, with a, statue of St. Michael in the center. Olindo also completed the monastery of St. Miguel at Valencia, begun by Cobarrubias.

## Oliva[[@Headword:Oliva]]

             a noted Italian Jesuit, who rose to the first dignity in the brotherhood, was descended from a noble family of Genoa, where his grandfather and uncle had been respectively doge of the republic. He was born near the opening of the 17th century. After entering the Jesuitical order he taught for some time, and was so well appreciated that he was given the rectorate of a Jesuit college at Rome. He was an intimate friend of pope Alexander VII, and when general Nickel was deprived of his office, pope Innocent X, also  his friend, pointed to Oliva as the proper person for Nickel's place. The Jesuits made haste to secure Oliva, as they too believed him “a chief according to their hearts.” In 1664 he was finally elevated to the generalship of the order, and the immense political importance which the society acquired under his government proved that they had made a wise choice (see Nicolini, p. 322). Personally Oliva was not a favorite. He kept himself at a great distance from the inferior brethren of the order, and seldom condescended to give an audience. He spent a great part of his time in the delicious villa near Albano, where he occupied himself with the cultivation of the rarest exotics. When at Rome he retired to-the novitiate of St. Andrea. He never went out on foot. He lived in a most sumptuously and elegantly adorned apartment, enjoying the pleasures of a table furnished with the most select. delicacies. He was only studious of enjoying the position he held, and the power he had obtained. Reserving for his particular attention matters of political importance, he left the affairs of the society to the entire management of subordinate officials. But it must by no means be inferred that Oliva failed to attract notice or to strengthen his order. The political importance which the Jesuits acquired then was due almost wholly to Oliva's personal efforts. He maintained a correspondence which extended to almost all the monarchs of Europe, in which indeed he showed himself a consummate politician, and deeply engaged in most serious and important affairs. Oliva died in 1681, and was succeeded by Noyelle (q.v.). See Nicolini, Hist. of the Jesuits, p. 320-325; Steinmetz, Hist. of the Jesuits, vol. ii; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 2:247 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Oliva, Alessandro[[@Headword:Oliva, Alessandro]]

             a distinguished Italian Roman Catholic prelate, noted also as a prominent member of the monastic order, was born at Sassoferato in 1408 of poor parents. When three years old he fell into the water, and was taken out for dead; but, being carried by his mother into the church of the Holy Virgin, he recovered wonderfully, or, according to the papists, miraculously. He was now dedicated by his parents to the service of the Church, and when yet but a youth was admitted among the Augustinian monks. He studied at Rimini, Bologna, and Perusa, in which last place he was first made professor of philosophy, and afterwards appointed to teach divinity. At length he was chosen provincial, and some time after accepted, not without reluctance, the post of solicitor-general of his order. This office obliged him to go to Rome, where his learning and virtue became greatly admired, notwithstanding that he took all possible methods, out of extreme humility,  to keep at a distance from papal notice. The cardinal of Tarentum, the protector of his order, could not prevail upon him to engage in any of the public disputations, where everybody wished to see a man of his great erudition: however, as he was a sublime theologian and a most eloquent orator, he attracted public attention by whatever he wrote and whenever he preached. He appeared in the pulpits of the principal cities in Italy, as Rome, Naples, Venice, Bologna, Florence, Mantua, and Ferrara; was elected first vicar-general, and then general of his order, in 1459; and at last created cardinal, in 1460, by pope Pius II. This learned pontiff gave Oliva afterwards the bishopric of Camerino, and made use of his abilities on several occasions. Oliva died shortly after at Tivola, where the court of Rome then resided, in 1463. He wrote, De Christi ortu Sermones centum: — De coena cum apostolisfacta: — De peccato in Spiritum Sanctum.: — Orationes elegantes. (J. H. W.)

## Oliva, Fernand Perez de[[@Headword:Oliva, Fernand Perez de]]

             a noted Spanish morlist, was born in Cordova about 1492. His father, who himself cultivated letters, educated him with much care. At twelve he was studying in the University of Salamanca; whence he went to Alcala, then to Paris, and finally to Rome, where, under the protection of his uncle, attached to the court of Leo X, he enjoyed all the advantages that the capital of the Christian world could offer. On the death of his uncle he was proposed to occupy the place thus left vacant; but he preferred to return to Paris, where he gave public lessons during three years. Pope Adrian VI, informed of the success of Oliva, endeavored to attract him to Rome. The love of country prevailed with the young Spaniard, who returned to Salamanca, and was one of the founders of the college of the Archbishop in 1528. He taught moral philosophy, and became the rector of the college. Shortly after having attained this elevated position he died, in 1530, though still a young man-a great loss to letters. Oliva had seen with what success Italian writers had, in imitation of the Latins, composed works in prose, and he regretted that in Spain the Latin was still the language for moral and philosophical discussions; he employed the Castilian tongue in a dialogue On the Dignity of Man. He also wrote several didactic discourses On the Faculties of the Mind and their Use, etc., and a discourse which he pronounced in Salamanca as candidate for the chair of moral philosophy. The historian Morales, his nephew, assures us that in all these treatises Oliva designed to give models of the power and resources of the Spanish tongue. His example was promptly followed by writers of merit —  Sedefno, Salazar, Luis Mexia, Navarra; but none equalled for force and expression the first part of the dialogue. On the Dignity of Man. All the works of Oliva were published for the first time by his nephew, Ambrosio de Morales. (Cordova, 1585, 4to); they were reprinted (Madrid, 1787, 2 vols. 12mo). The Inquisition held them until after correction. See Razionamento que hiro en. Salamanca, in the Works of Oliva; Rezabal y Ugarte, Biblioteca de los Escritores que han sido individuos de los seis Colegios Mayores (Madrid, 1805, 4to), p. 239, etc.; Nicolas Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispana nova; Ticknor, Hist. of Spanish Literature, 2:8 sq., 66; 3:401. (J. H. W.)

## Olive[[@Headword:Olive]]

             (זִיַת, za'yith, probably from זוּת, to be pleasant, said esp. of odors; or, as Gesenius supposes, from זָהָה, to shine, from the gloss of the oil; Gr. ἐλαία, i.e. oil-tree. The Heb. name is essentially found in all the kindred languages-the Arabic, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Coptic; comp. the Spanish azeyte, oil).

The olive-tree is one of the chief vegetable products of Palestine, and an important source of that country's wealth and prosperity throughout the Scripture period. It was cultivated in olive-gardens (called in Hebrew זִיַתכֶּרֶם), usually on high ground, and even on mountains (comp. Gen 8:11; Shaw, Travels, p. 293), preferring a dry and sandy soil (see Virgil, Georg. 2:180 sq.; Colum. v. 8; De Arbor. 17; Pliny, 17:3); yet it appears also in wet soil, and even grows under water (Theophr. Plant. 4:8; Pliny, 13:50). The species are widely distributed in the warmer temperate parts of the globe. The common olive (Oliva Eusropcea), a native of Syria and other Asiatic countries, and perhaps also of the south of Europe, although probably it is there rather naturalized than indigenous, is in its wild state a thorny shrub or small tree, but through cultivation becomes a tree of twenty to forty feet high, destitute of spines. It attains a prodigious age. The cultivated varieties are very numerous, differing in the breadth of the leaves, and in other characters. The general appearance of the trees is that of an apple-orchard, as to the trunk, and the willow as to the stems and leaves. The olive is of slow growth (Virgil, .Georg. 2:3). It never becomes a very large tree, though sometimes two or three stems rise from the same root, and reach from twenty to thirty feet high, with spreading branches (comp. Hos 14:7; Strabo, 16:769). The leaves are in pairs, lanceolate  in shape, of a dull green on the upper, and hoary on the under surface (comp. Psalm 52:10; 128:3; Jer 11:16; Ovid, Metamorph. 8:295; Theophr. Plant. 1:15; Pliny, 16:33; Diod. Sic. 1:17). Hence in countries where the olive is extensively cultivated the scenery is of a dull character from this color of the foliage. The flowers, which are white, appear in little tufts between the leaves. The fruit is an elliptical drupe, at first of a green color, but gradually becoming purple, and even black, with a hard, stony kernel, and is remarkable from the outer fleshy part being that in which much oil is lodged, and not, as is usual, in the almond of the seed. In Palestine the olive blossoms in June (Anderson, Bible Light, p. 202). It ripens from August to September. The tree is usually propagated by slips, and it bears very abundantly, with comparatively little care (Pliny, 17:19; comp. Jer 11:16). As to the growth of the tree, it thrives. best. in warm and sunny situations. It is of a moderate spread, with a knotty, gnarled trunk, and a smooth ash-colored bark. Its look is singularly indicative of tenacious vigor; and this is the force of what is said in Scripture of its “greenness,” as emblematic of strength and prosperity. The leaves, too, are not deciduous. Those who see olives for the first time are occasionally disappointed by the dusty color of their foliage; but those who are familiar with them find an inexpressible chaim in the rippling changes of these slender gray-green leaves. Mr. Ruskin's pages in the Stones of Venice (3:175-177) are not at all extravagant.

Of the olive-tree two varieties are particularly distinguished: the long- leafed, which is cultivated in the south of France and in Italy, and the broad-leafed in Spain, which has also much larger fruit than the former kind. On the wild olive-tree, as well as the practice of grafting, SEE OLIVE, WILD.

The olive is one of the earliest of the plants specifically mentioned in the Bible, the fig being the first Thus in Gen 8:11 the dove is described as bringing the olive-branch to Noah. How far this early incident may have suggested the later emblematical meanings of the leaf it is impossible to say; but now it is as difficult for us to disconnect the thought of peace from this scene of primitive patriarchal history as from a multitude of allusions in the Greek and Roman poets. Next, we find it the most prominent tree in the earliest allegory. When the trees invited it to reign over them, its sagacious answer sets it before us in its characteristic relations to divine worship and domestic life (Jdg 9:8-9). The olive, being an evergreen, was adduced as an emblem of prosperity (Psa 52:8; Psa 128:3), and it has continued, from the earliest ages, to be an emblem of peace among all civilized nations. Thus among the Greeks the olives was sacred to Pallas Athene (Minerva), who was honored as the bestower of it; it was also the emblem of chastity. A crown of olive-twigs was the highest distinction of a citizen who had merited well of his country, and the highest prize of the victor in the Olympic games. The different passages of Scripture in which the olive is mentioned are elucidated by Celsius (Hierobot. 2:330). So with the later prophets it is the symbol of beauty, luxuriance, and strength; and hence the symbol of religious privileges (Hos 14:6; Jer 11:6; comp. Sirach 1, 10). The olive is always enumerated among the valued trees of Palestine; which Moses describes (Deu 6:11; Deu 8:8) as “a land of oil-olive and honey” (so in 28:40, etc.). Solomon gave to the laborers sent him by Hiram, king of Tyre, 20,000 baths of oil (2Ch 2:10). Besides this, immense quantities must have been required for home consumption, as it was extensively used as an article of diet, for burning in lamps, and for the ritual service. The oil of Palestine was highly prized, and large quantities were exported to Egypt, where the tree has been little cultivated (Ritter, Erdk. 11:519; see Hos 12:12, and Jerome, ad loc.; Echa Rabb. 85:3). The Phoenicians also received much oil from Palestine (Eze 27:17; comp. 1Ki 5:11; Ezr 3:7). The kings of Israel raised a part of their revenue in oil (2Ch 32:28). The best olives grew in the region of Tekoa (Mishna, Menach. 8:3). It was not unusual to eat the olives themselves, either raw, softened in salt water (comp. Burckhardt, Travels, 1:85), or preserved (Dioscor. 1:138). On the method of preserving olives, see Colum. 12:47. SEE OIL.

Not only the olive-oil, but the branches of the tree were employed at the Feast of Tabernacles (Neh 8:15). SEE OLIVET. The wood also was used (1Ki 6:23) by Solomon for making the cherubim (vers. 31, 32), and for doors and posts “for the entering of the oracle,” the former of which were carved with cherubim and palm-trees and open flowers;. The wood of the olive-tree, which is imported chiefly from Leghorn, is like that of the box, but softer, with darker gray-colored veins. The roots have a very pretty knotted and curly character; they are much esteemed on the Continent for making embossed boxes, pressed into engraved metallic molds. Furniture is made of the olive-tree in Italy, and the closeness of the grain fits it even for painters palettes. The bark of the tree is bitter and astringent; and both it and the leaves have febrifuge properties. A gum-  resin exudes from old stems, which much resembles storax, has an odor like vanilla, and is used in all parts of Italy for perfumery. This was known to the ancients, and is now sometimes called olive-gum. But the fruit, with its oil, is that which renders the tree especially valuable. The green unripe fruit is preserved in a solution of salt, and is well known at desserts. The fruit when ripe is bruised in mills, and the oil pressed out of the paste. Different qualities are known in commerce, varying partly in the quality of the fruit, partly in the care with which the oil is extracted. SEE OLIVE- BERRY. The berries (Jam 3:12; Esdras 16:29), which produce the oil, were sometimes gathered by shaking the tree (Isa 24:13), sometimes by beating it (Deu 24:20). Then followed the treading of the fruit (Deu 33:24; Mic 6:15). Hence the mention of “oil- fats!' (Joe 2:24). SEE OIL-MILL. Nor must the flower be passed over without notice:

“Si belle floruerint olese, nitidissimus ainnus” (Ovid, Fast. v. 265).

The wind was dreaded by the cultivator of the olive, for the least ruffling of a breeze is apt to cause the flowers to fall:

“Florebant olea: yenti nocuere protervi” (Ibid. 321).

Thus we see the force of the words of Eliphaz the Temanite: “He shall cast off his flower like the olive” (Job 15:33). It is needless to add that the locust was a formidable enemy of the olive (Amo 4:9). It happened not unfrequently that hopes were disappointed, and that “the labor of the olive failed” (Hab 3:17). SEE FLOWER. “Of all fruit-bearing trees it is the most prodigal in flowers. It literally bends under the load of them. But then not one in a hundred comes to maturity. The tree casts them off by millions, as if they were of no more value than flakes of snow, which they closely resemble. So will it be with those who put their trust in vanity. Cast off, they melt away, and no one takes the trouble to ask after such empty, useless things — just as our olive seems to throw off in contempt the myriads of flowers that signify nothing, and turns all her fatness to those which will mature into fruit” (Thomson, Land and Book, 1:525). SEE BLAST.

That the olive grows to a great age has long been known. Pliny mentions one which the Athenians of his time considered to be coeval with their city,  and therefore 1600 years old. Near Terni, in the vale of the cascade of Marmora, there is a plantation of very old trees, supposed to consist of the same plants that were growing there in the time of Pliny. Lady Calcott states that at Tericoncio, on the mountain road between Tivoli and Palestrina, there is an ancient olive-tree of large dimensions, which, unless the documents are purposely falsified, stood as a boundary between two possessions even before the Christian sera, and in the 2d century was looked upon as very ancient. The difficulty on this point arises from a fresh tree springing up from the old stump. Chateaubriand says: “Those in the garden of Olivet (or Gethsemane) are at least of the times of the Eastern empire, as is demonstrated by the following circumstance. In Turkey every olive tree found standing by the Mussulmans when they conquered Asia pays one medina to the treasury, while each of those planted since the conquest is taxed half its produce. The eight olives of which we are speaking are charged only eight medinas.”. By some, especially by Dr. Martin, it is supposed that these olive-trees may have been in existence even in the time of our Savior. Dr. Wilde describes the largest of them as being twenty-four feet in girth above the roots, though its topmost branch is not thirty feet from the ground; Bove, who traveled as a naturalist, asserts that the largest are at least six yards in circumference, and nine or ten yards high; so large, indeed, that he calculates their age at 2000 years. SEE GETHSEMANE.

It is more than probable that the olive was introduced from Asia into Europe. The Greeks, indeed, had a tradition that the first branch of it was carried by a dove from Phoenicia to the temple of Jupiter in Epirus, where the priests received and planted it; and Pliny states that there were no olive-trees in Italy or Spain before the 173d year from the foundation of the city of Rome. Though the olive continues to be much cultivated in Syria, it is much more extensively so in the south of Europe, whence the rest of the world is chiefly supplied with olive-oil. SEE OLIVE-OIL.

No tree is more frequently mentioned by ancient authors, nor was any one more highly honored by ancient nations. By the Greeks it was dedicated to Minerva, and even employed in crowning Jove, Apollo, and Hercules, as well as emperors, philosophers, and orators, and all others whom the people delighted to honor. By the Romans also it was highly honored; and Columells describes it as “the chief of trees.” It is not wonderful that  almost all the ancient authors, from the time of Homer, so frequently mention it, and that, as Horac( says, to win it seemed the sole aim some men had in life (Carm. 1:7). The olive still continues to be one of the most extensively cultivated of plants. Kitto mentions that in a list he had made of references to all the notices of plants by the different travelers in Palestine those of the presence of the olive exceed one hundred and fifty, and are more numerous by far than those to any other tree or plant (Phys. Hist. of Palest. p. 203), The references to vines, fig-trees, mulberries, and oaks rank next in frequency. These depend partly upon the knowledge of plants the several travelers have. Botanists, even from Europe, neglect tropical species with Which they are unacquainted. See Tristram, Nat. Hist, of the Bible, p, 337; Thomson, Land and Book, 1:70. SEE TREE.

## Olive, Pierre Jean[[@Headword:Olive, Pierre Jean]]

             a French. theologian, noted as one of the Roman Catholics who favored reform in the Church, was born at Serignan in 1247. At the age of twelve he entered the convent at Beziers, and was sent thence to Paris, where he passed bachelor of theology. Full of fervor, he wrote vigorously against the rapidly increasing relaxation of monastic discipline, which raised many voices against him, and he was even accused of holding heretical views. Jerome Ascoli, general of the Franciscans (afterwards pope under the name of Nicholas IV), condemned in 1278 a book in which Olive deified the Virgin Mary, and Olive, in obedience to his orders, burned the book with his own hands. This did not prevent his being again accused in a chapter held in 1282 at Strasburg. Olive's views, which were extensively held among the Franciscans, were condemned, and general Bonagratia went himself to Avignon, where they had numerous partisans, in order to oppose them. Olive appeared before him, and defended himself so well that' he received only a slight reproof. Arlotto de Prato, who succeeded Bonagratia in 1285, obliged Olive to go to Paris; but there also he defended himself successfully. Finally, in 1290, Nicholas IV gave orders to general Raymond Gaufridi to proceed against the followers of Olive; it does not, however, appear that the latter was personally prosecuted.

He took part in' the general chapter held at Paris in 1292, and there gave explanations which all declared satisfactory. He died at Narbonne March 16, 1298. Before his death he declared his attachment to Scripture, and his obedience to the decisions of the Church of Rome. He also declared his regret at seeing the Minorite monks seeking to increase their worldly riches, and said that the begging orders should be satisfied with the necessaries of life, and never  expect or aim to lead as comfortable a life as the canons regular. After his death his enemies still attacked his memory, and it was condemned by John de Mur in 1297; twelve theologians accused him of heresy; his body was dug up and burned; his doctrines were solemnly condemned by the Council of Vienna in 1312. and again by pope John XXII in 1320; and all the historians of the Middle Ages give him the reputation of a heretic. Yet he had only aimed to secure reforms which might have prevented, or at least postponed, the breaking out of the Reformation. At the close of the 14th century Barthelemy of Pisa vindicated the opinions of Olive; St. Antonin praised him, and pope Sixtus IV rehabilitated his memory. His works are over forty in number, consisting of commentaries on various parts of the Bible, of the treatise attributed to Denis the Areopagite concerning the heavenly hierarchy, on the Master of Sentences, of a work on the rule of St. Francis, several controversial works, a panegyric of the Virgin Mary, treatises on vice and virtue, the sacraments, usury, the authority of the pope and that of councils, etc. His only printed works known are, Expositio in regulam Sancti Francisci (Venice, 1513, fol.): — Quodlibeta (ibido 1509, fol.). See Hist. Litter, de la France, 21:41-55; Wadding, Scriptores ord. Minorum; Dict. Historique des Auteurs Ecclesiastes vol. iii; Dom. de Gubernatis, Orbis seraphicus. vol. i.

## Olive, Wild[[@Headword:Olive, Wild]]

             (Gr. Α᾿γριελαία, Dioscorides, 1:125; N.T. Α᾿γριέλαιςο; Lat. Oleaster), a tree mentioned by the apostle Paul as the basis of one of his most forcible allegories in the argumentation concerning the relative positions of the Jews and Gentiles in the counsels of God (Rom 11:16-25). The Gentiles are the “wild olive” (ἀγριέλαιος), grafted in upon the “good olive” (καλλιέλαιος),-to which once the Jews belonged, and with which they may again be incorporated.

“Here different opinions have been entertained with respect not only to the plant, but also as to the explanation of the metaphor. One great difficulty has arisen from the same name having been applied to different plants.  Thus by Dioscorides (De Mater. Med. 1:137) it is stated that the Α᾿γριελαία, or wild olive-tree, is by some called Cotinus, and by others the Ethiopic olive. So in the notes to Theoph. (ed. Boda Stapel, p. 224), we read that κότινος, Cotinus, is to be rendered Oleaster, or wild olive. Hence the wild olive-tree has been confounded with Rhuscotinus, or Venetian sumach, to which it has no point of resemblance. Further confusion has arisen from the present Elceagnus angustifolia of botanists having been at one time called Olea sylvestris. Hence it has been inferred that the Α᾿γριελαία is this very Elaeagnus, E. angustifolia, or the narrowleaved Oleaster-tree of Paradise of the Portuguese. In many points it certainly somewhat resembles the true olive-tree-that is. in the form and appearance of the leaves, in the oblong-shaped fruit (edible in some of the species), also in an oil being expressed from the kernels; but it will not explain the present passage, as no process of grafting will enable the Elseagnus to bear olives of any kind.

If we examine a little further the account given by Dioscorides of the Α᾿γριελαία, we find in 1:141, ‘Upon the tears of the Ethiopian olive,' that our olives and wild olives exude tears-that is, a gum or resinlike the Ethiopian olive. Here it is important to remark that the wild olive of the Grecians is distinguished from the wild olive of Ethiopia. What plant the latter may be, it is not perhaps easy to determine with certainty; but Arabian authors translate the name by zait el- Sudan, or the olive of Ethiopia. Other synonymes for it are tuz el-bur, or wild almond; and badam-kohi, i.e. mountain almond. The last name is given to the kernels of the apricot in Northern India, and it is applied in Persian works as one of the synonymes of the bur-kukh, or apricot. which was originally called apricock and prsecocia, no doubt from the Arabic bur-kukh. The apricot is extensively cultivated in the Himalayas, chiefly on account of the clear, beautiful oil yielded by its kernels, on which account it might well be compared with the olive-tree. But it does not serve better than the Elaeagnus to explain the passage of Paul. From the account of Dioscorides, however, it is clear that the Ethiopic was distinguished from the wild, and this from the cultivated olive; and as the plant was well known both to the Greeks and Romans, there was no danger of mistaking it for any other plant except itself in a wild state, that is, the true Α᾿γριελαία, the common olive, or Olea Europcea, in a wild state. That this is the very plant alluded to by the apostle seems to be proved from its having been the practice of the ancients to graft the wild upon the cultivated olive-tree (see Colum. v. 9, 16; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 17:18; Pallad. R. R. 14:53; comp. Hoffmannsegg, Flore Portug. 1:287). SEE OLIVE.

“The apostle, therefore, in comparing the Romans to the wild olive-tree grafted on a cultivated stock, made use of language which was most intelligible, and referred to a practice with which they must have been perfectly familiar” (Kitto). It is to be noticed, however, that in the comparison of Paul, the wild branch is grafted on the garden tree in order to partake of its sap and life; while in the actual cultivation of the olive no- such grafting took place; the wild graft being really inserted in the tree as it became exhausted, in order to communicate its new vigor to the trunk. Still the grafting of which Paul speaks is not only not inconceivable in inature, but is really that which God has employed in his spiritual dealings with his people, “It must, moreover, occur to any one that the natural process of grafting is here inverted, the custom being to graft a good branch upon a bad stock, It has, indeed, been contended (see above) that in the case of the olive-tree the inverse process is sometimes practiced, a wild twig being engrafted to strengthen the cultivated olive. Thus Mr. Ewbank (Comm. on Rom., 2:112) quotes from Palladius:

‘Fecundat sterilis pingues oleaster olivas,

Et qune non novit munera ferre docet.'

But whatever the fact may be, it is unnecessary to have recourse to this supposition; and indeed it confuses the allegory. Nor is it likely that Paul would hold himself tied by horticultural laws in using such an image as this. Perhaps the very stress of the allegory is in this, that the grafting is contrary to nature (παρὰ φύσιν ἐνεκντρίσθης, v. 24).” SEE GRAFT.

## Olive-Berry[[@Headword:Olive-Berry]]

             (גִּרְגִּר, gargar', so called from its round and rolling form; Isa 17:6, “berry-;” ἐλαία, Jam 3:12, elsewhere “olive,” etc.), the drupe or fruit of the olive-tree, known as “olives” par excellence. It .is greenish, whitish, violet, or even black, never larger than a pigeons egg, generally oval, sometimes globular, or obovate, or acuminate. The fruit is produced in vast profusion, so that an old olive-tree becomes very valuable to its owner. It is chiefly from the pericarp that olive-oil is obtained, not from the seed, contrary to the general rule of the vegetable kingdom. Olives, gathered before they are quite ripe, are pickled; in various ways, being usually first steeped in lime-water, by which they are rendered softer and milder in taste. They are well known as a restorative of the palate, and are also said to promote digestion. Disagreeable as they generally are at first, they are soon greatly relished, and in the south of Europe are even a considerable article of food. Dried olives are there also used, as well as pickled olives. SEE OLIVE.

## Olive-Fat[[@Headword:Olive-Fat]]

             SEE OIL-MILL; SEE PRESS.

## Olive-Oil[[@Headword:Olive-Oil]]

             (fully זֵית שֶׁמֶן, olive of oil, Deu 8:8; briefly שֶׁמֶןExo 30:24, or זִיַת, simply, 2Ki 18:21; A. V. “oil olive”), the product of the fruit of the olive-tree, being emphatically the oil of the East, answering to butter, cream, and fat for the table, as well as for illumination. Olive-oil  is much used as an article of food in the countries in which it is produced, and to a smaller extent in other countries, to which it is exported also for medicinal and other uses. A good illustration of the use of olive-oil for food is furnished by 2Ch 2:10, where we are told that Solomon provided Hiram's men with “twenty thousand baths of oil.” Comp. Ezr 3:7. Too much of this product was supplied for home consumption: hence we find the country sending it as an export to Tyre (Eze 27:17) and to Egypt (Hos 12:1). This oil was used inn coronations: thus it was an emblem of sovereignty (1Sa 10:1; 1Sa 12:3; 1Sa 12:5), It was also mixed with the offerings in sacrifice (Lev 2:1-2; Lev 2:6; Lev 2:15). Even in the wilderness very strict directions were given that, in the tabernacle, the Israelites were to have “pure oil olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamp to burn always” (Exo 27:20), . For the burning of it in common lamps, see Mat 25:3-4; Mat 25:8. The use of it on the hair and skin was customary, and indicative of cheerfulness (Psa 23:5; Mat 6:17). It was also employed medicinally in. surgical cases (Luk 10:34). See, again, Mar 6:13; Jam 5:14, for its use in combination with prayer on behalf of the sick. SEE OIL.

In the south of France and in Italy, where the olive culture is conducted most carefully, the fruit is gathered by hand in November; and after passing through a mill, which separates the pulp or flesh from the hard stone, the pulp is put into bags of rushes and subjected to a gentle pressure. The result is the “virgin oil,” greenish in its tint, and highly prized for its purity. In Palestine several methods are practiced for extracting the oil. SEE OLIVE.

## Olive-Yard[[@Headword:Olive-Yard]]

             (זִיַת, za'yith, Exo 23:11; Jos 24:13; 1Sa 8:14; 2Ki 5:26; Neh 5:11; Neh 9:25, an olive, as elsewhere rendered), an orchard or grove of olive-trees, tended for the sake of the fruit. The olive “grows freely almost everywhere on the shores of the Mediterranean; but it was peculiarly abundant in Palestine. (See Deu 6:11; Deu 8:8; Deu 28:40.) Olive-yards are a matter of course. in descriptions of the country, like vineyards and corn-fields (Jdg 15:5; 1Sa 8:14). The kings had very extensive ones (1Ch 27:28). Even now the tree is very abundant in the country. Almost every village has its olive-grove. Certain districts may be specified where at various times this tree has been very luxuriant. Of Asher, on the skirts of the Lebanon, it was prophesied that he should ‘dip his foot in oil' (Deu 33:24)” (Smith). The  immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem is thus mentioned under OLIVET. SEE GAZA. We may refer to Van de Velde's Syria (1:386) for the extent and beauty of the olive-groves in the vale of Shechem. The abundance of these trees near Akka is thus spoken of by a modern traveler: “We turned out of the road, and entered an extensive olivegrove. Picturesque groups of men, women, and children, in bright-colored garments, were busy among the trees, or hastening along the road. I had always seen the olive- plantations so silent and deserted that it was quite a surprise to me. Saleh explained that it was the beginning of the olive harvest (October 19), and all of these people had been hired to gather the fruit. The men beat the trees with long sticks, and the women and children pick up the berries” (Rogers, Domestic Life in Palestine, p. 140). SEE OLIVE.

## Oliver Of Malmesbury[[@Headword:Oliver Of Malmesbury]]

             a Benedictine monk of the 11th century, is chiefly memorable as the first Englishman who attempted to travel through the aerial regions. He is said to have been well skilled in mechanics; but in attempting to fly from a lofty tower, with wings of his own construction fastened to his hands and feet, he fell and broke both his legs.

## Oliver, George, D.D[[@Headword:Oliver, George, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born at Papplewick in 1782, and educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1803. He took orders, and in 1809 became head-master of King Edward's Grammar-school at Great Grimsby. He became vicar of Scopwick in 1831, incumbent of Wolverhampton in 1834, rector of South Hykeham in 1847, arid died at Lincoln, March 3, 1867. He filled the highest offices in the Masonic order, and wrote numerous works on local ecclesiastical history and Freemasonry, for which see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Oliver, John[[@Headword:Oliver, John]]

             a noted Wesleyan preacher, generally spoken of as one of Wesley's “helpers,” was born and bred at Stockport, Cheshire, England. His father, who was a mechanic, seriously objected to John's association with the Methodists, but the boy was drawn towards them, liking their simplicity and fervor of Christian devotion, and finally became one of their converts (about 1750). The severity of the parental strictures upon his newly avowed faith deprived the young man of his reason, and for months his recovery to sanity was regarded as doubtful. His mother, a sensible and prudent woman, thought it best for John to attend the worship of the  Wesleyans, and with them he soon found the medicine which his disturbed mind craved, “My strength,” he says, “came again — my light, my life, my God; I was filled with all joy and peace in believing.” He was made a class- leader as soon as his restoration was demonstrated and in due time Mr. Wesley called him into the itinerant ranks, where he met with “fiery trials,” but bore them bravely. After many years of indefatigable labor we hear him say, “I bless God that I never was in any circuit where I had not some seals of my mission.” In the year 1783 he was discontinued as a preacher, and we hear nothing of him after that. He died in 1789. The fields in which Oliver's labors were most eminently successful were Bristol, Chester, Sheffield, Manchester, and Liverpool. In all of these his converts were counted by hundreds, and his name is revered to this day as of blessed memory. One of the severest trials he encountered while preaching was in 1774, when he was arrested in the midst of his sermon for vagrancy, notwithstanding his license to preach, and for some time suffered imprisonment. It was on Chester Circuit, and the excitement for a time ran high among those who believed in Oliver's labors; By his wise counsels riot and bloodshed were prevented. See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 2:139- 142; Southey, Life of Wesley, ch. 17; Arminian Magazine, 1779.

## Olivers, Thomas[[@Headword:Olivers, Thomas]]

             a noted English hymnologist, and one of Wesley's most eminent ministers, was born of humble parentage at Tregonan, Montgomeryshire, England, in 1725. Left an orphan at five, he was reared on a farm by a relative, who gave him some education, and with whom he lived until eighteen years of age, when he was bound as an apprentice to a shoemaker. Having received no religious education save a few forms, he early commenced a career of abandoned wickedness, from which he was at last saved by conversion through the preaching of Mr. Whitefield. From that time forth he was a most humble, devoted, and laborious Christian. After a while he was authorized to preach, and his ministrations were abundantly successful both in conversions and in persecutions. In October, 1753, he was sent by John Wesley into Cornwall to preach, whence he was removed to London. At the Conference of 1756 he was appointed to Ireland, and the next year again moved to London. During this year he married happily. After filling many of the principal stations in England, he was-sent to Scotland in 1764, whence he went to Ireland, and preached at Dublin, and then again over to England. After several years spent in the ministry with Mr. Wesley, he was by the latter put in charge of the printing, an important part of which was  the Arminian Magazine, which, under Mr. Wesley, he conducted with ability and success down to August, 1789, when Mr. Wesley became dissatisfied, and discharged Olivers. He afterwards resided in London Inlhorinsg as his age permitted, until his death. March 7, 1799. He was a man of robust mind and great versatility of talents; he was an able and convincing preacher, a masterly controversialist, and his writings, both in prose and verse, possess much merit. His noble hymn called Leoni, and beginning

“The God of Abrah'm praise,”

had reached its thirtieth edition before his death, and some others nearly as many. Mr. Fletcher speaks in high terms of him “as a writer, a logician, a poet, and a composer of sacred music;” and some of his tunes, written for his own hymns, will long be cherished in “the praises of Israel.” Montgomery says of Olivers's Leoni, “There is not in our language a lyric of more majestic style, more elevated thought, or more glorious imagery; its structure, indeed, is very attractive; but, like a stately pile of architecture, severe and simple in design, it strikes less on the first view than after deliberate examination, when its proportions become more graceful, its dimensions expand, and the mind itself grows greater in contemplating it.” It is said that this fine hymn had great influence on the mind of Henry Martyn when contemplating his important missionary career. Olivers was one of the most eloquent defenders of Mr. Wesley and the Wesleyan cause against the attacks of Toplady, Richard and Rowland Hill, and others. Olivers's separately published hymns, tracts, etc., number sixteen, and many of them were of marked ability and usefulness. Christophers, in his Epworth Singers and other Poets of Methodism (N. Y. 1876, 12mo), thus describes Olivers's personal appearance, as furnished by an eyewitness of the great Cornwall out-door service in September, 1773: “The other figure standing by Wesley was that of a man rather taller and less neatly made; a man in the prime of life, with a face that could not be; looked at without interest, open, well-formed, and man]y. The eye that kindled and flashed as the mighty music of the hymn rose from the enthusiastic multitude was the eye of a thinker, keen, telling of logical wariness and ready skill, and giving out, in harmony with its kindred features, expressions of genius, humor boldness, ardent temper, and vivid imagination.” See Lives of Early Methodist Preachers (ed. by Thomas Jackson), 1:195; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 2:41 sq.; 3:143 sq.; Southey, Life of Wesley, ch. 25; Christophers, Epworth Singers, ch. 11.

## Olives, Mount of[[@Headword:Olives, Mount of]]

             SEE OLIVET.

## Olivet[[@Headword:Olivet]]

             the well-known eminence, or rather ridge, on the east side of Jerusalem, separated from the city by the Jehoshaphat valley; it is intimately and characteristically connected with some of the gravest and most significant events of the history of the O.T., the N.T., and the intervening times, and one of the firmest links by which the two are united; the scene of the flight of David, and the triumphal progress of the Son of David, of the idolatry of Solomon, and the agony and betrayal of Christ. In the following account of it we collect and digest the information from all ancient and modern sources.

1. The name “Mount of Olives” (הִאּ הִזֵּיתַים; Sept. τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν) occurs only once in the O.T. (Zec 14:4), but the hill is clearly alluded to in five other passages. In 2Sa 15:30 we read that David, in fleeing from Jerusalem during Absalom's rebellion, “went up by the ascent of the Olives” (במעלה הזיתים), unquestionably the western side of the mount, up which he had to go “toward the way of the wilderness” (2Sa 15:23). In 1Ki 11:7 it is recorded that Solomon built “a high place for Chemosh in the hill that is before (בהר אשר עלִפני,) which is on the face of) Jerusalem.” This is an accurate description of the position of Olivet — facing the Holy City, visible from every part of it. The same hill is called in 2Ki 23:13 “The Mount of Corruption” (הר המשחית), doubtless from the idolatrous rites established by Solomon, and practiced there. In Neh 8:15 Olivet is called emphatically “The Mount” (ההר), etc. Ezekiel mentions it as the mountain which is on the east side (מקדם) of the city.

In the N.T. its ordinary name is “The Mount of Olives” (τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν), which may be regarded as a descriptive appellation-the mount on which the olives grew (Mat 21:1; Mat 24:3; Mat 26:30; Mar 11:1; Luk 19:37; Joh 8:1). But Luke in three passages gives it a distinct proper name” And it came to pass, when he was come nigh to Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount called Elaiozn”-( πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ  καλούμενον Ε᾿λαιών), not, as in the A. V., “the Mount of Olives.” The word is Ε᾿λαιών, the nom. sing., and not ἐλαιῶν, the gen. pi. of ἐλαία (see Alford, Tischendorf, Lachmann, etc., ad loc.), in which case it would have the article (Luk 19:29; comp. Luk 19:37; Luk 21:37; Luk 22:39). In Act 1:12 Luke again employs it in the gen. sing. — “Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet” (ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ε᾿λαιῶνος [“called Elaion”]). In Josephus also we read διὰ τοῦ Ε᾿λαιῶνος ὄρους (Ant. 7:9, 2; comp. 20:8, 6; War, v. 2, 3), showing that in his time Elalcion was the ordinary name given to the mount.

The rabbins called Olivet “The Mount of Anointing” (הר המשחה; Mishna, Para, 3:6; Reland, Palaest. p. 337); and Jarchi, in his note on 2Ki 23:13, says this was its usual name; but that the sacred writers changed it to “Mount of Corruption” (הר המשחית) by a play upon the word, and to denote its defilement by the idolatrous rites of Solomon. The name משחהis closely allied in sense to Olivet-the latter referring to the oil-producing tree, the former to the anointing with its oil (Lightfoot, Opera, 2:200). The names applied to the mount in the Targums are as follows: זֵיתִיָּא טוּר זֵיתָא(2Sa 15:30; 2Ki 23:13; Ezra 11:23; Zec 14:4), ט8 מַשְׁחָא' (Son 8:3; and Gen 8:11, Pseudo-Jon. only).

At present the hill has two names, Jebel et-Tuir, which may be regarded as equivalent to the expression “the Mount” (ההר) in Neh 8:15. This is the name almost universally given to it by the Mohammedan residents in Jerusalem. The Christians and Jews seem to prefer the Arabic equivalent of the Scripture name, Jebel ez-Zeitn, “Mount of Olives.”

2. Physical Features. — The Mount of Olives lies on the east side of Jerusalem, and intercepts all view of the wilderness of Judaea and the Jordan valley. It is separated from the city by the deep and narrow glen of the Kidron. Its appearance as first seen sadly disappoints the Bible student. Properly speaking it is not a hill. It is only one of a multitude of rounded crowns that form the summit of the broad mountain ridge which runs longitudinally through Central Palestine. Zion, Moriah, Scopus, Gibeah, Ramah and Mizpeh are others like Olivet. These bare rocky crowns encircle the Holy City, Olivet being the highest and most conspicuous in the immediate vicinity.  Approaching the city from the west, along the Joppa road, a low ridge is seen beyond it, barely overtopping the massive castle of David, and the higher buildings on Zion. It droops towards the right, revealing the pale blue mountains of Moab in the distant background; and it runs away to the left until it appears to join other ridges. It has no striking features. It is rounded and regular in form and almost entirely colorless. You descend from the Golden Gateway, or the Gate of St. Stephen, by a sudden and steep declivity, and no sooner is the bed of the valley reached than you again commence the ascent, for the foot of Olivet is in fact in the very hollow of the valley. So. great is the effect of this proximity that, partly from that, and partly from the extreme clearness of the air, a spectator from the western part of Jerusalem imagines Olivet to rise immediately from the side of the Haram area (Porter, Handb. p. 103a; also Stanley, S. and P. p. 186).

The best view of the mount is obtained from the city wall, near the St. Stephen's Gate (as in the preceding cut). There is a rocky platform, some fifty yards wide. runs along the wall, overhanging the dusky and venerable olive-groves which partly fill up the bottom of the Kidron, a hundred feet below. From the bottom of the glen rises the side of Olivet, in gray terraced slopes and white limestone crags, to a height of about six hundred feet. Farther south, opposite the Haram, the Kidron contracts so as barely to leave room for a torrent bed. Its general course is from north to south; but it winds considerably, so that the roots of the opposite hills-Moriah and Olivet-overlap. About three quarters of a mile south of the Haram area, the Kidron turns eastward, and there the ridge of Olivet terminates; but that part of the ridge to which the name properly belongs scarcely extends so far. The lower road to Bethany crosses it in the parallel of the village of Silwan, SEE SILOAM, where there is a considerable depression.The section of the ridge south of that road appears in some aspects as a distinct hill, having a low rounded top, and descendinglin lbrokeli cliffs into the Kidron. This is now called by travelers The Mount of Corruption.” -

From the Church of the Ascension, which is the central point of Olivet, the ridge runs due north for about a mile, and then sweeps to the west around a bend of the Kidron. At the elbow it is crossed by the road from Anathoth; and the part west of this road is most probably the Scopus (q.v.) of Josephus (War, v. 2,3).  The eastern limits of Olivet are not so easily defined. It forms the brow of the mountain-chain; and from its top there is an uninterrupted though irregular descent to the Jordan valley — a descent of about 3500 feet in a distance of 14 miles. The eastern declivity of Olivet thus shades gradually off into the wilderness of Judaea. There is no dividing-line; and from the east “The Mount” appears as one of the crowns of the mountainrange. We may assume Bethany, however, as the historical, if not the strictly physical limit of Olivet in this direction; though the slope below the village is quite as great as that above it.

A few measurements and elevations will now most satisfactorily exhibit the position and features of Olivet. Its central but not highest point the Church of the Ascension is due east of the Great Mosque, the site of the Temple, and it is one fifth. of a mile (in an air-line) distant from it. From the mosque on the crown of Moriah to the Haram wall on its eastern brow is 625 feet; from the wall to the western base of Olivet, in the bottom of the Kidron, is 450 feet; from the bottom of the Kidron to the Church of the Ascension, 2000 feet: from the church to the assumed eastern base of “The Mount,” in the line north of Bethany, 4000 feet. The relative elevations are as follows: Height of Olivet above: Bethany...433 feet. Bed of the Kidron...355 Moriah...224 N.W. angle of the city...69

About 530 feet north of the Church of the Ascension is the nearest eminence of the summit, called by monks and travelers Viri Galilaci; it is only-a few feet lower than the church. At a somewhat less distance northeastward is the culminating point of the Mount of Olives, now occupied as a Mohammedan cemetery. The Mount of Offence is about 3700 feet distant south-westerly from the Church of the Ascension, and is nearly 250 feet lower than Olivet.

The outline of Olivet is uniform. The curves are unbroken. Its western face has regular declivities of whitish soil, composed of disintegrated limestone, interrupted here and there by large rocky crowns, long ledges, and rude terrace walls. There is no grandeur, no picturesque ruggedness, no soft beauty; and the aspect, especially in summer and autumn, is singularly bleak. In early spring the painful bareness is in some measure relieved by  the coloring-green corn, brilliant wild-flowers, the soft gray tint of the olive leaves, and the dark foliage of the fig. The whole hill-side is rudely cultivated in little terraced strips of wheat and barley, with here and there some straggling vines trailing along the ground or hanging over the ledges and terrace walls. Fig-trees are abundant, but olives are still, as they were in our Lord's days, the prevailing trees. The mount has as good a title now as perhaps it ever had to the name Olivet. Olive-trees dot it all over-in some places far apart, in others close together, though nowhere so close as to form groves. Most of them are old, gnarled, and stunted; a few are propped up and in the last stage of decay; but scarcely any young, vigorous trees are met with. The base of the hill along the Kidron is more rugged than any other part of the western side. At and near the village of Silwnn are precipices of rock from twenty to thirty feet high, which continue at intervals around the Mount of Corruption. These cliffs are stiaded with excavated tombs; and in Silwin, and northward, some of them are hewn into chaste facades and detached monuments. The hill-side is here covered also with the tombstones of the modern Jewish cemetery. It is the favorite burial-place of the children of Abraham, and the spot where they believe the final judgment will take place.

With the exception of Silwan at its,western base, Bethany at its eastern, and Kefr et-Teron its summit, Olivet is almost-deserted. There are three or four little towers one habitable; the others in ruins built originally as watch-towers for the vineyards and orchards. Nearly opposite St. Stephen's Gate, just across the bed of the, Kidron, is the garden of Gethsemane, and from it a shallow wady, or rather depression, runs. up the hill towards the Church of the Ascension, making a slight curve northward. A short distance south of Gethsemane, and a little farther up the hill, at the spot traditionally known rias that where, the Lord's Prayer was delivered, a French lady has taken up her residence, and built a chapel adjoining her dwelling, which contains the Lord's Prayer in almost all known languages. These structures are the only noticeable features on the western side of the hill. The eastern is much more rugged. The ledges are higher, the cliffs bolder, and there are several deep ravines.

Two ancient roads, or rather bridle-paths, cross the mount to Bethany. From St. Stephen's Gate — the only gate in the eastern side of Jerusalem — a road winds down to the Kidron, crosses it by a bridge, and then forks  at Gethsemane. One branch keeps to the right, ascends the hill diagonally by an easy slope, winds around its southern shoulder, and descends to Bethany. This was the caravan and chariot road to Jericho in ancient days. The other branch keeps to the left of Gethsemane, right up the hill, following the course of the wady, passes Kefr et-Tir, and descends by steep zigzags to Bethany. Perhaps this path is even more ancient than the other. It is in places hewn in the rock; and here and there are rude steps up shelving ledges.

There are several other paths on Olivet, but they are of no historical importance, and require only to be mentioned as features in its topography. A path branches off from No. 2 at the side of Gethsemane, skirts the upper wall of the garden, ascends to the tombs of the prophets, and then turns to the left, up to the village. Another branches off a little higher up, and ascends the steep hill-side, almost direct to the village. Another, leading from St. Stephen's Gate, crosses the Kidron obliquely in a north-easterly direction, and passes over the northern shoulder of the mount to the little hamlet of Isawlyeh. Another path-ancient, though now little used to run from Kefr et-Tur northward along the summit of the ridge to Scopus, joining the road to Anathoth.

3. Historical Notices. — The first mention of Olivetish in connection with David's flight from Jerusalem on the rebellion of Absalom. His object was to place the Jordan between. himself and Absalom. Leaving the city, “he passed over the valley (נחל) of Kidron, toward the way of the wilderness” (2Sa 15:23) — the wilderness of Judah lying between Olivet and the Jordan. Having crossed the Kidron, “he ascended by the ascent of the Olives” (2Sa 15:30), and came to the summit, “where he worshipped God” (2Sa 15:32). It has been supposed from the latter statement that there was here, on the top, an ancient high place, where David had been accustomed to worship; and that this may have been the source and scene of all subsequent idolatrous rites and Christian traditions. The Hebrew phrase does not warrant any such conclusion. The scope of the passage suggests that on reaching the summit he turned to take a last look at the city, to which he had just sent back the ark, and on some of whose heights he probably still saw it. There, with his face towards the sanctuary, he worshipped God (see Theodoret and Jerome, ad loc.). This is the view of most Jewish commentators, though the Talmudists state that there was an idol shrine on the summit (Lightfoot, Opp 2:570). David's route is manifest. He ascended by the ancient path (No. 2) to the top; there he  worshipped, with the city in full view. Turning away, he began to descend: and there, “a little past the top” (2 Samuel 16), he met Ziba. At Bahurim, while David and his men kept the road, Shimei scrambled along the slope of the overhanging hill above, even with him, and threw stones at him, and covered him with dust (2Sa 16:13). After passing Bahurim, probably about where Bethany now stands, he continued the descent through the “dry and thirsty land” (Psalms 63), until he arrived “weary” at the bank of the river (Josephus, Ant. vii. 9, 2-6; 2Sa 16:14; 2Sa 17:21-22).

The next notice is in the time of Solomon, who built “a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem; and for Molech” (1Ki 11:7). The hill was Olivet: but the locality of the high place is not specified. Statements made at a later period show that it could not have been upon the summit. “The high places that were before Jerusalem, which were on the right hand of the Mount of Corruption, which Solomon the king of Israel had builded . . . did the king (Manasseh) defile” (2Ki 23:13). The stand-point of observation and description here is the Holy City, which formerly extended much farther south than at present. “Solomon high place was in front of it, within view, and on the right hand of Olivet. This indicates the southern section of the ridge, the traditional “Mount of Corruption.” There was probably some connection between the high place of Molech, on the right hand of Olivet and those idol shrines which stood in Tophet, at the entrance of the valley of Hinnom (comp. 2Ki 23:13-14; Jer 7:31 sq.; Jerome, Comm. ad loc.). The Mount of Corruption is directly opposite Tophet, and then hill- side is filled with ancient tombs, as Jeremiah predicted (Jer 19:6; Jer 19:11). The tradition which gives its name to the Mount of Corruption is first mentioned in the 13th century by Brocardus: “Ultra torrentem Cedron, in latere aquilonlari-montis Oliveti, est: mons alius altus, quatuor stadiis a Jerusalem distans, ubi Salomon idolo Moabitorum, nomine Chamos, templum construxit, et ubi tempore Machabaeorum eedificatum fuit castrunz, cujus indicia adhuc hodie ibi cernuntur” (cap. 9).

During the next four hundred years we have only the brief notice of Josiah's iconoclasms at this spot. Ahaz and Manasseh had no doubt maintained and enlarged the original erections of Solomon. These Josiah demolished. He “defiled” the high places, broke to pieces the uncouth and obscene symbols which deformed them, cut down the images, or possibly the actual groves, of Ashtaroth, and effectually disqualified them for worship by filling up the cavities with human bones (2Ki 23:13-14).  Ezekiel also mentions Olivet in the wondrous vision of the Lord's departure from Jerusalem. The glory of the Lord first left the sanctuary and stood on the threshold of the house (Eze 10:4); then it removed to a position over the east gate of the Lord's house (Eze 10:19); then it went up “and stood upon the mountain, which is upon the east side of the city” (Eze 11:23), that is, on Olivet. This is doubtless the source of the Rabbinical tradition, which represents the Shekinah as having remained three years and a half on Olivet, calling to the Jews, “Return to me, and I will return to you” (Reland, Palaest. p. 337).

The reference to Olivet in Neh 8:15 shows that the mount, and probably the valley at, its base, abounded in groves of various kinds of trees — “Go forth unto the mount, and fetch olive branches, and pine branches, and myrtle branches, and palm branches, and branches of thick trees, to make booths.” In the days of our Lord the trees were still very numerous (Mar 11:8). The palms, pines, and myrtles are now all gone; and, with the exception of olives and figs, no trees are found on Olivet. Caphnatha, Bethpage, Bethany — all names of places on the mount, and all derived from some fruit or vegetational are probably of late origin, certainly of late mention.

The only other mention of Olivet in the O.T. is in Zechariah's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the preservation of God's people in it. He says of the Messiah, “His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem, on the east” (Zec 14:4).

But his mainly from its connection with N.-T. history that Olivet has so strong a claim upon the attention and affections of the Christian student. During the periods of our Lord's ministry in Jerusalem the mount appears to have been his home. As poor pilgrims were then, and still are, accustomed to bivouac or encamp in the open fields, so Jesus passed his nights amid the groves of Olivet. He did so partly, perhaps, that he might enjoy privacy; partly to escape the ceaseless and bitter persecution of the Jews; and partly through necessity. It looks as if we have here a practical:illustration of his own touching statement, “The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head” (Mat 8:20; Joh 8:1; Luke 28:27). The Mount of Olives was the scene of four events, among the most remarkable in the history Of our Lord.

(1.) The Triumphal Entry. — Its scene was the road — doubtless the ancient caravan road-which winds around the southern shoulder of the hill from Bethany to Jerusalem. A short distance from Bethany the road meets a deep ravine, which comes down from the top of Olivet on the right, and winds away to the wilderness on the left. From this point the-tops of the buildings on Zion are seen, but all the rest of the city is hid. Just opposite this point, too, on the other side of the ravine, are the remains of an ancient village cisterns, hewn stones, and sharpened rocks. The road turns sharply to the right, descends obliquely to the bottom, then turns to the left, ascends and reaches the top of the opposite bank a short distance above the ruins. This then appears to be the spot, “at the Mount of Olives,” where Jesus said to the two disciples, “Go into the village which is opposite you (τὴν ἀπέναντι ὑμῶν), and immediately ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her; having loosed, bring them to me” (Mat 21:2). These active footmen could cross the ravine direct in a minute or two, while the great procession would take some time to wind around the road. The people of the village saw the procession; they knew its cause, and they were thus prepared to give the ass to the disciples the moment they heard; “The Lord hath need of him.” The disciples took the ass, led it up to the road, and met Jesus.

The procession advanced up the easy eastern slope. It gained the crown of the ridge, where “the descent of the Mount of Olives” begins, and where Jerusalem, in its full extent and beauty, suddenly bursts upon the view; and then the multitude, excited by the noble prospect, and the fame of him whom they conducted, burst forth in joyous acclamation, “Hosanna! Blessed is he that cometh in the. name of the Lord: blessed be the kingdom of our father David” (Mar 11:10). The Pharisees were offended, and said, “Master, rebuke thy disciples. He answered, I tell you, that if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out” (Luk 19:39-40). The hill-side is there covered with rugged crowns of rock. The procession advanced, descending obliquely. “And when he came near” to a point nearly opposite the Temple” he beheld the city, and wept over it,” giving utterance to those words so well known and of such deep import The splendid buildings of the Temple were then in full view, a little below the level of the eye, and not more than 600 yards distant. Beyond them Zion appeared crowned with Herod's palace, and the lofty towers of the wall and citadel. Looking on so much splendor and beauty, and looking onward to future desolation, what wonder that divine compassion manifested itself in tears!  The traditionary spot of the lamentation over Jerusalem, however, now marked by a small tower, is on a mamelon or protuberance which projects from the slope of the breast of the hill, about 300 yards above Gethsemane. The sacred narrative requires a spot on the road from Bethany at which the city or Temple should suddenly come into view; but this is one which can only be reached by a walk of several hundred yards over the breast of the hill, with the Temple and city full in sight the whole time. It is also pretty evident that the path which now passes the spot is subsequent in date to the fixing of the spot. As. already remarked, the natural road lies up the valley between this hill and that to the north, and no one, unless with the special object of a visit to this spot, would take this very inconvenient path. The inappropriateness of this place is obvious (Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, p. 190-193).

(2.) From a commanding point on the western side of Olivet Jesus predicted the Temple's final overthrow. He had paid his last visit to the Temple. When passing out, the disciples said, “Master, see what manner of stones, and what buildings are here!” (Mar 13:1). They had probably heard some word fall from his lips which excited their alarm, and they thus tried to awaken in him a deeper interest in their holy temple. He replied, “Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down” (Mar 13:2). He passed on over the Kidron, took the lower road to Bethany, which led him up to a spot “on the Mount of Olives over against the Temple” (Mar 13:3); and there, with the Temple, its stately courts, and the colossal magnitude of its outer battlements before him, he predicted its final ruin, summing up with the words, “This generation shall not pass till all these things be done. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.” The whole discourse in Mark 13 was spoken on that spot (comp. Matthew 24; Luke 21).

(3.) After the institution of the Supper, “when they had sung a hymn,” our Lord led his disciples “over the brook Cedron,” “out into the Mount of Olives,” to a garden called Gethsemane (Joh 18:1; Mat 26:30; Mat 26:36). That was the scene of the agony and the betrayal. SEE GETHSEMANE.

(4.) The Ascension was the most wondrous of all the events of which Olivet was the scene. Luke records it at the close of his. Gospel history, and the beginning' of his apostolic history. In the first record Olivet is not  mentioned. Jesus led his disciples out ἕως εἰς Βηθάνίαν, “as far as to Bethany.” In the second record the reader is referred back to the former. The narrative opens abruptly at the spot to which he had led his disciples, as indicated in the Gospel. A fuller account of his last words is given; and after the ascension, the writer adds, “Then returned they unto Jerusalem, from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath-day's journey” (Luk 24:50-53; Act 1:9-12).

Considerable difficulty has been felt in reconciling the topographical notices in these passages; and still more in attempting to bring them into harmony with the traditional scene of the ascension on the summit of Olivet. The difficulties are as follows:

(a) In Luke Christ is said to have led his disciples “as far as to Bethany,” where he ascended.

(b) In Acts the return from the scene of the ascension is described as from Olivet, which is a Sabbath-day's journey from Jerusalem.

(c) A Sabbath-day's journey was, according to the Talmud, 2000 cubits, about 7.5 stadia (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Luk 24:50).

(d) Bethany was fifteen stadia distant from Jerusalem (Joh 11:18). Lightfoot in one place. explains these apparent discrepancies by stating that the ascension took place at Bethany; that the disciples returned over Olivet; and that the Sabbath-day's journey refers to the distance of that mount from the city (Comment. in Act 1:12). But in a later work he gives a totally different explanation. He says that by Bethany is meant a district, and not the village; that district included a large section of Olivet; and its border, where the ascension took place, was a Sabbath-day's journey from Jerusalem (Hor. Heb. ut sup.). Lightfoot's opinion, therefore, is not of much critical value (see, however, Robinson, Bibl. Sacra, 1:178; Williams, Holy City, 2:440 and 611, 2d ed.).

The presence of the crowd of churches and other edifices implied in the ecclesiastical descriptions must have rendered the Mount of Olives, during the early and middle ages of Christianity, entirely unlike what it was in the time of the Jewish kingdom or of our Lord. Except the high places on the summit, the only buildings then to be seen were probably the walls of the vineyards and gardens, and the towers and presses which were their invariable accompaniment. But though the churches are nearly all  demolished, there must be a considerable difference between the aspect of the mountain now and in those days when it received its name from the abundance of its olive-groves. It does not now stand so pre-eminent in this respect among the hills in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. “It is only in the deeper and more secluded slope leading up to the northernmost summit that these venerable trees spread into anything like a forest.” The cedars commemorated by the Talmud (Lightfoot, 2:305); and the date-palms implied in the name Bethany, have fared still worse: there is not one of either to be found within many miles. This change is no doubt due to natural causes, variations of climate, etc.; but the check was not improbably given by the ravages committed by the army of Titus, who are stated by Josephus to have stripped the country round Jerusalem for miles and miles of every stick or shrub for the banks constructed during the siege. No olive or cedar, however sacred to Jewor Christian, would at such a time escape the axes of the Roman sappers, and, remembering how under similar circumstances every root and fibre of the smallest shrubs was dug up for fuel by the camp-followers of the army at Sebastopol it would be wrong to deceive ourselves by the belief that any of the trees now existing are likely to be the same or immediate descendants of those which were standing before that time.

Except on such rare occasions as the passage of the caravan of pilgrims to the Jordan, there must also be. a great contrast between the silence and loneliness which now pervades the mount and the busy scene which it presented in later Jewish times. Bethpage and Bethany are constantly referred to in the Jewish authors as places of much resort for business and pleasure. The two large cedars already mentioned had below them shops for the sale of pigeons and other necessaries for worshippers in the Temple, and these appear to have driven an enormous trade (see the citations in Lightfoot, 2:39, 305). Two religious ceremonies performed there must also have done much to increase the numbers who resorted to the mount. The appearance of the new moon was probably watched for, certainly proclaimed, from the summit — the long torches waving to and for in the moonless night till answered from the peak of Kurn Surtabeh; and an occasion to which the Jews attached so much weight would be sure to attract a concourse. The second ceremony referred to was the burning of the Red Heifer. There seems to be some doubt whether this was an annual ceremony. Jerome (Fpitaph. Paulae, § 12) distinctly says so; but the rabbins assert that from Moses to the captivity it was performed but  once; from the captivity to the destruction eight times (Lightfoot, 2:306). This solemn ceremonial was enacted on the central mount, and in a spot so carefully specified that it would seem not difficult to fix it. It was due east of the sanctuary, and at such an elevation on the mount that the officiating priest, as he slew the animal and sprinkled her blood, could see the fadade of the sanctuary through the east gate of the Temple. To this spot a viaduct was constructed across the valley on a double row of arches, so as to raise it far above all possible proximity to graves or other defilements (see citations in Lightfoot, 2:39). The depth of the valley is such at this place (about 350 feet from the line of the south wall of the present Haram area) that this viaduct must have been an important and conspicuous work. It was probably demolished by the Jews themselves on the approach of Titus, or even earlier, when Pompey led his army by Jericho and over the Mount of Olives. This would account satisfactorily for its not being alluded to by Josephus. During the siege the 10th legion had its fortified camp and batteries on the top of the mount, and the first, and some of the fiercest, encounters of the siege took place here.

“The lasting glory of the Mount of Olives,” it has been well said, “belongs not to the old dispensation, but to thee new. Its very barren-ness of interest in earlier times sets forth the abundance of those associations which it derives from the closing scenes of the sacred history. Nothing, perhaps, brings before us more strikingly the contrast of Jewish and Christian feeling, the abrupt and inharmonious termination of the Jewish dispensation — if we exclude the culminating point of the Gospel history — than to contrast the blank which Olivet presents to the Jewish pilgrims of the Middle Ages, only dignified by the sacrifice of the ‘red heifer,' and the vision. too great for words, which it offers to the Christian traveler of all times, as the most detailed and the most authentic abiding-place of Jesus Christ. By one of those strange coincidences, whether accidental or borrowed, which occasionally appear in the Rabbinical writings, it is said in the Midrash (rabbi Janna, in the Midriash Tehillim, quoted by Lightfoot, 2:39; perhaps a play upon the mysterious passage Eze 11:23), that the Shekinah, or Presence of God, after having finally retired from Jerusalem, ‘dwelt' three years and a half on the Mount of Olives, to see whether the Jewish people would or would not repent, calling, ‘Return to me, O my sons, and I will return to ou;' ‘Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near;' and then, when all was in vain, returned to its own place. Whether, or not this story has a direct allusion to  the ministrations of Christ, it is a true expression of his relation respectively to Jerusalem and to Olivet. It is useless to seek for traces of his presence in the streets of the since ten times captured city. It is impossible not to find them in the free space of the Mount of Olives” (Stanley, Sin. and Pal. p. 189).

A careful consideration of the passage in Act 1:12 shows that it cannot affect in one way or another the direct statement made in Luke regarding the scene of the ascension, because —

(1st.) Bethany was upon the Mount of Olives; therefore the expressions, “He led them out as far as to Bethany,” and “they returned from the mount called Olivet,” indicate the same spot.

(2dly.) It is not certain whether the “Sabbath-day's journey” is intended to describe the distance of the mount or of the exact scene of the ascension.

(3dly.) Suppose it did refer to the latter, still it would not necessarily militate against the statement in Luke that Bethany was the place, because the exact length of a Sabbath-day's journey is uncertain-some say 2000 cubits, or nearly one Roman mile; others, 2000 Roman paces, or two miles: and, moreover, the point from which the measurement commences is unknown — some say from the city wall; others from the outer limit of the suburb Bethphage, a mile beyond the wall (see Lightfoot, 1. c.; Wieseler; also Barclay, who gives important measurements, City of the Great Kinq, p. 59). On the other hand, the statement in Luke is explicit, ἕως εἰς Βηθανίαν. There is nothing here to limit it; and in all other places Bethany means the village (Meyer; Lechler, On Acts; Lange; Alford; Ebrard). The ascension appears to have been witnessed by the disciples alone. It was not in Bethany, nor was it on such a conspicuous place as the summit of Olivet. Dr. Porter, who has carefully examined the whole region, saw one spot, as far from Jerusalem as Bethany, near the village, but concealed by an intervening cliff; and this he thought, in all probability, was-the real scene.' The disciples, led by Jesus, would reach it by the path over the top of Olivet, and they would naturally return to the city by the same route (Hand-book, p. 102 sq.).

Since the days of Eusebius the summit of Olivet has been the traditional scene of the ascension. As this fact has been questioned (Stanley, S. and P. p. 447), it is well to quote his words: . . . ἔνθα τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀκρωρείας τοῦ των ἐλαιῶν ὄρους τὰ περὶ τῆς συντωλείας  μυστήρια παραδεδωκότος, ἐντεῦθέν το τὸν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἄνοδον πεποινμένου (Demonstr. Evang. 6:18; comp. Vit. Const. 3:41). In honor of the event the empress Helena built a church on the spot (Vit. Const. 3:43). Since that time the tradition has been almost universally received (Baronius, Annales, A.D. 34; Reland, Palaest. p. 337); but the statement of Luke is fatal to it-'“ He led them out as far as to Bethany,” and Bethany is nearly a mile beyond the summit of the mount. The tradition has still, nevertheless, a number of devoted adherents, whose arguments are worthy of careful consideration (Williams, Holy City, 2:440, 609; Ellicott, Life of our Lord. p. 413). The Bordeaux Pilgrim, however, who arrived shortly after the building of the church (A.D. 333), seems not to have known anything of the exact spot. He names the Mount of Olives as the place where our Lord used to teach his disciples; mentions that a basilica of Constantine stood there;... he carefully points out the Mount of Transfiguration in the neighborhood(!), but is silent on the ascension. From his time to that of Arculf (A.D. 700) we have no information, except the reference of Jerome (A.D. 390), cited above. In that long interval of 370 years the basilica of Constantine or Helena had given way to the round church of Modestus (Tobler, p. 92, note), and the tradition had, become fairly established. The church was open to the sky “because of the passage of the Lord's body,” and on the ground in the center were the prints of his feet in the dust (pulvere). The cave or spot hallowed by his preaching to his disciples appears to have been moved off to the north of Bethany (Early Trav. p. 6).

The spot is just about 850 yards from the present city wall. The church has long since disappeared, and a mosque has taken its place. In the center of an open court beside it is a little domed building covering a rock, on which is the supposed impress of Christ's foot, where he last touched the earth. Formerly, tradition affirms there were two footmarks, but the Mohammedans stole one of them, and put it in the Mosque el-Aksa (Williams, Holy City, 2:445; Stanley, S. and P. p. 447; Maundrell, under April 7).

4. Holy Places. — With these, as above partially noted, Olivet, is thickly studded, where they have been located by the superstitious of former ages, and preserved by tradition. The majority of these sacred spots now command little or no attention. Only two or three of them have even a shadow of claim to be real, while most of them are absurd. Several of them have been fully considered above. They may most conveniently be  described in connection with the three, or rather perhaps four, independent summits or eminences into which the entire ridge, especially when seen from below the, eastern wall of Jerusalem, divides itself. Proceeding from north to south these occur in the following order: Galilee, or Viri Galilaei; Mount of the Ascension; Prophets, subordinate to the last, and almost a part of it; Mount of Offence.” In considering these, we shall have an opportunity to complete the above physical description.

(1.) Of these eminences, the central one, distinguished by the minaret and domes of the Church of the Ascension, is in every way the most important. ‘The church, all in the tiny hamlet of wretched hovels which surround it. — the Kefr et-Tur are planted slightly on the Jordan side of the actual top, but not so far as to hinder their being seen from all parts of the western environs of the mountain, or, in their turn, commanding the view of the deepest recesses of the Kidron valley (Porter, Handbook, p. 103). The eminence above noted, a little to the north-east of that containing the mosque, and actually somewhat higher, now occupied by the Mohammedan cemetery, deserves no special notice in this survey, as it is of no traditional importance, and is hidden from observation in the city.

The central hill, which we are now considering, purports to contain the sites of some of the most sacred and impressive events of Christian history. During the Middle Ages most of these were protected by an edifice of some sort; and, to judge from the reports of the early travelers, the mount must at one time have been thickly covered with churches and convents. The following is a complete list of these traditional spots, as far as they can be compiled from Quaresmiuls, Doubdan, Mislin, and other worlks.

1. Commencing at the western foot, and going gradually up the hill (Plenary indulgence is accorded by the Church of Rome to those who recite the Lord's Prayer and the Ave Maria at the spots marked thus\*.) \*Tomb of the Virgin: containing also those of Joseph, Joachim, and Anna. Gethsemane: containing, Olive garden., \*Cavern of Christ's prayer and agony. (A church here in the time of Jerome and Willibald.) ,Rock on which the three disciples slept. ,\*Place of the capture of Christ. (A church in the time of Bernard the Wise.) Spot from which the Virgin witnessed the stoning of Stephen. Spot at which her girdle dropped during her assumption.  Spot of our Lord's lamentation over Jerusalem (Luk 19:41). (A church here formerly called Dominus fle vit;, Surius, in Mislin, 2:476.) Spot on which he first said the Lord's Prayer, or wrote it on the stone with his finger (Saewulf, Early Trav. p. 42). (A splendid church here formerly. Maundeville seems to give this as the spot where the beatitudes were pronounced, Early Trav. p. 177.) Spot at which the woman taken in adultery was brought to him (Bernard the Wise, Early Trav. p. 2S). \*Tombs of the prophets (Mat 23:29): containing, according to the Jews, those of Haggai and Zechariah. Cave in which the apostles composed the Creed; called also Church of St. Mark, or of the Twelve Apostles. Spot at which Christ discoursed of the judgment to come. (Mat 24:3). Cave of St. Pelagia: according to the Jews, sepulcher of Huldah the prophetess. \*Place of the ascension. (Church, with subsequently a large Augustine convent attached.) Spot at which the Virgin was warned of her death by an angel. In the valley between the ascension and the Viri Galiltei (Maundeville, p. 191, and so Doubdan: but Maundrell, Early Trav. p. 470, places it close to the cave of Pelagia). Viri Galilcei, or spot from which the apostles watched the ascension; or at which Christ first appeared to the three Marys after his resurrection (Tobler, p. 76, note). This locality we add here for the sake of convenience in the connection, although it constitutes a separate eminence, as noted below.

2. On the east side, descending from the Church of the Ascension to Bethany. The field in which stood the fruitless fig-tree. Bethphage. Bethany: House of Lazarus. (A church there in Jerome's time, Lib. de Situ, etc., “Bethania.”) \*Tomb of Lazarus. Stone on which Christ was sitting when Martha and Mary came to him.  The Tomb and Chapel of the Virgin, at the western base of Olivet, a few yards north of Gethsemane, is one of the most picturesque buildings around Jerusalem. Its fagade is deep down in a sunk court, and admits by a spacious door to a flight of sixty steps leading down to a dark, rock-hewn chapel. At its eastern end is a smaller chapel containing the reputed tomb of the Virgin; on the south are shown the tombs of Joachim and Anna her parents; and on the north that of Joseph her husband. The tradition attached to this grotto is comparatively recent. It is not mentioned during the first six centuries (Quaresmius, 2:244 sq.). John of Damascus is the first who speaks of it (Lib. c.); and it is also mentioned by Willibald (Early Trav. p. 19), and most travelers and pilgrims after the 8th century (Williams Holy City, 2:435).

(2.) Next to the central and principal portion of the mount, and separated from it on the southern side by a slight depression, or, rather, less precipitous declivity, up which the path mentioned above as the third takes its course, is a spur, which appears neither to possess, nor to have possessed, any independent name. It is remarkable only for the fact that it contains the “singular catacomb” known as the “Tombs of the Prophets,” probably in allusion to the words of Christ (Mat 23:29). Of the origin, and even of the history of this cavern hardly anything is known. It is possible (Schultz, p. 72) that it is the “rock called Peristereon,” named by Josephus (War, v. 12, 2) in describing the course of Titus's great wall of circunmvallation, though there is not much to be said for that view (see Robinson, 3:254, note). To the earlier pilgrims it does not appear to have been known; at least their descriptions hardly apply to its present size or condition. Stanley (S. and P. p. 453) is inclined to identify it with the cave mentioned by Eusebius as that in which our Lord taught his disciples, and also with that which is mentioned by Arculf and Bernard as containing “the four tables” of our Lord (Early Trav. p. 4 and 28). The first is not improbable, but the cave of Arculf and Bernard seems to have been down in the valley not far from the tomb of the Virgin, and on the spot of the betrayal (Early Trav. p. 28), therefore close to Gethsemane. This catacomb is fully described by Nugent (Lands, Classical and Sacred, 2:73), Tobler (Oelberg, p. 350), and Porter (Handbook, p. 147).

(3.) The most southern portion of the Mount of Olives-much more distinctly separated from the northern congeries of summits than they are from each other-is that usually known as the “Mount of Offence,” Mons Offensionis, though by the Arabs called Baten el-Hawa' “the bag of the  wind.” It rises next to the gently sloping spur last mentioned; and in the hollow between the two — a tolerably well-defined although broad ravine — runs the road from Bethany, which was without doubt the road of Christ's entry to Jerusalem.

The title Mount of Offence, or of Scandal, was bestowed on the supposition that it is the “Mount of Corruption,” on which Solomon erected the high places for the gods of his foreign wives (2Ki 23:1; 1Ki 11:7). This tradition appears to be of a recent date. It is not mentioned in the Jewish travelers Benjamin, hap-Parchi, or Petachia, and the first appearance of the name or the tradition as attached to that locality among Christian writers appears to be in John of Wirtzburg (Tobler. p. 80, note) and Brocardus (Descriptio Ter. S. cap. 9), both of the 13th century. At that time the northern summit was believed to have been the site of the altar of Chemosh (Brocardus), the southern one that of Molech only (Thietmar, Pernegr. 11:2). The title “Mount of Corruption”' (הִמִּשְׁחַית

הִר) seems to be connected etymologically in some way with the name by which the mount is occasionally rendered in the Targums- טוּר מַשְׁחָא(Jonathan. Son 8:9; Pseudo-Jon. Genesis 8, 10). One is probably a play on the other. Stanley (S. and P. p. 188, note) argues that the Mount- of Corruption was the northern hill (Viri Galilaei), because the three sanctuaries were south of it, and therefore on the other three summits.

This southern summit is considerably lower than the center one. and, as already remarked, it is so distinct as almost to constitute a separate hill or eminence in the general range. It is also sterner and more repulsive in its form. On the south it is bounded by the Wady en-Nar, the continuation of. the Kidron, curving around eastward on its dreary course to Mar Saba and the Dead Sea. From this barren ravine the Mount of Offence rears its rugged sides by acclivities barer and steeper than any in the northern portion of the mount, and its top presents a bald and desolate surface, contrasting greatly with the cultivation of the other summits, and this not improbably, as in the case of Mount Ebai, suggested the name which it now bears. On the steep ledges of its western face clings the ill-favored village of Silwan, a few dilapidated towers rather than houses, their gray bleared walls hardly to be distinguished from the rock to which they adhere, and inhabited by a tribe as mean and repulsive as their habitations.  Crossing to the back or eastern side of this mountain, on a half isolated promontory or spur which overlooks the road of our Lord's progress from Bethany, are found tanks and foundations and other remains, which are maintained by Dr. Barclay (City, etc., p. 66) to be those of Bethphage (see also Stewart, Tent and Khan, p. 322).

(4.) The only one of the summits remaining to be considered is that on the north of the “Mount of Ascension” — the Karem es-Seyad, or Vineyard of the Sportsman; or, as it is called by the modern Latin and Greek Christians, the Viri Galilei. This is a hill of exactly the same character as the Mount of the Ascension, and so nearly its equal in height that few travelers agree as to which is the more lofty. The summits of the two are about 400 yards apart. It stands directly opposite the north-east corner of Jerusalem, and is approached by the path between it and the Mount of Ascension, which strikes at the top into a cross-path leading to el-Isawiyeh and Anata. The Arabic name well reflects the fruitful character of the hill, on which there are several vineyards, besides much cultivation of other kinds. The Christian name is due to the singular tradition that here the two angels addressed the apostles after our Lord's ascension — “Ye men of Galilee!” This idea, which is so incompatible, on account of the distance, even with the traditional spot of the ascension, is of late existence and inexplicable origin. The first name by which we encounter this hill is simply “Galilee,” ἡ Γαλιλαία (Perdiccas, A.D. cir. 1250, in Reland, Palest. cap. 52). Brocardus (A.D. 1280) describes the mountain as the site of Solomon's altar to Chemosh (Descr. cap. 9), but evidently knows of no name for it, and connects it with no Christian event. This name may, as is conjectured (Quaresmius, 2:319, and Reland, p. 341), have originated in its being the custom of the apostles, or of the Galilaeans generally, when they came up to Jerusalem, to take up their quarters there; or it may be the echo or distortion of an ancient name of the spot, possibly the Geliloth of Jos 18:17 one of the landmarks of the south boundary of Benjamin, which has often puzzled the topographer. But, whatever its origin, it came at last to be considered as the actual Galilee of Northern Palestine, the place at which our Lord appointed to meet his disciples after his resurrection (Mat 28:10), the scene of the miracle of Cana (Reland, p. 338). This transference, at once so extraordinary and so instructive, arose from the. same desire, combined with the same astounding want of the critical faculty, which enabled the pilgrims of the Middle Ages to see without perplexity the scene of the transfiguration.  (Bourdeaux Pilgr.), of the beatitudes (Maundeville, Early Trav. p. 177), and of the ascension all crowded together on the single summit of the central hill of Olivet. It testified to the same feeling which has brought together the scene of Jacob's vision at Bethel, of the sacrifice of Isaac on Moriah, and of David's offering in the threshing-floor of Araunah, on one hill; and which to this day has crowded within the walls of one church of moderate size all the events connected with the death and resurrection of- Christ.

In the 8th centlury the place of the angels was represented by two columns in the Church of the Ascension itself (Willibald, Early Trav. p. 19). So it remained, with some trifling difference, at the time of Saewulfs visit (A.D. 1102), but there was then also a chapel in existence-apparently on the northern summit — purporting to stand where Christ made his first appearance after the resurrection, and called “Galilee.” So it continued at Maundeville's visit (1322). In 1580 the two pillars were still shown in the Church of the Ascension (Radzivil, Peregrin. p. 75, cited by Williams, Holy City, 2:127, note), but in the 16th century (Tobler, p. 75) the tradition had relinquished its ancient and more appropriate seat, and thenceforth became attached to the northern summit. where Maundrell (A.D. 1697) encountered it (Early Tray. p. 471), and where it even now retains some hold, the name Kalilea being occasionally applied to it by the Arabs (see Pococke and Scholz, in Tobler, p. 72). An ancient tower connected with the tradition was in course of demolition during Maundrell's visit, “a Turk having bought the field in which it stood.” The summit is now crowned by a confused heap of ruins, encompassed by a vineyard.

5. Literature. — A monograph on the Mount of Olives, exhausting every source of information, and giving the fullest references, will be found in Tobler's Siloahquelle und der Oelberg (St. Gallen, 1852). Earlier monographs have been written in Latin by Bibelhausen (Lips. 1704); Ortlob (Viteb. 1606); Sylling (Hafn. 1697). See also Hamilton, Mount of Olives (Lond. 1863). The ecclesiastical traditions are in Quaresmius, Elucidatio Terrce Sanctae, 2:277-340; Geramb, Pilgrimage, 1:210 sq.; Williams, Holy City, vol. ii; and others. Doubdan's account (Le Voyage dans la Terre Sainte, Paris, 1657) is excellent, and his plates very correct. The Rabbinical traditions are contained in Lightfoot (Opp. 2:201), Reland (Palcest. p. 337), and others. Modern descriptions are given by Bartlett (Walks, etc., p. 94 sq.; Jerusalen Revisited, p. 114 sq.), Robinson  (Researches, 2:405 sq.), Olin (Travels, 2:127), Barclay (City of the Great King, p. 59 sq.), Stanley (Sin. and Pal. p. 183 sq.), and others. The best topographical delineation is that contained in the last English Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem (Lond. 1865, 3 vols. fol.). SEE JERUSALEM.

## Olivet, Pierre Joseph[[@Headword:Olivet, Pierre Joseph]]

             abbot of Thoulier, a French Roman Catholic theologian and writer, was born at Salins April 1, 1682. On leaving college he joined- the Jesuits, passing successively some time in the Jesuit colleges of Rheims, Dijon, and Paris. In this manner he became acquainted with a number of distinguished men, such as Maucroix, the friend of Lafontaine, father Oudin, president Bouhier, Boileau, Huet, La Monnoye, J. B. Rousseau, etc. They incited him to write, and his first attempts were French verses; but soon finding that he would never succeed in poetry, he gave it up and applied himself to Latin prose. He was a great admirer of the ancients, and especially of Cicero, whom he considered as the only master of eloquence. In 1713 he was sent to Rome by his superiors for the purpose of writing the history of the society; but frightened at the long time he would be obliged to devote to this uncongenial employment, Olivet left the society as he was about taking the final vows. They vainly offered him the place of instructor to the prince of Asturias to induce him to remain. In 1723 Olivet was elected a member of the French Academy. He passed the remainder of his life at Paris, engaged in various literary works, and in occasional squabbles with his associates in the academy. He died Oct. 8, 1768. The personal character of Olivet appears, notwithstanding the attacks of some of his enemies, to have been without reproach. Among his numerous friends, who always spoke of him with the greatest respect, no one appears to have had a higher opinion of his talents and virtues than Voltaire, who was introduced by Olivet into the French Academy (see Discours de M. de Voltaire a l'Acaduensie Franpaise, in his (Euvres completes, vol. 46). Several letters of Voltaire to Olivet are extant. Olivet's principal work is an edition of Cicero, which was originally published at Paris (1740-1742, 9 vols. 4to). It is of little critical value, though it contains many useful notes, chiefly extracted from preceding commentators, It was reprinted at Geneva (1758, 9 vols. 4to), and very incorrectly at Oxford (1783, 10 vols. 4to). Olivet's translations of Cicero are some of the best that have been published, though, like most of the French translations, they are deficient in accuracy. Of these the principal are, the De Natura Deorum (1721, 1732, etc.): — Tusculance Quaestiones (1737, 1747), of which the third and fifth  books are translated by Bouhier: — the Orations against Catiline, together with the Philippics of Demosthenes (1727,1736, etc.). He also edited extracts from Cicero, with a translation into French, under the title of Pensees de Ciceron, which has been frequently reprinted and extensively used in the French schools. The only other work of Olivet worthy of notice is his continuation of Pelisson, Histoire de l'Academie Franqaise (1729, 2 vols. 4to; 1730, 2 vols. 12mo). etc. See Eloge de l'Abbe d'Olivet, Necrologe (1770); D'Alembert, Hist. des Menrbres de l'Academie Francaise, vol. vi; Bachaumont, Memoires secrets (Oct. 1768); Mairet, Eloge histor. et litter. de l'Abbe d'Olivet (1839).

## Olivetan, Pierre Robert[[@Headword:Olivetan, Pierre Robert]]

             a leader in the French Reformation; and one of the first translators of the Bible into French, was born at Noyon towards the end of the 15th century. We are told that it was he who, in advising Calvin, his relative, to examine into the questions then controverted, introduced him to the cause of the Reformation. Says Merle d'Aubigne, “Olivetan seems to have been the first who so presented the doctrine of the Gospel as to draw the attention of Calvin” (comp. Maimbourg, Histoire du Calvinisme, p. 53). Olivetan certainly was one of the first to spread the new religious doctrines in Geneva, where we find him in 1533. Once, hearing a preacher denounce Luther in the pulpit, Olivetan interrupted the speaker, and undertook to refute him, thus creating a disturbance which nearly cost him his life and led to his being banished from the territory of Geneva. He retired to Neufchatel, where he commenced his French translation of the Bible, probably at the suggestion of Farel. Olivetan, who was less thoroughly acquainted with Hebrew than is asserted by Beza, and not very proficient in Greek, made great use of the translation of Lefevre d'Etaples, just published at Antwerp; but he carefully compared that translation with the original texts, and interpreted some passages in a different manner. His French version appeared under the title of La Bible qui est toute la Sainte Ecriture (Neufchatel, 1535, 2 vols. fol.). This edition was published at the expense of the Waldenses, from a MS. said to have been written by Bonaventure des Perriers. A second edition, printed at Geneva, was corrected by Calvin, and thus Olivetan's labors became the foundation of the Genevan Bible. Olivetan, obliged to leave Switzerland, went to Italy, and died at Ferrara in 1538. It was rumored that he was poisoned at Rome during a short stay he made in that city. See Richard Simon Hist. crit. du Vieux Testament, p. 342; Lailouette, Hist. des Traductions Frang. de  l'ciriture Saiute, ch. ii; Senebier, Hist. Litter. de Geneve, 1:153; Haag, Lat France Protestante, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:635; Merle D'Aubigne, Hist. of the Ref. 3:365 sq.; Brit. Qu. Rev. April, 1865, p. 420.

## Olivetans[[@Headword:Olivetans]]

             SEE MONTOLIVETENSES; SEE PTOLOMEI.

## Oliveyra, Francisco Xavier de[[@Headword:Oliveyra, Francisco Xavier de]]

             a Portuguese nobleman, noted as an ecclesiastical writer, was born in Lisbon in the beginning of the 18th century, and began his studies under the celebrated father Pinto. For almost forty years he was a slave to the prejudices of popery; but extensive reading, joined to his observations in Protestant countries, illuminated his mind, and dispelled by degrees the clouds with which superstition had obscured his intellect. When he had determined to change his religion he quit his patrimonial estates, and, relinquishing all honors, sought refuge first in Holland, and afterwards in England, where he spent the remainder of his life in retirement. He employed his time in literary labors. He published, Memoirs of his Travels: — Familiar Letters: — A Pathetic Discourse to his Countrymen on the Earthquake at Lisbon in 1756:The Chevalier d'Oliveyra burned in Effigy as a Heretic, why and wherefore'? etc.; and he left besides a great number of MSS., including Oliveyriana, or Memoirs. Historical and Literary (27 vols. 4to). When the overthrow of Lisbon occurred, he distinguished himself by a judicious and effective address to his former fellow-citizens. It was reprinted several times, and a second part added, and the whole translated into English. He died at Hackney Oct. 18, 1783.

## Oliveyra, Salomon de, Ben-David[[@Headword:Oliveyra, Salomon de, Ben-David]]

             a distinguished Hebrew poet. and grammarian, and chief rabbi of the Portuguese Jews at Amsterdam, was born about 1640. He was a master in Hebrew, and wrote synagogical poetry when very young. He first succeeded Moses Raphael de Aguilar as teacher in the Kether Thora (כתר תורה), and was elected in 1674 to the dignity of chacham in the institution called Geniluth Chassadim, where he delivered exsositions on the Pentateuch between 1674 and 1678, and on the historic and poetic books between 1678 and 1682. In 1693 he succeeded Aboab as president of the Rabbinic college, and died in May, 1708. He wrote, אִיֶּלֶת אֲהָבַים, the Lovely Hind, a moral philosophical work on Hebrew rhetoric  (Amsterdam, 1665): — דִּל שְׂפָתִיַם, the Door of Lips, a Chaldee grammar, with the title Grammatica da lengoa Chaldaica” (ibid. 1682): — נֹעִםדִּרְכֵּי, a methodology and logic of the Talmud (ibid. 1688): — דִּרְכֵּי יי an alphabetical index to the 613 Precepts, etc. (ibid. 1689): — זִית רִעְנָן, the Green Olive, a Portuguese translation of the words which frequently occur in the Mishna and Gemara, and of the technical expressions (ibid. 1683): — טוּב טִעִם וָדִעִת, on the Hebrew accents, printed together with No. 3 (ibid. 1688): — יִד לָשׁוֹן, on Hebrew and Chaldee grammar, to which is appended כָּתוּב אֲרָמַית, on the Biblical Aramaisms (ibid. 1682,1689): — עֵוֹ חִיַּים, a Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Portuguese lexicon (ibid. 1682): — שִׁרְשׁוֹת גִּבְלֻת, Chain of Terminations, a lexicon on Hebrew assonance (ibid. 1665): — טִעֲמֵי הִטְּעָמַים, the Reasons for the Accents, a treatise on Hebrew accents, in which he discourses especially on the poetical accents of Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms, published with the Pentateuch and Haphtaroth (ibid. 1665, and often). He also wrote a Calendar an astronomical work, etc. — See Frankel, Monatsschrift fur Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenthuns (Breslau, 1861), 10:432-436; Steinschneider, Catalogus Librorum in Biblioth. Bodleiana, col. 2379-83; the same, Bibliogr. Handbuch (Berlin, 1859), No. 1471-78; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; First, Bibl. Jud. 3:46, etc.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. i iii, iv, n. 1955; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 251 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Lindo, History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal (Lond. 1848),. p. 368; Finn, Sephardim, or the History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal (ibid. 1841), p. 464; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 3:179, 234; Kayserling, Sepharidinm (Leips. 1859), p. 206, 261, 315; the same, Geschichte der Juden in Portugal (ibid. 1867), p. 310; the same, Bibliothek Jiidischer Kanzebledner (Berlin, 1870), vol. i; Beiblatt, p. 10. (B. P.)

## Olivier, Cardinal[[@Headword:Olivier, Cardinal]]

             a German theologian and historian, was born in Westphalia about the middle of the 12th century. After studying at Paderborn he became canon of the church of that city, and afterwards director of the schools of Cologne. In 1210 he went to the south of France to preach a crusade against the Albigenses. After returning to his native country he preached a crusade against the Saracens in Westphalia, Friesland, Flanders, and Brabant, and in 1214 and 1217 went himself to the Holy Land with the  volunteers. In 1222, having returned to Europe, he was made bishop of Paderborn; and while at Rome, in 1225, he was created cardinal-bishop of Sabina, and entrusted by the pope with a mission to the emperor Frederick. He died soon after at Sabina, in 1227. He wrote a letter to Engelbert, archbishop of Cologne, repeatedly published, as in Bongars, Gesta Dei per Francos; Bistoria rieguni Terroce Sinctae, in, Eckard, Coypus historics, 2:1355; Historiac Damiatina, in the same, 2:1398. Michaud has given an analysis of these works in his Bibliotheque des Croisades, p. 177; and Petit Radel umentions the most important passages in the Hist. Litter. de la France. See Schatenius, Annales Paderbornenses; Historiens de France, vol. 18; Ughelli, Italia Sacra, 1:167; Hist. Litter. de la France, 18:14.

## Olivier, Jean[[@Headword:Olivier, Jean]]

             a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born near the opening of the 16th century. He joined the Benedictines in Poitou, and afterwards removed to the abbey of St. Denis, near Paris, where he became great almoner and vicar-general. After he was elected abbot, he surrendered his claims in favor of the cardinal of Bourbon, at the request of Francis I, who gave him in exchange the abbey of St. Medard at Soissonis. In 1532 he resigned this dignity to become bishop of Angers. He had a great reputation for learning and piety, and enacted very strict regulations against the laxity of ecclesiastical discipline in his diocese. Some say that he was in favor of the Reformation, and Crespin reports that he permitted the preaching of the Gospel at Angers. He died there April 12, 1540. He wrote well in Latin, as is shown by his own epitaph, that of Louis XII, quoted by Papire Masson, an ode to Salmon Macrin, and especially by a poem entitled Pandora Jani Oliverii Andium hierophante (Paris. 1542, 12mo). This poem, which was much read when it appeared, was published by Stephen Dolet, and translated by William Michel into French verses (new ed. Rheims, 1608, 8vo). See Scevola de Sainte- Marthe, Elogia, lib. ii; Gallia Christiana, 2:147; Doublet, Hist. de l'Abbaye de St. Denys; Crespin, L'Etat de lEglise; Haag, La France Protestante.

## Olivier, Nicolas Theodore[[@Headword:Olivier, Nicolas Theodore]]

             a French Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Paris April 28,1798. He was early destined for the Church; studied under Boucher, curate of St. Merry, and entered the seminary of St. Sulpice. Ordained priest in 1822, he was sent as a missionary into the province of Beauce. and on his return was  made. vicar of St. Denis, and afterwards of St. Etienne du Mont, Paris. He now became successively curate of St. Peter at Chaillot, March 25, 1827; of St. Etienne du Mont, Jan. 17, 1828; and of St. Roch, Feb. 7, 1833. Here, in the favorite parish. of queen Marie-Amelie, he found an ample field for his activity and.his benevolence. Among his numerous discourses, a charity sermon he preached in favor of the orphans whose parents had died by cholera is perhaps the most remarkable: the collection taken up on' the occasion surpassed all expectations. He was made bishop of Evreux April 18, 1841, and died in that city Oct. 21, 1854. Besides a number of homilies, sermons, mandements, and pastoral instructions, scattered through various collections, Olivier wrote, Oraison funibre de M. l'Abbe Philippe Jean Louis Desjardins, Docteur en Sorbonne et Vicaire General de Paris (Paris, 1834, 8vo): — Le Catholique a la sainte Table (Paris and Lyons, 1839, 18mo): — Delices des dnes affligees, ou lettres de consolation tirees des saints Peres (Paris, 1840 and 1854, 18mo): — Concordances de rapport de la thiologie de Bailly avec le code civil, in the Traite. de la justice- et des contrats:. — Un sermon entre deux histoires (Paris, 1836, 18mo). See Biogr. du clergg contesmporain, vol. i; L'Eveque d'Evreux; Dix annees de M. Olivier (1841, 8vo); Bouclon, Etat actuel du diocese d'Evreux, ou la franche verite sur M. Olivier (1845, 8vo); same, Hist. de Mgr. Olivier, Eveque d'Evreux .(1855, 12mo); Fisquet, France pontificale.

## Olivier, Seraphin[[@Headword:Olivier, Seraphin]]

             a French prelate of note, was born at Lyons, Aug, 2, 1538. He studied at I Tournol, and afterwards at Bologna, where he graduated as doctor in civil and canon law. In 1562 he was professor in the university, and was afterwards called to Rome by pope Pius IV, and appointed in 1564 auditeur de la rote for France. He held this office for thirty-six years. Gregory XIII sent him to France in 1573 to congratulate the duke of Anjou (afterwards Henry II) on his election to the throne of Poland; and he was sent on a second mission to that country by Sixtus V in 1589. He took an active part in inducing Clement VIII to grant absolution to Henry IV. When cardinal D'Ossat resigned, Henry IV nominated Olivier to the bishopric of Rennes in June, 1609; but he never took possession of that see, and was created patriarch of Alexandria Aug. 26, 1602, and cardinal June 9, 1604. He died at Rome March 9, 1609. He wrote, Decisiones rotae Romance mille quingentae (Rome,. 1614, 2 vols. fol.; Francf. 1615, 1661, 2 vols. fol., with notes and additions). It begins with the funeral sermon of  that prelate, preached by John du Bois, which was also published separately (Rome, 1609, 4to). See Frizon, Gallia purpurata, p.680; Sainte- Marthe, Gallia Christiana, vol. iii; Amelot de la Houssaye, Lettres du Cardinal d'Ossat, 2:76, 316, 440; De Thou, HistaP. univ. 1:131; Alby, listoire des Cardinaux illustres; France pontificate.

## Olivieri, Augustin[[@Headword:Olivieri, Augustin]]

             a Genoese prelate, was born in Genoa in 1758. He entered the Mere-de- Dieu and taught philosophy at Naples. King Ferdinand I confided to him the education of his son (afterwards Francis I). Olivieri followed the Bourbons to Sicily, and attached himself to their fortune. He was rewarded, upon their restoration, by the bishopric in partibus of Arethusa. He died at Naples June 10, 1834. We have of his works, Filosofia norale, ossia li doveri dell' uomo (Genoa, 1828, 2 vols. 12mo). See Votizie Romane; L'Ami de la Religion, ann. 1834.

## Olivieri, Domenico[[@Headword:Olivieri, Domenico]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Turin in 1679. According to Della Valle, he excelled in painting subjects requiring humorous talent for caricature, and in this has seldom been surpassed. Lanzi says: “In his time the royal collection was enriched at the death of Prince Eugene by the addition of nearly four hundred Flemish pictures; and none profited more than Olivieri from the study of these works. But, although he chiefly painted in what the Italians style Bambocciate, he was yet perfectly competent to execute works in the higher walks of history, as is proved by his Miracle of the Sacrament, in the sacristy of Corpus Domini in his native city.” He died in 1755.

## Ollier, Pierre[[@Headword:Ollier, Pierre]]

             a Protestant theologian of Montauban, was born at that place in 1573. In 1606 he was pastor at Saint-Andre de Valborgne, in 1610 at Alais, and in 1621 at Montauban, where he died October 5, 1645. He was the successor of Pierre Berauld in the theological chair, and wrote La Conference de St. Antoine entre Pierre Ollier, et Pascal (Montauban, 1624). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ollivant, Alfred, D.D[[@Headword:Ollivant, Alfred, D.D]]

             an Anglican prelate, was born at Manchester, England, in 1798. He studied at St. Paul's school, London; graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1821, and became a fellow. In 1820 he was elected Craven University scholar, and in 1822 Tyrwhitt Hebrew scholar. He was vice-principal of St. David's College, Lamfeter, from 1827 to 1843, and from 1843 until 1849 held the regius professorship of divinity at Cambridge. He became bishop of Llandaff in 1849, and died December 16, 1882. He published a number of sermons and some other practical works. He was a member of the Old Test. company of the Bible Reyision Committee.

## Olmstead, James Munson, D.D.[[@Headword:Olmstead, James Munson, D.D.]]

             an American Presbyterian divine of note, was born at Stillwater, N. Y., Feb. 17, 1794; was educated at Union College, class of 1819; then studied at the Princeton Theological Seminary, class of 1822; was licensed to preach immediately after graduation, and performed missionary work until 1825, when he was ordained pastor of the churches at Landisburg and Centre; subsequently became pastor at Middle Tuscarora, Flemington, N. J., and Snow Hill, Md. He died at Philadelphia Oct. 16, 1870. Besides Sermons and Essays, he published Thoughts and Counsels-for-the  Impenitent (1846): — Our First Mother (1852): — and Noah and his Times (1853).

## Olmstead, Lemuel Gregory, LL.D[[@Headword:Olmstead, Lemuel Gregory, LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian. minister, was born at Maltaville, N.Y., July 5, 1808. He graduated from Union College in 1834, and pursued his studies in the Western Theological Seminary. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Beaver in 1837, and ordained by the Presbytery of Erie, April 20, 1848. He then visited Europe, sojourning in Rome for several years. His principal business was teaching. During the war of the rebellion he acted as chaplain for some three years. He died March 18, 1880. As a scientific scholar and antiquarian Dr. Olmstead has had few equals among his brethren of the Presbytery. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Semn. 1881, page 54.

## Olof, Skotkonung[[@Headword:Olof, Skotkonung]]

             (Tribute-king), the first Christian king of Sweden, reigned from 995. until his death, 1022. He was the son of Erik Segersaill and Sigrid the Proud. From his father he inherited Denmark, but in 999 he gave it, with his mother's approval, to Svend Forkbeard. He fought at the battle of Swolder, where the Norse king Olaf Tryggveson fell. For several years after that battle (1000) Norway had to pay a yearly tax to king Olof, and hence his name Skotkonung. He and his courtiers are believed to have been baptized about the year 1001. He had been instructed in Christianity by Siegfried, an Englishman, who, next after St. Ansgarius. is the most famous apostle of the North. This good man devoted a long life to the work of converting the pagan Swedes, and died at a great age among the people of Smaland, with whom he had begun his labors. But although Olof became a Christian, and provided for the preaching of the Gospel among his subjects, still the Asa-faith continued to flourish among the Swedes, and they cannot be said to have become completely Christianized before 1150. Olof established a bishopric at Skara, the mother see of the North. He died in 1022, leaving the kingdom to his son and joint ruler Anund. See Peetersen, Norges Sverigesog Danmarks Historie; Munchs, Det Norske Folks Historie; Otte, Scandinavian History. (R. B. A.)

## Olonetzian Version[[@Headword:Olonetzian Version]]

             SEE RUSSIA, VERSIONS OF.

## Olonne, Jean-Marie D[[@Headword:Olonne, Jean-Marie D]]

             a French Hebraist, was born at Toulon in the first years of the 18th century, and probably belonged to the ancient family Tillia d'Olonne, which still remains at Carpentras. He was a Carmelite of the province of Avignon. We have of his works, Lexicon Hebraico - Chaldaico - LatinoBiblicum (Avignon, 1765, 2 vols. fol.); vol. 3, which was promised, never appeared. This work, without the author's name, has been placed under the auspices of cardinal Dominicus Passionei. See Achard, Diet. de la Provence; Barjavel, Dict. hist. du Vaucluse.

## Olotzaga, Juan De[[@Headword:Olotzaga, Juan De]]

             an eminent Spanish architect, was a native of Biscay, and flourished during the latter part of the 15th centutry. His instructor is not mentioned, but he attained great excellence in the art. He erected the cathedral at Huesca, in  Aragon, on the site of the celebrated mosque Mislegda. This work gained him great reputation, and is much admired for its fine proportions. Milizia says: “The principal fagade is grand, with fourteen statues larger than life on each side of the entrance, placed on pedestals within niches; above these are forty-eight smaller statues, a foot in height.” Under the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella the Grecian-style of architecture became prevalent in Spain, and was adopted by Olotzaga. Among his principal works in that manner were the great college of Santa Cruz at. Valladolid, commenced in 1480 and completed in 1492; also the Foundling Hospital at Toledo, and the great college of St. Ildefonso, founded by cardinal Ximenes.

## Olshausen, Detlev Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Olshausen, Detlev Johann Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 30,1766, at Nordheim, Hanover. He studied at Gottingen, and after completing his studies acted as private tutor-at different places. In 1794 he was deacon at Oldesloe, Holstein; in 1801 first preacher at Gluckstadt; in 1815 superintendent at Eutin, and died January 14, 1823. He wrote, Prolegomena zu einer Kritik aller sogenannten Beweise fur und wider Offenbarungen (Copenhagen, 1791): — De Immortalitate Hominum Sublata et Doctrina de Animi Simplicitate Certa (ibid. eod.): — De Usu Rationis in Religione Revelata (1792): — Lehrbuch der Moral und Religion (2d ed. 1799): — Predigten uber die ganze christliche Plichtenlehre, (Altona, 1798-1805, 8 volumes). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:126, 153, 203, 236; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Olshausen, Hermann[[@Headword:Olshausen, Hermann]]

             a German Protestant theologian, noted especially as an exegete, was born Aug. 21, 1796, at Oldesloe, in the duchy of Holstein. From 1814 to 1.818 he studied theology at Kiel and Berlin; at the former university Twesten, and at the latter Neander and Schleiermacher, lectured in those times. He applied himself particularly to historical theology, and his first work, which was a prize-essay, Melanchthon's Charakteristik aus seinen Briefen dargestellt (Berlin, 1817), brought him to the attention of the Prussian minister of public worship. In the year 1818 he became licentiate in theology and “privat docent” in the university; in 1821 he was elected extraordinary professor at Konigsberg, where he taught till 1834, and where at first he also belonged to the theosophic circle inaugurated by J. H. Schonherr. In the year 1827 he was made a regular professor, and inn 1834 accepted a call to a theological professorship at Erlangen, hoping that a change of climate would help his health, which had become very much impaired by overwork; but he did not realizes what he anticipated, and died Sept. 4, 1839, in the prime of life. Besides his prizeessay, he wrote, Historiae Ecclesiastes veteris monumennta (Berlin, 1820-22): — Die Aechtheit der vier kanonischen Evangelien, aus den Geschichte der zwei ersten Jahrhunderte erwiesen (Konigsberg, 1823): — Ein Wort uber tiefren Schriftsinn (ibid. 1824): — Die Eibl. Schriftauslegung:Noch ein Wort iiber tieferen Schriftsinn (Hamburg, 1825). where he rejects the belief of a literal, mechanical inspiration as taught by the Protestant divines of the 17th century, and as held to this day by most of the popular English commentators. But his principal work — the one on which his immortality rests, a work of real genius, which, like Neander's Church History, has become already, we may say, a standard of English and American, as well as German literature is his Commentar uber saimmtliche Schriften des  Nezten Testaments (Konigsberg, 1830 sq., vols. i-iv), completed and revised after the author's death by doctors Ebrard and Wiesinger. “The principal merit and greatest charm of Olshausen's exegesis lies in its spirit. He excels beyond most commentators in what we may call the art of organic reproduction of the sacred text, and the explanation of Scripture by Scripture.

The philological portions are often too brief and unsatisfactory for the advanced scholar; but he pays the more careful attention to the theological exposition, enters into the marrow of religions ideas, and introduces the student to the spirit and inward unity of the divine revelation in its various stages of development under the old and new dispensation. He has an instinctive power of seizing, as if by a sacred sympathy, the true meaning of the inspired writer, and bringing to light the hidden connections and transitions, the remote allusions and far reaching bearing of the text. There is nothing mechanical and superficial about him. He is always working in the mines and digging at the roots. Sometimes his mysticism carries him beyond the limits of sober criticism. ‘But there is a peculiar charm in his mysticism, and even its occasional mistakes are far preferable to that cold, dry, and lifeless exegesis whicli weighs the spiritual and eternal truths of God in the scales of Aristotle's logic, Kuhner's grammar, and Wahl's dictionary. Fritzsche and Strauss may sneer at some expositions of Olshausen, but the pious student will read him with delight and profit, and regard the spiritual depth and the warm glow of a profoundly pious heart as the sweetest charm and highest recommendation of his work. He approaches the Bible with devout reverence as the Word of the living God. leads the reader into the sanctissimum, and makes him feel that here is the gate of heaven” (Schaff). Olshausen's commentary was translated into English for Clark's Foreign Theological Library, and has been revised and republished on this side of the water with additional notes, together with Olshausen's valuable tract on the Genuineness of the Writings of the New Testament (transl. by Fosdick), as an appropriate introduction, by Prof. A. C. Kendrick, of Rochester (New York, 1863, 6 vols.). See Lubker, Lexikon der Schleswig-Holstein. Schrilfisteller von 1796-1828 (2d div. p. 413 sq.); Rheinwaldt, Allg. Repertor. fur Theol. Literatur (ed. 1840, pt. vii), p. 91-94; Herzog, Real-Enyklop. s.v.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Kitto, Cyclop. s. .; Schaff, Germany: its Universities, Theology, and' Religion, p. 295 sq.; Kurtz, Leh rbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 2:270, 310 (Engl. transl. 2:362-408); Kahnis, Hist. Protestant Theol. p. 268; Pye-Smith, Introd. to Theoloy, p. 349, 697; Alzog (Romans Cath.), Kirchengesch. 2:709; Meth. Qu. Rev.  April, 1859, p. 254; Hagenbach, Hist. Doctrines, 2:470; Berl. Allgem. Kirchenzeitung, 1839, No. 76.

## Olshausen, Justus[[@Headword:Olshausen, Justus]]

             a famous German Orientalist, brother of Hermann, was born May 9,1800, at Hohenfelde, Holstein, and studied at Kiel, Berlin, and Paris. In 1823 he was professor at Kiel, and in 1845 member of the Danish Academy of Sciences. Four years after Holstein was annexed by Denmark, in 1848, Olshausen was deposed of his professorship. He was appointed, in 1853, head-librarian and professor of Oriental languages at Konigsberg; in 1858 he was called to a position in the ministry for education at Berlin, from which he retired in 1874. Olshausen died Dec. 28, 1882. Besides his  contributions to the monthly reports of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, Olshausen published, Emendationen zum Alten Testament (Kiel, 1826): Zur Topographie des alten Jerusalem (1833): — Erklarung der Psalmen (Leipsic, 1853): — Lehrbuch der Hebr. Sprache (Brunswick, 1861): — Die Pehlewi-Legenden auf den Miinzen der letzten Sassaniden (Leipsic, 1843): — Ueber den Charakter der in den assyrischen Keilinschriften erhaltenen semitischen Sprache (Berlin, 1866). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:98, 151, 520; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:47, (B.P.)

## Olympas[[@Headword:Olympas]]

             (Ολυμπᾶς, from the same etymology as Olympius [q.v.]), a Christian at Rome, saluted by Paul in his epistle to the Church in that city (Rom 16:15). A.D. 55. The context, perhaps, implies that he was of the household of Philologus. It is stated by pseudo-Hippolytus that he was one of the seventy disciples, and underwent martyrdom at Rome; and Baronius ventures to give A.D. 69 as the date of his death,

## Olympia Morata[[@Headword:Olympia Morata]]

             SEE MORATA.

## Olympiad[[@Headword:Olympiad]]

             SEE ERA.

## Olympic Games[[@Headword:Olympic Games]]

             SEE GAMES.

## Olympiodorus Of Alexandria[[@Headword:Olympiodorus Of Alexandria]]

             a Greek monk, said also to have been a deacon of a church in Alexandria, is believed to have lived in the first part of the 6th century A.D. He was a Peripatetic in philosophy, and wrote a commentary on the Meteorologica of Aristotle, which was printed by Aldus (Venice, 1561, fol.). He is sometimes called the Younger, to distinguish him from the Peripatetic philosopher of the same name who was the master of Proclus, but who is not known to us by any extant work. He also wrote a commentary on Ecclesiastes, which is printed in the Auctarium Patr. Due. 2:602 sq., and in the Bibl. Max. Patr. 18:490. His Notes on Job are included in the Catena of Nicetas on that book (Lond. 1637, fol.); and his Notes on Jeremiah in the Catena Ghisteriana.

## Olympiodsrus[[@Headword:Olympiodsrus]]

             a Neo-Platonic philosopher, was a native of Alexandria, and lived probably in the latter part of the 6th century A.D. There are extant by him commentaries on the First Alcibiades, the Phaedo, the Gorgias, and Philebus of Plato. The first-mentioned of these commentaries contains a life of Plato. His commentary on the Gorgias was published by Routh in his edition of the “Gorgias” and “Euthydemus” (Oxford, 1784); that on the Phaedo by Andreas Mustoxvdes and Demetrius Schinas in the συλλογὴ ἀποσπασματίων ἀνεκδότων (Venice, 1817); that on the Philebus by Stallbaum in his edition of the “Philebus;” and that on the First Alcibiades by Creutzer, in the 2d and 3d volumes of the Initia Philosoph. ac Theolog. ex Platonicis Fontibus (Frankf. 1826). In estimating Olympiodorus from these publications of his, it would appear that he was an acute and vigorous thinker, and a man of great erudition.

## Olympius[[@Headword:Olympius]]

             (Ο᾿λύμπιος, i.e. Olympian), one of the chief epithets of the Greek deity Zeus, so called from Mount Olympus in Thessaly, the abode of the gods (2Ma 6:2). SEE JUPITER.

## Olympius (2)[[@Headword:Olympius (2)]]

             an Arian theologian of the 4th century, flourished at Constantinople. He is reputed to have been a very decided opponent of the orthodox Christians, and to have profaned the Trinity; but there is no reason for the accusation, as the persons upon whose testimony the accusation is made are not regarded as trustworthy witnesses. See however Jortin, Remarks on Eccle. Hist. 2:442, 443.

## Olzoffski, Andrew[[@Headword:Olzoffski, Andrew]]

             an eminent Polish divine, was born about 1618. In the course of his studies, which were pursued at Kalisch, he applied himself particularly to poetry, for which he was so peculiarly fitted that. Ovid-like, his ordinary discourse frequently ran into verse. After he had finished his studies in divinity and jurisprudence he traveled through Italy, where he visited the best libraries, and took the doctorate in law at Rome. Thence he went to France, and was introduced at Paris to the princess Mary Louisa, who, when about to marry Ladislaus IV, king of Poland, invited Olzoffski to attend her thither. On Olzoffski's arrival the king offered him the secretary's place, but he declined it, for the sake of following his studies. Some time later he was  made a canon of the cathedral church at Gnesen, and chancellor to the archbishop. After the death of that prelate he was called to court, and made Latin secretary to his majesty, which place he filled with great reputation, being a complete master of that language. In the war between Poland and Sweden he wrote Vindiciae Polonae. He attended at the election of Leopold to the imperial crown. of Germany, in quality of ambassador to the king of Poland, and there secured the esteem of the three ecclesiastical electors. He was also sent on other diplomatic missions; and immediately on his return was invested with the high office of prebendary to the crown, and promoted to the bishopric of Culm. After the death of Ladislaus he fell into disfavor with the queen, because he opposed the design she had of setting a prince of France upon the throne of Poland; however, this did not prevent his being made vice-chancellor of the crown. He did all in his power to dissuade Casimir II from renouncing the crown; and, after the resignation of that king, several competitors appearing to fill the vacancy, Olzoffski on the occasion published a piece called Censura, etc.

This was answered by another, entitled Censura Censurae Candidatorum; and the liberty which our vice-chancellor had taken in his Censura was likely to cost him dear. It was chiefly leveled against the young prince of Muscovy, who was one of the competitors, though no more than eight years of age; and the czar was highly incensed, and made loud complaints and menaces unless satisfaction was made for the offense. Upon the election of Michel Koribut to the throne, Olzoffski was dispatched to Vienna to negotiate a match between the newly-elected king and one of the princesses of Austria; and on his return from that embassy was made grand-chancellor of the crown. He did not approve the peace concluded with the Turks in 1676, and wrote to the grand-vizier in terms of which the grand-seignior complained to the king of Poland. After the death of Koribut, Olzoffski labored earnestly for the election of John Sobieski, who rewarded Olzoffski with the archbishopric of Gnesen and the primacy of the kingdom; and no doubt he might have obtained a cardinal's hat if he had not publicly declared against it. However, he had not been long possessed of the primacy before his right thereto was disputed by the bishop of Cracow, who laid claim also to certain prerogatives of the see of Gnesen, and arrogated the right of officiating at the obsequies of the Polish monarchs. Hereupon Olzoffski published a piece in defense of the rights and privileges of his archbishopric. He also some time afterwards published another piece, but without putting his name to it, entitled Singularia Juris Patronatus R. Poloniae, in support of the king of Poland's right of nomination to the  abbeys. In 1678, going by the king's command to Dantzic, in order to compose certain disputes between the senate and people of that city, he was seized with a disorder which carried him off in three days. He was particularly distinguished by eloquence and love for his country; and his death was greatly lamented.

## Om[[@Headword:Om]]

             a Sanscrit word of asseveration, much used in Buddhistic works as an introductory term. It is especially prominent in Lamaism (q.v.).

## Omadius[[@Headword:Omadius]]

             a surname of Dionysus or Bacchus as the flesh-eater, human sacrifices being offered to this deity in the islands of Chios and Tenedos.

## Omaerus[[@Headword:Omaerus]]

             (Ι᾿ωμαῆρος, v. r. Ι᾿σμάηρος and Μαῆρος; Vulg. Abramus), a corrupt Grmecized form (1Es 9:34) for AMRAM SEE AMRAM (q.v.), a descendant of Bani (Ezr 10:34).

## Oman[[@Headword:Oman]]

             a strip of maritime territory in the most eastern portion of Arabia, extends between Ras el-Jibdl and Ras el-Had, and is bounded on the north-east by the Gulf of Oman, and on the south-west by the deserts of the interior. It has an area of about 80,000 square miles, and a population estimated in 1873 at 1,598,000, mostly Mohammedan. A part of the territory of Oman is known under the name of Muscat. At a distance of twenty to forty miles from the coast a chain of mountains runs parallel to it, which reaches in its highest ridge, called Jebel Achdar (Great Mountain), an elevation of 6000 feet; the average height is 4000 feet. There are a few not inconsiderable streams, and some richly fertile tracts, in this region, but the greater part is a waste of sand, with here and there a small oasis, where, however, the vegetation is most luxuriant. Groves of almond, fig, and walnut trees tower to an enormous height, overshadowing the orange and citron trees, but are themselves overtopped by the splendid date-palms. The country is rich in mining wealth; lead and gold are found in considerable quantity. SEE ARABIA; SEE PERSIA.

## Omar[[@Headword:Omar]]

             (Heb. Omar', אוֹמָר, eloquent; Sept. ᾿Ωμάρ), the second named of the seven sons of Eliphaz, son of Esau (Gen 36:15 [comp. Gen 36:11]; 1Ch 1:36), who were heads and princes of tribes among the Edomites. B.C. cir. 1900. The name is supposed to survive in that of the tribe of Amir Arabs east of the Jordan. Bunsen asserts that Omar was the ancestor of the Bene ‘Aammer in Northern Edom (Bibelwerk, Gen 36:11), but the names are somewhat different (א initial, and the Arabic equivalent of ע).

## Omar, Abu-Hafsa, Ibn Al-Khatab[[@Headword:Omar, Abu-Hafsa, Ibn Al-Khatab]]

             the second caliph of the Moslems, and one of the most noted characters in Mohammedan annals, was born about 581. Of his early history little is known. He was the third cousin of Abdullah, the father of the Prophet, but previous to his conversion was an ardent persecutor of Mohammed and his followers. He even attempted to take Mohammed's life. He was, however, most remarkably converted to Islam, and thereafter became as zealous an apostle as he had formerly been a persecutor, and rendered valuable aid to the Prophet in all his warlike expeditions. After Mohammed's death he caused Abu-Bekr to be proclaimed caliph, and was himself appointed hajeb, or prime minister. Though of a fiery and enthusiastic temperament, he proved a sagacious adviser, and it was at his suggestion that the caliph put down with an iron hand the many dissensions which had arisen among the Arabs after the Prophet's decease, and resolved to strengthen and consolidate their new-born national spirit, as well as propagate the doctrines of Islam, by engaging them in continual aggressive wars. SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

Omar succeeded Abu-Bekr in the caliphate by the express wish of the first caliph in A.D. 634, and immediately pushed on the war of conquests with increased vigor. He was a most enthusiastic Moslem, and vowed that the Crescent should receive the homage of the world. Every soldier or officer who had proved himself incompetent for the trust reposed in him was promptly removed, and every precaution taken to put in responsible offices only men of character and bravery. Thus he dismissed from the command of the Syrian armies the celebrated Khaled ibn-Walid, surnamed “The Sword of God,” who by his rapacity and cruelty towards the vanquished had made himself obnoxious, and replaced him by Abu Obeydah ibn-al-Jerrah, another brave general who had distinguished  himself in the wars against the Greeks. Khtled. fortunately for Omar, had virtue enough to accept the second post in the army, and he continued to serve under the new general. These two officers prosecuted the conquest of Syria, and took Damascus, its capital, in the month of Rejeb, A.H. 14 (August-September A.D. 635). After the capture of Damascus, the Moslems proceeded to the reduction of Emesa, Hamah, and Kennesrin. The emperor Heraclius sent a considerable force to stop the progress of the Arabs, but the Greeks were completely defeated at the bloody battle of Yermuik (636). The following year (637) Omar sent Amru ibn-al-As and Sarjil to besiege Jerusalem. The city was stoutly defended by the garrison; but after a siege of several months the patriarch Sophronius. who commanded in it, agreed to surrender to the Moslems, but refused to treat with any other except the caliph himself. A messenger having been dispatched to Omar, who was then residing at Medina, he hastened to Jerusalem followed by a scanty suite. Omar's journey from Arabia to Palestine is thus described by the historian Tabari:

“He rode a sorrel-colored camel, and was dressed in an old tattered habit of hair-cloth; he carried with him, in two bags, his provisions, consisting of dry fruits, barley, rice, and boiled corn, besides a skin for the water. Whenever he halted to make a repast, he permitted those who. accompanied him to partake of it, eating from the same wooden dish; if he took any rest, the earth was his couch. During his march he administered justice to ail applicants; in several instances he corrected the laxity of morals, and reformed several abuses, especially among the new converts; abolishing also many luxurious indulgences which had spread among the Moslems, such as the drinking of wine, the using of silken garments, etc. Arrived at the camp, he caused several Moslems to be seized and dragged through the mud for having, in disobedience to his orders, arrayed themselves in the silken tunics of the conquered Greeks.”

After a short conference with Sophronius, the terms of a capitulation were agreed upon, and the keys of the Holy City were delivered up to Omar. The articles of the capitulation of Jerusalem have been translated (Mines de l'Orient, vol. ii), and as they were the model upon which the Moslems dictated many others to the subdued cities of Africa and Spain, we transcribe them here:  “The inhabitants shall retain their lives and property; they shall preserve the use of their churches, but they shall build no new ones; they shall neither place crosses upon those which they already have, nor hinder the Moslems from entering them night or day; they shall not ring their bells, but they shall be allowed to toll them; if a Moslem travels through the city, the inhabitants shall give him hospitality for three days. They shall not be enforced to teach their children the Koran, but they shall not try to convert any Moslem to their religion; they shall in every instance show respect for the Moslems, and give them the precedence; they shall wear turbans and shoes, and use names different from theirs. They shall be allowed to ride on horseback, but without either saddle or arms; they shall never go out without their girdles [the distinctive mark of all Christians then living under the Mohammnedans wary]; they shall not sell wine to the Moslems, and shall remain faithful to the caliph, and pay regularly the taxes imposed upon them.”

Omar made his triumphant entry into Jerusalem towards the middle of the year 16 of the Hegira (A.D. 637). After conversing for a while with Sophronius, and addressing to him several questions on the antiquities of the place, visiting the Church of the Resurrection. and saying his prayers under its portico, he desired to be conveyed to Bethlehem, where he also performed his devotions. Returning again to the city, he caused a magnificent mosque to be erected on the site of Solomon's Temple, the predecessor of that which still bears his name and remains an object of great veneration to the Mussulmans. The taking of Jerusalem wasfollowed by the reduction of all the principal cities of Palestine while Khaled and Abu Obeydah made themselves masters of Laodicea, Antioch, Aleppo, and Baalbek. Omar next prepared to invade Persia, a kingdom: then ruled by a king named Yezdegerd, against which he had at the beginning of his reign unsuccessfully contended (634). Saad ibn-Abi Wakas, who was, now entrusted with the command of the army, penetrated far into Persia; defeated at Kadeslyah a powerful army commanded by Rustam, who fell in the battle; took: possession of Bahr-Shir, in the western quarter of the. city of Madavin, the ancient Ctesiphon; founded the city of Kfifah, near the Euphrates (638); crossed the Tigris; and at last took Madayin, the capital of Yezdegerd's kingdom. In the mean while Amru ibn-al-As, who commanded the armies of Egypt, completed the conquest of that country by the reduction of Alexandria: (640). It was then that the famous library  founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus is said to have been destroyed by the conquerors. Upon an application from Amru to; the caliph to know his pleasure concerning its contents,. an answer was returned commanding its destruction; for, said Omar, “if the books of the Greeks agree with the book of God (Koran), they are superfluous, and need not be preserved; and if they disagree, they are pernicious, and ought to be destroyed.” In consequence of this decision, we are told, and (notwithstanding all Gibbon's ingenuity to discredit the account) we are inclined to believe, that the manuscripts were delivered up to the four (others say five) thousand public baths in the city, to which they served as precious fiel for six months. The conquest of Egypt was followed by that of part of Africa. Amru pushed his victorious arms as far as the deserts of Tripoli and Barca. Armenia was in the meanwhile subdued by Mugheyrah (641), and Khorassan (642). by Ahnaf ibn-Kays, another of Omar's lieutenants. In the same year was fought the famous battle of Nehavend, which decided the fate of Persia. Firiz, who now commanded the armies of Yezdegerd, was killed; and the monarch himself was obliged to seek an asylum at Farghanah among the Turks, where he died soon after in poverty.

The success which attended the arms of Omar, his unflinching severity towards the vanquished who would not embrace the religion of the Prophet, and, more than all, the inexorable justice which he dealt among his own people, excited against him numerous enemies at home and abroad, and several attempts were made upon his life. Iabalah ibn-Ahyam, chief of the Arabian tribe of Ghosan, became one of his most implacable enemies. Although a tributary to the Greek emperor, in whose states he lived with his tribe, and though professing the Christian religion, Iabalah went to see Omar at Medina, swore obedience to him, and embraced Islam with all his followers. Omar then took him with him on a pilgrimage to Mecca. While the nieophyte was making, as usual, seven times the circuit of the Kaaba, an Arab of low extraction happened to run against him, and was the cause of the prince's cloak falling off his shoulders. Iabalah resented the incivility by immediately striking the man a blow on the face. The man made his complaint to Omar, who, having summoned Iabalah to his presence, sentenced him to receive a similar blow from the complainant. Against this sentence, just as it was, Iabalah most warmly remonstrated, saying that he was a king among his own people, and that the offender deserved to be punished with death. “My friend,” said Omar to him, “the religion that thou and I follow makes no distinction between the king and  the subject.” Rather than submit to the indignity, Iabalah secretly left Mecca with all his suite, abjured Islam, and sought the protection of the Greek emperor. He had, moreover, sworn to revenge the outrage. Having communicated his plans to a resolute young slave of his, Wathek ibn- Musafer by name, he promised him his liberty if he should succeed in killing Omar. Having arrived at Medina (638), where the caliph was then residing, Wathek was informed that Omar was in the habit of sitting down every day under a tree on his way to the mosque. Wathek, having climbed up the tree, awaited the arrival of Omar, who took his seat beneath it and fell asleep. Wathek, according to the account of the Mohammedan historians, was upon the point of coming down for the purpose of stabbing Omar with his dagger, when, lifting up his eyes, he saw a lion walking around him and licking his feet. Nor did the lion cease to guard the caliph until he awoke, when the lion instantly went away. Wathek was so much struck by this circumstance that he came down, kissed the caliph's hand, confessed his intended crime, and embraced the Mohammedan religion.

Yet the life of Omar was finally cut short by assassination. A Persian slave of the Magian sect, whose name was Abu Lulu Firuz, had been obliged by his master, Almugheyrah ibn-es-shaabah, to pay him two dirhems daily, in conformity with the Mohammedan custom, for the free exercise of this religion. Firiz, resenting this treatment, brought a complaint before the caliph, and requested that some part at least of the tribute exacted of him might be remitted; but this favor being refused by Omar, the Persian swore his destruction, and some days afterwards while Omar was performing his morning devotions in the mosque at Medinna, he stabbed him thrice in the belly with a sharp dagger. The people fell upon the assassin, but he made so desperate a defense that, although he was armed with no other weapon than his dagger, he wounded thirteen of the assailants, and seven of them mortally. At last one of the caliph's attendants drew his cloak over his head, and seized him; upon which he stabbed himself, and soon after expired, Omar languished five days. He died on a Friday, in the month of Dhu-l-hajjah, A.H. 23, answering to the month of November, A.D. 644. He was buried on the following. Saturday, close to the Prophet and Abu-Bekr in a mosque which he had founded at Medina, where his tomb is still visited with great respect by the Mussulmans. Having been asked, some time before his death, to name his successor, he refused; and upon the suggestion of one of his courtiers that he should leave the caliphate to his son Abdullah, he remarked, “It is enough that one out of my family has been forced to bear this burden, and account afterwards to his God for the  command and government of the faithful.” Mohammedanism cannot boast of a more virtuous sovereign or a more zealous apostle. It has been said of him that he contributed more efficaciously to the advancement of the Mohammedan religion than the Prophet himself Khondemir, the celebrated Persian historian, thus recapitulates the praiseworthy acts of this caliph: “He took from the infidels 36,000 cities or castles, destroyed 4000 temples or churches, and founded or endowed 1400 mosques.” The Prophet had the greatest esteem for Omar, whose daughter Hafsah he married. On a certain occasion he was heard to' say, “If God had wished to send a second messenger to this world, his choice would undoubtedly have fallen on Omar.”

The devotion, humility, and abstinence of this caliph had become proverbial among the Mussulmans. He never tasted any other food than barley-bread and dates; water was his only drink; and he was often found asleep under the porch of a mosque or beneath a tree. He complied most strictly with all the precepts of the Koran. Eutychius tells us that during his caliphate he performed nine times the pilgrimage to Mecca. In order better to conform to the regulations of the Koran, he lived by the work of his hands, supporting himself entirely by the sale of leather belts which he manufactured. But the quality for which Omar was most conspicuous was justice, which he is said to have administered with an even hand to infidels as well as believers. The historian Wakedi says that the staff of Omar was more dreaded than the sword of his successors. In the lifetime of Mohammed, a Moslem, condemned for his iniquitous treatment of a Jew, happening to appeal to Omar from the sentence of the Prophet, was immediately cut down with the scimitar for not acquiescing in the sentence of so upright a judge. From this circumstance Mohammed gave Omar the surname of Al-faruk which he retained ever afterwards, a word meaning the divider, or the discriminator, thus doubly alluding to his action and the discernment which prompted it. Several of the best Mohammedan institutions date from the reign of Omar. It was in his time that the aera of the Hegira, or flight of Mohammed, by which all Mohammedan nations compute their years, was established, and its beginning fixed on July 16, A.D. 622. He was the first who kept armies under pay, and assigned pensions to officers out of the public revenue; he instituted a sort of police force to watch at night for the security of the citizens; and he promulgated some excellent regulations respecting the duties of masters towards their slaves. He was also the first who assumed the title of Amir el-mumenin (commander of the faithful), instead of that of Khalifah-rasuli-llahi (vicar of the messenger of God), which his predecessor Abu-Bekr had used. Omar's  memory is an object of the greatest veneration among Mussulmans of the Sunni, or orthodox sect; not so among the Shiites, or partisans of Ali, who look upon the first three caliphs, Abu-Bekr, Omar, and Othman, as usurpers of the caliphate, to the prejudice of Ali, to whom, they pretend, it belonged as the nearest relative of the Prophet. See Abulfeda, Annales Moslemici (transl. by Reiske, Hafnire, 1790), 1:2-0 sq.; Almakin, Hist. Saracenica (ap. Erpenium, Lugd. Batav. 1625), p. 20 sq.; Ibn-Shihnah (MS.), Raudhaztrt -l- manadhidr; Ockley, Hist. of the Sarcacens, 1:300: Ibn-al-Khattib Hist. Calipharum (ap. Casiri); Bib. Ar. Hisp. Esc. 2:177 sq.; D'Herbelot, Bib. Or. s.v. Omar ben-al-Khattab, Khaled, Damashk, Iskandriah, et al.: Weil, Isla.nitische Vhlker, p. 4787; Wright, Chrisiianity in Arabia, p. 186 sq.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, 9:222, etc.; and especially the article in the English Cyclopaedia, S. .

## Ombay, Or Maloewa[[@Headword:Ombay, Or Maloewa]]

             (Maluwa), an island between Celebes and the north-west coast of Australia, lies to the north of Timor, from which it is separated by the Strait of Ombay, lat. 8° 8'-8° 28' S., long. 124° 17' -125° 7', and has an area of 961 square miles. The population amounts to over 200,000. The hills of Ombay are volcanic, and the coasts steep and difficult to approach. The inhabitants are dark brown, have thick lips, flat nose, and woolly hair, appearing to be of mixed Negro and Malay origin. They are armed with the bow, spear, and creese, and live on the produce of the chase, with fish, cocoa-nuts, rice, and honey. A portion of the island formerly belonged to the Portuguese, but since Aug. 6, 1851, it is entirely a Netherlands possession. The Dutch postholder resides at the village of Alor, to which iron wares, cotton goods, etc., are brought from Timor, and exchanged for wax, edible nests, provisions, and other native products. Ombay has oxen, swine, goats, etc., and produces maize. cotton, and pepper. Amber is also found, and the Boeginese of Celebes import European and Indian fabrics, exchanging them for the produce of the island. which they carry to Singapore (Chambers). The Dutch missionary societies are the only Protestant Christians who labor in Ombay, and thus far but little progress has been made in converting these Malayan Negritos.

## Ombiasses[[@Headword:Ombiasses]]

             priests and soothsayers among the inhabitants of Madagascar (q.v.), who compound charms, which they sell to the people.

## Ombrius[[@Headword:Ombrius]]

             a surname of Zeus, as the rain-giver, under which title he was worshipped on Mount Hymettus, in Attica.

## Ombwiri[[@Headword:Ombwiri]]

             a class of good and gentle spirits who are believed by the natives of Southern Guinea to take part in the government of the world. Almost every man has his own ombwiri as a tutelary and guardian spirit, for which he provides a small house near his own. “All the harm that is escaped in this world,” as Mr. Wilson informs us, “and all the good received, are ascribed to the kindly offices of this guardian spirit. Ombwiri is also regarded as the author of everything which is marvelous or mysterious. Any remarkable feature in the physical aspect of the country, any notable phenomenon in the heavens, or extraordinary event in the affairs of men, is ascribed to Ombwiri. His favorite places of abode are the summits of high mountains, deep caverns, large rocks, and the base of very large forest trees. While the people attach no malignity to his character, they guard against any unnecessary intercourse with him, and they never pass a place where he is supposed to dwell except in silence. He is the only one of all the spirits recognized by the people that has no priesthood, his intercourse with men being direct and immediate.”

## Omega[[@Headword:Omega]]

             [many Ome'ga, but against the proper rule] (ω. fully Ω μέγα, i.e. the great or long o, in distinction from. ῎Ομικρον, the short o), the last letter of the Greek alphabet, as Alpha is the first. It is used metaphorically to denote the end of anythiing: “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending... the first and the last” (Rev 1:8; Rev 1:11; comp. Rev 21:6; Rev 22:13). This may be compared with Isa 41:4; Isa 44:6, “I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God.” So Prudentius (Cathemer. hymn. 9:11) explains it:

“Alpha et O cognominatur: ipse fons et clausula

Omninum quse sunt, fuerunt, quneqne post futura sunt.”

SEE ALPHA. The symbol את, which contains the first and last letters of the Hebrew alphabet, is according to Buxtorf (Lex. Talm. p. 244), “‘among the Cabalists often put mystically for the beginning and end, like A and ? in  the Apocalypse.” Schoettgen (Hor. Hebr. 1:1086) quotes from Jalkut Rubeni (fol. 17, 4), “Adam transgressed the whole law from א to ת,” that is, from the beginning to the end. It is not necessary to inquire whether in the latter usage the meaning is so full as in the Revelation: that must be determined by separate considerations. As an illustration merely, the reference is valuable. Both Greeks and Hebrews employed the letters of the alphabet as numerals. It the early times of the Christian Church the letters Α and Ω were combined with the cross or with the monogram of Christ (Maitland, Church in the Catacombs, p. 166-8). SEE MONOGRAM OF CHRIST.

## Omen[[@Headword:Omen]]

             (for the deriv. see OM), or Prodigy (generally said to be from pro and dico, but more probably from pro and ago, to lead; hence anything conspicuous or extraordinary), the name given by the Romans to signs by which approaching good or bad fortune was supposed to be indicated. The terms Omen and Prodigy were not, however, exactly synonymous; the former being applied rather to signs received by the ear, and particularly to spoken words; the latter to phenomena and occurrences, such as monstrous births, the appearance of snakes, locusts. etc., the striking of the foot against a stone or the like the breaking of a shoe-tie, and even sneezing, etc. If an omen or prodigy was promised on the part of a god, it was to be interpreted according to the promise; but otherwise, the interpretation was extremely arbitrary. It was supposed that evil indicated as approaching might be averted by various means, as by sacrifices, or by the utterance of certain magic formulas; or by an extempore felicity of interpretation, as when Caesar, having fallen to the ground on landing in Africa, exclaimed, “I take possession of thee, Africa.'“ Occasionally, it is true, we read of a reckless disregard of omens; as, for example, when P. Claudius, in the First Punic War, caused the sacred chickens, who would not leave their cage, to be pitched into the sea, saying, “If they won't eat, they must drink.” Still the belief in omens was universal, and in general the greatest care was taken to avoid unfavorable ones. The heads of the sacrificial priests were covered, so that nothing distracting might catch their eyes; silence was enjoined at the commencement of every sacred undertaking, and at the opening of the games. Before every sacrificial procession ran the heralds, calling on the people to “pay respect to it,” and admonishing them to cease working till it should have passed, that the  priests might not hear unfavorable sounds. At the beginning of a sacrifice, the bystanders were addressed in the words Favete Linguis (“Speak no word of evil import”), and the aid of music was sought to drown whatever noises might prove unpropitious. See Fallati, Ueber ‘Begriff und Wesen des Ponm. Omen (Tub. 1836). SEE DIVINATION.

The belief in omens has existed in all ages and countries, and traces of it linger even yet in the most civilized communities; in the dread, for instance, that many entertain at sitting down to table in a party of thirteen. Not a little of the philosophy of omens is contained in the Scottish proverb: “Them who follow freits, freits follow:” meaning that a fatalistic belief in impending evil paralyzes the endeavor that might prevent it. Against the belief of omens it is observed that it is contrary to every principle of sound philosophy; and whoever has studied the writings of Paul must be convinced that it is inconsistent with the spirit of genuine Christianity. We cannot proceed to discuss the subject here, but will present the reader with a quotation on the other side of the question. “Though it be true,” says Mr. Toplady, “that all omens are not worthy of observation, and though they should never be so regarded as to shock our fortitude or diminish our confidence in God, still they are not to be constantly despised. Small incidents have sometimes been preclusive to great events; nor is there any superstition in noticing these apparent prognostications, though there may be much superstition in being either too indiscriminately or too deeply swayed by them” (Works, iv; 192). SEE SUPERSTITION.

## Omer[[@Headword:Omer]]

             (Heb. id. עֹמֶר, prop. a sheaf, as in Lev 23:10, etc., from עָמִר, to bind or gather; Sept. γομόρ; Vulg. gonzer), a Hebrew dry measure (Exo 16:16; Exo 16:18; Exo 16:22; Exo 16:32-33), the tenth of an ephah (Exo 16:36); therefore about two quarts according to the rabbins, but three and a half quarts according to Josephus. SEE METROLOGY.

## Omer (St.), Ecclesiastical Council Of[[@Headword:Omer (St.), Ecclesiastical Council Of]]

             (Conciliunm Audomarenzse), was held in June, 1099, by Manassez of Rheims and four of his suffragans. The “Treve de Dieu” was established, and at the entreaty of Robert, count of Flanders, five articles of peace were drawn up. See Labbe, Conc. vol. x.

## Omer, St., Audomarus[[@Headword:Omer, St., Audomarus]]

             a French ascetic, was born about 595 at Orval, or Goldenthar, near Constance. He was of a wealthy family, but after the death of his mother he induced his father to give all his goods to the poor, and to retire with him into the convent of Luxeuil. There his talents and his zeal attracted the attention of his superior, and by the advice of St. Achaire, bishop of Noyon and Tournay, king Dagobert I appointed Omer bishop of Trrouenne in 637.  The diocese had been much neglected for over eighty years; but Omer, with the assistance of Bertin, Mummolin, and Ebertran, all three monks of Luxeuil, succeeded in bringing about a thorough reform among the people. Having obtained the gift of the estate of Sithiu, on the Aa, from the owner, Adroald, Omer built a church on it, which he dedicated in 648 to St. Martin, and beside it a convent, of which he made Mummolin abbot. After the latter had been made bishop of Noyon and Tournai, Omer appointed in his place Bertin, who afterwards. gave the convent the name of St. Omer, and it was soon surrounded by the city bearing the same name. Omer died at Terouenne Sept. 9, 668. He was buried in the church he had built. The Romish Church commemorates him Sept. 9. See Acta Sanctorunm, Sept. 9; Mabillon, Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, ix saec.; Baillet, Vies des Saints, vol. iii; Breviarium Paris-iense; Friance pontificale; Longue.val, Histoire de l'Eglise Gallic. Vol. iv.

## Omish Church[[@Headword:Omish Church]]

             a sect of Mennonites in America are sometimes so called, after one of their preachers of the 17th century. They are found also in Germany and Switzerland. SEE MENNONITES.

## Omnibonus[[@Headword:Omnibonus]]

             canonist. SEE GLOSSARIES; SEE GLOSSATORS.

## Omnipotence[[@Headword:Omnipotence]]

             an attribute of God alone, and essential to his nature as an infinite, independent, and perfect Being. Among the distinct declarations of Scripture attributing such power to God are the following: Gen 17:1; Exo 15:11-12; Deu 3:24; 1Sa 14:6; Psa 62:11; Psa 65:6; Psa 147:5; Dan 4:35; Mat 6:13; Mat 19:26; Eph 3:20; Rev 19:6. It is also clearly expressed in the epithet Shaddai (q.v.), often applied to him in the O.T. The power of God is especially evinced:

1. In creation (Gen 1:1; Rom 1:20);

2. In the preservation of his creatures (Heb 1:3; Col 1:16-17);

3. In the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ (Luk 1:35; Luk 1:37; Eph 1:19);

4. In the conversion of sinners (Psa 110:3; 2Co 4:7);

5. In the continuation and success of the Gospel in the world (Mat 13:31-32);

6. In the preservation of the saints (1Pe 1:5);

7. In the resurrection of the dead (1 Corinthians ch. 15);

8. In making the righteous happy forever, and in punishing the wicked (Mat 25:34; Php 3:20-21). This power is only limited by God's own holy nature, which renders it impossible for him to do wrong (Num 23:19; Heb 6:18), and by the laws of possibility which he has himself created in the nature of things; in other words, we cannot conceive of his performing either a metaphysical or a moral contradiction. See Cocker, Theistic Conception of the World (N.Y. 1876, 12mo), p. 355 sq.; Malcom, Theol. Index, s.v.; Haag, Histoire des Dogmes Chretiens, 1:291; 2:16 sq., 139 sq., 147. SEE LAW.

## Omnipresence[[@Headword:Omnipresence]]

             another attribute of God alone, his ubiquity, or his. presence in every place at the same time. This attribute may be argued from his infinity (Psalms 139); his power, which is everywhere (Heb 1:3); his providence (Act 17:27-28), which supplies all. As he is a spirit, he is so omnipresent as not to be mixed with the creature, or divided, part in one place and part in another; nor is he multiplied or extended, but is essentially present everywhere. God is everywhere, but he is not everything. All things have their being in him, but he is distinct from all things; he fills the universe, but is not mingled with it. He is the intelligence which guides, and the power which moves; but his personality is preserved, and he is independent of the works of his hands, however vast and noble. See Krauth, The Conservative Reformation, p. 797; Pearson, On the Creeds; Wardlaw, Syst. Theol. 1:554; Haag, Hist. des Dogmes Chretiens, 2:140 sq., 311; Malcom, Theol. Index, s. SEE PANTHEISM.

## Omniscience[[@Headword:Omniscience]]

             the third essential or natural attribute of God, is that perfection by which he knows all things. This is:

1. Infinite (Psa 147:5);

2. Eternal (Isa 46:10; Act 2:23; Act 15:18; Eph 1:4);

3. Universal, extending to all persons, times, places, and things (Psalms 1, 10-13; Heb 4:13);

4. Perfect, relating to what is past, present, and to come. He knows all independently, distinctly, infallibly, and perpetually (Jer 10:6-7; Rom 11:33).

5. This knowledge is peculiar to himself, and not communicable to any creature (Job 36:4; Mar 13:32).

6. This attribute is incomprehensible to us, how God knows all things, yet it is evident that he dies; for to suppose otherwise is to suppose him an imperfect Being, and at variance with the revelation he has given of himself (Job 21:22; Job 28:24; Psa 139:6; 1Jn 3:20).

This attribute of God is constantly connected in Scripture with his omnipresence, and forms a part of almost every description of that attribute; for as God is a spirit, and therefore intelligent, if he is everywhere, if nothing can exclude him, not even the most solid bodies, nor the minds of intelligent beings, then, indeed, as Paul avers, are “all things naked and open to the eyes of him with whom we have to do.” Where he acts, he is; and where he is, he perceives. He understands and considers -things absolutely, and as they are in their own natures, forms, properties, differences, together with all the circumstances belonging to them, “Known unto him are all his works from the beginning. of the world,” rather from all eternity, known before they were made, and known now they are made, in their actual existence. It is also properly associated with his omnipotence; so that God is universal in his perfections.

Two theological, or rather metaphysical, questions have been raised on this subject.

1. Whether this knowledge is all equally present to the divine consciousness, or only brought up as occasion requires. That the latter  position cannot be true may be argued from the consideration that it would imply an imperfection or limitation in God's knowledge itself, inasmuch as it would thus become partial and fragmentary. The “occasion” implied in the supposition must be either in the divine mind, or else outside of it. If ab intra, it must be either voluntary or involuntary. The former involves the absurdity of supposing a volition respecting a subject not consciously present at the time to the mind of the wilier, and the latter leaves the matter subject to some secret law of variable and therefore contingent action. If, on the other hand, the supposed occasion be ab extra, then still more palpably must the knowledge be fluctuating, and even uncertain altogether. In short, we cannot predicate of the divine mind any such laws of mental association as those which call up stores of information in human thoughts: these belong only to finite and imperfect beings. Knowledge is not latent in God's consciousness; his nature precludes such a supposition. Even with ourselves positive knowledge or absolute certainty springs only from consciousness; all else is merely belief, probability, reasoning, etc. Memory itself is but the reflex action of consciousness. With God, as there is no need of information or inference, so knowledge must be simple intuition, or what is in human language consciousness of all truth, possible as well as actual, throughout that infinity of time and space which his presence permeates.

2. The other and more important question mooted relates to God's foreknowledge of the future. This, Calvinistic theologians generally affirm, depends upon his predetermination of all things. Of course, a Being of infinite power must know that his will cannot be frustrated, and may therefore predict with certainty whatever he ordains. But this is not really knowledge at all; it is simply reasoning, a rapid conclusion from certain data. If the foregoing views are correct, God does not properly foreknow or remember anything. He simply knows everything — past, present, and future — by virtue of that absolute and infinite intuition which takes in the entire range of fact and, possibility in one everlasting survey. In the lofty language of Holy Writ, he “inhabiteth eternity.” Of course, however, he knows events in their true relation and sequence as to time, and he also knows that they might have been, might now or hereafter be, otherwise, i.e.he contemplates at the same time with the certain the contingent also, and even the imaginary. For mere mortals, within their finite sphere of the past and present, may do this. The essential difference — aside from the enlarged field of view — is, that God looks upon the future just as we do  upon the past, but by a peculiar faculty inherent in Deity alone. Any other view reduces God to but a man of larger proportions. See the literature referred to in Malcom, Theol. Index, s.v.; and comp. SEE PRESCIENCE.

## Omophagia[[@Headword:Omophagia]]

             (ὠμοφαγία,' eating raw flesh), a custom which was anciently followed at the celebration of the Dionysia (q.v.) in the island of Chios, the Bacchantes being obliged to eat the raw pieces of flesh of the victim which were distributed among them. From this act Dionysus also received the name of Omadius (q.v.).

## Omophorium[[@Headword:Omophorium]]

             (ὠμοφόριον, borne on the shoulder), a kind of scarf or stole worn by the Eastern bishops. It resembles the Latin pall, but is broader, and tied around the neck in a knot. SEE VESTMENTS, SACRED.

## Omphalopsuchi[[@Headword:Omphalopsuchi]]

             SEE HESYCHASTS.

## Omri[[@Headword:Omri]]

             (Heb. Omri', עָמְרַי, thought by Gesenius and Furst to be for עָמְרַיָּה, the former in the sense of taught of Jehovah, the latter apportioned of Jehovah; but it is doubtful if the etymology contains the divine name; Sept. in 1 Kings Α᾿υβρί; elsewhere Α᾿μαρία Α᾿μαρί, v. r. Ζαμβρί, Μαρί; Josephus, Α᾿μαρῖνος, Ant. 8:12, 5), the name of fourmen:

1. The fifth named of nine sons of Becher, son of Benjamin (1Ch 7:8). B.C. cir. 1618.

2. Son of Imri and father of Ammihud, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 9:4). B.C. post 1618.

3. Son of Michael, and David's captain in the tribe of Issachar (1Ch 27:18). B.C. cir. 1017.

4. The commander-in-chief of the armies of Elah, king of Israel (1Ki 16:16), and the seventh king of Israel, who began to reign in B.C. 926, and reigned eleven fill (or twelve current) years, founding the third dynasty. He was engaged in the siege of Gibbethon, a Levitical city in Dan,  of which the Philistines had gained possession, when the news came to the camp of the death of Elah and the usurpation of Zinri. On this the army proclaimed their general, Omri, king of Israel. He then lost not a moment, but leaving Gibbethon in the power of the infidels, went and besieged his competitor in Tirzah, carrying on the war so vigorously that Zimri soon despaired, and burned himself in his palace. But Omri was no sooner delivered of this rival, SEE ZIMRI, than another appeared in the person of Tibni, whom a part of the people had raised to the throne, probably from unwillingness to submit to military dictation. This occasioned a civil war which lasted four years (comp. 1Ki 16:15 with 23) and left Omri undisputed master of the throne (B.C. 922). His reign lasted seven years more, his general character being “worse than all that had preceded him” (1Ki 16:25). This is the same Omri mentioned (2Ch 22:2) as father of Athaliah, the mother of Ahaziah, king of Israel. Six of these latter years “he spent in Tirzah, although the palace there was destroyed; but at the end of that time, in spite of the proverbial beauty of the site (Son 6:4), he transferred his residence, probably from the proved inability of Tirzah to stand a siege, to the mountain Shomron, better known by its Greek name Samaria, which he bought for two talents of silver from a rich man, otherwise unknown, called Shemer. SEE SAMARIA.

It is situated about six miles from Shechem, the most ancient of Hebrew capitals; and its position, according to Prof. Stanley (S. and P. p. 240), ‘combined, in a union not elsewhere found in Palestine, strength, fertility, and beauty.' Bethel, however, remained the religious metropolis of the kingdom, and the calf-worship of Jeroboam was maintained with increased determination and disregard of God's law (1Ki 16:26). He seems to have been a vigorous and unscrupulous ruler, anxious to strengthen his dynasty by intercourse and alliances with foreign states. Thus he made a treaty with Benhadad I, king of Damascus, though on very unfavorable conditions, surrendering to him some frontier cities (1Ki 20:34), and among them probably Ramoth-Gilead (1Ki 22:3), and admitting into Samaria a resident Syrian embassy, which is described by the expression he made streets in Samaria for Benhadad. SEE AHAB.

As a part of the same system, he united his son in marriage to the daughter of a principal Phoenician prince, which led to the introduction into Israel of Baal-worship, and all its attendant calamities and crimes. This worldly and irreligious policy is denounced by Micah (Mic 6:16) under the name of the ‘statutes of Omri,' which appear to be contrasted with the Lord's precepts to his people, ‘to do justly, and to love mercy,  and to walk humbly with thy God.' It achieved, however, a temporary success, for Omri left his kingdom in peace to his son Ahab; and his family, unlike the ephemeral dynasties which had preceded him, gave four kings to Israel, and occupied the throne for about half a century, till it was overthrown by the great reaction against Baal-worship under Jehu.:” Omri is mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.) as the founder of Beth- Khumri or Samaria (Rawlinson, Hist. Evidences, p. 109). On the chronology of this reign, see Offerhaus, Spicil. p. 45; Ussher, Annal. p. 37. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

## On[[@Headword:On]]

             the name of a man, and also of a city.

1. (Heb. id. אוֹן, strength, as Job 18:7; Sept. Αὔν.) A son of Peleth, and a chief of the tribe of Reuben, who was one of the accomplices of Korah in the revolt against the authority of Moses and Aaron. B.C. cir. 1637. He is mentioned among the leaders of this conspiracy in the first instance (Num 16:1), but does not appear in any of the subsequent transactions, and is not by name included in the final punishment. “Possibly he repented; and indeed there is a Rabbinical tradition to the effect that he was prevailed upon by his wife to withdraw from his' accomplices. Abendana's note is, ‘Behold On is not mentioned again, for he was separated from their company after Moses spake with them. And our rabbins of blessed memory said that his wife saved him.' Josephus (Ant. 4:2, 2) omits the name of On, but retains that of his father in the form Φαλαοῦς, thus apparently identifying Peleth with Phallu, the son of Relluen.”

2. An important city in Egypt. In the following account we depend largely upon the elucidation which modern researches have afforded.

Name. — This in the Heb. is the same as the above, אוֹן, Gen 41:50, or in the condensed form אֹן, Gen 41:45; Gen 41:50; Gen 46:20 (Sept. ῾Ηλιούπολις; Vulg. Heliopolis), which is doubtless of Coptic etymology. But in Eze 30:17, it is Hebraized אָוֶן, A ven (q.v.), i.e. wickedness (Sept. and Vulg. as before).  The same city is also mentioned in the Bible as BETH-SHEMESH, בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ(Jer 43:13), corresponding to the ancient Egyptian sacred name HA-RA, “the abode of the sun;” and perhaps it is likewise spoken of as IR- HA-HERES, עַיר הִהֶרֶס, or הִחֶרֶס, the second part being, in this case, either the Egyptian sacred name, or else the Hebrew חֶרֶס, but we prefer to read “a city of destruction.” The two names were known to the translator or translators of Exodus in the Sept., where On is explained to be Heliopolis (῎Ων ἣ ἐστιν ῾Ηλιούπολις, 1:11); but in Jeremiah this version seems to treat Beth-shemesh as the name of a temple (τοὺς στύλους ῾Ηλιουπόλεως, τοὺς ἐν ῎Ων), 43:13, Sept. 1, 13). The Coptic version gives On as the equivalent of the names in the Sept., but whether as an Egyptian word or such a word Hebraized can scarcely be determined. The latter is perhaps more probable, as the letter we represent by A is not commonly changed into the Coptic O, unless indeed one hieroglyphic form of the name should be read ANU, in which case the last vowel might have been transposed and the first incorporated with it. Brugsch (Geogr. Inschr. 1:254) supposes AN and ON to be the same, “as the Egyptian A often had a sound intermediate between a and o.” But this does not admit of the change of the a vowel to the long vowel o, from which it was as distinct as from the other long vowel i, respectively like אand ע, ו, and י.

The ancient Egyptian common name is written AN or AN-T, and perhaps ANU; but the essential part of the word is AN, and probably no more was pronounced. There were two towns called AN: Heliopolis, distinguished as the northern, AN-MEHIT, and Hermonthis, in Upper Egypt, as the southern, AN-RES (Brugsch Geogr. -nschr. 1:254, 255, Nos. 1217 a, b, 1218. 870,1225). As to the meaning, we can say nothing certain. Cyril, who, as bishop of Alexandria, should be listened to on such a question, says that On signified the sun (᾿῏Ων δέ ἐστι κατ᾿ αὐτοὺς ὁ ἣλιος, ad Hosea p. 145), and the Coptic Ouoini (Memphitic), Ouein, Ouoein (Sahidic), “light,” has therefore been compared (see La Croze Lex. p. 71, 189), but the hieroglyphic form is UBEN, “shining,” which has no connection with AN.

Scriptural Notices. — The first mention of this place in the Bible is in the history of Joseph, to whom we read Pharaoh gave “to wife Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On” (Gen 41:45. comp. Gen 41:50; and Gen 46:20). Joseph was possibly governor of Egypt under a king of the fifteenth dynasty, of which Memphis was, at least for a time, the capital. In  this case he would doubtless have lived for part of the year at Memphis, and therefore near to Heliopolis. The name. of Asenath's father was appropriate to a Heliopolite, and especially to a priest of that place (though according to some he may have been a prince), for it means “Belonging to Ra,” or “the sun.” The name of Joseph's master Potiphar is the same, but with a slight difference in the Hebrew orthography. According to the Sept. On was one of the cities built for Pharaoh by the oppressed Israelites, for it mentions three “strong cities” instead of the two “treasure cities” of the Heb., adding On to Pithom and Raamses (Καὶ ᾠκοδόμησαν πόλεις ὀχυρὰς τῷ Φαραῷ, τήν το Πειθώ, καὶ ῾Ραμεσσἤ, καὶ ᾿῏Ων, ἣ ἐστιν ῾Ηλιούπολις, Exo 1:11). If it be intended that these cities were founded by the labor of the people, the addition is probably a mistake, although Heliopolis may have been ruined, and rebuilt; but it is possible that they were merely fortified, probably as places for keeping stores. Heliopolis lay at no great distance from the land of Goshen and from Raamses, and probably Pithom also.

Isaiah has been supposed to speak of On when he prophesies that one of the five cities in Egypt that should speak the language of Canaan should be called Ir-ha-heres, which may .mean the City of the Sun, whether we take “heres” to be a Hebrew or an Egyptian word; but the reading “a city of destruction” seems preferable; and we have no evidence that there was any large Jewish settlement at Heliopolis, although there may have been at one time from its nearness to the town of Onias (q.v.). — Jeremiah speaks of On under the name Beth-shemesh, “the house of the sun” (comp. “oppidum solis,” Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 11), where he predicts of Nebuchadnezzar, “He shall break also the pillars [? מצבות, but perhaps statues] of Bethshemesh, that [is] in .the land of Egypt; and the houses of the gods of the Egyptians shall he burn with fire” (43:13). By the word we have rendered “pillars,” obelisks are reasonably supposed to be: meant, for the number of which before the temple of the sun Heliopolis must have been famous; and perhaps by “the houses of the gods,” the temples of this place are intended, as their being burned would be a proof of the powerlessness of Ra and Atum, both forms of the sun, Shu, the god of light, and Tafnet, a fire-goddess, to save their dwellings from the very element over which they were supposed to rule. — Perhaps it was on account of the many false gods of Heliopolis that, in Ezekiel, On is written Aven, by a change in the punctuation, if we can here depend on the Masoretic text, and so made to signify “vanity,” and especially the vanity of  idolatry. The prophet foretells, “The young men of Aven and of Pi-be-seth shall fall by the sword: and these [cities] shall go into captivity” (30:17). Pibeseth, or Bubastis, is doubtless spoken of with Heliopolis as in the same part of Egypt, and so to be involved in a common calamity at the same time when the land should be invaded. After the age of the prophets we hear no more in Scripture of Heliopolis. Local tradition, however, points it out as a place where our Lord and the Virgin came, when Joseph brought them into Egypt, and a very ancient sycamore is shown as a tree beneath which they rested. The Jewish settlements in this part of Egypt, and especially the town of Onias, which was probably only twelve miles distant from Heliopolis in a northerly direction, but a little to the eastward (Modern Egypt and Thebes, 1:297, 298), then flourished, and were nearer to Palestine than the heathen towns, like Alexandria, in which there was any large Jewish population, so that there is much probability in this tradition. And perhaps Heliopolis itself may have had a Jewish quarter, although we do not know it to have been the Ir-ha-heres of Isaiah.

Monumental History. — The oldest monument of the town is the obelisk, which was set up late in the reign of Sesertesen I, head of the 12th dynasty, dating B.C. cir. 2050. According to Manetho, the bull Mnevis was first worshipped here in the reign of Kaiechos, second king of the 2d dynasty (B.C. cir. 2400). In the earliest times it must have been subject to the first dynasty so long as their sole rule lasted, which was perhaps for no more than the reigns of Menes (B.C. cir. 2717), and Athothis; it doubtless next came under the government of the Memphites, of the 3d (B.C. cir. 2640), 4th, and 6th dynasties; it then passed into the hands of the Diospolites of the 12th dynasty and the Shepherds of the 15th; but whether the former or the latter held it first, or it was contested between them, we cannot as yet determine. During the long period of anarchy that followed the rule of the 12th dynasty, when Lower Egypt was subject to the Shepherd kings, Heliopolis must have been under the government of the strangers. With the accession of the 18th dynasty it was probably recovered by the Egyptians, during the war which Aahmes, or Amosis, head of that line, waged with the Shepherds, and thenceforward held by them, though perhaps more than once occupied by invaders (comp. Chabas, Papyrus Magique Harris), before the Assyrians conquered Egypt. Its position near the eastern frontier must have made it always a post of especial importance. SEE NO-AMON.

The chief object of worship at Heliopolis was the sun, under the forms Ra, the sun simply, whence the sacred name of the place, HA-RA, “the abode  of the sun,” and Atum, the setting sun, or sun of the nether world. Probably its chief temple was dedicated to both. Shu, the son of Atum, and Tafnet, his daughter, were also here worshipped, as well as the bull Minevis, sacred to Ra, Osiris, and His; and the Phoenix, Bennu, probably represented by a living bird of the crane kind. (On the mythology, see Brugsch, p. 254 sq.) The temple of the sun, described by Strabo (17, p. 805, 806), is now only represented by the single beautiful obelisk, which is of red granite, 68 feet 2 inches high above the pedestal, and bears a: dedication showing that it was sculptured in or after his 30th year (cir. 2050) by Sesertesen I. first king of the 12th dynasty (B.C. cir. 2080-2045). There were probably far more than a usual number of obelisks before the gates of this temple, on the evidence of ancient writers, and the inscriptions of some yet remaining elsewhere, and no doubt the reason was that these monuments were sacred to the sun. From the extent of the mounds it seems to have been always a small town.

An imperfect monumental inscription of the time of Thothmes III mentions the city of On in the following terms: “In his thirty-fifth year the king (Thothmes III) sent forth an army of ten full cohorts against Heth. Then he marched against the city of On, where the unclean race were assembled . .” — alluding perhaps to the Shepherds, whom Thothmes finally expelled from Egypt. There are other indications of this Pharaoh having been at Heliopolis or On. Two of the obelisks removed by the Romans from that ancient city bear the well-known cartouche of Thothmes III. The one stands upright before the cathedral of St. John at Rome, the other in the Atmeidan at Constantinople. Osburn declares “that it becomes a historical fact that the patron of Joseph, Pharaoh Apophis, had possession of Heliopolis, and for a long period held his regal state there” (Monuma. Hist. of Egypt, 2:87). SEE EGYPT.

Later Notices. — The traces of this city which are found in classic authors correspond with the little of it that we know from the brief intimations of Holy Writ. According to Herodotus (2:59), Heliopolis was one of the four great cities that were rendered famous in Egypt by being the centers of solemn religious festivals, which were attended by splendid processions and homage to the gods. In Heliopolis the observance was held in honor of the sun. The majesty of these sacred visits may be best learned now by a careful study of the temples (in their ruins) in which the rites were performed (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt.). Heliopolis had its priesthood, a numerous and learned body, celebrated before other Egyptians — for their  historical and antiquarian lore, and occupying extensive, buildings around the temple; it long continued the university of the Egyptians, the chief seat of their science (Kenrick, Herod. 2:3; Wilkinson); the priests dwelt as a holy community in a spacious structure appropriated to their use. In Strabo's time the halls were to be seen in which Eudoxus and Plato had studied under the direction of the priests of Heliopolis. A detailed description of the temple, with its long alleys of sphinxes. obelisks, etc., may be found in Strabo (17; Josephus, c.'Apion. 3 2), who says that the mural sculpture in it was very similar to the old Etruscan and Grecian works. In the temple a bullock was fed — a symbol of the god Mnevis. The city suffered severely by the Persian invasion. From the time of Shaw- and Pococke the place has been described by many travelers. At an early period remains of the ‘famous temple were found. Abdallatif (A.D. 1200) saw many colossal sphinxes, partly prostrate, partly standing. He also saw the gates or propylaea of the temple covered with inscriptions; he describes two immense obelisks whose summits were covered with massive brass, around which were others one half or one third the size of the first, placed in so thick a mass that they could scarcely be counted, most of them thrown down. This city furnished works of art to Augustus for adorning Rome, and to Constantine for adorning Constantinople. Ritter (Erdkunde, 1:823) says that the sole remaining obelisk bears hieroglyphics which remind the beholder of what Strabo terms the Etruscan style. “The figure of the cross which it bears (crux ansata) has attracted the special notice of Christian antiquaries” (Ritter).

Heliopolis was situate on the east side of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, just below the point of the Delta, and about twenty miles north-east of Memphis. It was before the Roman time the capital of the Heliopolitic Nome, which was included in Lower Egypt (Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 9; Ptolem. 4:5). Now its site is above the point of the Delta, which is the junction of the Phatmetic, or Damietta branch, and the Bolbitine, or Rosetta, and about ten miles to the north-east of Cairo. The site is now marked by low mounds, enclosing a space about three quarters of a mile in length by half a mile in breadth, which was once occupied by houses and by the celebrated Temple of the Sun. This area is at present a plowed field, a garden of herbs; and the solitary obelisk which still rises in the midst of it is the sole remnant of the former splendors of the place. In the days of Edrisi and Abdallatif the place bore the name of Ain Shems; and in the neighboring village, Matariyeh, is still shown an ancient well bearing the same name.  Near by it is the above-mentioned very old sycamore, its trunk straggling and gnarled, under which legendary tradition relates that the holy family once rested (Robinson, Biblical Researches, 1:36).

## Onachus (or Onacus)[[@Headword:Onachus (or Onacus)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was probably bishop of the Isles about 1304. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 301.

## Onam[[@Headword:Onam]]

             (Heb. Onam', אוֹנָם, strong), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. ᾿Ωμάρ in Genesis, ᾿Ωνάμ in Chron.; v. r. ᾿Ωμάν, Σωνἀν), the last named of the five children of Shobal, son of Seir the Horite (Gen 36:23; 1Ch 1:40). B.C. cir. 1964.

2. (Sept. Οὐνομά, v. r. Ο᾿ζόμ), son of Jerahmeel, of the tribe of Judah, by his wife Atarah, and father of Shammai and Jada (1Ch 2:26; 1Ch 2:28). B.C. ante 1658.

## Onan[[@Headword:Onan]]

             (Heb. Onanz', אוֹנָן, strong; Sept. Αὐνάν), the second son of Judah by the daughter of Shuah the Canaanite (Gen 38:4; Num 26:19; 1Ch 3:3). Being constrained by the obligations of the ancient Levirate law (q.v.) to espouse Tamar, his elder brother's widow, he took means to frustrate the intention of this usage, which was to provide heirs for a brother who had died childless (Deu 25:5-10; Mar 12:1-9). This offense, rendered without excuse by the allowance of polygamy, and the seriousness of which can scarcely be appreciated but in respect to the usages of the times in which it was committed, was punished by premature death (Gen 38:8 sq.). B.C. cir. 1870. His act was evidently different from the vice which has been given his name.

## Onca[[@Headword:Onca]]

             a surname of Athene, under which she was worshipped at Oncae, in Boeotia. — Gardner, Faiths of the World, vol. ii, s.v.

## Oncacus[[@Headword:Oncacus]]

             a surname of Apollo, from Oncaeium, in Arcadia, where he had a temple. — Gardner, Faiths of the World, vol. ii, s.v.

## Oncken, John Gerhard, D.D[[@Headword:Oncken, John Gerhard, D.D]]

             a German Baptist minister, was born in Varet, in the grand duchy of Oldenburg, January 26, 1800.He went to England in his youth, and was converted. The British Continental Society sent him in 1823 as a missionary to Germany, his labors being principally confined to Hamburg and Bremen, and the province of East Frisia. In 1828 he became the agent of the Edinburgh Bible Society. He and six others were immersed, April 22, 1834, in the river Elbe, near Hamburg, by Reverend Barnas Sears, then of the Hamilton Theological Seminary, pursuing his studies in Germany. At the close of 1879 there were in Germany 16,602 members of Baptist churches, and the gospel was preached in 1173 preaching stations. Later statistics would largely swell these numbers. Mr. Oncken was ordained soon after his baptism, and "his life was one of apostolic toil and blessed success in spreading the gospel through Germany." His pastoral Relation with the Church at Hamburg always remained, and that city was made the centre of his evangelistic labors. He frequently visited England to solicit funds to carry on his work in Germany, and in 1853 came to the United States for the same purpose. He died Jan. 1884, in Zurich, where he had resided for two years. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 869. (J.C. S.)

## Onderdonk, Benjamin Treadwell D.D., LL.D.[[@Headword:Onderdonk, Benjamin Treadwell D.D., LL.D.]]

             an eminent American divine and bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, noted especially because of the severe trials through which he passed, and his consequent deposition from the episcopal office, was born in the city of New York in July, 1791. He was educated at Columbia College, New York, class of 1809, and, after a most critical study of divinity, was ordained priest in 1812, and in the following year was made assistant pastor of Trinity parish, New York. He soon distinguished himself by unusual pulpit talents, and became one of the favorite preachers of the metropolis. In 1826 he was elected professor in the General Theological Seminary of New York, and he held that position until 1830, when he was elevated to the episcopate as successor to the then recently deceased bishop Hobart. of Eastern New York. He was consecrated to this important office Nov. 26.1830. By his eminent qualifications for the episcopal work he soon acquired general trust, and by his untiring industry gained many warm admirers and friends. In 1844, however, and that very unexpectedly, most serious charges were brought against the purity of his moral character, and in December of that year he was therefore tried by the House of Bishops acting as a court. After a long and searching investigation, the court decided (eight voting for deposition and nine for suspension) that he be suspended from the office and functions of the ministry (Jan. 3, 1845). Bishop Onderdonk himself never acknowledged that he was guilty of the offenses imputed to him, but the careful and prolonged trial that had been afforded him revealed that he must have been frequently guilty of very gross immorality, the testimony depending upon parties whose character was unquestionable in every particular, Largely his improper advances to ladies — and these were the principal charges — were prompted by liquor, for he is known to have been an habitual drinker of intoxicating beverages. It is claimed by his friends that he could never have been guilty of gross immorality in any other than an intoxicated state, and that the accusations, having been brought forward only after he had reformed in his habits, should not have been countenanced by the House of Bishops. Even after the suspension of the bishop his friends zealously continued to labor for the removal of his suspension from the episcopate. After much delay, the General Convention of 1850 passed a canon allowing a provisional bishop to be chosen. The Convention of New York adopted a petition to the General Convention of 1859 in favor of bishop Onderdonk's restoration, and the lower house supported it by a large vote,  but the bishops rejected it, and he died, unrestored to his diocese, April 30, 1861. He published, Sermon before and for the Domestic and Foreign Mission Society (N.Y. 1829, 8vo): — Sermon at the Funeral of the Right Rev. John H. Hobart (1830, 8vo). See The Proceedings of the Court convened under the third Canon of 1844 in the City of New York, on Dec. 10, 1844, for the Trial of the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D.D., Bishop of New York, etc. (N. Y. 1845, 8vo).

## Onderdonk, Henry Ustic M.D., D.D.[[@Headword:Onderdonk, Henry Ustic M.D., D.D.]]

             a brother of the preceding, and also an eminent American divine and bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in the city of New York in March, 1789. He was educated at Columbia College, class of 1805, and then went abroad to study medicine in London and Edinburgh. After his return to this country he practiced in his profession for several years, but finally decided to enter the ministry. He was at that time (1815) editor, with Dr. Valentine Mott, of the N. Y. Medical Journal, but he closely applied himself to the study of divinity, and was soon after ordained deacon. In January, 1816, he went as missionary to Canandaigua, which, under his care, grew into a flourishing parish, and of this he became the rector in 1818. In 1820 he removed to Brooklyn as rector of St. Ann's Church. and there he gained much distinction as preacher and writer. In 1827 he was elected to the episcopacy, and. was consecrated assistant to the bishop of Pennsylvania Oct. 25 of that year. In 1837, on the death of bishop White, Onderdonk was put in full possession of the diocesan power, and he discharged its duties until 1844, when he felt compelled, by the dissatisfaction which had arisen among the clergy and laity of his diocese, to resign his episcopal functions. Not only was the resignation accepted by the House of Bishops, but they also brought him to trial for intemperance, and suspended him from the office and functions of the priesthood from and after Oct. 21 1844. In 1856 bishop Onderdonk was restored to the sacred ministry and to his diocese, but he did not resume. the privileges of his office, and died only two years later, Dec. 6,1858, at Philadelphia. He published, Appeal to the Religious Public, etc., of Canandaigua (1818): — Episcopacy tested by Scripture (N.Y. 1846; first, published as an essay in the Protestant Episcopalian, November and December, 1830; second, in pamphlet form anonymously; third, as a tract by the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society; and then reviewed by the Rev. Albert Barnes in the Christian Spectator, 1834-this review was reprinted in Barnes's Miscellaneous Essays and Reviews, 1855, 1:200-251): — Episcopacy  Examined and Re-examined (1835): — Essay on Regeneration (Phila. 1835): — Family Devotions from the Liturgy (1835): — Sermons and Episcopal Charges (1851, 2 vols. 8vo). “They show him to be not only a polished writer, but a scholar and reasoner of the highest rank” (R.W. Griswold, D.D.). Bishop Onderdonk also published a number of occasional Sermons, Tracts, and Pamphlets, and contributed papers to the American Medical and Philosophical Register, the New-York Medical Magazine, the Church Register, the Churchman's Monthly Magazine, the Evergreen, the Protestant Episcopalian, the Banner of the Cross, the Churchman, etc. He has besides substantial claims to the character of a poet; in evidence of which we may instance Hymns Nos. 14, 105, 106, 109, 131, 195, 203, 208, 211, and Psalms 16, 23, , 59. in the Book of Common Prayer of the American Protestant Episcopal Church. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; and the article by Prof. Spencer in The Amer. Cyclop. s.v.

## Oneida Community[[@Headword:Oneida Community]]

             SEE SOCIALISM.

## Oneirocritica[[@Headword:Oneirocritica]]

             (from ὄνειρος, a dream, and κρίνω, to judge), the art of interpreting dreams, which among the ancient Egyptians was the duty of the hierogrammateis, or sacred scribes. SEE DREAMS.

## Oneiromancy[[@Headword:Oneiromancy]]

             (from ὄνειρος, a dream, and μαντεία, divination), divination by means of dreams, or the interpretation of dreams in reference to future events. SEE DREAMS.

## Onesimus[[@Headword:Onesimus]]

             (Ο᾿μἡσιμος, profitable) is the name of the servant or slave in whose behalf Paul wrote the Epistle to Philemon (Philippians 10; Col 4:9). A.D. 58. He was a native, or certainly an inhabitant, of Colosss, since Paul, in writing to the Church there, speaks of him (Col 4:9) as ὅς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, “one of you.” This expression confirms the presumption which his Greek name affords that he was a Gentile, and not a Jew, as some have argued from μάλιστα ἐμοί in Philippians 16. Slaves were numerous in Phrygia, and the name itself of Phrygian was almost synonymous with that of slave. Hence it happened that in writing to the Colossians (Col 3:22 to Col 4:1) Paul had occasion to instruct them concerning the duties of masters and servants to each other. Onesimus was one of this unfortunate class of persons, as is evident both from the manifest implication in οὐκέτι ὠς δοῦλον in Philippians 16, and from the general tenor of the epistle. There appears to have been no difference of opinion on this point among the ancient commentators, and there is none of any critical weight among the modern. The man escaped from his master and fled to Rome, where in the midst of its vast population he could hope to be concealed, and to baffle the efforts which were so often made in such cases  for retaking the fugitive (Walter, Die Geschichte des Romans Rechts, 2:63 sq.). It must have been to Rome that he directed his way, and not to Caesarea, as some contend; for the latter view stands connected with an indefensible opinion respecting the place whence the letter was written (see Neander, Pflanzung, 2:506).

Whether Onesimus had any other motive for the flight than the natural love of liberty, we have not the means of deciding. It has been very generally supposed that he had committed some offense, as theft or embezzlement, and feared the punishment of his guilt. This is grounded upon ἠδίκησε, in Philippians 18, in connection with the context; the meaning, however, is somewhat uncertain (see Notes in Ep. to Philippians by the Amer. Bible Union, p. 60). Commentators at all events go entirely beyond the evidence when they assert (as Conybeare, Life and Epistles of Paul, 2:467) that he belonged to the dregs of society that he robbed his master, and confessed the sin to Paul. Though it may be doubted whether Onesimus heard the Gospel for the first time at Rome, it is beyond question that he was led to embrace the Gospel there through the apostle's instrumentality. The language in Philippians 18:10 of the letter (ὃν ἐγέννησα ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου) is explicit on this point. As there were believers in Phrygia when the apostle passed through that region on his third missionary tour (Act 18:23), and as Onesimus belonged to a Christian household (Philippians 2), it is not improbable that he knew something of the Christian doctrine before he went to Rome.

How long a time elapsed between his escape and conversion we cannot decide; for πρὸς éραν in the 15th verse, to which appeal has been made, is purely a relative expression, and will not justify any inference as to the interval in question'. After his conversion the most happy and friendly relations sprung up between the teacher and the disciple. The situation of the apostle as a captive and an indefatigable laborer for the promotion of the Gospel (Act 28:30-31) must have made him keenly alive to the sympathies of Christian friendship, and dependent upon others for various services of a personal nature, important to his efficiency as a minister of the Word. Onesimus appears to have supplied this twofold want in an eminent degree. We see from the letter that he won entirely the apostle's heart, and made himself so useful to him in various private ways, or evinced such a capacity to be so (for he may have gone back to Colossae soon after his conversion), that Paul wished to have him remain constantly with him. Whether he desired his presence as a personal attendant or as a minister of the Gospel is not certain from Ι῞να διακονῇ in Act 28:13 of the epistle. Be this as it may, Paul's attachment to him as a disciple, as a personal friend,  and as a helper to him in his bonds, was such that he yielded him up only in obedience to that spirit of self-denial, and that sensitive regard for the feelings or the rights of others, of which his conduct on this occasion displayed so noble an example. Onesimus, accompanied by Tychicus, left Rome with not only this epistle, but with that to the Colossians (Col 4:9). It is believed that Onesimus, anxious to justify the confidence which Paul reposed in him, by appearing speedily before his master, left Tychicus to take the Epistle to the Ephesians, and hastened to Colossae, where he doubtless received the forgiveness which Paul had so touchingly implored for him as “a brother beloved” (Canon. Apost. 73).

There is but little to add to this account, when we pass beyond the limits of the New Testament. The traditionary notices which have come down to us are too few and too late to amount to much as historical testimony. Some of the later fathers assert that Onesimus was set free, and was subsequently ordained bishop of Bercea, in Macedonia (Constit. Apost. 7:46). The person of the same name mentioned as bishop of Ephesus in the first epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians (Hefele, Patrum Apost. Opp. p. 152) was a different person (Winer, Realw. 2:175). SEE ONESIMUS, ST. It is related also that Onesimus finally made his way to Rome again, and ended his days there as a martyr during the persecution under Nero. His name is found in the Roman martyrology under date of March 2, 95.

We mistake if we consider that the occasion on which Paul interfered was really small. Throughout the Roman empire the number of the enslaved was perhaps seven times the number of the free. It was important that a practical exemplification should be given by Paul himself of the meaning of his own language, that in the new creation there is “neither bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all.” There is no violent interference with the prescriptive rights of ownership which Philemon had acquired; Paul gently states that while his natural impulse was to retain Onesimus for the sake of his services (Philippians 13), yet, apart from Philemon's consent, he would forego the comfort which the presence of such a Christian brother was able to impart. Yet the language in which Paul speaks of Onesimus clearly shows that Philemon could no longer maintain those rights without forfeiting his Christian character. Slavery is nowhere expressly condemned in Scripture any more than polygamy; the duty of emancipating slaves is not expressly inculcated any more than the duty of family worship. The influence of vital Christianity implicitly forbids the permanency of a system which defeats the apostle's injunction: “Masters, give unto your servants  that which is just and equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.” Where the owner is Christianized, the bondsman is enfranchised. The interference of Paul in behalf of Onesimus may thus be considered a divine act of emancipation, illustrating the legitimate and necessary influence of Christian principle. Amid all the defects and corruptions of the Christian Church we can discover proofs of its divine origin in every age and in every clime, by its tendency to build the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke; the Church has very generally felt that the command, “He who loveth God should love his brother also,” strikes at the root of a system which severs the domestic relations of husband and wife, of parent and child, while it blasts the oppressor with the blinding and hardening effects of arbitrary rule and irresponsible power. SEE PHILEMON.

## Onesimus St.[[@Headword:Onesimus St.]]

             an early Christian bishop, who succeeded Caius in the chair at Ephesus, and was the third bishop of that city. He governed that Church in 107. His festival is celebrated Feb. 16 in the Latin Church. See, Acta Sanctorum, February and March; Dom Calmet, Dict, de la Bible, s.v.; Baillet. Vies des Saints, vol. i.

## Onesiphorus[[@Headword:Onesiphorus]]

             (Ο᾿νησιφορος, profit-bringing), a believer of Ephesus, who came to Rome during the second captivity of Paul in that city (A.D. cir. 64), and having found out the apostle, who was in custody of a soldier, to whose arm his own was chained, was “not ashamed of his chain,” but attended him frequently, and rendered him all the services in his power. This faithful attachment, at a time of calamity and desertion, was fully appreciated and well remembered by the apostle, who in his Epistle to Timothy carefully records the circumstance; and,. after charging him to salute in his name “the household of Onesiphorus,” expresses the most earnest and grateful wishes for his spiritual welfare (2Ti 1:16-18; comp. 4:19). It would appear from this that Onesiphorus had then quit Rome (Kitto). It has even been made a question whether this friend of the apostle was still living when the letter to Timothy was written, because in both instances Paul speaks of “the household” (in 2Ti 1:16, δóη ἔλεος ὁ κύριος τῷ Ο᾿νησιφόρου οἴκῳ), and not separately of Onesiphorus himself. If we infer that he was not living, then we have in 2Ti 1:18 almost an instance of the apostolic sanction of the practice of praying for the dead. But the probability is that other members of the family were also active Christians; and as Paul wished to remember them at the same time, he grouped them together under the comprehensive τὸν Ο᾿ν. Οικον (2Ti 4:19), and thus delicately recognized the common merit, as a sort of family distinction. The mention of Stephanas in 1Co 16:17 shows that we need not exclude him from the Στεφανᾶ οικον in 1Co 1:16. It is evident from 2Ti 1:18 (ὅσα ἐν Ε᾿φέσῳ διηκόνησε) that Onesiphorns had his home at Ephesus; though if we restrict the salutation near the close of the epistle (4:19) to his family, he himself may possibly have been with Paul at Rome when the latter wrote to Timothy. Nothing authentic is known of him beyond these notices. According to a tradition in Fabricius (Lux Evang. p. 117), he became bishop of Corone, in Messenia. I

## Oniares[[@Headword:Oniares]]

             (Ο᾿νιάρης), a name that appears in 1Ma 12:20 as the author or director of the letter of the Lacedaemonians to Onias; but it is evidently a corruption for Onias (Ο᾿νίᾷ Α᾿ρεῖος, the latter name repeated from the following verse). See Josephus, Ant. 12:4, 10.

## Onias[[@Headword:Onias]]

             (Ο᾿νίας. perh. for אַנַיָּה, a ship), the name of five Jewish pontiffs, mentioned by the Apocrypha and by Josephus. The following account of tlhemI Is mostly from those authorities. SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

1. The son and successor of Jaddua, who entered on the office about the time of the death of Alexander the Great, B.C. cir. 330-309, or, according to Eusebius, 300 (Josephus, Ant. 11:7, 7). According to Josephus he was father of Simon the Just (Ant. 12:2, 4; comp. Sirach 1, 1). SEE SIMON.

2. The son of Simon the Just (Josephus, Ant. xii 4, 1). He was a minor at the time of his father's death (B.C. cir. 290), and the high-priesthood was occupied in succession by his uncles Eleazar and Manasseh to his exclusion. He entered on the office at last (B.C. cir. 240), and his conduct threatened to precipitate the rupture with Egypt which afterwards opened the way for Syrian oppression. Onias, from avarice, it is said — a vice which was likely to be increased by his long exclusion from power —  neglected for several years to remit to Ptolemy Euergetes the customary annual tribute of 20 talents. The king claimed the arrears with threats of violence in case his demands were not satisfied. Onias still refused to discharge the debt, more, asit appears, from self-will than with any prospect of successful resistance. The evil consequences of this obstinacy were, however, averted by the policy of his nephew Joseph, the son of Tobias, who visited Ptolemy, urged the imbecility of Onias, won. the favor of. the king, and entered into a contract for farming the tribute, which he carried out with success. Onias retained the high-priesthood till his death (B.C. cir. 226), when he was succeeded by his son Simon II (Josephus, Ant. 12:4).

3. The son of Simon II, who succeeded his father in the high-priesthood. B.C. cir. 198. In the interval which had elapsed since the government of his grandfather the Jews had transferred their allegiance to the Syrian monarchy (Dan 11:14), and for a time enjoyed tranquil prosperity. Internal dissensions furnished an occasion for the first act of oppression. Seleucus Philopator was informed by Simon, governor of the Temple, of the riches contained in the sacred treasury, and he made an attempt to seize them by force. At the prayer of Onias, according to the tradition (2Ma 3:1), the sacrilege was averted; but the high-priest was obliged to appeal to the king himself for support against the machinations of Simon. Not long afterwards Seleucus died (B.C. 175), and Onias found himself supplanted in the favor of Antiochus Epiphanes by his brother Jason, who received the high-priesthood from the king. Jason, in turn, was displaced by his youngest. brother Menelaus, who procured the murder of Onias (B.C. cir. 171), in anger at the reproof which he had received from him for his sacrilege (2Ma 4:32-38). But though his righteous zeal was thus fervent, the punishment which Antiochus inflicted on his murderer was a tribute to his “sober and modest behavior” (2Ma 4:37) after his deposition from his office. SEE ANDRONICUS.

It was probably during the government of Onias III that the communication between the Spartans and Jews took place (1Ma 12:19-23; Josephus, Ant. 12:4, 10). SEE SPARTANS. How powerful an impression he made upon his. contemporaries is seen from the remarkable account of the dream of Judas Maccabaeus before his great victory (2Ma 15:12-16).

4. The youngest brother of Onias III, who bore the same name, which he afterwards exchanged for Menelaus (Josephus, Ant. 12:5,1). SEE MENELAUS.

5. The son of Onias III, who sought a refuge in Egypt from the sedition and sacrilege which disgraced Jerusalem. The immediate occasion of his flight was the triumph of “the sons of Tobias,” gained by the interference of Antiochus Epiphanes. Onias, to whom the high-priesthood belonged by right, appears to have supported throughout the alliance with Egypt (Josephus, War, 1:1, 1), and receiving the protection of Ptolemy Philometor, he endeavored to give a unity to the Hellenistic Jews which seemed impossible for the Jews in Palestine. With this object he founded the temple at Leontopolis, which occupies a position in the history of the development of Judaism of which the importance is commonly overlooked; but the discussion of this attempt to consolidate Hellenism belongs to another place, though the connection of the attempt itself with Jewish history could not be wholly overlooked (Josephus, Ant. 13:3; War, l, c, 1; 7:10, 2; comp. Ewald, Gesch. 4:405 sq.; Herzfeld, Gesch. ii, 460 sq., 557 sq.).

## Onias, City Or Region Of[[@Headword:Onias, City Or Region Of]]

             the city in which stood the temple built by Onias, and the region of the Jewish settlements in Egypt. Ptolemy mentions the city as the capital of the Heliopolitic Nome: ῾Ηλιοπολίτης νομός καὶ μητρόπολις Ο᾿νίου (4:5, § 53); where the reading Ηλίου is not admissible, since Heliopolis is afterwards mentioned, and its different position distinctly laid down (§ 54). Josephus speaks of “the region of Onias,” Ο᾿νίου χώρα (Ant. 14:8, 1; War, 1:9, 4; comp. 7:10, 2), and mentions a place there situate called “the Camp of the Jews,” Ι᾿ουδαίων στρατόπεδον,(Ant. 14:8, 2; War, l, c.). In the spurious letters given by him in the account of the foundation of the temple of Onias, it is made to have been at Leontopolis in the Heliopolitic Nome, and called a strong place of Bubastis (Ant. 13:3, and 1, 2); and when speaking of its closing by the Romans, he says that it was in a region 180 stadia from Memphis, in the Heliopolitic Nome, where Onias had founded a castle (lit. watch-post, φρούριον War, 7:10, 2-4). Leontopolis was not in the Heliopolitic Nome, but in Ptolemy's time was the capital of the Leontopolitie (4:5, § 51), and the mention of it is altogether a blunder. There is probably also a confusion as to the city Bubastis; unless, indeed,  the temple which Onias adopted and restored was one of the Egyptian goddess of that name.

The site of the city of Onias is to be looked for in some one of those to the northward of Heliopolis which are called Tell. el-Yehud, “the Mound of the Jews,” or Tell el-Yehuldiyeh, “the Jewish Mound.” Sir Gardner Wilkinson thinks that there is little doubt that it is one which stands in the cultivated land near Shibin, to the northward of Heliopolis, in a direction a little to the east, at a distance of twelve miles. “Its mounds are of very great height.” He remarks that the distance from Memphis (29 miles) is greater than that given by Josephus; but the inaccuracy is not extreme. Another mound of the same name, standing on the edge of the desert, a short distance to the south of Belbeis, and 24 miles from Heliopolis, wouldl, he thinks, correspond to the Vicus Judaeorum of the Itinerary of Antoninus (see Modern Egypt and Thebes, 1:297-300). During the years 1842-1849 excavations were made in. the mound supposed by Sir Gardner Wilkinson to mark the site of the city of Onias. No result. however, was obtained but the discovery of portions of pavement very much resembling the Assyrian pavements now in the British Museum.

From the account of Josephus, and the name given to one of them, “the Camp of the Jews,” these settlements appear to have been of a half military nature. The chief of them seems to have been a strong place; and the same is apparently the case with another, that just mentioned, from the circumstances of the history even more than from its name. This name, though recalling the “Camp” where Psammetichus I established his Greek mercenaries (Magdolus), does not prove it was a military settlement, as the “Camp of the Tyrians” in Memphis (Herod. 2:112) was perhaps in its name a reminiscence of the Shepherd occupation, for there stood there a temple of “the Foreign Venus,” of which the age seems to be shown by a tablet of Amenoph II (B.C. cir. 1400) in the quarries opposite the city in which Ashtoreth is worshipped, or else it may have been a merchant settlement. We may also compare the Coptic name of El-Gizeh, opposite Cairo, Persioi, which has been ingeniously conjectured to record the position of a Persian camp. The easternmost part of Lower Egypt, be it remembered, was always chosen for great military settlements, in order to protect the country from the incursions of her enemies beyond that frontier. Here the first-Shepherd king Salatis placed an enormous garrison in the stronghold Avaris, the Zoan of the Bible (Manetho, ap. Josephus, c. Rev 1:14). Here foreign mercenaries of the Saitic kings of the 26th dynasty were settled;  here also the greatest body of the Egyptian soldiers had the lands allotted to them, all being established in the Delta (Herod. 2:164-166). Probably the Jewish settlements were established for the same purpose, more especially as the hatred of their inhabitants towards the kings of Syria would promise their opposing the strongest resistance in case of an invasion. The history of the Jewish cities of Egypt is a very obscure portion of that of the Hebrew nation. We know little more than the story of the foundation and overthrow of one of them, though we may infer that they were populous and politically important. It seems at first sight remarkable that we have no trace of any literature of these settlements; but as it would have been preserved to us by either the Jews of Palestine or those of Alexandria, both of whom must have looked upon the worshippers at the temple of Onias as schismatics, it could scarcely have been expected to have come down to us. See Frankel, “Zur Forschung ther den Oniastempel,” in the Monatsschr. fur Wiss. d. Judenth. 1:273 sq. SEE EGYPT.

## Onias, Ham-Magal[[@Headword:Onias, Ham-Magal]]

             (המעגל), an ancient rabbi, who was a contemporary of Simon ben- Shetach (q.v.) under the reign of Aristobulus II (B.C. 69-63), is especially reputed for his piety and the power of his prayers. When an unusual drought threatened the land with famine, a deputation of the Sanhedrim came to Onias to bespeak his prayers. At their request he entered a circle which he had traced in the ground (hence his surname the Rut), and did not leave it till in answer to his prayers rain descended — at first in drops, but afterwards in such quantity that he had again to intercede for its cessation. While the Sanhedrim voted thanks to the successful rabbi, Simon ben- Shetach, the president or nasi of the Sanhedrim, who disapproved of the embassy, and of Onias's conduct, as divulging the secretsof the Cabala (q.v.), sent the following characteristic message: “If thou hadst not been Onias, I would have excommunicated thee; for it would have been better for us to have suffered famine as in the days of Elias than that the name of the Lord should have been profaned by thee” (Talmud, tract Taanith, p. 23). This event is said to have taken place on the 20th of Adar, which is still marked in the Jewish calendar as a feast (comp. the art, SEE CALENDAR, under “Adar,” vol. 2, p. 23). But soon after this Onias met with a violent death at the hands of his brethren.

The occasion of it was the civil war in Palestine between the sons of king Alexander Jannaeus, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. Aristobulus forced the weak Hyrcanus to  abdicate. Anitipater, the father of Herod, sensible that the exaltation of a weak prince was the surest means of promoting his own schemes, persuaded Hyrcanus after his abdication to flee to Aretas, king of Arabia. Antipater gained Aretas for the cause of the fugitive prince, who was thus enabled to advance, at the head of a Jewish and Arab force, upon Jerusalem. Aristobulus, obliged precipitately to flee to Jerusalem, defended himself behind the Temple walls. It was at that stage that Onias was accidentally found by the superstitious army of Hyrcanus, and urged to .pronounce some magical curse against the defenders of the Temple. Unable to obey, he is recorded, instead of the desired curse, to have uttered the following prayer: “Lord God of heaven and King of the world, in whose hand are the hearts of all living, and the thoughts of the hearts of thy only people and of thy priests, direct thou their hearts, and do not hear their prayers against each other for evil, but only for good, seeing the one are thy people, the others thy priests.” He had scarcely pronounced this brief and patriotic supplication before the exasperated multitude let fly at him such volleys of stones as killed him on the spot. Josephus remarks that misdeeds so heinous called for speedy punishment. An awful storm shortly after the murder of Onias destroyed all the fruit and grain throughout Judaea, so that a measure of wheat sold for eleven drachms of silver, and all the people suffered grievously from famine. Se Josephus, Ant.:xiv. 2, 1; Otho, Historia Doctorum Misnicorum, p. 66 sq.; Frankel, Monatsschriff, 2:38; by the same author, דרכי המשנה,' or Hodegetica in Mischnamn (Leips. 1859), p. 40; Raphall, Post-Biblical History of the Jews (N.Y. 1866), 2:181 sq.; Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation (Edinburgh, 1857) p. 127 sq.; Gratz, Geschichte- der Juden (Leips. 1863), 4:133, 136; Derenbourg, Essai sur l'histoire et la geographie de la Palestine, d'aprs les Talmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques (Paris, 1867), p. 112 sq.; Milman, History of the Jews (N.Y. 1870), 2:50 sq.; ספר יוחסין השלם, or Liber Juchassin sive Lexicon Biographicum et Historicunm (ed. H. Filipowski, London, 1857), 15 sq.; Schurer, Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte (Leips. .1874), p. 133. (B. P.)

## Onion[[@Headword:Onion]]

             (בֶּצֶל, betsel, only found in Num 11:5, in the plural form בְּצָלַים, from the root בָּצִל, same as כּצִל, to peel; Sept. κρόμμυον; Vulg. caepe). The Israelites in Taberah, weeping for the flesh of Egypt, said: “We remember the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and  the melons, and the leeks and the onions (betsalim), and the garlic” (Num 11:4-5). Though the identification of many Biblical plants is considered uncertain, there can be no doubt that betsel means the common onion, the Alium cepa of botanists. This is proved by its Arabic name, and its early employment as an article of diet in Egypt. In the present day the onion, distinguished from other species of Allium by its fistular leaves and swelling stalks, is well known as cultivated in all parts of Europe aid in most parts of Asia. Its native country is not known; but it is probable that some part of the Persian region first produced it in a wild state, as many species of Aliudm are found in the mountainous chain which extends from the Caspian to Cashmere, and likewise in the Himalaya Mountains. It is common in Persia, where it is called piaz, and has long been introduced into India, where it receives the same name. By the Arabs it is called basl or bassal, under which name it is described in their works on Materia Medica, where the description of κρόμμυον given by Dioscorides (2:181) is adopted. That the onion has long been cultivated in the south of Europe and in the north of Asia is evident. from the different kinds enumerated by Theophrastus, which he states derived their names chiefly from the places where they were reared. Among these probably some other species may have been included; but no doubt several were varieties only of the onion. Pliny (Hist. Nat. 19:6) also enumerates these as well as others cultivated in Italy, and notices the superstition of the Egyptians in regard to them: “Where, by the way, I cannot overpass the foolish superstition of the Egyptians, who used to swear by garlick and onions, calling them to witness in taking their othes, as if they were no less than some gods” (Holland's transl.). Juvenal (Sat. 15:9) in like manner ridicules the Egyptians for their superstitious veneration of onions, etc.: “holy nation, that raises in gardens its inviolable divinities, the leeks and the onions!” This, however, must be an exaggerated statement, as it is unlikely that the Israelites should have been allowed to regale themselves upon what was considered too sacred for or forbidden to their taskmasters. It is probable, as suggested by Dr. Harris, that the priests only refrained from what was freely partaken of in the rest of the people.

This may be observed in the present day among the Brahmins of India. It has also been supposed that some particular kind of onion may have been held sacred, from its utility as a medicine. as the sea-onion, or squill (Scilla maritima), which grows in abundance on the sea-coast in the neighborhood of Pelusium, whose inhabitants are said by Lucian to have especially worshipped the onion. But it is evident that the Israelites in the desert did not long for that acrid bulb  as they did for the melons and cucumbers (Kitto). It may, moreover, be remarked that the onions of warm, dry countries grow to a considerable size, and instead of being acrid and pungent in taste, are comparatively bland and mild and nutritious articles of diet.' This is conspicuous in the Portugalonionis, which are largely imported into other countries; but it especially distinguishes the onions of Egypt, as travelers have often remarked (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians [Harpers' ed.], 1:169), they being an important part of the food of the nation (Herod. 2:125; comp. Wilkinson, 1:168 sq.) and a leading article of the markets (Sonini, Trav. 2:321; comp. Arvieux, Voyage, I, 176; Korte, Reis. p. 430). Hasselquist (Trav. p. 290) says, “Whoever has tasted onions in Egypt must allow that none can be had better in any other part of the universe: here they are sweet; in other countries they are nauseous and strong. They eat them roasted, cut into four pieces, with some bits of roasted meat which the Turks in Egypt call kebab; and with this dish they are so delighted that I have heard them wish they might enjoy it in Paradise. They likewise make a soup of them.” The Jews cultivated onions in Palestine, and the Talmud often mentions them (see Mishna, Terumoth, 2:5; 10:1; Meaaser. v. 8). Korte (Reis. p. 430) remarks that in Asia Minor also the onions are better than in Europe.

## Onkelos The Proselyte[[@Headword:Onkelos The Proselyte]]

             (אונקלוס הגר), son of Kalonymus (בר קלונימוס), is the supposed author of the celebrated Chaldee paraphrase of the Pentateuch called Targum Onkelos. We possess no certain data as to the time when he lived, but he is generally believed to have been a contemporary of Christ, or certainly of the apostles. Some assign A.D. 40 as the year of his birth; others make it earlier. He is reputed to have been a scholar of Gamaliel (q.v.); but, unless Onkelos was a contemporary of Christ, he must have been the disciple of Gamaliel II (q.v.), and not of the grandfather of the eminent rabbi, generally called in distinction Gamaliel I, who was the teacher of the apostle Paul (Act 22:3; comp. on this point Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 4:152). In the Tosiftha (Mikvaoth, vi; Kelim, 3:2; Chigigah, 3:1) Onkelos is spoken of as the disciple of Gamaliel II. This learned Jew was also the teacher of Aquila, and there are some students who confound Onkelos with Aquila, also a Jewish proselyte, who flourished about the close of the 1st century, and translated the Old Testament into Greek. But more of this below. Onkelos it appears clearly was a proselyte. His love for his newly adopted Jewish faith was. so  intense, we are told by Jewish writers, “that, after dividing his paternal inheritance with his brothers, he threw his portion into (מי המלח) the Dead Sea (Tosiftha Denai, 6:9), and when Gamaliel, his teacher in the new faith, died, Onkelos, out of reverence for him, burned at his funeral costly garments and furniture to the amount of seventy Tyrian mince =about twenty-one pounds sterling (Tosiftha- Sabbath, ch. viii; Semachoth, ch. viii; Aboda Sara, 11 a).

The Babylonian Talmud says that he was nephew of the emperor Titus (קלוניקוס בר אחתיה דטיטוס אונקלוס בר); and that before his conversion to Judaism he successively conjured up from the other World the ghosts of his uncle Titus, Balaam. and Christ, to inquire of them which nation is the happiest in the next world. Titus, whom he called up first, told him that the Jews were the happiest, but warned him against embracing their faith, because of the great difficulty in fulfilling all its multitudinous commandments, and advised him to persecute them, for every one who oppresses Israel shall become a chief (Lament. 1:5). Balaam, whom he brought up next, also told him that the Jews were the most distinguished in the other world, and yet admonished him “neither to seek their peace nor their prosperity all his days forever” (Deu 23:6); while Christ, whom he called up last, and who also declared that the Jews were the first in the next world, counseled him to seek their good and not their evil, for he who touches them touches the apple of his eyes (Gittin, 56 a, 57 b). Onkelos's conversion to Judaism, however, was no easy thing. For as soon as it was known that “Onkelos, son of Kalonycos, or. Kalonvmos, had become a proselyte, the emperor [either Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, or Hadrian, as Titus. was dead] sent a Roman cohort to capture him and bring him before the imperial tribunal; but he converted the soldiers. The emperor then sent another cohort, charging them not to speak to him. As they caught him and were marching him off; he simply remarked [בעלמא מלתא, without its appearing religious or controversial], the פיפיוראcarries the fire before the ניפיורא, the ניפיוראbefore the דוכסא=-dux, the dux before הגמונא= ἡγεμών, the ἡγεμών before the קומא= κόμης', but who carries the fire before the κόμης? The soldiers replied, Nobody. Now, said Onkelos, the Holy One, blessed be he, carries the fire before Israel, as it is written, The Lord went before them by day in a pillar of cloud to lead them in the way, and by night in a pillar of fire (Exo 13:21); and he also converted them. Whereupon the emperor sent a third cohort, charging them very strictly to hold no converse with him whatever. As they captured him, and were  leading him away, he looked at the Mezuza (q.v.), and, putting his hand on it, asked the soldiers what it was. They not being able to say, inquired of him what it was; whereupon he said, It is the custom of this world for a human king to sit inside his palace and for servants to guard him outside; whereas the Holy One, blessed be he, his servants are inside, and he keeps guard outside, as it is written, The Lord watches thy going out and coming in from this time forth and for evermore (Psa 121:8); and Onkelos also converted this cohort, whereupon the emperor sent no more” (A boda Sara, 11 a).

The first distinct intimation that Onkelos is the author or compiler of the Chaldee paraphrase which goes by his name is contained in the following passage: R. Jeremiah, and according to others, R. Chija bar-Abba, said: The Targum of the Pentateuch was made by Onkelos, the Proselyte, from the mouth of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua” (Megilla, 3 a). We are also informed here that Onkelos's paraphrase embodied the orally transmitted Chaldee version of the text which the people generally had forgotten. Being, therefore, the floating national Targum, as well as the compilation of Onkelos, the paraphrase is alternately quoted as we paraphrase (כדמתרגמינן),our Targums (תרגום דדן, Kiddushin, 49 a), the Targum has it (כתרגומו), the Targum (תרגום),and as the Targum Onkelos (אונקלוס תרגום). Thus the Targum is distinctly quoted as the paraphrase of Onkelos (תרגום אונקלוס) in Pirke Rabbi Eliezer (cap. 38, 28 a, ed. Lemherg, 185,8), a Midrash on the principal events recorded in the Pentateuch, which is ascribed to Eliezer b.-Hyrcanus, but which is not of a later date than the 9th century, SEE MIDRASH; by Ibn-Koreish, who flourished A.D. 870-900, SEE IBN-KOREISH; by Menachem b.-Saruk (born about 910, died about 970), who, in his lexicon entitled מחברת מנחם, says that (פתר אנקלוס) Onkelos explains ותשב באיתן קשתו(Gen 49:29) by בתוקפא רוחצניה ושוי(p. 23, s.v. איתן, ed. Filipowski. 1854); and by Dunash Ibn-Librat (born about 920, died about 980), in his polemical work against Menachem b.-Saruk's Hebrew Lexicon, who cites, with great approbation, Onkelos's rendering of וידגו לרב(Gen 48:16, וכנוני ימא יסגון יהיטב היטב פירש אונקלוס המתורגמן באומרו, ed. Filipowski. 1855, p. 57, s.v. וידגו; comp. also ibid. p. 61). Those writers alternately quote the Targum by the name of Onkelos, and simply as the Targum (תרגום; comp. Menachem, p. 144,  s.v. פחד; p. 143, s.v. פנק) and as it is paraphrased (תרגומו,- comp. ibid. p. 19, s.v. אזל). The same is the case with Rashi (born in 1010, died in 1105), who, though he distinctly quotes the' Targum of Onkelos (תרגום אונקלוס) no less than seventeen times in his Comment. on Genesis alone (comp. Comment. on Gen 6:6; Gen 14:7; Gen 18:23; Gen 20:13; Gen 22:2; Gen 24:21; Gen 33:12; Gen 36:4; Gen 43:18; Gen 49:9-11; Gen 49:17; Gen 49:24; Gen 49:27), yet still more frequently cites it simply as the Targum has it (כתרגומו, comp. Comment on Gen 11:6; Gen 12:17; Gen 13:11; Gen 14:6; Gen 14:14; Gen 14:17; Gen 15:2; Gen 15:11; Gen 16:14; Gen 17:1; Gen 19:15; Gen 19:18; Gen 20:17; Gen 22:3; Gen 24:64; al.), because everybody knew and believed that it was the Targum of Onkelos. That class of critics, however, who identify Onkelos with Aquila either ascribe to him both the Chaldee and Greek versions, or maintain that the former was made known by some unknown person or persons after the model of the latter, and therefore obtained the name Targum Onkelos, which means nothing else than Aquila Targum, or a Targum done in the manner of Aquila. The second is the more general view, and is defended by the following arguments:

1. The Jerusalem Talmud (Megilla, 1:9) relates: “R. Chija bar-Abba said, Akilas the Proselyte made a version under the auspices of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, and they praised him.”

2. This version, which is distinctly quoted by the name of the Targum of Akilas, the Proselyte (תירגם עקילס הגר), is Greek, and agrees for the most part with the fragments preserved of Aquila's translation.

3. The description given of עקילס— Aquila is almost the same as that given of אונקלוס: he is a heathen by birth, a native of Pontus, a relative of the emperor Hadrian (Midrash Tanchuma Parsha, משפטים), or, as Epiphanius calls him, πενθερίδες of the emperor (De Pond. et. Aiens. sec. 12); became a convert to Judaism and a disciple and friend of R. Gamaliel II, Eliezer, R. Joshua, and R. Akiba (Jerome in Iesaiam, 7:14; Jerusalem Kidlushin, 1:1), and made a version under the auspices of these heads of the Jewish community, which they greatly praised (Jerusalem Megilla, 1:2; Jerusalem Kiddushin, 1:2); and,

4. It is submitted that, unless the identity of Onkelos and Akilas be accepted, we must believe that two men were living simultaneously, of remarkably similar names, both relatives of the reigning emperor, both converts to Judaism, both disciples of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, and that  both translated the Bible under the auspices and with the approbation of these rabbins. These are the principal reasons which Levi, Frankel, Gritz, Geiger, Jost, Deutsch, and others adduce for the identification of the two names, and for taking Targum Onkelos to denote a Targum made after the manner of Akilas of Aquila, the Greek translator.

The style of the translation of the Pentateuch makes it almost certain that it was written in the first years of the Christian aera; another evidence, aside from the characteristics of the language, is its simplicity: it if literal, and not overloaded with the legendary explanations so common in subsequent Chaldaic paraphrases. It may be remarked, however, that there are some critics of post-biblical literature who pronounce this translation of Scripture ascribed to Onkelos, in its present shape at least, as late as the 3d and 4th centuries, and attribute the authorship to the Babylonian school. Jahn (Hebrew Antiquities) argues that the style does not authorize a later date than the 2d or 3d century. The Christian fathers Origen and Jerome do not mention this Targum, and therefore also some have preferred to give it a later origin; but this want of allusion on the part of these fathers may be accounted for by the circumstance that Origen did not know Chaldee, and that Jerome only learned it late in life. The Targum is said to be composed of the verbal teachings of Hillel, Shammai, and Gamaliel the elder. It is more likely, however, that the author availed himself of the paraphrases, either written or verbal, existing in the synagogues at his time, and that he combined and corrected them. The history of the origin and growth of Aramaic versions in general will be treated under SEE TARGUM.

In idiom Onkelos closely resembles Ezra and Daniel. The translation itself is executed in accordance with a sober and clear though not a slavish exegesis, and keeps closely to the text in most instances. In some cases, however, where the meaning is not clear, it expands into a brief explanation or paraphrase, uniting the latter sometimes with Haggadistic by-work, chosen with tact and taste, so as to please the people and not offend the dignity of the subject. Not unfrequently it differs entirely from the original, as far, e.g., as anthropomorphisms and anthropopathies — anything, in fact, which might seem derogatory to the Deity — are concerned. Further may be noticed a repugnance to bring the Divine Being into too close contact, as it were, with man, by the interposition of a kind of spiritual barrier (the “Word,” “Shechinah,” “Glory” ) when a conversation, or the like, is reported between God and man. Its use lies partly in a linguistic, partly in a theological direction; but little has been done for its study as yet.  The Targum has been inserted in all the polyglots.

The punctuation adopted in these works is very defective. Buxtorf the elder labored to correct it. but did not succeed completely. There are besides numerous other editions of it. The Jews, who esteem it highly, published it repeatedly either with or without the Hebrew text. ‘The oldest edition known is that of Bologna (1482, and the Hebrew text and commentaries by Sal. Jarchi). One of the most recent and best is that of Heinemann (Berlin, 1831-35, 3 pts. 8vo). It contains also the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, the commentaries of Sol. Jarchi, and Mendel's German version; but thus far no really critical edition has been prepared and published, notwithstanding the numerous MSS. of it extant in almost all the larger libraries of Europe. There are quite a number of translations of the Targum; noteworthy is that of Alphonse de Zamora in the polyglots of Alcala, Antwerp, Paris, and London, and at the end of the Vulgate of Venice (1609, fol.), and of that of Antwerp (1616, fol.), and also published separately (Antwerp, 1539, 8vo); that of Paul Fagius, Paraphrasis Onkeli Chaldaica, ex Chaldaeo in Latinum fidelissime versa (Strasb. 1546, fol.); that of Bernardin Baldi's MS. in the Albani library. Onkelos On the Pentateuch has been translated into English by Etheridge (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 12mo). Useful glosses and commentaries have been written by Berlin, entitled מיני תרגימא(Breslau, 1827; Wilna, 1836); by Luzzatto,. entitled אהב גר(Vienna, 1830); and by BenZion, called עוטה אור(Wilna, 1843). The MS. copies of Onkelos's Targum are very numerous; De Rossi possessed fifty-eight, and Wolf gives a long list of them in his Bibliotheca Hebraea, vol. 2. According to Richard Simon, the copies vary greatly from each other, especially in regard to the punctuation. See De Rossi, Dizionareio storico degli autori Ebrei, and his Meor .Encrjim, iii, cap. xlv, p. 233 b, sq. (Vienina, .1829); Simon, Histoire — critique du -Vieux Testament, lib. ii, ch. xviii; Eichhorns, Einleitung ins Alte Testament (2d ed.), 1:168 sq.; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebrcea, ii, lib. vi, ch. ii; Landau, Rub. - trasne. deutsch. Worterb. 1:11-16, 36-39; Schonfelder. Onkelos und Peschitho (Munich,1869,8vo); Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden, p. 61 sq.; Anger, De Onkeloso (Leipsic, 1846); Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 4:124 sq., 508 sq.; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2:61 sq., 551 sq., 609; Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums. 2:52 sq.

## Only-begotten[[@Headword:Only-begotten]]

             (μονογενής, from. μόνος, only, and γίνομαι, to be born), an epithet of Jesus Christ, expressive of his peculiar relation to the Godhead (Joh 1:14, etc.). The term properly means an only child (Luk 7:12). SEE SON OF GOD.

## Ono[[@Headword:Ono]]

             (Heb. Ono', אוֹנוֹ[Neh 7:37, אֹנוֹ], strong; Sept. ᾿Ωνώ, .but ᾿Ωνών ‘ in Neh 7:37, v. r. ᾿Ωνάν; and Αἰλάμ .r. r. Α᾿δάμ in Chron.), the name of a city of the tribe of Dan; and perhaps originally that of its founder. It does not appear in the catalogues of the book of Joshua, but is first found in 1Ch 8:12, where Shamed or Shamer is said to have built Ono and Lod with their “daughter villages.” It was therefore probe ably annexed by the Benjamites subsequently to their original settlement, like Aijalon, which was allotted to Dan, but is found afterwards, in the hands of the Benjamites (1Ch 8:13). The tradition of the Talmudists is that it was left intact by Joshua, but burned during the war of Gibeah (Jdg 20:48), and that 1Ch 8:12 describes its restoration. (See Targum on this latter passage.) The men of Lod, Hadid, and Ono, to the number of 725 (or Nehemiah 721), returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:33; Neh 7:37; see also 1Es 5:22). A valley ( בַּקְעָה) was attached to the town, and bore its name, “the plain of Ono” (Neh 6:2), perhaps identical with the “valley of craftsmen” (Nehemiah 11:56); and in any case a part or extension of the vale of Sharon. By Eusebius and Jerome Ono is not named. The rabbins frequently mention it, but without any indication of its position further than that it was three miles from Lod. (See the citations from the Talmud in Lightfoot [Chor. Decad on S. Mark, ch. ix, § 3] and Schwarz [Palest. p. 135]). A village called Kef- ‘Ana is enumerated by Robinson among the places in the districts of Ramleh and Lydd (Bib. Res. iii, - 1st ed. App. 120, 121). This village, almost due north of Ludd, is suggested bs Vain de Velde (Memoir. p. 337) as identical with Ono. Against the identification are the difference in the names — the modern one containing the letter Ain-. and the distance from Lydda, which, instead of being three milliaria, is fully five, being more than four English miles, according to Van de Velde's map. These difficulties, however, do not seem insuperable objections. Winer remarks that Beit Unia is more suitable as  far as its orthography is concerned; but on the other hand it is much too far distant from Ludd to meet the requirements of the passages quoted above.

## Ono (2)[[@Headword:Ono (2)]]

             The probable representative of this place, Kaf Ana, is laid down on the Ordnance Map at nearly five miles north by west of Ludd (Lydda), and described in the accompanying Memoirs (2:251) as "a mud village, surrounded with palms and other trees in gardens, and has a well (sebil) to the north."

## Onolatry[[@Headword:Onolatry]]

             (Gr. ὄνος, an ass. and λατρεία, worship), a form of animal worship, of which there are obscure. traces in some ancient authors, chiefly as a slander upon the Jews — (Walch, De cultu asinino, Schleus. 1769). SEE ASS.

## Onomacritus[[@Headword:Onomacritus]]

             a celebrated religious poet of ancient Greece, lived at Athens in the time of the Pisistratidae. He collected and expounded — according to Herodotus — the prophecies or oracles of Musseus; but is said to have been banished from the city by Hipparchus, about B.C. 516, on account of interpolating something of his own in these oracles. He then, we are told, followed the Pisistratidae into Persia, and while there was employed by them in a very dishonorable way. They got him to repeat to Xerxes all the ancient savings that seemed to favor his meditated invasion of Greece. Some critics, among whom is Aristotle, have inferred from a passage in Pausanias that Onomacritus is the author of most of the so-called Orphic hymns. More certain, however, is the view which represents him as the inventor of the great Orphic myth of Dionysus Zagreus, and the founder of Orphic religious societies and theology. Pausafiias states that “Onomacritus established orgies in honor of Dionlysus, and in his poems represented the Titans as the authors of the sufferings of Dionysus.” See Müller, Geschichte der Griech. Litteratur bis auf das Zeitalter Alexander's (Breslau, 1841); Grote, History of Greece, etc.

## Onquenira, Isaac Ben-Moses[[@Headword:Onquenira, Isaac Ben-Moses]]

             a rabbi who lived in the house of Don Joseph Nasi at Constantinople about the middle of the 16th century, published כִנַּדְגָּלוֹת אִיּוּמָה, Terrible as Bannered Hosts, (with reference: to the Son 6:4), an ethical poem, with an extensive commentary (Constantinople, 1571; Berlin, 1701): — a twofold commentary on Nachshon ben-Zadok's work, רְאוּמָהס, Revelator Arcanum (Constantinople, 1566): — he edited Don Joseph Nasi's יוֹסֵŠ בֵּן פּוֹרָת, a treatise written against such as disbelieve in religious philosophy, but believe in astrology (ibid. 1577): — and a treatise written against the Christians. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. iii. 48; De Rossi,  Bibliotheca Judaica Antichristiana, p. 41 sq. (Parma, 1800); by the same author, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 252 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Buxtorf, Bibl. rabbinica, p. 170; Hottinger, Bibl. Orientalis, p. 22; Bartolocci, Bibliotheca magna crabbinica, 3:889; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. ‘i. 646; Gratz, Geschichte d. Juden, 9:426; Wertheimer, Wiener Jahrbuch, 1856; J6cher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, 3:1077. (B. P.)

## Ontology[[@Headword:Ontology]]

             (from Greek ὄν and λόγος, i.e. the science of being) is, strictly speaking a synonyme of metaphysics (q.v.), but neither the one name nor the other was used by Aristotle. He called the science now designated by them philosophia prima, and defined it as ἐπιστήμη τοῦ ὄντος ῃ ὄντος — Scientia. Entis quatenus Entis — that is, the science of the essence of things; the science of the attributes and conditions of being in general, not of being in any given circumstances, not as physical or mathematical, but as being.

The science of ontology is regarded as comprehending investigations of every real existence, either beyond the sphere of the present world, or in any other way incapable of being the direct object of consciousness, or which can be deduced immediately from the possession of certain feelings or principles and faculties of the human soul (comp. Butler; Lectures on Ancient Philosophy, vol. 2). Watts thus defines it: “Ontology is a discourse of being in general, and the various or most universal modes or affections, as well as the several kinds or divisions of it. The word being here includes not only whatsoever actually is, but whatsoever can be” (On Ontology, ch. ii). The name ontology seems to have been first made current in philosophy by Wolf. He divided metaphysics into four parts: Ontology, psychology, rational cosmology, and theology. It was chiefly occupied with abstract inquiries into possibility; necessity, and contingency, substance, accident, cause, etc., without reference to the laws of our intellect by which we are constrained to believe in them. Kant denied that we have any knowledge of substance or cause as really existing. But there is a science of principles and causes, of the principles of being and knowing. In this view of it, ontology corresponds to metaphysics. Ontology may be treated of in two different methods, according as its exponent is a believer in τὸ ὄν or in τὰ ὄντα, in one or in many fundamental principles of things. In the former, all objects whatever are regarded as phenomenal modifications of one and the same substance, or as self-determined effects of one and the same cause.  The necessary result of this method is to reduce all metaphysical philosophy to a rational theology. the one substance or cause being identified with the Absolute or the Deity. According to the latter method, which professes to treat of different classes of beings independently, metaphysics will contain three co-ordinate branches of inquiry — rational cosmology, rational psychology, and rational theology. The first aims at a knowledge of the real essence, as distinguished from the phenomena of the material world; the second discusses the nature and origin, as distinguished from the faculties and affections; the third aspires to comprehend God himself, as cognizable a priori in his essential nature, apart from the indirect and relative indications furnished by his works, as in Natural Theology (q.v.), or by his Word, as in Revealed Religion (q.v.). These three objects of metaphysical inquiry God, the world, the mind-correspond to Kant's three ideas of the Pure Reason; and the object of his Kritik is to show that, in relation to all these, the attainment of a system of speculative philosophy is impossible (Mansel, Prolegom. Log. p.:272).

In theology the ontological argument has been freely employed, especially in the Middle Ages, regarding the Being of God. St. Augustine used it, so did Boethius; but it was left for Anselm to develop it fully. They all three inferred the existence of God from the existence of general ideas. Thus Augustine taught (De Lib. Arbitr. lib. ii, c. 3-15) that there are general ideas which have for every one the same objective validity, and are not (like the perceptions of sense) different and conditioned by the subjective apprehension. Among these are the mathematical truths, as 3+7=10; here, too, belongs the higher metaphysical truth — truth in itself, i.e. wisdom (veritas, sapientla). The absolute truth, however, which is necessarily demanded by the human mind, is God himself. Augustine asserts that man is composed of existence, life, and thinking, and shows that the last is the most excellent; hence he infers that that by which thinking is regulated, and which, therefore, must be superior to thinking itself, is the summum bonum. He finds this summum bonum in those general laws which every thinking person must acknowledge, and according to which he must form an Opinion respecting thinking itself. The sum total of these laws or rules is called truth or wisdom (veritas, sapientia). The absolute is, therefore, equal to truth itself. God is truth. (Comp. Ritter, Christl. Philippians 1:407- 411.) Boethius expresses himself still more definitely (De Consol. Philippians v. Prosa 10): he shows that empirical observation and the perception of the imperfect lead necessarily to the idea of perfection and its  reality in God. (Comp. Schleiermacher, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 166.) Of Anselm's argument we can here give only the heads; the thread of reasoning must be seen from the connection:

“Monol. I. Cum tam inuumtlerabilia bona sint; quorum tam.mnltam diversitatem et sensibus corporeis experimur et ratione mentis discernimus, estne credendum esse unum aliquid, per quod unum sunt bona, qusecunque bona saunt, ant sunt bona alia per aliud? III. Demique non solum omnia bona per idem aliquid sunt boina et omnia magna per idem aliquid sunt magna, sed quicquid est, per unumu aliquid videtur esse... Quoniam ergo cuncta quse sunt, Sunt per ipsum unum; procul dubio et ipsum sunum est per se ipsum. Qusecunque igitur alia sunt, sunt per alind, et ipsum solum per se ipsum. Ac quicquid est per aliud, ninus est quam illud, per quod cuncta sunt alia et quod solum est per se: quareillud, quod est per se, maxime omnium est. Est igitur unum aliquid, qnod solnm maxime.et summe omnium est; quod autem maxime omnium est et per quod est quicquid est bonilm vel magiram, et omnino qnicquid est aliquidc est, id necesse est esse summe bonum et summe magnum et summum omnium. que sunlt. Quare est aliquid, quod sive essentia, sive substantia, sive natura dicatur, optimum et maximum est et summum omnium quae sunt.”

The mode of argument which is found in Proslog. c. ii is more original (he there proceeds from the reality of the idea): The fool may say in his heart there is no God (Psa 14:1), but he thereby shows himself a fool, because he asserts something which is contradictory in itself. He has the idea of God in him, but denies its reality. But if God is given in idea, he must also exist in reality. Otherwise the real God, whose existence is conceivable, would be superior to the one who exists only in imagination, and consequently would be superior to the highest conceivable object, which is absurd; hence it follows that that beyond which nothing can be conceived to exist really exists (thus idea and reality coincide). If, therefore, the fool says, There is no God, he says it indeed, and may, perhaps, even think it. But there is a difference between thought and thought. To conceive a thing when the word is without meaning, e.g. that fire is water (a mere sound, an absurdity!), is very different from the case in which the thought corresponds with the word. It is only according to the former mode of thinking (which destroys the thought itself) that the fool can say, There is no God, but not according to the latter. See Ueberweg,  Hist. of Philos.' i,. 378, 383 sq;; 2:42, 49, 56, 104 sq., 148, 177, 497 sq.; M;Cosh, Intuition of God; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought; Morell, Hist. of Philos. 18th and 19th Cent. p. 653; Baur; Dogmengesch. vol. ii; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 1:325 sq.; Krauth's Vining, Voccbulary of Philos. s.v.; Cocker, Christianity and Greek Philos. p. 491-494.

## Onuphis[[@Headword:Onuphis]]

             one of the sacred bulls of the ancient Egyptians. It was of a black color, had shaggy recurved hair, and is supposed to have been the emblem of the retroceding sun.

## Onuphrius, Panvinius[[@Headword:Onuphrius, Panvinius]]

             a celebrated Augustinian monk of Italy, was born in 1529 at Verona. He applied himself especially to the study of ecclesiastical history, and continued the Lives of the Popes, begun by Platina, which he published, with a dedication to pope Pius V, in 1566. The work had been printed before at Venice in 1557 by his friend James Strada, who had forcibly taken the copy from him. Onuphrius afterwards marked several mistakes in the piece, and intended to correct them in a general history of the popes and cardinals, on which he was engaged when he died at Palermo, in Sicily,  in 1568. He published also, De prinmatu Petri: — Chronicun Ecclesiasticum: — De antiquo ritu baptizandi Cathecunzenos, et de origine baptizandi imagines: — Festi et triumphi Romanorum: — De Sibyllis:Comment. Reipub. Romance: — Comment. de triumpho: Comment. in fastos consulares: — Libri qucatuor de imper. Rom.: — De urbis Veronce viris illustribus: Civitas Roma: — De ritu sepeliendi mortuos apud veteres Christianos: — De prcecipuis urbis Romce basilicis. etc. Paulus Manutius, in Epistolis, calls him the “Helluo antiquarum historiarum;” and it is said that he acquired the title of the Father of History. It is certain he was beloved by two emperors, Ferdinand and his son Maximilian, as also by Philip II, king of Spain. — Onuphrius took for his emblem an ox standing between a plow and an altar, with this motto, “In utrumque paratus;” importing that he was equally ready to undergo the fatigues of divinity or those of human sciences. A magnificent marble monument, with his statue in bronze, was erected by his friends to his memory in the church of the Augustine monks at Rome.

## Onuphrius, St[[@Headword:Onuphrius, St]]

             (Onofrio, Honofrio, Onuphre), a hermit of the early Christian Church, went out from Thebes and passed sixty, years in the desert, during which time he never uttered a word except in prayer, nor saw a human face. His clothing was of leaves, and his hair and beard were uncut. He was thus seen by Paphnutins, who when he first saw him was filled with fear, believing him to be some strange wild beast; but when he saw that it was a man, he fell at his feet filled with reverence of his sanctity. Then Onuphrius recounted all he had endured in his solitude: how he had been tempted; had suffered from cold, heat, hunger, thirst, and sickness; and how God had sent angels to comfort, strengthen, and minister unto him. Then he begged Paphliutius to remain with him, as he was near to death. It was not long before he died, and Paphnutius covered his remains with one half of his cloak. Then he had a revelation that he should go into the world and make known the wonderful life and merits of him who had died. Many convents where silence and solitude are practiced are placed under the protection of this saint. Tasso died and is buried in the convent of St. Onofrio, in the Trastevere in Rome. He is represented as meagre and old; a stick in his hand, and a branch with leaves twisted about him. In many old pictures he looks more the beast than the man. Sometimes money; is lying at his feet, to signify his scorn of it. He is commemorated June 12. See Mrs. Jameson, Monastic Legends; Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Mythology, etc., s.v.

## Onus[[@Headword:Onus]]

             (᾿Ωνούς), a corrupt Graecized form (1Es 5:22) of the name of the town ONO SEE ONO (q.v.).

## Onyambe[[@Headword:Onyambe]]

             a wicked spirit much dreaded by the natives of Southern Guinea. The people seldom speak of him, and always manifest uneasiness when his name is mentioned in their presence. They do, not seem to regard this spirit as having much influence over the affairs of men.

## Onycha[[@Headword:Onycha]]

             a modified form of the Greek ὄνυξ, a finger-nail, is used in the A.V. for the Heb. שְׁחֵלֶת, sheche'leth (prop. a shell, from a root signifying to scale or peel off), which occurs only in Exo 30:34 (Sept. ὄνυξ; Vulg. onyx) as one of the ingredients of the sacred perfume. Similarly in Sir 24:15, wisdom is compared to the pleasant odor yielded by “galbanum, onyx, and sweet storax. Most versions, Hebrew interpreters and Talmudists, understand the Unguis odoratus, the well-known Constantinople “sweet-hoof' (Blatta Byzantina) of the shops. It consists of  the shells of several kinds of muscles, which when burned produce a scent similar to that of the castoreum. (See passages of Arabic and other authors in Bochart, Hieroz. 3:796 sq.) There can be little doubt that the ὄνυξ of Dioscorides (2:10) and the onyx of Pliny (32:10) are identical with the operculum of a Strombus, perhaps S. lenztiginosus. There is frequent mention of the onyx in the writings of Arabian authors, and it would appear from them that the operculum of several kinds of Strombus were prized as perfumes. The following is Dioscorides's description of the ὄνυξ: “The onyx is the operculum of a shell-fish resembling the purpura, which is found in India in the nard-producing lakes; it is odorous, because the shell- fish feed on the nard, and is collected after the heat has dried up the marshes: that is the best kind which comes from the Red Sea, and is whitish and shining; the Babylonian kind is dark, and. smaller than the other; both have a sweet odor when burned, something like castoreum.” It is not easy to see what Dioscorides can mean by “nard-producing lakes.”

The ὄνυξ, “‘nail,” or “claw,” seems to point to the operculum of the Strombid, which is of a claw shape and serrated, whence the Arabs call the mollusk “the devil's claw;” for Unguis odoratus, or Blatta Byzantina — for under both these terms apparently the devil-claw (Teufelsklau of the Germans) is alluded to in old English writers on Materia Medica has by some been supposed no longer to exist. Dr. Lister laments its loss, believing it to have been a good medicine, “from its strong aromatic smell.” Dr. Gray,; of the British Museum, says that the opercula of the different kinds of Strombidae agree with the figures of Blatta Byzantina and Unguis odoratus in the old books; with regard to the odor he writes, “The horny opercula when burned all emit an odor which some may call sweet, according to their fancy.” Mr. Daniel Hanbury procured some specimens in Damascus in October (1860), and a friend of his bought some in Alexandria a few months previously. The article appears to be always mixed with the opercula of some species of Fusus. As regards the perfume ascribed to this substance, it does not appear to deserve the character of the excellent odor which has been attributed to it, though it is not without an aromatic scent. See a figure of the true Blatta Byzantina in Matthiolus's Comment. In Dioscor. (2:8), where there is a long discussion on the subject; also a fig. of B. Byzant. and the operculum of Fusus in Pomet's Histoire des Drogues (1694, pt. ii, p. 97). “Mansfield Parkyns,” writes Mr. Hanbury, “in his Life in Abyssinia (1:419), mentions among the exports from Massowah a certain article called dufu, which he states is the  operculum of a shell, and that it is used in Nubia as a perfume, being burned with sandal-wood.”

Without this authority of the ancient versions, the Syriac etymology of the word, namely, to run in drops, exude, distil, would lead to the idea of a resinous and odoriferous substance of the vegetable kingdom. Accordingly Bochart (l. c.) would refer the word to a kind of resin called bdellium, a transparent aromatic gum found in Arabia; while Jarchi explains it of a smooth root, resembling a nail. Bahr gives the preference to this view (Symbol. 1:422), on the ground that the odor of the burned shells is not pleasant. But this is not a sufficient reason for rejecting the common explanation, as its properties might be essentially modified by mixture with other aromatic substances. Whatever is meant by the sea-nail, whether the shells or the operculum of any of the marine mollusca, the scale-like covering of their eggs, or any other production or part of an animal, it seems improbable that any such substance could have been one of the constituent spices of the most holy perfume; not only because we know of none bearing any powerful and agreeable odor, but specially because all marine creatures that were not finned and scaled fishes were unclean, and as such could not have been touched by the priests or used in the sanctuary. If, therefore, the substance denoted were of such an origin, it could only have been used by the Hebrews in ignorance of the fact. For further information on this subject, see Rumph, Amiboinische Rar-itdten- Kamnme,- cap. xvii, p. 48 (the German ed. Vienna, 1766); and comp. also Sprengel, Comm-enf. ad Dioscor. 2:10; Forskal, Desc. A sinm. p. 143 (“Unguis odoratus”); Philos. Transactions, 17:641; Johnston, Introd. to Conchol. p. 77; Gesennius, Thesaur. p. 1388.,

## Onychomancy[[@Headword:Onychomancy]]

             a species of divination anciently practiced by examining the nails of a boy. For this purpose they were covered with oil and soot and turned to the sun. The image represented by the reflection of the light upon the nails gave the answer required. SEE DIVINATION.

## Onymus, Adam Joseph[[@Headword:Onymus, Adam Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born March 29,1754, at Wurzburg, and died there September 9, 1836, doctor of theology, cathedral dean, and vicar-general. He is the author of, De Usu Intespretationis Allegoricac in Novi Foederis Tabulis (Bamberg, 1803): — Der 104. Psalm ubersetzt und mit Anmerkungen (Wiirzburg, 1807): — Die Weisheit Sirach's aus dem Griechischen mit Anmerkungen (1786-88): — Die Glaubenslehre der kathol. Kirche praktisch vorgetragen (Sulzbach, 1820-23, 3 parts): — Die SittenZlehre der kathol. Kirche in systematischer Form (1826): — Das Leben und die Lehre Jesu nach Matthaus, Markus, Lund Lukas in Homilien vorgetragen (1831): — Geschichte des Alten und Neuen Testaments (1789-97, 5 parts): — Romilien und Betrachtungen uber die Leidensgeschichte Jesu, seine Auferstehung u. Himmelfahrt (Wurzburg, 1827). See Furst, Bibl. Jud.  3:48 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:109, 233, 307, 317, 596; 2:118, 258, 402. (B.P.)

## Onyx[[@Headword:Onyx]]

             the uniform translation in the English version of the Hebrew word shoharn,שֹׁהִם, which occurs in eleven passages of the O.T. The renderings of the old interpreters are various, and often inconsistent with each other. The Sept. in Exo 25:7; Exo 35:9, renders σάρδιος, sardius; in Exo 28:9; Exo 39:6, σμάραγδος, smaragdus; in Eze 28:13, σάπφειρος, sapphire; elsewhere onyx or beryl. This strange inconsistency could spring only from ignorance and conjecture. Yet the Venetian MS. has always κρύσταλλος, crystal. The Sept. in Job (Job 28:16), with Symmachius (Gen 2:12; Exo 25:7), Josephus (Ant. 3:7, 6), and Jerome, (usually) understand the gem which was called by the Greeks ὄνυξ; onyx, from its resemblance in color to a human nail. This seems to be favored by comparing the similar Arabic root saham, denoting paleness (see Pliny, Hist. Nat. 37:6, 24; Edrisi, 1:150, ed. Jaubert). The shechem stone is mentioned (Gen 2:12) as a product of the land of Havilah. Two of these stones, upon which were engraven the names of the children of Israel, six on either stone, adorned the shoulders of the high-priest's ephod (Exo 28:9-12), and were to be worn as “stones of memorial” (see Kalisch on Exodus l.c.). Ashdham was also the second stone in the fourth row of the sacerdotal breastplate (Exo 28:20). Shohain stones were collected by David for adorning the Temple (1Ch 29:2). In Job 28:16, it is said that wisdom “cannot be valued with the gold of Ophir, with the precious shdham or the sapphire.” The shoham is mentioned as one of the treasures of the king of Tyre (Eze 28:13).

There is nothing in the contexts of the several passages where the Hebrew term occurs to help us to determine its signification. Braun (De Vest. sac. Heb. p. 727) has endeavored to show that the sardonyx is the stone indicated, and his remarks are well worthy of careful perusal. Josephus (Ant. 3:7, 5, and War, v. 5, 7) expressly states that the shoulder-stones of the high-priest were formed of two large sardonyxes, an onyx being, in his description, the second stone in the fourth row of the breastplate. The sardonyx, however, is but that variety of the. onyx in which white and reddish stripes alternate. Rosenmüller remarks (Bibl. Alterth. 4:1): “The onyx is not a transparent stone; but as the color of the flesh appears through the nail (in Greek called onyx) on the human body, so the reddish mass which is below shines delicately through the whitish surface of the onyx. There are several varieties of this stone, according to the manner in which thin strata of different colors alternate in it; white and reddish stripes alternating, form the sardonyx; white and reddish-gray, the chalcedonlyx; grayish-white and yellow-brown, the memphitonyx. The onyx most esteemed by the ancients had milk-white and brown or white and black strata. When polished, it has a fine lustre; it is easily wrought into a gem of great beauty. The different kinds of onyx have, from. early antiquity, been used for rings, for seals and cameos, and, accordingly, they are frequently  found in collections of antiques.” Braun traces shodham to the Arabic sachma, “blackness:” “Of such a color,” says he, “are the Arabian sardonyxes, which have a black ground-color.” This agrees essentially with Mr. King's remarks (Antique Gems, p. 9): “The Arabian species,” he says, “were formed of black or blue strata, covered by one of opaque white; over which again was a third of a vermilion color.” As to the “onyx” of Sir 24:15, SEE ONYCHA.

But the more usual interpretation of the Hebrew word shoham is beryl. This is the rendering given by the Syriac, the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, and the Sept. in two places (Exo 28:20; Exo 39:13); and it is supported by Bellermann (Urnim, p. 64), Winer (Real- Worterbuch, 1:283, 4th ed.), Rosenmüller (ut sup.), and others. This is the same stone called by the Sept. (Gen 2:12) λίθος πράσινος, the leek-stone, i.e. the stone of a leek-green color; Latin, porraceus. (But Schleussner, s.v., makes this the sardonyx.) According to Pliny (Hist. Nat. 37:5, 20), the beryl is found in India, and but rarely elsewhere, and is of the highest value when like the sea in color. SEE BERYL. For other explanations, see Wahlius, Asien, p. 856; Benfev, Encyclop. Halens. II, 17:14; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1370. SEE GEM.

## Oojein Version[[@Headword:Oojein Version]]

             SEE HINDUWEE, DIALECTS OF.

## Ooms, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Ooms, Jean Baptiste]]

             a Belgian mystical writer, was born at Ghele, in Brabant, near the middle of the 17th century. He studied at Falcon. College, Louvain, and became professor of theology at Ghent. He was made archpriest of the deanery of that city June 18, 1694, and confessor of the Capuchin nuns. He died at Giele July 24, 1710. Ooms wrote, Leven svan de edele joejrouw Francisca Taffin ( Ghent, 1717, 12mo): — Verclaerinzghe van het Leven en dte feysterien, van de alderheylityhste Mlaget en de Moeder Godes Maria, etc. (ibid. 1703-1706, 12mo): — Godtvruchtighe Ecclesiastyke Tleoblgie van de )Deughden, etc. (ibid. 1708-1712, 3 vols. 4to). See Sander, Flandria illustr. 1:241; Sweert, Necrol. p. 90; Paquiot, Men. pour l'hist. des Pays-Bas, xii 327-334.

## Oonsell, Guillaume Van[[@Headword:Oonsell, Guillaume Van]]

             a Flemish Roman Catholic preacher, was born at Antwerp August 9, 1571. He studied in Spain, and after his return to his native land joined the Dominicans at Ghent in 1593. After being for a while professor of theology at Anitwerl. He became successively sub-prior at Maestricht, prior at  Ghent and Bruges, and definitor of the province. He had at the same time great success as a preacher. Oonsell died at Ghent Sept. 3, 1630. He wrote, Clavis cellarii divinae et humanae sapientice (Antw. 1613, 12mo; Ghent, 1627, 12mo): — Pratum floridissinum concionun de tempore (Antw. 1617, 4 pts. 12mo): — Enchiridion concionatorumn, ex Roseto aureo Silvestri Prieratis (ibid. 1619, 12mo): Syntaxis instructissima S. Scripturce (ibid. 1622-1627, 12mo; Paris, 1682, 2 vols. 12mo): — Offcina sacra Biblica .(Douai. 1624, 12mo): — Hieroylyphica sacra (Antw. 1627, 12mo). See Echard et Quetif, Scriptores ord. Prcedicat. 1:551, 667 sq.; 2:7, 9, 465; Paquot, Memoires, vol. x.

## Oort, Lambrecht Van[[@Headword:Oort, Lambrecht Van]]

             a Flemish painter and architect, was born at Amersfort about 1520. He acquired considerable reputation as a historical painter, but was more distinguished as an architect. He resided chiefly at Antwerp, where he was received into the academy in 1547. In the museum at Antwerp is a picture of the Resurrection of Christ by him, and in that of Brussels are two representing the Adoration of the Shepherds and the Descent from the Cross.

## Ooscopy[[@Headword:Ooscopy]]

             (fr. ὤον, an egg, and σκοπἐω, to observe), a method of divination by the examination of eggs. SEE DIVINATION.

## Oost, Jacob van The Elder[[@Headword:Oost, Jacob van The Elder]]

             an eminent Flemish painter, was born at Bruges about 1600. It is not known under whom he first studied, but in 1621 he painted an altar-piece for one of the churches in his native city, which excited the surprise and admiration of contemporary artists. Being ambitious of further improvement, he went to Rome, where he attentively studied the works of the great masters, and made those of Caracci the particular objects of his imitation. During his residence in that metropolis Van Oost produced several works of his own composition, so much in the style of the great artist that they astonished the best connoisseurs at Rome, and gained him great reputation. After a residence of five years in Italy, the love of country induced him to return to Bruges, where his talents had excited the most sanguine expectations even before he had gone abroad. Immediately on his arrival home he was loaded with commissions, and during the remainder of  his life he continued to exercise his talents with undiminished reputation. He executed an incredible number of works for the churches and public edifices, as well as for the private collections of his country, particularly of Bruges. He also excelled in portraits, and painted many distinguished personages. His most famous works are, the Nativity, in the church of St. Savior; the Resurrection, in the cathedral; a grand composition; and the Descent from the Cross, in the church of the Jesuits at Brtuges, which last is considered his masterpiece. Most of his pictures are of large size. He died at Bruges in 1671. Van Oost is justly ranked among the ablest artists of the Flemish school. His first studies were the works of Rubens and Vandyck, and from them he acquired that freshness and purity of coloring for which his works are distinguished. Following the example of the greatest masters, his compositions are simple and studied, and he avoided crowding them with figures not essential to his subject. In his design, and in the expression of his heads, he seems always to have had in view the great style of Caracci. The backgrounds of his pictures are generally enriched with noble architecture, of which he was a perfect master. He had a ready invention, and, though he wrought with extraordinary facility of pencil, his works are well finished. See Descamps, La vie des peintres Flammands, 1:264, 280, 285; Pilkington, Dict. of Painters, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts vol. ii, s.v.

## Oost, Jacob van, The Younger[[@Headword:Oost, Jacob van, The Younger]]

             son and pupil of the preceding, was born at Bruges in 1637. At twenty years of age his father sent him to Italy to complete his education, and, after having resided there several years, he returned to Flanders an able and accomplished designer. He painted some pictures for the churches at Bruges, and then settled permanently a Lille, where he acquired a distinguished reputation, and where are the greater part of his works. His historica pictures, like those of his father, are admirably composed, partaking more of the Roman than the Flemish school. Among his best works are the Martyrdom of St. Barbara, in the church of'St. Stephen; and the Transfiguration, in the church of St. Savior, at Lille He was less eminent than his father as a historical painter, but excelled him in portraits, which some have not hesitated to rank with those of Vandyck. Jacol van Oost, Jun., died in 1713. See Spooner, Biog. Hist of the Fine Arts, vol. ii, s.v.; and Descamps, referred to in the preceding article.

## Oosterzee, Johann Jacob Van[[@Headword:Oosterzee, Johann Jacob Van]]

             a noted Dutch theologian, was born April 1, 1817, at Rotterdam. He studied at Utrecht, and on leaving the university in 1840 was made doctor of theology for presenting his Disputatio Theologica de Jesu, e Virgine Maria Nato. In 1841 he was preacher at Eemnes, in 1843 at Alkmaar, in 1844 at Rotterdam. In 1862 he became professor of theology at Utrecht, and opened his lectures with a Latin oration, De Scepticismo Hodiernis Theologis Caute Vitando. Oosterzee lectured upon almost all the branches of theology, and soon became the recognized leader of the evangelical school of Holland. In learning, eloquence, and piety he ranked with the greatest divines of his age. He was also a voluminous writer. Several of his works have been translated, and commend themselves very highly to practical and conservative religious minds in Great Britain and America.

Oosterzee died July 29, 1882, at Wiesbaden, Germany, where he had gone to restore his broken health. Besides his opening addresses, as, Hoe moet het modern Naturalisme bestreden werden? (1863): — Zollen wij nog Theologie studeeren of niet? (1865): — Welke Theologie is in Staat, de Stormen van dezen Dagen te verduren? (1866): — Van welke Theologen is iets goeds voor de Toekomst der Kerk te verwachten? (1867): — and valuable essays which he published in the Jaarboeken voor wetenschappelijke Theologie, edited by himself, and in other reviews, we mention, Jacques Saurin (1855): — Christologie des Oude en Nieuwe Verbonds (1855-57, 2 parts): — Het Leven van Jezus (2d ed. 1863-65): — Historie of Roman? het Leven van Jezus door Renan vorlooping toegelicht (1863): — Het Johannes Evangelie, een viertal apologetische Voorlezingen (1867): — De Theologie des Nieuwven Verbonds (2d ed. 1872; Engl. transl. Lond. 1870; 4th ed. 1882): — Voor Keork en Theologie, Mededeelingen en Bijdragen (1871-75, 2 parts): — Christelijke Dogmatick (2d ed. 1876, 2 parts; Engl. transl., Lond. and New York, 1874; 2d ed. 1878): — Practische Theologie (Engl. transl. 1878, 2 parts): — Theopneustie (1882). For Lange's Bible Work Oosterzee wrote the commentary on Luke (1859; Engl. transl. New York, 1866); the  Pastoral Epistles and Philemon (1861; transl. 1868); and with Lange he prepared the commentary on James's epistle (1862; Engl. transl. 1867). His Sermons comprise twelve volumes. Oosterzee left an autobiography and a work upon apologetics. See Zickler, in Beweis des Glaubens, 1882; Evans, in Catholic Presbyterian, October 1882; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:959; Neue evangel. Kirchenzeitung, 1882, No. 36; Luthardt, Lutherische Kirchenzeitung, 1882, col. 810. (B.P.)

## Opalia[[@Headword:Opalia]]

             a festival celebrated by the ancient Romans in honor of Ops, the wife of Saturn, on Dec. 19 being the third of the Saturnalia. The vows made of this occasion were offered in a sitting posture, the devotee touching the ground, because Ops represented the earth.

## Open-air Preaching[[@Headword:Open-air Preaching]]

             SEE PREACHING.

## Opera Supererogationis[[@Headword:Opera Supererogationis]]

             SEE SUPEREROGATION, WORKS OF.

## Operatio Sacra[[@Headword:Operatio Sacra]]

             i.e. sacred ministration, is a term which was used in the ancient churches of the West to designate the Lord's Supper. It is supposed to have been derived from the expression ministering the gospel of God (Rom 15:16), and is used in the same general and figurative sense.

## Operation of the Holy Ghost[[@Headword:Operation of the Holy Ghost]]

             SEE HOLY GHOST; SEE SPIRIT.

## Operation of the Mind[[@Headword:Operation of the Mind]]

             is that action of the mental faculty which gives us consciousness of possession. We know that we have a stomach, but are not made conscious of its possession until it is impaired, and so with every other physical part. Quite differently do we become aware of the possession of mental or, better, spiritual faculties. It is in their healthy condition that we are most thoroughly conscious of such property. SEE MIND. “By the operations of the mind,” says Dr. Reid (Intell. Powers, essay 1, ch. 1), “‘we understand every mode of thinking of which we are conscious.” In all language the various modes of thinking have always been designated by this term, or one of like import. It is used to establish clearly the distinction of mind from matter. The former is from its very nature a living and active being. Everything we know of it implies life and active energy; and “the reason why all its modes of thinking are called its operations is that in all, or in most of them, it is not merely passive, as a body is, but is really and properly active” (Reid). To body we simply ascribe certain properties, but  not operations, properly so called: it is extended, divisible, movable, inert; it continues in any state in which it is put; every change of its state is the effect of some force impressed upon it, and is exactly proportional to the force impressed, and in the precise direction of that force. These are the general properties of matter, and these are not operations; on the contrary, they all imply its being a dead, inactive thing; which moves only as it is moved, and acts only by being acted upon. See Krauth's Fleming, Vocab. of Philos. s.v.

## Opfergeld Friedrich[[@Headword:Opfergeld Friedrich]]

             a German theologian, was born in Breslau in 1668. After having been pastor at Festenberg and Nauen, he became in 1721 provost of the convent of Notre Dame at Magdeburg. He died in 1740. We have of his works, Sonderbare Feste (Brug. 1696, 12mo): — Bibliotheca sacra (Magdeburg, 1728, 8vo): — Nachricht von den judischen Lehresrn und von ihren zur Exegese gehorigen Schruften (Halle, 1738, 8vo). See Moser, Lexikon der jetztlebenden Theologoen, and its continuation by Neubauer.

## Ophel[[@Headword:Ophel]]

             (Heb. always with the article, ha-O'phel, הָעֹפֵל,the knoll, as in Micah 4, 8 Sept. ᾿Ωφάλ, Neh 3:26; Ο᾿φλά, Neh 3:27; v. r. Ο᾿πελ, Ο᾿πλά; Vulg. Ophel), the name of two places in Palestine.

1. A fortified place or quarter of Jerusalem near the walls (2Ch 27:3), on the east side, inhabited by the Nethinim after the rebuilding of the city (Neh 3:26; Neh 11:21). Ophel, or as he calls it; Ophla (οΟ῾᾿φλά), is often mentioned by Josephus as adjoining the valley of the Kidron and the Temple mount (War, 2:17, 9; 5. 6, 1). He explains himself more precisely in v. 4, 2, where he makes the first wall of the city to extend from the tower of the Essenes over Siloam and the pools of Solomon to Ophel, where the latter joins the eastern porch of the Temple, i.e. at its southern extremity. Hence there can be no doubt that the hill Ophel was the steep southern projection from the mountain on which the Temple stood, — aid that in the ancient city it was covered with houses — (Josephus, War, v. 6, 3). Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. 1:394) describes it as a ridge extending south from Moriah to Siloam, between the deep valley of Jehoshaphat on the east, and the steep but shallower Tyropoeon valley on the west. The top of this ridge is flat, descending rapidly towards the south, sometimes by Offsets of rocks; and the ground is now tilled and planted  with olive and other fruit trees. This ridge is considerably below the level of Mount Moriah; its length is 1550 feet, and its breadth in the middle part, from brow to brow, 290 feet. The excavations of the English engineers have shown that it was originally separated from Moriah by a considerable gully, but the ancient wall has been discovered joining it with the Temple near the south-east angle. SEE JERUSALEM.

2. A place in Central Palestine, in which was the house where Gehazi, Elisha's servant, stowed away the presents which he took from Naaman in the name of his master (2Ki 5:24). SEE GEHAZI; SEE NAAMAN. In the Auth. Vers. it is wrongly rendered “the tower;” margin, “the secret place,” after the Sept. (τὸσκοτεινόν). As the name means hill, it is probably here the name especially of an elevation in the immediate vicinity of the city of Samaria. Comp. Viervot, Bibl. Brem. Nov. 2:137 sq.

## Opher[[@Headword:Opher]]

             SEE ROE.

## Ophereth[[@Headword:Ophereth]]

             SEE LEAD.

## Ophiomancy[[@Headword:Ophiomancy]]

             (ὄφις, a serpent, and μαντεία, divination), a species of divination practiced in ancient times by means of serpents. SEE DIVINATION.

## Ophir[[@Headword:Ophir]]

             (Heb. Ophir', אוֹפַירand אוֹפַר), the name of a man and of a country. “There is apparently no sufficient reason to doubt that the word Ophir is Shemitic, although, as is the case with numerous proper names known to be of Hebrew origin, the precise word does not occur as a common name in the Bible. See the words from אפרand עפרin Gesenius's: Thesaurus, and compare Α᾿φάρ, the metropolis of the Sabaans in the Periplus, attributed to Arrian. Gesenius suggests that it means a ‘fruitful region,' if it is Shemitic. Baron von Wrede, who explored Hadhramaut, in Arabia; in 1843 (Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, 14:110); made a small vocabulary of Himyaritic words in the vernacular tongue, and among these he gives ofir as signifying red. He says that the Mahra people call themselves the tribes of the red country (ofir), and call the Red Sea bahr  ofir. If this were so, it might have somewhat of the same relation to aphar, ‘dust' or ‘dry ground' ( אand עbeing interchangeable) that adorn, ‘red,' has to adamah, ‘the ground.' Still it is unsafe to accept the use of a word of this kind on the authority of any one traveler, however accurate.”

1. (אוֹפֹר; Sept. Οὐφείρ; Vulg. Ophir.) The eleventh named of the thirteen sons of Joktan, the son of Eber, a great-grandson of Shem (Gen 10:26-29; 1Ch 1:23). B.C. post 2450, Many Arabian countries. are believed to have been peopled by these persons, and to have been called after their respective names, as Sheba, etc., and among others Ophir (Bochart, Phaleg, 3:15). SEE ARABIA.

2. (אוֹפַיר; Sept. Οὐφίρ Οὐφείρ, v. r. Σουφίρ; etc.; Vulg. Ophir). A region, famous for its gold, which the ships of Solomon and of the Phoenicians visited. It is difficult to ascertain its situation, the Scripture indications being few and indefinite. By comparing the passages in which it is mentioned (1Ki 9:26; 1Ki 9:28; 1Ki 10:11; 1Ki 22:49; so 2Ch 8:18; 2Ch 9:10), we learn that it was reached by fleets fitted out in Ezion-Geber (q.v.), on the Gulf of Akabah — the eastern arm of the Red Seain the territory of the Edomites; that the ships made the voyage once in three years (comp. 1Ki 10:22), bringing large amounts of gold to Palestine, besides silver, precious stones, red sandal-wood, ivory, apes, and peacocks. We know further, from various allusions in the poetical and prophetical books, that Ophir produced the purest and most precious gold then known (Job 20:11; Job 20:24; Job 28:16; Psa 45:9; Isa 13:12; Ecc 7:18; ton which may be added Jer 10:9; Dan 10:5, if, with many interpreters, we understand Uphaz, אוּפָז, to be simply a varied orthography of Ophir' אוֹפַר; but SEE UPHAZ ).

It is evident that any attempt to determine the precise region intended must be more or less uncertain; but the extreme latitude which conjecture has taken on this question seems hardly justifiable. Nearly every place where gold has ever been found is understood by some writer or another as Ophir. “Calmet (Diet. of the Bible, s.v.) regarded it as in Armenia; — Sir Walter Raleigh (Hist. of the World, bk. 1, ch. 8) thought it was one of the Molucca Islands; and Arias Montanus (Bochart, Phaleg, Pref. and ch. 9), led by the similarity of the word Parvaim, supposed to be identical with Ophir (2Ch 3:6), found it in Pert. But these countries, as well as Iberia and Phrygia, cannot now be viewed as affording matter for serious discussion — on this point, and the three opinions which have found supporters in our  Own time were formerly represented, among other writers, by Huet (Sur le Commerce et la Navigation des Anciens, — p. 59), by Bruce (Travels, bk. 2, ch. 4), and by the historian Robertson (Disquisition respecting Ancient India, sec. i), who placed Ophir in Afirica; by Vitringa (Geograph. Sacra, p. 114) and Reland (Dissertatio de Ophir), who placed it in Indic; and by Michaelis (Spicilegium, 2:184), Niebuhr, the traveler (Description de l'A rabie, p. 253), Gossellin (Recherches sur la Geographie des Anciens, 2:99), and Vincent (History of the Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients, 2:265-270), who placed it in Arabia. Of other distinguished geographical writers, Bochart (Phaleg, 2:27) admitted two Ophirs, one in Arabia and one in India, i.e. at Ceylon; while D'Anville (Dissertation sur le Pays d'Ophir, Memoires de la Litterature, 30:83), equally admitting two, placed one in Arabia and one in Africa. In our own days the discussion has been continued by Gesenius, who in articles on Ophir in his Thesaurus (p. 1141), and in Ersch and Gruber's Encyklopadie (s.v.), stated that the question lay between India and Arabia, assigning the reasons to be urged in favor of each of these countries, but declared the arguments for each to be so equally balanced that he refrained from expressing any opinion of his own on the subject. M. Quatremere, however, in a paper on Ophir which was printed in 1842 in the Memoires de l'institut, again insisted on the claims of Africa (Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, t. 15, 2:362); and in his valuable work on Ceylon (pt. vii, ch. i) Sir J. Emerson Tennant adopts the opinion, sanctioned by Josephus, that Malacca was Ophir. Otherwise the two countries which have divided the opinions of the learned have been India and Arabia — Lassen. Ritter, Bertheau (Exeget. Handbuch, 2Ch 8:18), Thenius (Exeget. Handbuch, 1Ki 10:22), and Ewald (Geschichte, 3:347, 2d ed.) being in favor of India, while Winer (Realw.s.v.), First (Hebr. und Chald. Handw. s.v.), Knobel (Vletcafel der Genesis, p. 190), Forster (Geogr. of Arabia, 1:161-167), Crawfurd (Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands, s.v.), and Kalisch (Commentary on Genesis, chap. ‘The Genealogy of Nations') are in favor of Arabia. The fullest treatise on the question is that of Ritter, who in his Erdkunde (vol. 19, published in 1848) devoted eighty octavo pages to the discussion (p. 351-431), and adopted the opinion of Lassen (Inud. Alt. 1:529) that Ophir was situated at the mouth of the Indus.” Melind'dh, on the coast of Africa, Angola, Carthage, San Domningo Mexico, New Guinea, Uiphe, an island in the Red Sea, Ormuz, in the Persian Gulf, and especially Peru, have had their several advocates; but the opinions likely to be embraced at this day may be enumerated very briefly:

1. Some suppose Ophir to be a general name for lands abounding in gold, used with the vagueness of Thule in the classics, or El Dorado in the Middle Ages. In support of this view, it has been observed that, in Arabic, the word Ophir means simply rich country, or perhaps dust, i.e. gold-dust, and may therefore have easily passed into a generic name for the sources of valuable articles of commerce; especially in an age when the geographical views, even of the best informed, were very vague. But the definiteness of the allusions' in the Scripture history to Ophir as a well-known trading place are quite sufficient to refute this view.

2. Some seek it on the eastern coast of Africa, opposite the island of Madagascar. This supposition has found many and able supporters (see Quatremere, Mim. de l'Acad. des Inscrip. XV, ii [1845, 349-402; Heeren, Researches, 2:73, 74' [Eng. ed.]; Huetius, De Navig. Salom. ch. ii, in Ugolini, Thes. vol. vii; Bruce, p. 479 sq.; Ritter, Erdk, 1:118 sq.; Weston, in the Classic. Jour. 1821, No. 47), having been first advanced by one friar John don Sanctos, who was a resident of Sofala, in Monomotopa, and found in that vicinity a mountain with ancient ruins on its summit. According to friar John, this mountain still contains “much fine gold,” and is called Fura, which he thinks to be evidently a corruption of Ophir. (See this view confuted by Tychsen, Anmerk. zu Bruce R. V. p. 327 sq.; and esp. Salt, Voyage to Abyssinia [Lond. 1814], p. 99 sq.) But Huetius (as cited above) has argued the question on more general grounds, deriving the name Africa itself from Ophir, and making no doubt that the inscriptions said to have been found at Sofala, but never read, were a record or kind of log-book of the fleets of Solomon. The name Sofala, again, has been urged in favor of this view, as akin with Ophir; but Sofala in the Shemitic languages means the low country, the coast-land (Heb. Shephelah, שְׁפֵלָה; similarly the Chaldee and Arabic), ‘and has nothing to do with Ophir (אוֹפַר).

3. A much more probable view-is that which refers Ophir to Arabia. This has been advanced in a variety of forms, but usually placing the port visited by Solomon's ships near the western extremity of the southern coast, bordering on the Erythrsean-Sea. In Gen 10:29, Ophir is mentioned among the sons of Joktan, who peopled various Arabian countries. (See Ophir, 1, above.) Yet Gesenius supposes that it is here the name of an Arabian tribe who colonized some foreign land. Again, though gold is not now found in Arabia (Niebuhr, Description de l'Arabie [Copenhagen,  1773], p. 124), yet the ancients ascribe it to the inhabitants in great plenty (Jdg 8:24; Jdg 8:26; 2 Chronicles 1; 1Ki 10:1-2; Psa 72:15). This gold, Dr. Lee thinks, was no other than the gold of Havilah (Gen 2:11), which he supposes to have been situated somewhere in Arabia and refers to Gen 10:7; Gen 10:29; Gen 25:18; 1Sa 15:7; 1Ch 1:9 (Translation of the Book of Job, etc. [Lond. 1837], p. 55). But Diodorus Siculus ascribes gold-mines to Arabia (2:50). He also testifies to the abundance of “precious stones” in Arabia (2:54), especially among the inhabitants of Sabas (3:46; comp. Gen 2:12; 2Ch 9:1; 1Ki 10:1-2). Pliny also speaks of the wealth of Sabea in gold (Hist. Nat. 6:32). Others suppose that, though Ophir was situated somewhere on the coast of Arabia, it was rather an emporium. (see Beke, Source of the Nile, p. 64), at which the Hebrews and Tyrians obtained gold, silver, ivory, apes, almugtrees, etc., brought thither from India and Africa by the Arabian merchaits, and even from Ethiopia, to which Herodotus (3:114) ascribes gold in great quantities, elephants' teeth, and trees and shrubs of every kind. Apes, properly speaking, are likewise ascribed to it by Pliny (8:19), who speaks also of the confluence of merchandise in Arabia (ut sup.; comp. Strabo, xvi; 2 Chronicles 9; Eze 27:21-22; Diod. Sic. 2:54). It has further been insisted that the classical name of the Arabian port Aphar varies much as the Septuagint translation of Ophir. Thus it is called by Arrian Aphar, by Pliny Saphar, by Ptolemy Sapphera, and by Stephanus Saphirini. (Comp. the Sept. ut sup.) It is a serious objection to this view, however, that land carriage, by caravans, would have been easier and safer if Ophir were in Arabia (comp. Encyclop. Londin. s.v.), while the etymological arguments, so often and earnestly pressed as conclusive, could at best only serve to create a presumption, in the absence of all direct evidence. The considerations above mentioned, however, in connection with the strong reasons for placing Ophir in India, weighed so strongly with Bochart (Phaleg, 2:27) and Michaelis (Spicil. 2:185) that they suppose two countries of that name, one in Arabia and one in India. This conjecture, however, is unsupported and unnecessary (Gesen. Thes. p. 141).

4. On the whole, then, India must be adopted as the most probable region of the Ophir of Solomon. The Sept. translators also appear to have understood it to be India, from rendering the word Σωφίρ, Σουφίρ, Σωφιρά, which is the Egyptian name for that country. Champollion says that in the Coptic vocabularies India bears the name Sophir (L'Egypte sous  les Pharaons [Paris, 1814], 1:98; Jablonskii Opuscula [Lug. Bat. 1804], 1:336, etc.). Josephus also gives to the sons of Joktan the locality from Cophen, an Indian river, and in part of Aria adjoining it (Ant. 1:6, 4). He also expressly and unhesitatingly affirms that the land to which Solomon sent for gold was “anciently called Ophir, but now the Aurea Chersonesus, which belongs to India” (Ant. 8:6, 4). The Vulgate renders the words “the gold of Ophir” (Job 28:16) by “tiictis Indiae coloribus.” Hesychius defines Sophir (Eovaeip) “a place in India where gems and gold are found.” So Suidas (s.v.; comp. Eusebius, Onomast. p. 146, ed. Clerici). But the controlling argument for this view is that all the productions referred to Ophir ‘may be procured in India, and in India alone. Gold, silver, jewels, sandal-wood, ivory, apes, and peacocks are there all articles of commerce, and are found side by side in no other part of the world; while the last is believed to be an exclusively Indian bird, and the very name by which it is denoted in the Hebrew text (tukiyim, תּוּכַיַּים[see Gesen. Thes. s.v.]) is an Indian, not a Hebrew word. SEE PEACOCK. Yet the exact locality must ever remain conjectural. There are several places comprised in that region which was actually known as India to the ancients, any of which would have supplied the cargo of Solomon's fleet: for instance, the coast of Malabar, where the name togoei is still applied to the peacock; and Malacca, which is known to have been “the golden Chersonesus” of the classic writers, and where gold-mines are still called ophirs. (See P. Poivre, Voyage d'un Philosophe, OEuvres Completes, 1797, p. 123.)

See further, Humboldt, Cosmos, 2:132 sq.; C. Varrer, in Crit. Sacr. 6:459; A. G. Wahner, De regione Ophir (Helmst. 1714); Tychsen, De commerc. — Hebr. in the Comment. Gott. 16:164 sq.; Gesenius, in the Hall. Encycl. vol. iii, sect. iv, p. 201 sq., and Thesaur. 1:141 sq.; Rosenmüller, Alterth. 3:177 sq.; Ritter, Erdk. 2:201 sq.; Keil, in the Ddrpt. Beitrig. 2:233 sq.; Tuch, in the Hall. Lif. — Zeit. 1835, No. 80 sq.; Lassen, Ind. Alterthumsk. 1:538 sq.; Kitto, Daily Bible Illust. Solomon, p. 103 sq.; Htillman, Staatsverf. d. Israel. p. 220; Hardt, Diss. Regionem Ophir esse Phrygiam (1746). SEE TARSHISH.

## Ophites[[@Headword:Ophites]]

             (Gr. ῤφίται. i.e. serpent brethren, from ὄφις, a serpent) is the name of an Egyptian sect of Christians who are regarded as a branch of the Gnostics (q.v.); but while the Ophites shared with the Gnostics the general belief of  dualism, the conflict of matter and spirit, the emanations, the Demiurgus, and other notions common to the many subdivisions of this extraordinary school, the, Ophites were distinguished by their peculiar doctrine and worship connected with the ophis, or serpent. Like most other Gnostics, they regarded the Demilurgus, or the Jehovah of the Old Testament with great abhorrence, but they pursued this notion into a very curious development. Regarding, like the Valentinians, the emancipation of man from the power and control of the Demiurgus, or, as they called him, Jaldabaoth, as a most important end, they declared the serpent who tempted Eve, and introduced into the world “knowledge” and revolt against Jehovah, to have been the great benefactor of the human race, and hence they worshipped the serpent. Other views which they held and sought to propagate were equally strange. We may instance their singular attempt to engraft “Othism” on Christianity; their seeking, as it were, to impart to the Christian Eucharist an Ophitic character, by causing the bread designed for the eucharistic sacrifice to be licked by a serpent, which was kept in a cave for the purpose, and which the communicants kissed after receiving the Eucharist (Tertullian, Adv. Haeres. 2; Epiphanius, Hor. 37, § 5). Regarding Christ, they taught that he who was born of the Virgin was Jesus alone, and that afterwards Christ descended upon Jesus and in proof of this they pointed to the fact that Jesus wrought no miracle either before his baptism or after his resurrection.

They held that Jaldabaoth brought about the crucifixion of Christ. After his resurrection Jesus remained eighteen months on the earth, during which time he received from the Sophia a clearer knowledge of the higher truth, which he imparted to a few of his disciples. He was then raised to heaven by the celestial Christ, and sits at the right hand of Jaldabaoth unobserved by him, but gradually receiving to himself every spiritual being that has been emancipated and purified by the redemption. Jaldabaoth they set forth as begetting six beings, the spirits of the seven planets. By these six beings man was created after their common image, a body without a soul; and they brought him to Jaldabaoth, who breathed into him a living spirit. At the sight of man's perfection Jaldabaoth became envious, and gave him a command which the serpent led him to disobey. Hence the conflict of good and evil in the world, the good being represented by the serpent. The mythic Christ of the Valentinians is the opponent of Jaldabaoth, and is ever endeavoring to defend man from his enemy.  So meager is our information regarding the Ophites that it is difficult to give much of an exhibit of them or their doctrines. Their principles appear to have been a compound of the mysteries of His and of the involved fancies of Oriental mythology, mingled with corrupt notions of Christian history and doctrine.

The doctrines maintained by this sect in regard to the origin and destination of man are thus described by Neander: “The empire of Jaldabaoth is the starry world. The stars are the representatives and orians of the cosmical principle, which seeks to hold mans spirit in bondage and servitude, and to environ it with all manner of delusions. Jaldabaoth, and the six angels begotten by him, are the spirits of the seven planets, the Sun, the Moon, Mars, Vellnus, Jupiter, Mercuyl, and Saturn. It is the endeavor of Jaldabaoth to assert himself as self-subsistent Lord and Creator, to keep his six angels, from deserting their subjection, and, lest they should look up and observe the higher world of light, to fix their attention upon some object in another quarter. To this end he called upon the six angels to create man, after their own common image, as the crowning seal of their independent creative power. Man was created, and being in their own image, was a huge corporeal mass, but without a soul. He crept on the earth, and had not power to lift, himself erect. They therefore brought the helpless creature to their Father, that he might animate it with a soul. Jaldabaith breathed into it a living spirit, and thus, unperceived by himself, the spiritual seed passed from his owns being into the nature of man whereby he was deprived himself of this higher principle of life. Thus had the Sophia ordained it. In mann (i.e. those men who had received some portion of this spiritual seed) was concentrated the light, the soul, the reason of the whole creation. Jaldabaoth was now seized with amazement and wrath when he beheld a being created by himself, and within the bounds of his own kingdom, rising both above himself and his kingdom. He strove therefore to prevent man from becoming conscious of his higher nature, and of that higher order of world to which he had now become related — to keep him in a state of blind unconsciousness and thus of slavish submission. It was the jealousy of the contracted Jaldabaoth which issued that. command to the first man; but the mundane soul employed the serpent as an instrument to defeat the purpose of Jaldabaoth by tempting the first man to disobedience.

According to another view, the serpent was itself a symbol or disguised appearance of the mundane soul: and, in the strict sense it is that part of the sect only that adopted this view which rightly received the name of Ophites, for they actually worshipped the serpent as a holy symbol; to which they may have been led by an  analogous idea in the Egyptian religion, the serpent in the latter being looked upon as a symbol of Keph, who resembled the Sophia of the Ophites. At all events, it was through the mundane soul, directly or indirectly, that the eyes of the first man were opened. The fall of man — and this presents a characteristic feature of the Ophitic system, though even in this respect it was perhaps not altogether independent of the prior Valentinian theory — the fall of man was the transition point from a state of unconscious limitation to one of conscious freedom. Man now became wise, and renounced his allegiance to Jaldabaoth. The latter angry at this disobedience, thrust him from the upper region of air, where until now he had dwelt in an ethereal body, down to the dark earth, and banished him into a dark body. Man found himself now placed in a situation where, on the one hand, the seven planetary spirits sought to hold him under their thrall, and to suppress the higher consciousness in his soul; while, on the other hand, the wicked and purely material spirits tried to tempt him into sin and idolatry, which would expose him to the vengeance of the severe Jaldabaoth. Yet ‘wisdom' never ceased to impart new strength to man's kindred nature by fresh supplies of the higher spiritual influence; and from Seth, whom the Gnostics generally regarded as a representative of the contemplative nature, she was able to preserve through every age a race peculiarly her own, in which the seeds of the spiritual nature were saved from destruction. The doctrines of the Ophites were far from being favorable to purity of morals. Olrien indeed goes so far as to exclude them from the Christian Church, and declares that they admitted none to their assemblies who did not curse Christ. Irenens, Theodoret, Epiphanius and Augustine regard them as Christian heretics. Origen gives a minute account of the Diagram of the Ophites, which appears to have been a sort of tablet on which they depicted their doctrines in all sorts of figures, with words annexed.”

The Ophites originated in Egypt, probably from some relation to the Egyptian serpent-worship, and spread thence into Syria and Asia Minor. They continued to exist as a sect after other forms of Gnosticism had died out, the emperor Justinian enacting laws against them (Cod. i, v. 1, 18, 19, 21) so late as A.D. 530. Offshoots of them are the Cainites. SEE SETHITES.

Cyprian mentions the Ophites (Ephesians 72:4); and the last chapter but one of Irenaeus's first book is supposed to have been written against them and the Sethians (Adv. Haeres. i, 30). Origen calls them “a very obscure  sect,” and denies that they were Christians, saying that “no person was allowed to join their assemblies till he had uttered curses against Jesus” (Contr. Cels. 3:13; 6,-24). He also says they were founded by a man named Euphrates (ibid. 11:28), a name mentioned by Theodoret as belonging to the founder of the heresy of the Peratee, but which in the account of the Naassen, or Ophites, given by Hippolytus is regarded as the name of the mystical water of life spoken of Joh 4:10. Hippolytus looks upon the Ophites as the originators of all heresies, and associates them with both Jews and the Gnostics; for he writes of them under the Hebrew form of their name as “the Naasseni,” from נחשׁ (nachash, “a serpent”), “who call themselves Gnostics” (Hippol. Refut. v. 6). Philastes places them first in his list of heresies before Christ (De Haer. 1), while Epiphanius (Panar. 38) and Augustine (De Haer. 17) say that they were alleged to have been derived from the Nicolaitanes or the Gnostics. The heretical philosophy of the sect is given by Hippolytus and Epiphanius, as above quoted. The former says that they professed to derive it from James, the brother of our Lord, who handed it down to Mariamne. He also quotes from a “Gospel according to Thomas” which was in use among them, which seems to be the “Gospel according to the Egyptians” mentioned by Epiphanius in his twenty-sixth book among the Gnostic Apocrypha. In addition to these sources of information, there is also an account given by Origen of their “‘ Diagram,” a tablet on which they set forth their doctrines in a hieroglyphical form (Contr. Cels. 6:33). See, besides the literature on Gnosticism, Pressense, Doctrines and Heresies of the Early Christian Church, p. 58; Werner, Gesch. d. rimisch. - kathol. Kirchenlehre;— Neander, Ch. Iist. vol. ii; id. Genetische Entwickelung des gnostischen Systems, p. 231 sq.; id. Hist. of Christian Dogmas, 1:178, 179; Haag, Histoire des Dogmes Chretiens, i, § 25; Walch, Gesch. der Ketzereien, 1:447 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Christianity; Liddoll, Divinity of Christ, 1:59, 143, 163; Schaff, Ch. Hist. vol. i; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines; Baur, Die christl. Gnosis, p. 171 sq.; and his Das Christenthum der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, p. 176; Mosheim, Gesch. der Schlangenbruder (Helmst. 1748, 8vo); Schumacher, Lehrtofel der Ophiten (Wolfenb. -1755, 4t0); Fuldner, Commentaria de Ophitis; Jdcher, De Ophio-um heresi; Kille, Ophitarum mysteria retecta (Freib. 1822, 4to); Vogt, De Ophitis, in his Bibl. heresiol. 2:37 sq.; Wilke, De Oph. (Regiom. 1706); Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 2:409 sq. There is an article on the Ophitic System, by Lepsius, in the Zeitschr. fur wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1863, vol. iv; 1864, vol. 1. SEE SERPENT-WORSHIPPERS.

## Ophni[[@Headword:Ophni]]

             (Heb. Ophni', עָפְנַי[always with the art. הָעָפְנַי, ha-Ophni', q. d. the Ophnite], perh. pressure, famisne [comp. כָּפִן]; Sept. Α᾿φνί, but most MSS. omit; Yulg. — 9 hni), a town in the north-eastern section of the tribe of Benjamin, named only in Jos 18:24, between Chephar- haammonai and Gaba (q.v.). “Its name may perhaps imply that, like others of the towns of this: region, it was originally founded by some non- Israelitish tribe — the Ophnites — who in that case have left but this one slight trace of their existence” (Smith). It was probably the Gufzith (גופנית), Gufna, or Beth-gufnin of the Talmud (Schwarz, p. 126), and doubtless the Gophna of Josephus (Γοφνά Ptolemy, Γούφνα 4:16), a place which at the time of Vespasian's invasion was apparently so important as to be second only to Jerusalem (War, 3:3, 5), as the center of a district or toparchy (Ant. 14:11, 2). It was fifteen Roman miles from Jerusalem on the way to Neapolis (Eusebius, ‘Onomast. s.v. φάραγξ βότρυος). The place still survives in the modern Jifha or Jihna, two and a half miles north-west of Bethel (Reland, Palaest. p. 816; Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 2:41). The change from the Ain, with which Ophlni begins, to G, is common enough in the Sept. (comp. Gomorrah, Athaliah, etc.). It is now a poor village, in a fertile valley between high hills, and contains about 200 Christian inhabitants (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3:79). Remains of an old Greek church still exist there, especially a baptistery; End traces may be seen of the Roman road leading through the town from Jerusalem to Antipatris (ib. 2:138).

## Ophni (2)[[@Headword:Ophni (2)]]

             The modern representative of this place, Jufna, is laid down on the Ordnance Map at two and three quarter miles north-west of Beitin (Bethel), and thus described in the accompanying Memoirs (2:294):

"An important Christian village, with a Latin church and convent (Mar Yusef), on an ancient road from the north to Jerusalem. The octagonal apse of this church, with colored glass in its east window, and a red-tiled pointed roof, forms a conspicuous feature of the village as seen from the south. The place is situated in a small plain, and on the south, higher up, is a spring called Ain Jelaztm. The road crosses the valley-bed by a small footbridge (now broken), with an inscription in Arabic, and on the south of this is a Greek church of St. George, with a fine walnut-tree and two meiss- trees. There are ruins of a town in the village, and pillar-shafts, as if of a former chapel, east of the Latin monastery. The hills and valleys are cultivated with olives, vines, figs, pears, apricots, and pomegranates. The population is stated by Robinson at two hundred, some Latins, some Greeks." The Greek church is particularly described, ibid. page 323.

## Ophrah[[@Headword:Ophrah]]

             (1) OF BENJAMIN. The probable modern representative of this place, et- Tayibeh, lies four miles north-east of Bethel on the Ordnance Map, and is thus described in the accompanying Memoirs (2:293): "A large village in a conspicuous position, with well-built stone houses. A central tower stands on the top of the hill; on either side are olive and fig gardens in the foreground. The view is extensive on both sides. A ruined church of St. George exists near, and there are remains of a ruined castle in the village. The inhabitants are Greek Christians." The archaeological remains are minutely described (ibid. page 370).

(2) OF MANASSEH. For this place Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:339) the modern Ferata, south-west of Nablfs; but this is not within Manasseh, and is proposed by Guerin for Pirathon (q.v.). It is more probably (Tristram, Bible Places, page 203) Arrabeh, which is laid down on the Ordnance Map at two miles southwest of Dothan, and described in the accompanying Memoirs (2:154) as a very large village on the slope of a bare ridge, with remains of an ancient town.

## Ophrai[[@Headword:Ophrai]]

             (Heb. Ophrah', עָפְרָה, fawn; Sept. Α᾿φαρά, Ε᾿φρά, Ο᾿φερά, v. r. Ε᾿φραθα, Γοφερά; but 1Ch 4:14, Γοφορά), the name of two places in Palestine, and of a man.

1. A town of Benjamin (Jos 18:23), mentioned between hap-Parah and Chephar ha-Ammonai, in the north-east of that tribe's domain (Keil, Joshua, ad loc.). “It appears to be named again (1Sa 13:17) in describing the routes taken by the spoilers who issued from the Philistine camp at Michmash. One of these bands of ravagers went due west, on the road to Bethhoron; one towards the ‘ravine of Zeboim,' that is in all probability one of the clefts which lead down to the Jordan valley, and therefore due east; while the third took the road to Ophrah and the land of  Shual — doubtless north, for south they could not go, owing to the position held by Saul and Jonathan” (Smith). Accordingly it is placed by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Aphia) five Roman miles east of Bethel. This corresponds with the position of a place called etTaiyibeh, which was visited by Dr. Robinson in his excursion to Bethel (Bibl. Researches, 2:120-123). It is now a small village, curiously situated upon a conical hill, on the summit of which is an old tower, whence is commanded a splendid view of the valley of the Jordan, the Dead Sea, and the eastern mountains (so Rodiger, in the Hall. Lit. - Zeit. 1842, No. 71; Stanley, Palest. p. 211; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 238). These notices also suggest the identity of Ophrah with EPHRAIN or EPHRON, a city which king Abijah took from Jeroboam along with Bethel (2Ch 13:19). We read in Josephus also that Vespasian captured a small town near Bethel called EPHRAIM, which appears to be the same place (War, 4:9, 9); and probably it was to this that Christ went from Jerusalem after the resurrection of Lazarus (Joh 11:54). It may also have given its name to the district or government of APHERETMA (1Ma 11:34).

2. The native place of Gideon (Jdg 6:11); the scene of his exploits against Baal (Jdg 6:24); his residence after his accession to power (9:5), and the place of his burial in the family sepulcher (8:32). In Ophrah also he deposited the ephod which he made or enriched with the ornaments taken from the Ishmaelitish followers of Zebah and Zalmunnah (8:27), and so strong was the attraction of that object that the town must then have been a place of great pilgrimage and resort. We may infer that it lay within the territory of Manasseh, as it is called “Ophrah of the Abiezrites” (6:24), and it is stated that the angel who appeared to Gideon to' summon him to deliver Israel “sat under an oak which was in Ophrah, that pertained unto Joash the Abiezrite” (6:11). “Ophrah possibly derived its name from Epher, who was one of the heads of the families of Manasseh in its Gileaditish portion (1Ch 5:24), and who appears to have migrated to the west of Jordan with Abiezer and Shechem (Num 26:30; Jos 17:2)” (Smith). SEE ABIEZER. “The prophet Micah, when foretelling the destruction of the land and cities of Israel, says, ‘In the house of Aphrah roll thyself in the dust,' or rather, perhaps, we should render, ‘In Beth- Ophrah roll thyself in Ophr' (dust); or, in the house of dust roll thyself in dust (Mic 1:10, לעפרה בבית; thelappears to be merely the sign of the genitive; Sept. ἐξ οἴκου κατὰ γέλωτα; Vulg. in domo Pulveris pulvere vos conspergite). The place referred to is possibly identical with  Ophrah of Manasseh; and the prophet perhaps intends some allusion to Gideon's deliverance, and to the fact that there would be none like him to deliver them in time of oppression” (Kitto). SEE BETH-LEAPHRAH. The Ophrah of Gideon was probably not far from Shechem (Jdg 9:1; Jdg 9:5). Neither Eusebius nor Jerome appears to have known anything of it (Reland, Palest. p. 913). Van de Velde suggests a site called Esfai, a mile south of Akrabeh, about eight miles south-east from Nablis (Memoir, p. 338), and Schwarz (Palest. p. 158) identifies it with “the village Erafa, north of Sanur,” by which he probably means Arrabeh, west of Tell Do'than. The former is sufficiently in the required position. For other vague conjectures, see Hamaker, Miscell. Phoen. p. 276.

3. An Israelite, son of Mienothai, of the tribe of Judab (1Ch 4:14). B.C. post 1614. But it is more probable that the word father here means founder; and that Ophrah here also is the name of a village. SEE MENOTHAI.

## Opinion[[@Headword:Opinion]]

             (from Latin opinor, to think) is a synonyme of belief, and measurably, too, of knowledge; but, while the last-named term can be applied to what is objectively and subjectively held as sufficient, and belief is applied to what is subjectively sufficient, opinion is properly applied only to a consciously insufficient judgment, or, as Sir Lewis has it: “The essential idea of opinion seems to be that it is a matter about which doubt can reasonably exist, as to which two persons can without absurdity think differently... Any proposition, the contrary of which can be maintained with probability, is matter of opinion” (Essay on Opinion). According to the last of these definitions, matter of opinion is opposed not to matter offact, but to matter of certainty. Thus the death of Charles I is fact — his authorship of Icon Basilike, an opinion. It is also used, however, to denote knowledge acquired by inference, as opposed to that acquired by perception. Thus that the moon gives light is matter of fact; that it is inhabited or uninhabited is matter of opinion. It has been proposed to discard from philosophical use these ambiguous expressions, and to divide knowledge, according to its sources, into matter of perception and matter of inference; and, as a cross division as to our conviction, into matter of certainty and matter of doubt. ‘Subjective sufficiently is termed conviction (for myself); objective determination is termed certainty (for all). SEE KNOWLEDGE.

## Opitz (Opitius), Heinrich[[@Headword:Opitz (Opitius), Heinrich]]

             a German Lutheran divine, was born at Altenberg, in Misnia, in 1642, and became professor of the Oriental languages and theology in Kiel, where he died in 1712. We have many Latin works of his on Hebrew antiquities, and he was deservedly reckoned one of the most learned men of his age; but what peculiarly marks him is an attempt (a very strange one surely) to show the relationship between the Greek and the Oriental languages, and the connection which the dialects of the one have with those of the other. This chimerical scheme of subjecting the Greek language to the rules of the Hebrew induced him to publish a small work entitled Graecismus facilitati sue restitutus, methodo nova, eaque cun proeceptis Helmiis Wasmuthianis (for it seems that Wachsmuth was the originator of this theory) et suis Orientalibus quam proxime harmonica, adeogue regulis 34 succincte absolutus.

## Opitz, Martin[[@Headword:Opitz, Martin]]

             (afterwards ennobled as OPITZ VON BOBERFELD), a famous German poet, noted for his literary productions of a moral and religious character, was born Dec. 23, 1597, at Bunzlau, in Silesia. He studied at Frankfort and Heidelberg, and published in 1618 a Latin essay, Aristarchus de contemptu linguae Teutonicae, in which he vindicates the merit of the German language. His most important work, Von der deutschen Poeterei, or the “Book of German Poetry” (1624), passed through nine editions before 1669, and produced a reform in German versification. For nearly three centuries the art of writing in verse had degenerated, until it had been reduced to nothing better than a mere counting of syllables. Opitz insisted on the importance of both metre and rhythm, while he contended for purity in the choice of words. His own attainments as a Scholar — especially as a writer of respectable Latin verses — recommended his book to the notice of educated men. and its success made Opitz the founder of a new school — the First Silesian School. After several years of service in diplomacy he settled in Dantzig, and gained in 1637 an appointment as historiographer to the king, Vladislaus IV, of Poland. He was closely engaged in historical researches, and was looking forward to the enjoyment of years of literary industry when his career was cut short. He died Aug. 20, 1639, of the plague, caught from a beggar to whom he had given alms. Opitz was more honored by his contemporaries than almost any other poet ever was. German poetry, which had been neglected and despised, began again to be  esteemed and cultivated.

The popularity of Opitz, and his relations with the chiefs of the Roman Catholic party, led to the adoption, throughout the whole of Germany, of the form given to the German language by Luther, which had previously obtained general acceptance only in the Protestant states (see Hallam, Introd. to the Lit. of Europe). His poetry is characterized by careful attention to language and metre, and by reflection rather than by brilliant fancy or deep feeling. There are several complete editions of his works (Breslau, 1690, 3 vols.; Amsterdam, 1646, 3 vols.; Frankfort and Leipsic, 1724, 3 vols.); a selection of his works was published by Müller (Leipsic, 1822) and Tiltmann (1869). “Opitz was essentially a clever, industrious literary man of the world, with the art of making himself everywhere agreeable, and was petted and caressed accordingly more than was good for his work. Such a man would probably never have written religious poetry at all in ordinary times; but living as he did when grave thoughts and terrible struggles were in all men's minds, he, too, was influenced by his age, and he wrote a good deal of this kind — versions of all the Epistles for the Sundays of the year, of many of the Psalms, and of the Song of Solomon. Among his sacred poems, however, his hymns are by far the best, and some are really fine.” One of its best is, O Licht geboren aus demni Lichte (Wilkworth, Singers of Germany, “O Light, who out of Light wast born”). See Koch, Gesch. d. Kirchenliedes, 3:6 and 9; Strehlke, Martin Opitz (Leipsic, 1856); Weinhold, Martin Opitz von Bobe-feld (Kiel, 1862); Palm, — Martin Opitz (1862); Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 173 sq.

## Opitz, Paul Friedrich[[@Headword:Opitz, Paul Friedrich]]

             a German scholar, son of Heinrich, was born at Kiel, March 26, 1684. He studied at different universities, was in 1721 professor of Greek and Oriental languages at his native city, in 1727 professor of philosophy, and died Oct. 5,1747. He published, De Custodia Templi Hierosolymitani Nocturna (Kiel, 1710): — De Gigantibus (1715): — De Amico Israelitarum in Festo Tabernaculorum Consortio (1717): — De Christo Apostolo et Pontifice Confessionis Nostrce (1721): — De Hadriani Imperatoris Nomine, Indole, Virtutibus ac Vitiis (1722): — De Hadriani Imperatoris Moribus, Eruditisque cum Doctoribus Judceorum Controversiis (1723). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Oporin, Joachim[[@Headword:Oporin, Joachim]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 12, 1695. He studied at different universities, and commenced his academical career at Kiel in 1719. In 1733 he was professor of theology, in 1735 went to Gottingen, and died Sept. 5, 1753, doctor of theology. He published, Historice Criticae de Perennitate Animi Humani (Kiel, 1719): — Historia Critica Doctrinae de Immortalitate lMortdliun, etc. (Hamburg, 1735): — De Messia, cum Infans Esset (1739): — De Firmitate ac Inspiratione Divina (1740): — Clavis Evangelii Joannis (Gottingen, 1743): — Zacharias auf's Neue ubersetzt, etc.: — Diss. Oracula Esaice c. 40-55 (1750), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:49; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v., where a complete list of Oporin's writings is given. (B.P.)

## Oppelt, Godfrey Sebastian[[@Headword:Oppelt, Godfrey Sebastian]]

             a well-known German Moravian missionary among the Indians of North America, was born March 20, 1763, at Gorlitz, Silesia. In 1799 he began to preach to the converts in Canada, and in 1804 inaugurated an enterprise among the Delawares on the Pettquotting, now Huron River, Ohio. Subsequently, from 1810 to 1818, he was the agent of the “Society of the United Brethren for Propagating the Gospel among the Heathen,” incorporated in 1788, and lived in the Tuscarawas Valley, Ohio, administering the grant of 12,000 acres of land made by Congress to that association in trust for the Christian Indiana. He died at Nazareth, Pa., Aug. 9, 1832. (E. de S.)

## Oppenheim, David[[@Headword:Oppenheim, David]]

             a modern Jewish writer, was born December 18, 1816, at Leipnik, Moravia. He received a thorough rabbinical education, was in 1846 rabbi at  Jamnitz, in 1857 at Gross-Beeskerelk, Hungary, and died October 21, 1876, at Vienna. Oppenheim contributed to all the leading Jewish journals and reviews, and caused a great stir among Roman Catholics by keenly criticising, in the Wiener Mitheilunqen, an article on the history of the Jews in Austria, which had appeared in the Freiberger Kirchenlexikon. Oppenheim laid bare the falsehoods and misstatements of that article, and elicited the rejoinder of Ritter von Pawlikowski, who, in his book of a hundred sheets, on the relation between Jews and Christians, devoted no less than seventy pages to refute, or rather to insult, Oppenheim. One of his ancestors was David ben-Abraham Oppenheim (q.v.) (B.P.)

## Oppenheimer, Eberhard Carl Friedrich[[@Headword:Oppenheimer, Eberhard Carl Friedrich]]

             of Vienna, a convert to Christianity, an enthusiast and chiliast, flourished at Leipsic as tutor of the Hebrew language, and there he probably died after 1750. He wrote, Hodegus Ebraeo-rabbinicus, a manual of the Hebrew and Rabbinic language (Leipsic, 1731): — Lied aller Lieder, an exposition of the Song of Songs (ibid. 1745 and 1750, but under the title Das Mohelied Salomonis, oder der allerheiligste Lobgesansg). See Jocher, A hqemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, 3:1085, and supplement by Rotermund, v. 1148 (Bremen, 1816); Acta histor. ecclesiast. 14:777 sq.; Müller, בית הספר, or catalogue of Hebrew works (Amsterdam, 1868), No. 4251. (B. P.)

## Oppeniheim(er), David ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Oppeniheim(er), David ben-Abraham]]

             a noted German rabbi, was born at Worms in 1664 ar 1667. At the age of twenty-two he was called to Brisk, to become the head of the Jewish community. there. Four years later, in 1690, he received a call to the Jewish school at Nicolsburg, where he had received his own literary training, and in 1704 he was called as chief rabbi to Prague, where he died, Sept. 12, 1736. Oppenheimer is the author of a number of Talmudical works, and published an edition of the Pentateuch, with, the commentaries of Samuel ben-Mei'r (רש8 בם), Abr. ibn-Esra (רא8 בע), etc., and the Targums; in five vols. (Berlin, 1705), to which he wrote a lengthy preface; and which edition, entitled וַתִרְגּוּמַים חוּמִשׁ עַם רש8 בם וְרא8 בע, has been noticed in the Peristylium librorum novorum, etc., 14:99 sq. While his writings will claim the attention of the student in Talmudic lore, Oppenheimer's fame mainly depends on his large collection of Hebrew works, which now constitutes the famous Oppenheimeriana in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, in England. It was this collection that gave Wolf thematerial for his famous Bibliotheca Hebraea (Hamburg, 1715-33, 4 vols. 4to), since he had 7000 volumes, inclusive of 1000 MSS., at his disposal, and it was estimated at $30,000, but in 1829 was bought for $9000 by a Hamburg merchant of opulence, who caused a catalogue of this collection to be published by Isr. Breszelau: Katalog der beruhmten Bibliothek, etc. (Hamburg, 1783). Another catalogue had previously been published (Hanover, 1764), and a third was brought out by Eis. Metz (קְהַלִּת דָּוַד, Katalog der David Oppenheimzerschen Bibliothek, etc.) at Hamburg in 1826. — This catalogue gives a list of 1147 folios, 1708 quartos, 919 octavos, and 326 duodecimos, in all 4100 articles. A fourth one, edited by Jac. Goldenthal, furnishes an index to all books as given in Metz's catalogue (Leipsic, 1843). See Lebrecht, Die Oppenheimerische Bibliothek in Oxbrld, in the Magazinfur Literaturdes Auslandes, 1843, No. 135 sq.; L. L. B. d. Or. 1844, c. 247-250, 271-278, 472, 473; Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur, p. 235 sq.; Hartmann, in the periodical Jedidja, vol. vi (Berlin, 1820-21); Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:50 sq.; Introduction to the same work, p. 45 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, s.v. (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebrea, 1:290 sq.; 3:178 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:346 sq., 360; Jost, Gesch. d. Jud. u. s. Sekten, 3:281; Cassel, Leitfdden firjiid. Geschichte u. Literatur (Berlin, 1872), p. 105; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten (Breslau, 1870), p. 450;  Zunz, Literaturgeschichte dei synagogalen Poesie, p. 445; Lieben, Grabschrift u. Biographie des D. Oppenh., in ס8 גַּלְעִד(Prague, 1856). (B. P.)

## Opportune[[@Headword:Opportune]]

             ST., a French nun, was born in Normandy, in the diocese of Seez, near the opening of the 8th century. Descended from one of the first families of Hiemois (now country of Auge), she entered the monastery of Montreuil, of which she soon became the abbess. Already familiar with privations and austerities, she redoubled her fervor in retreat. She had a brother called Chrodegand; who was elected bishop; of Seez in 756 and was assassinated a few years after by his godson in the borough of Nonlant. She died at Montreuil, April 22, 770, and her name is inserted in the Roman martyrology. In 878 Hildebrand, bishop of Seez, brought the body of Sainlte Olpporitune to Moussy-le-Neut, in the diocsese of Meaux and shortly after transferred it to Paris. The remains of the saint were thrown into the immense receptacle of the catacombs in 1797. Her life was written before 888 by Adelhelme, bishop of Seez. It is found in the Bollandists and in Mabillon. See Acta Sanctorum, April 22; Mabillon, Acta Sanctorunt Ordinis S. Benedicti, pt. ii, ssec. 3, p. 220; Gallia Christiana, vol. 11; Nicolas Gosset, Vie de Sainte Oppaortune.

## Opposants[[@Headword:Opposants]]

             SEE JANSENISTS.

## Oppression[[@Headword:Oppression]]

             is the spoiling or taking away of men's property by constraint, terror, or force, without having any right thereto; working on the ignorance, weakness, or fearfulness of the oppressed. Men are guilty of oppression when they offer violence to the bodies, property, or consciences of others; when they crush or overburden others, as the Egyptians did the Hebrews (Exo 3:9). There may be oppression which maligns the character, or studies to vex and, other, yet does not affect his life; as there is much persecution, for conscience' sake, which is not fatal though distressing. God is the avenger of all oppression.

## Ops[[@Headword:Ops]]

             (Lat. plenty), a Roman goddess of fertility, regarded as a daughter of Coelus and Terra, the same as the Rhea of the Greeks, who married Saturn, and became mother of Jupiter. She was known among the ancients by the different names of Cybele, Bona Dea, Mragna Mater, Thya, Tellus, Prpserpina, and even of Juno and Minerva; and the worship which was paid to these apparently several deities was offered merely to one and the same person, mother of the gods. Tatius built her a temple at Rome in common with Ceres. She was generally represented as a matron, with her right-hand opened, as if offering assistance to the helpless, and holding a loaf in her left hand. Her festivals were called Opalia, etc. — She was the protectress of agriculture. Her abode was the ground, and newly-born children were commended to her care.

## Optatus[[@Headword:Optatus]]

             (wished for), a Roman Catholic bishop of Milevia, in Asia Minor, is known by his work, still extant, entitled De schismateDonatistarum libri vii adversus Parmenianum. We possess no information as to his personal history; even the ancient Church historians who mention him, such as Jerome (De Viris illustribus, cap. 121), Augustine (De Doctrina Christ. lib. ii, cap. 40, num. 61; Contra epist. Parmenaiani, cap. 13, Numbers 5; De unitate Ecclesiastes cap. 19, num. 50), Fulgentius (Ad Monimum, lib. ii, cap. 13), Honorius of Autun (De scriptorib. Ecclesiastes cap. 3), speak only of his work. The Roman martyrology mentions him under the date of June 4, with the simple notice, Milevi in Numidia sancti Optati episcopi doctrina et sanctitate conspicui. According to Jerome, he wrote his work during the reign of Valentinian I († 375) and Valens († 378). This is  derived from Optatus's statement that the persecution commenced by Diocletian had spread all over Africa for more than sixty years (“ferme ante annos sexaginta et quod excurrit”). Aside from the vagueness of this statement, Jerome's opinion seems contradicted' by the fact that Optatus mentions (2:2) Siricius as occupying the see of Rome, whence we would sluppose his work to have been written between the years 384 and 398. As a writer of the African Church during the period which elapsed from the death of Cyprian to Augustine, his work is the only important one which we now possess. It was written in answer to a work of the Doniatist bishop Parmenianus of Carthage, the same whose tetter to the Donatist Tychonius Augustine afterwards opposed in three books. These two works of Parmenianus, now lost, must not be confounded. That which was attacked by Augustine disputed the views, held by Tychonius concerning the Church; that opposed by Optatus was a polemic against the Roman Catholic Church. According to Jerome, Optatus's work contained but six books, and as known at present it has seven, yet Dupin (Praef. Numbers 2) solved this difficulty by showing that the seventh book consists of four independent fragments, the first three of which, at least, have Optatus for their author, and are additions made by him to the first, second, and third books; while the fourth part gives evidence in its style and tendencies of being from another writer, and very badly connected with the other. After the writings of Augustine, this work of Optatus is the most important source we possess for the history of Donatism, for although essentially polemic in its character, and particularly intended as an answer to Parmenianus, it gives a vast amount of interesting historical information on the subject. It is also of value for the history of dogmas, as affording a clear and comprehensive view of the position of the North African Church previous to St. Augustine. The central dogma of Optatus is the unity of the Church, so impressively asserted by Cyprian, and considered by him as of paramount importance (3:4). He looks upon the see of Rome as its outward manifestation, and entitled as such to the regard and obedience of all.

He considers the catholicity of the Church as resulting from its rationality (from an erroneous derivation from κατὰ λόγον), and from its spreading over the earth (“quod sit rationabilis et ubique diffusa,” 2:1). However, he already went farther than Cyprian in considering the holiness of the Church to consist, not in the individual purity of its members, but in the sacraments (“ergo ecclesia una est. cujus sanctitas de sacramentis colligitur, non de superbia personarum ponderatur,” 2:1) — an opinion which we must consider as the most important result of the Donatistic  controversy. He even denies the possibility of perfect holiness within the Church; he considers Christ as alone perfect, commanding his disciples to attain to perfection, but not making them perfect (2:20). This view stands in close connection with that which he held concerning the relation between freewill and grace; even the Christian, though willing only that which is right, yet can, put it into practice but to a certain extent; the final accomplishment is not in man's power, but in God's, because he alone is perfect, and alone capable of perfecting anything (“sed homini non est datum perficere, ut post spatia, quae debet homo implere, restet aliquid Deo, ubi deficienti succurrat quia ipse est perfectio,” 2:20). Such declarations coming from the North-African Church show clearly what a change Augustine wrought in the views of the Church. The, opinions of Optatus on baptism are particularly deserving of notice: since all, even the children of Christian parents, are from their birth animated by an unclean spirit, exorcism must precede baptism, so that the evil spirit depart and make room for the heart to become a temple of God (4:6). Baptism is to be looked upon in two principal aspects, the objective and subjective; the first is based in the Trinity, the second in the faith and profession of the person baptized coinciding with the first. The result of this coincidence is the blessing attached to baptism, spiritual regeneration, by virtue of which God becomes the father of man, and the Church his mother (“concurrit Trinitati fides credentium et professio ut dum Trinitas cum fide concordat, qui natus fuerit seculo, renascatur spiritaliter Deo; sic' fit hominum pater Deus, sancta fit mater ecclesia,' 2:10). The sanctifying efficacy of baptism is independent of the person baptized, who only acts as an operative (operatrins); it depends exclusively on the name of the Godhead (“nomen est, quod sanctificat, non opus,” v. 7), which also is the source whence flows the holy water (“aqua sancta, quae de trium nominum fontibus inundat,” v. 3). Baptism performed in the name and through the power of the Trinity confers grace (“‘baptisma Christianorum, Trinitate confectum, confert gratiam,” v. 1); this baptism is the vital force of virtue (“virtutum vita”), the death of sin (“criminium mors”), the immortal birth (“nativitas immortalis”),the acquisition of the kingdom of heaven (“coelestis regni comparatio”), the wreck of all sins (“peccatorum naufragium,” v. 1). Although the expression baptismus onzfert gratiam may at a first glance be thought to indicate that Optatus inclined to the subsequent Roman Catholic dogma on that subject, we find that he differed widely from it in considering the efficiency of the sacrament to be independent of the disposition of the receiver.

Faith (which he considers only as a subjective  acquiescence in the Trinitarian creed) is for him not merely a condition for the reception of the grace connected with the sacrament, but a necessary, constitutive element of the sacrament itself (“duas enim species video necess. principal. loc. Trin. possidet, sine qua res ipsa non potest geri; hanc sequitur fides credentis,” v. 4); he designates it as the merit of believers (“restat jam de credentis merito aliquid dicere, cujus est fides,” v. 8); he values it the more as Christ considers it as: superior to his holiness and majesty (“fidem filius Dei et sanctitati suae anteposuit et majestati”); he points out various miracles in which faith was the acting principle (v. 8). He looks, upon immersion anointing, and the imposition of hands, which he finds portended in Christ's baptism (4:7), as parts of the sacrament of baptism. He denies the efficacy of baptism performed by. heretics, because of the absence of the Trinitarian creed (“haereticorum morbidi fontes”), while he considers baptism performed by schismatics as valid and efficacious, and condemns its being renewed (v. 1). He also declares positively that those converts who were permitted to renew the vows of baptism previously taken by them should not be anointed, as be says to Parmenianus. “Quod a vobis unctum est, tale servamus, quale suscipimus” (7:3). He was the first to hold to the indelible character of baptism- afterwards established by Augustine. His views concerning the Lord's Supper are also of importance: he considers it as a sacrifice offered for the universal Church (2:12), but on the other hand he does not name the body and blood of Christ, but the offering of the community. He calls the altar the place where the gifts of the brotherhood are brought to show the peace of the Church; the place for the prayers of the community and the members of Christ (i.e. the community presenting itself to God in its gifts, and constituting the body of Christ); and when he speaks of the Eucharist itself, he says that the Almighty descends upon the altar, as does the Holy Spirit, at the prayers of the faithful; at the altar many find eternal salvation, and the hope of immortality. In his work Optatus uses especially the allegorical method of interpretation, which, like most of the writers of his time, he even abuses. His style is heavy, and wholly wanting in elegance; and in dialectic talent and ingenuity he is far behind Augustine. That Optatus was highly considered in the North-African Church is shown by what Augustine relates of him (Brevicul. collation. cap. 20, No. 38)., On the third day of the Synod of Carthage, in 411, the Donatistic bishops asserted that bishop Cecilianus of Carthage had been condemned by the emperor Constantine I, basing themselves on the statement in Optatus's work (1:26). This passage, however, said only that Cecilianus had, at the investigation of his  schismatic enemies, and for the sake of restoring peace in the Church, been banished by the emperor to Brescia. The editio princeps of the six books of Optatus was printed by F. Behem (Apud S. Victoremn prope Moguntiam), 1549, fol., under the inspection of Joannes Cochlaeus, from a MS. belonging to the Hospital of St. Nicholas, near Trives. The text, which there appears under a very corrupt and mutilated form, was corrected in a multitude of passages by Balduinud, first from a single new MS. (Paris, 1653, 8vo, with the seventh book added in small type), and afterwards from two additional codices (ibid. 1659, 8vo). The second of these impressions remained the standard, until the appearance of the elaborate edition by Dupin (ibid. 1700, fol.; Amst. 1701, fol.; Antw. 1702, fol.); the last, in point of arrangement, is superior to all the others. That of Casaubon (Lond. 1631, 8vo) is of no particular value; that, of L'Aubespine, bishop of Orleans (Paris, 1631, fol.), is altogether worthless. Galland, in his Bibl. Path. v. 462 (Venet. 1769, fol.), has followed the text of Dupin, selected the most important of his critical notes, adopted his distribution of the Monumenta Vetera ad Donatistarum Historiam pertinentia, and brought together much useful matter in his Prolegomeza, cap. 18, p. 29. See Jerome De Viris ill. p. 110; Honor, p. 1, 3; Trithenm. p. 7.6; Augustine, De Doctrin. Christ. 2:40; Lardner, Credibility of Gospel History, cap. cv; Funcius, De L. L. veget. Senect. cap. x, § 56-63; Schonemann, Bibl. Patr. Lat. vol. i, § 16; Bahr, Gesch. der Romans Lit. suppl. pt. ii, § 65; Tillemont; Hist. des Empereurs, 4:364; Wernsdorf, Dissert. in Poet. Lat. min.; Milman, Hist. of Christianity; Mosheim, Ecclesiastes Hist. vol. i; Alzog, Patrologie, § 62; Shepherd, Hist. Ch. of Rome, p. 176, 222, 524 sq.; Herzog; Real-Encyklopadie, 10:665; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generate, 38:723; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Optimism[[@Headword:Optimism]]

             (from Lat. optimus, best) is the doctrine that the existing order in this universe, notwithstanding the possibility of imperfection and sin, is nevertheless, as a whole, the most perfect that could have been ordered by a wise Creator, and the best which it is possible for man to conceive. In other words, optimism looks upon existence as a great good; but the advocates of this school have differed, one class contenting themselves with maintaining the absolute position that, although God was not by any means bound to create the most perfect order of things, yet the existing order is de facto the best; because it is by contact with evil that we learn the value of good, just as the child's consciousness to good, to duty, and to  what is ethically right is roused by the preceptor through painful punishments; in short, that the blessedness of optimism man must attain for himself through suffering and by his own efforts. Another class of Optimists, however, contend not only this, but, in addition, that the perfection and wisdom of Almighty God could produce none other than the most perfect order of things possible; and that, though God foresaw the suffering and moral evil of the world as inevitable, it was yet more consistent with his goodness to create than not to create, supposing the latter possible; in other words, it appears to be in unison with his perfection, and especially with his goodness, to call beings into existence to confer on them as far as possible the enjoyment of life and the capability of attaining perfection, and that therefore the motive for creation appears stronger than for non-creation. SEE NECESSITY; SEE WILL.

The philosophical discussions of which this controversy is the development are as old as philosophy itself, and form the groundwork of all the systems, physical as well as moral, whether of the Oriental or of the Greek philosophy; of Dualism, Parsism, and of the Christian Gnosticism and Manichaeism in the East; and in the West, of the Ionian, the Eleatic, the Atomistic; no lessthan of the later and more familiar Stoic, Peripatetic, and Platonic schools. In the philosophical writings of the fathers, of Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and above all of Augustine, the problem of the seeming mixture of good and evil in the world is the great subject of inquiry, and through all the subtleties of the mediaeval schools it continued to hold an important and prominent place. During the Middle Ages it was ably discussed by the schoolmen St. Anselm and St. Thomas. In times comparatively modern Optimism was embraced by Descartes and Malebranche. Spinoza may also be accounted an Optimist. But the full development of the optimistic theory as a philosophical system was reserved for the celebrated Leibniitz (q.v.). It forms the subject of his most elaborate work, the Theodicea, the main thesis of which may be briefly stated thus: Among all the systems which presented themselves to the infinite intelligence of God as possible, God selected and created, in the existing universe, the best and most perfect physically as well as morally. The Theodicea, published in 1700, was principally designed to meet the skeptical theories of Bayle, by showing not only that the existence of evil, moral and physical, is not incompatible with the general perfection of the created universe, but that God, as all-wise, all-powerful, and all perfect, has chosen out of all possible creations the best and most perfect; that had  another more perfect creation been present to the divine intelligence, God's wisdom would have required of him to select it; and that if another, even equally perfect, had been possible, there would not have been any sufficient determining motive for the creation of the present world.

The details of the controversial part of the system would be out of place in this work. It will be enough to state that the existence of evil, both moral and physical, is explained as a necessary consequence of the finiteness of created beings; and it is contended that in the balance of good and evil in the existing constitution of things, the preponderance of the former is greater than in any other conceivable creation. The optimism of Leibnitz has been misunderstood and misrepresented by Voltaire and others. But the doctrine which Leibnitz advocated is not that the present state of things is the best possible in reference to individuals nor to classes of beings, nor even to this world as a whole, but in reference to all worlds, or to the universe as a whole — and not even to the universe in its present state, but in reference to that indefinite progress of which it may contain the germs. The great argument of the optimists is the following: If the present universe be not the best that is possible, it must be either because God did not know of the (supposed) better universe, or because God was not able to create that better one, or was not willing to create it. Now every one of these hypotheses is irreconcilable with the attributes of God: the first; with his omniscience; the second, with his omnipotence; and the third, with his goodness. See Leibnitz, Theodicea; Baumeister, Historia de Mundo Optimo (Corletei, 1741); Wolfart, Controversiae de Mundo Optimo (Jena, 1743); Creuzer, Leibnitii Doctrina de Mundo Optimo sub Examine denuo Revocata (Leipsic, 1795); Contemp. Rev. May, 1872, art. v. SEE PESSIMISM; SEE THEODICY.

## Optimists[[@Headword:Optimists]]

             According to Mr. Stewart (Nat. and Mor. Powers, bk. 3, ch. 3, § 1), under the title of optimists are comprehended those who admit and those who deny the freedom of human actions, and the accountableness of man as a moral agent. SEE OPTIMISM; SEE PESSIMISM.

## Optimus, Heinrich[[@Headword:Optimus, Heinrich]]

             SEE OPITZ, HEINRICH.

## Option[[@Headword:Option]]

             (Lat. optare, to elect, choose) is in ecclesiastical language the choice or preference which the archbishop of a province enjoys as a customary prerogative, when one of his suffragan bishops is consecrated by him, in the appointment of a clerk or chaplain. In lieu of this it is now usual. however, for the bishop to make over by deed to the archbishop, his executors, administrators, and assigns, the next presentation of such dignity or benefice in the bishop's disposal within that see; so that the archbishop himself may choose, and this is hence called the archbishop's option. If the bishop die or be translated before the archbishop exercises his right, the option is lost, because the new bishop is not bound by the grant of the predecessor; and the archbishop cannot present to any benefice which is vacant at the time of the bishop's death, because the patronage of all such vacant benefices belongs by prerogative to the crown. An option is considered the private patronage of the archbishop; and if the archbishop die, it belongs to his personal representatives, who may present whomsoever they please, unless the archbishop has by his will directed them to present a particular individual in which case they can be compelled to obey the will.

## Opus[[@Headword:Opus]]

             (work), a term used in ecclesiastical art to designate several species of antique mosaics or similar intermixture of colors: e.g. Opus Aglicanum (“English work”), embroidery; Opus Alexandrinum (“Alexandrian work”), an invention of the Egyptians, or, as others say, made in the time of Alexander Severus, being a kind of mosaic pavement, made of squares and circles of porphyry, colored stones, and marbles, of brass, silver, and gold; Opus Graecum (“Greek work”), mosaics; Opus intextum (“in-weaved work”), irregular masses of stone-work; Opus reticulbaturn (“netted work”), stones. arranged diagonally; Opus Teutonicun (“German work”), metal work; (pus vermiculstum (“worm-like work”), chequer work, latticed embroidery.

## Opus Operantis[[@Headword:Opus Operantis]]

             (Lat. literally the work of the worker), a well-known theological phrase, intended to signify that the effect of a particular ministration or rite is primarily and directly due, not to the rite itself (opus), but to the disposition of the subject (operans). Thus, in the act of kissing or praying  before a crucifix, of sprinkling one's self with holy water, of telling the prayers of the rosary upon blessed beads, the fervor and personal piety of the supplicant, and not the material object of the religious use, is held to be, the efficient cause of the grace which is thereby imparted. The term is used chiefly by writers of the Roman Catholic schools, in whose system, however, the sacramental rites are held to differ from all others in this respect. SEE OPUS OPERATUM.

## Opus Operatum[[@Headword:Opus Operatum]]

             (Lat. literally the work wrought) is the phrase employed by Roman Catholic theologians to describe the manner of the supposed operation of the sacramental rites in the production of grace (q.v.). It is intended to imply, say the Romanists to Protestant polemics, that the ministration of the rite (opus) is in itself, through the institutions of Christ, an efficient cause of grace, and that, although its operation is not infallible, but requires and presupposes certain dispositions on the part of the recipient, yet these dispositions are but conditiones sine qua non, and do not of themselves produce the grace; and hence, when the sacraments are administered to dying persons in a state of apparent insensibility, this is done in the hope and on the presumption that the dying person may, though seemingly unconscious, be nevertheless really disposed to receive the sacrament. The teachings of the Romish Church do not, however, warrant such a mild construction. It is evident from the received writings of the Church of Rome that, even if the dispositions conditioned above be wanting, the sacrament will itself justify the unrepentant sinner. Thomas Aquinas boldly defended the doctrine that the sacraments now have virtue ex opere operato, and not, as in Old-Testament times, ex opere operantis. And the Council of Trent (sess. 7, canons 7, 8) says: “If any one shall say that grace, as far as concerneth God's part, is not given through the said sacraments, always and to all men, even though they lightly receive them, but [only] sometimes, and to some persons, let him be anathema. If any one shall say that by the said sacraments of the new law grace is not conferred through the act performed, but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for obtaining grace, let him be anathema.” It is but too clearly apparent from these quotations that the efficacious operation of the sacrament does not presuppose as conditions the repentance and other moral dispositions of the recipient, and that the grace which they give is due, not to these dispositions, but to the sacraments alone. This doctrine, if carried out, would obviously equalize, in a great measure, the benefits  received by the worthy and the unworthy who approach the altar, and would justify the administration of baptism to the heathen, etc., not only on consent, but by the application of physical force. In a certain sense it is unquestionably true that all the appointed means of grace have an effect ex opere operate, inasmuch as the act itself though inefficacious in its own nature, is an institution of God, and consecrated by him as an instrument not to be made void at the caprice of man. Thus the preaching of the Gospel is inevitably a savor of life or of death. The administration of baptism is invariably an admission into the Church. But that the use of an appointed ordinance goes beyond this, and results in all cases in a moral effect on the individual, and in the insuring of higher portions of divine grace or ex necessitate, is contrary to the views of the apostolic and primitive Church, the doctrine of Scripture, and the preservation of man's free agency. See for Protestant views, Elliott, Delineation of Romanism; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, p. 370; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2:80, 303, 306. On Roman Catholic views, Mohler. Symbolik; and Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Opus Supererogationis[[@Headword:Opus Supererogationis]]

             SEE SUPEREROGATION.

## Oquamiris[[@Headword:Oquamiris]]

             sacrifices offered by the Mingreliaris in the Caucasus, which partake partly of a Jewish, partly of a pagan character. “Their principal sacrifice,” as we learn from Picart, “is that at which the priest, after he has pronounced some particular prayers over the ox, or such other animal as is appointed and set apart for that solemn purpose, singes the victim in five several places to the skin with a lighted taper; then leads it in procession around the devotee for whose particular service it is to be slaughtered; and at last, having sacrificed it, orders it to be dressed and brought to table. The whole family thereupon stand round about it, each of them with a wax taper in his hand. He for whom the sacrifice is peculiarly intended kneels down before the table, having a candle or wax taper in his hand, while the priest reads some prayers that are suitable to the solemn occasion. When he has done. not only he who kneels, but his relatives, friends, and acquaintances throw frankincense into the fire, which is placed near the victim. The priest then cuts off a piece of the victim, waves it over the head of him at whose request it is offered up, and gives it him to eat; after which the whole  company, drawing near to him, wave their wax tapers over his head in like manner, and throw them afterwards into the same fire where they just before have cast their frankincense. Every person that is present at this solemn act of devotion has the liberty to eat as much as he thinks proper, but is enjoined to carry no part of it away; the remainder belongs to the sacrificator. They have another Oquamiri which is celebrated in honor of their dead. There is nothing, however, very particular or remarkable inn it but the ceremony of sacrificing some bloody victims, upon which they pour oil and wine mingled together. They make their oblations of wine likewise to the saints after divers forms, a particular detail whereof would be tedious and insipid, and of little or no importance. I shall only observe; therefore, that, besides the wine, they offer up a pig and cock to St. Michael; and that the Oquamiri which is. devoted to the service of St. George, when their vintage is ripe, consists in consecrating a barrel of wine to him, which contains about twenty-four flagons, though it. must not be broached until after Whitsuntide, on the festival of St. Peter, at which time the master of each family carries a small quantity of it to St. George's Church, where he pays his devotions to the saint; after which he returns home, and takes all of his family into his cellar. There they arrange themselves in order around the barrel, the head whereof is plentifully furnished with bread and cheese, a parcel of chibbals, or little onions, by the master of the house, who, before anything is touched, repeats a prayer. At last he kills either a hog or a kid, and sprinkles part of the blood all around the vessel. The ceremony concludes with eating and drinking.”

## Or-Sarua, Isaac Ben-Moses[[@Headword:Or-Sarua, Isaac Ben-Moses]]

             of Vienna, by way of abbreviation also called ריאז, i.e. Rabbi Isaac Or- Sarua, and by his contemporaries styled רבינו הגדול, i.e. “our great Master,” while others called him הדור מופת, i.e. “the wonder of the age,” or רבינו הקדוש, i.e. “our holy Master,” is one of the greatest Talmudical authorities of the 13th century. Or-Sarua witnessed the awful treatment of his coreligionists in France, who were obliged to wear some kind of mark on their clothes. He witnessed the persecutions against the Jews of Germany, which seem to have been the order of the day, and speaks of the horrible massacres that took place at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1241, where many suffered martyrdom. Or-Sarua attained to a great age, for he flourished about 1200-1270. To satisfy his thirst for learning, he undertook great journeys, in order to hear the greatest teachers of the German and French academies. He was probably before 1217 at Regensburg, where he attended the lectures of the famous R. Jehuda the Pious, the author of the ethical work entitled חֲסַידַים ס8. About 1216-17 Or-Sarua was at Paris, where the Jewish academy was in a very flourishing condition under the presidency of the famous R. Jehuda ben-Isaac Sir Leon. Or-Sarua was one of the most prominent of Leon's pupils, in whose spirit he lived and labored. From France Or-Sarua returned to Germany, living and laboring at different places, especially at Vienna; hence he is called Isaac ben-Moses of Vienna. He is the author of a great Talmudical work entitled אור זרוע, a ritual codex and commentary. He is also said to have written a commentary on the Pentateuch, which is still extant. The works of Or-Sarua were published for the first time at Scytomir (1862, 2 vols. fol.). See De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 332 (German transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:654 sq; 3:561, No. 1167; Dr. H. Gross, R. Isaak ben-Mose OrSarua aus Wien, in Frankel- Gratz, Monatsschrift, 1-871, p. 248-264. (B. P.)

## Oracle[[@Headword:Oracle]]

             occurs in several places in the Auth. Ver. as the rendering of the Heb. דְּבַיר, debir, ordinarily derived from דָּבִר, in the sense to say, speak; i.e. the response or place of the voice of God. But the best critics understand it to mean properly a back-chamber, a back or west room, from דָּבִר, to be behind (see Gesenius, Thes., and esp. Furst, Lex. s.v.); hence the inner or most secret room of the Temple (1 Kings 6, passim; 7:49; 8:6, 8; 2Ch 3:16; 2Ch 4:20; 2Ch 5:7; 2Ch 5:9; Psa 28:2), elsewhere called “the Holy of Holies” (Heb. הִקָּדָשַׁים קֹרֶשׁ, 1Ki 6:16; 2Ch 4:22, and often). SEE TEMPLE. The Sept. in these passages simply adoptsthe Hebrew word:( τὸ δαβίρ) “but Jerome followed” by some modern versions, renders oraculum— the word used by the heathen to denote the places where they consuited their gods. In 2Sa 16:23, the Hebrew  word rendered oracle is dabdr (דָּבָר)., which usually means word, and is often applied thus to the word or revelation of God (see margin, ad loc.; so Jer 1:4; Jer 1:11). In the N.T. only the word oracles is found, in the plural (as the rendering of the Greek λόγια, Act 7:38), especially the oracles of God (τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom 3:2; comp. Heb 5:12; 1Pe 4:11), in reference to the divine communications which had been given to the Jews throughout their history, SEE HOLY OF HOLIES; SEE URIM.

The manner of such utterances among the Hebrews was various. God spake to his people of old at sundry times and in divers manners — sometimes face to face, as with Abraham and Moses — sometimes by dreams and visions, as with Joseph and Pharaoh — sometimes by signs and tokens, as with Gideon and Barak — sometimes by the word of prophecy — and sometimes by a regularly organized system of communication, as by the Urim and Thummim. SEE PRIEST.

These last, which had a distinct locality, and were always accessible, were especially the Hebrew oracles. We have an instance in the case of David (1Sa 23:9); when he desired to know whether it would be safe for him to take refuge with the men of Keilah, against the persecution of Saul, he inquired of Abiathar the priest. “Bring hither,” said he, “the ephod;” and the reply to his inquiry was that it would not be safe, for the men of Keilah would deliver him up to the king. Another similar instance occurs in the same book (1Sa 30:7-8); and there appears no reason to doubt that such was the mode of “inquiring at the mouth of the Lord” for a considerable period. SEE DIVINATION; SEE EPHOD; SEE INSPIRATION; SEE REVELATION.

The most ancient oracle on record, probably, is that given to Rebekah (Gen 25:22); but the most complete scriptural instance is that of the child Samuel (1 Samuel 3). The place was the residence of the ark, the regular station of worship. The manner was by an audible and distinct voice: “The Lord called Samuel;” and the child mistook the voice for that of Eli (and this more than once), “for he did not yet know the word of the Lord.” The subject was of high national importance; no less than a public calamity, with the ruin of the first family in the land. Nor could the child have any inducement to deceive Eli; as in that case he would have rather invented something flattering to his venerable superior. This communicative voice, issuing from the interior of the sanctuary, was properly an oracle. SEE SAMUEL.

Heathen oracles are occasionally referred to in the Scriptures, and one in particular seems to have been very celebrated. This was the oracle of Baalzebub, or Baalzebul, at Ekron. Ahaziah, the son of Ahab (2Ki 1:2), having fallen through a lattice in his upper chamber, and suffering greatly in consequence, sent to Ekron to inquire of this oracle, and his messenger was stopped by Elijah, who administered to the king of Israel a reproof for consulting a false god, and gave him the assurance of speedy death. The name Baalzebub, signifying “lord of a fly,” has been occasionally interpreted as a derisive appellation bestowed by the Jews on the god worshipped at Ekron; but there is little ground for this criticism. Ekron was much infested by flies, and these were often believed to bring with them contagious disorders. The god whom the inhabitants supposed able to deliver them from these minute but vexatious enemies might well take a title from the exploit, just as the Jupiter, or rather Zeus, of the Greeks assumed among other epithets those of Μυιώδης and Μυίαγρος. SEE BEEL-ZEBUB.

Other oracular means in Palestine were the Teraphim, as that of Micah (Jdg 17:1-5); the ephod of Gideon (8:27, etc.), and the false gods adored in the kingdom of Samaria, which had their false prophets, and consequently. their oracles. Hos 4:12 reproaches Israel with consulting wooden idols, as does the book of Wisdom (13:16, 17) and the prophet in Hab 2:19. SEE IDOLATRY. For the daemoniacal responses referred to in Act 16:16, SEE PYTHONESS... Among the heathen the term oracle was usually taken to signify an answer, generally conveyed in very dark and ambiguous terms, supposed to be given by daemons of old, either by the mouths of their idols or by those of their priests, to the people who consulted them; Oracle is also used for the daemon who gave the answer, and the place where it was given. Seneca defines oracles to be communications by the mouths of men of the will of the gods; and Cicero simply calls them deorum oratio, the language of the gods. Among the pagans they were held in high estimation; and they were consulted on a variety of occasions pertaining to national enterprises and private life. When the heathen made peace or war, enacted laws, reformed states, or changed the constitution, they had in all these cases recourse to the oracle by public authority. Also, in private life. if a man wished to marry, if he proposed to take a journey, or to engage in any business of importance, he repaired to the oracle for counsel. Mankind have always had a propensity to explore futurity; and, conceiving that future events were known to their gods, who possessed the gift of prophecy, they sought information and advice from the oracles, which in their opinion were  supernatural and divine communications. Accordingly, every nation in which idolatry has subsisted has also had its oracles, by means of which imposture was practiced on superstition and credulity. SEE PROPHECY.

The principal oracles of antiquity among the Greeks were that of Abe, mentioned by Herodotus; that of Amphiaraus, at Oropus, in Macedonia; that of the Branchidae, at Didymeum; that of the camps at Lacedaemon; that of Dodona; that of Jupiter Ammon; that of Nabarca, in the country of the Anariaci, near the Caspian Sea; that of Trophonius. mentioned by Herodotus; that of Chrysopolis; that of Claros, in Ionia; that of. Amphilochus, at Mallos; that of Petarea; that of Pella, in Macedonia; that of Phaselides, in Cilicia; that of Sinope, in Paphlagonia; that of Orpheus's head at Lesbos, mentioned by Philostratus. But of all the oracles, the oracle of Apollo Pythius, at Delphi, was' the most celebrated. The responses of oracles were delivered in a variety of ways: At Delphi the priestess of Apollo was seated on a tripod over a fissure in the rock, from which issued an intoxicating vapor, under the influence of which the priestess delivered incoherent hexameter verses, which were interpreted by the priests. At Dodona the responses were uttered from beneath the shade of a venerable oak. The oracle of Tropholius was in a cavern, in which the inquirer spent the night. The god replied by visions, which were usually of so awful a character that it was said that he who had passed a night in the cave of Trophonius was never again seen to smile. Uniformly the answers of oracles were given in ambiguous terms, and capable of quite opposite and contradictory interpretations. The Romans, who had the Sibylline books, augury, and many other means of discovering the will of the gods, never adopted the oracle. The ancient Scandinavians had their oracles, and it was generally believed by all the Northern nations that the Three Destinies gave forth these oracles. Some, among whom were nearly all the fathers of the early Church, contend that these oracular responses were really given by daemons; citing as proof a host of testimonies to their truth in ancient times, the fact that all oracles died away soon after the coming of Christ, who gave to the early Church miraculous gifts by which such utterances were stopped; and arguing that much more glory is given to God by a theory which allowed the reality and continuance of diabolic power than by one which resolved all such wonders into mere fraud and imposture. Others, among whom are Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius, maintain that they were but more or less refined examples of imposture; dwelling on the ambiguity of most of the recorded responses — which indeed were so contrived that, whatever happened, the event would justify  the oracle the merely traditional testimony concerning those cited as true, and observing that oracles continued after Christ, and that some of the most remarkable miracles claimed by the post-apostolic Church rest upon that continued existence. The ambiguity of the oracles in their responses, and their double meaning, contributed much to their support. But notwithstanding all these and other precautions, the heathen priests succeeded very imperfectly in maintaining the credit of the oracles.

The wiser and more sagacious of the heathen, especially in later times, held them in utter contempt. They were ridiculed by the comic poets; and the pretendedly inspired priestess was, in several instances, even popularly accused of being bribed to prophesy according to the interests of a particular party. Such was the poor success of false prophecy, even with all the aids of art, and a systematic plan of imposture, to preserve it from detection. The ancient and beautiful tradition (see Plutarch, De Oraculorunm defectu) above referred to, that immediately on our Savior's death all the heathen oracles became silent, cannot indeed be supported in the face of many testimonies of ancient writers to responses given after that time (see esp. Plutarch, De Pyth. Orac. c. xxiv); but the legend, in the sense in which it has passed into modern Christian poetry as emblematic of the triumphs of the cross, is sufficiently justified by their rapid decline in the apostolic age (comp. Strabo, 9, p. 420; Pausan. 10:7,1). See Manger, De Adyto דביר(Tr. ad Bk. 1751); Milton, Hymns on the Nativity; E. B. Browning, The Dead Pan; Schiller, Gotter Griechenlands. SEE NECROMANCER; SEE WITCHCRAFT.

## Oracles[[@Headword:Oracles]]

             (from the Latin oraculum) is a term of fluctuating and often vague signification, according to the various modes of its employment. In its primary acceptation it means an utterance inspired by a divinity; and the term may have originated from the supposition that the human mouth — os, oris — from which the supernatural declaration proceeded, was merely the mechanical and involuntary instrument moved by divine power, as in the case of the Cumaean Sibyl, to become the means of communicating the divine will to men

“Ille fatigat Os rabidum, fera corda domans, fingitque premendo.”

By an easy metonymy the term is used to denote the place where such communications are made. By various metaphorical deflections the name is  applied to the deity who inspires and the possessed who proclaims the messages. By a further transition it is given to all predictions or revelations; and hence, in an especial manner, to the commands of God contained in the Scriptures of the Old and of the New Covenant; to the priests and preachers whose calling it is to promulgate, expound, and enforce these decrees. Hence also its application is extended to those who possess an extraordinary degree of sagacity and wisdom; and, ironically, to those who arrogate such superior wisdom to themselves, or whose manner appears to indicate the assumption of such pretensions. The subordinate meanings are sufficiently illustrated by the dictionaries. It is only the primary and the closely associated secondary meaning that it will be appropriate to consider here the supernatural communication, and the place where it is habitually delivered.

1. An oracle, or oraculum, in this primary signification, corresponds very closely to the Greek χρηστήριον and μαντεῖον — the former term referring to a divine answer given at a definite place by a particular deity; the latter having a more general application, and including all prophetic utterances by those recognized as possessing the gift of vaticination, though frequently employed in the more restricted sense. It is not essential, however, that the communication should be made directly by the divinity through the mouth of the human instrument. The priest, prophet, seer, or medium may be merely the appointed and singularly gifted interpreter of signs or sounds or visions or impressions or symbols or associations. The answers to applicants were sometimes conveyed by speech, sometimes by writing, sometimes by strange noises, sometimes by tintamarre of sacred vessels, sometimes by dreams which were explained by the inspired ministrants; and at other times by the exposition of the mystic meaning of the first exclamations of the inquirer after awakening from a vaticinatory trance. Nearly all the multitudinous forms of divination were, in different periods or localities, connected with Oracular illumination. All signs, accidents, and lots might come from the deities as well as dreams from Jove. As the gods were consulted in regard to all the concerns, interests, and desires of human life, public and private, the answers received from them embraced the same variety of subjects, and were by no means confined to prophetic warnings or divine indications of future events. It is thus that the designation of oracle is extended to all divine commands, or directions supposed to be divine, and hence also to wise counsels and precepts. But the derivative significances need to be no further regarded  than maybe necessary for the avoidance of ambiguities. The topics immediately before us require only the notice of communications supposed to be of divine origin, by whatever modes or channels they may be transmitted to men.

If Mr. Austin Caxton had ever completed and published his History of Human Error, a large and very important division of his work must have been devoted to the consideration of oracular credulity. . The oracles of Greece exercised such influence on the Hellenic world, and are so prominent in classic literature, that the mind spontaneously and almost exclusively reverts to the grove of Dodona, the temple of Delphi, the cave of Trophonius, or the oasis of Ammon, when the subject of oracles is introduced. But these are only the most notable and the most noted instances of oracular persuasion. The temper which provokes these delusive satisfactions and the temper which gratifies such delusions are found alike in all ages and among all races, though frequently so disguised as to be entirely overlooked. In every pagan age and in every pagan race the superstitious belief in oracular communications is readily discernible. The human heart instinctively craves, supernatural guidance; the human mind longs for the supernatural revelation of the issues of actions and of coming events, and eagerly believes in any pretense which professes to satisfy its anxiety in either respect. It was the despairing advice of the skeptical Epicurean, after the multitudinous hazards, surprises, fears, and disappointments of the civil wars, which was given by Horace when he ejaculated,

“Quid sit futurum oras, fuge quaerere;”

and a second time, when he exclaimed,

“Tu ne quaesieris (scire nefas) quem mihi, quem tibi, Finem di dederint.”

But in all crude and still believing periods, among all rude and unenlightened populations and classes, whether in the 19th century before or the 19th century after Christ, and in all the intervening centuries,'we find the same disposition to seek and to accept supramundane direction and knowledge; and no age is so poor in deceivers, themselves often deceived, as to fail in providing ministers for this want.

It is not simply that among savage tribes or classes of imperfect mental and moral discipline prophets constitute venerated and important members of  the loose organization; but that their prophets always pretend and are believed to be in direct communication with unearthly wisdom, and to be specially commissioned to impart — always for a consideration, as Bayle follows Athenaeus in remarking — the will or the purpose of destiny to those who consult them. To the untutored fancy the whole universe swarms with superhuman intelligences. The strong and hungry faith and the weak intellectual discernment recognize but slight differences between the human and the divine, and see no improbability in the constant intercourse between the guardian deities and the favored spirits of the tribe. If Pindar, in the age when the Theseum was built, could maintain that “men and gods were of one origin, and that both descended from the same mother,” how much deeper .must have been the sentiment of communion between embodied and disembodied souls in less advanced populations?

Recent investigations into “primitive culture,” or the condition and belief of the earlier stages of society, with the comparison of similarities of conviction and practice which such investigations have occasioned, throw new though often indirect light upon the mystery of oracles, and enable us to form juster notions of the phase of popular thought by which they are induced and accredited. When the attention was restricted to the oracles of Greece and the rarer and less notable oracles of Italy, the explanation of their occurrence and of their frequent appearance of veracity might oscillate between the allegation of demoniac, or truly divine inspiration, and systematic fraud and imposture. But when oracles in all variety, from crude mummery to singular discernment, are discovered among all pagan nations, and among all semi-pagan classes in Christian communities, it is necessary to refer their production and acceptance to the characteristics of the untrained intellect of man. With the information thus obtained it may be possible to understand the changing aspects of the same enduring delusion.

The office of the prophet in his character of interpreter of the will of the gods, and intermediary between deities and men, has existed, as already declared, among all heathen peoples. Such seers were found not merely among the Greeks, from the time of the Homeric Calchas and the precursors of Calchas, but were also an established order in the Phoenician cities and among the Celtic tribes. They still exercise their controlling influence not only among the North American Indians and the Tartars, but, contemporaneously with sachems and Shamans, their congeners are common among African tribes and Polynesian Islanders. It is strange also to find in the accounts given of a Kaffre prophet the symptoms of the  access of the divine afflatus which were reported of the Delphic Pythoness, and ascribed by Virgil to the Cumsean Sibyl. “He becomes depressed in mind; prefers solitude to company, and often has fainting fits; he is visited by dreams of an extraordinary character; he becomes more and more possessed, until the perturbations of the spirit manifest themselves openly. In this stage he utters terrible yells, leaps here and there with astonishing vigor.” He tells his family and friends, “People-call me mad; I know they say I am mad; that is nothing; the spirits are influencing me.” Is this all imposture in the poor African? Is it not more hallucination than imposture.? Is it actual daemoniacal possession? or is it not rather that morbid exaltation of enthusiastic credulity which has been recognized by physicians as a specific disease? Are not the like furies which were attributed to the priestess of Delphi, at least in their primitive exhibition, due to the same causes?

With the accounts of the African prophet and of the Sibyl and Pythoness may be advantageously compared the report of the call of Tecumseh's brother to the prophetic office. “Lo, the poor Indian!” In this case there was more of artifice and design, more imposture than self-delusion; but could the experiment have succeeded with his people and the allied tribes unless there had originally been innocent hallucination to cherish the growth of credulity?

The suggestion of a natural exposition, at once physiological and psychical, for the phenomena of oracular inspiration, by no means militates against the recognition of a large infusion of fraud and imposture in the systematic establishment of oracular agencies. It is impossible, as has frequently been observed, to distinguish by any clear line of demarcation between delusion and deception. The two temperaments blend insensibly into each other. What began in a diseased apprehension — in a morbid, dreamy conviction — passes by slow degrees and by multitudinous shades of difference into hypocritical pretense and mercenary jugglery; but something of the original fantasy remains in the mind of the impostor, and continues to fill the awe- struck hearts of the votaries.

2. There has been, and not yet has there ceased to be, much discussion in regard to the character of the inspiration of the ancient oracles of Greece. Whatever doctrine may be adopted, it is manifest that it should be capable of embracing all the phenomena, and should be applicable to the explanation of oracles in all their forms and in all their localities. Three  theories have been propounded and warmly advocated by their respective champions: 1: The hypothesis of actual and veracious inspiration by God, or the angels of God. 2: That of diabolic intervention. 3: That of the contrivance of designing men, which will include the common and unreflecting' allegation of pure chicanery and fraudulent deception. The first view has been entertained even in late years, and seems partially sanctioned by some of the Christian fathers, especially in their respect for Sibylline inspiration. The second opinion prevailed generally among the doctors of both the Greek and Latin churches, and was usually entertained until recent times, having the support of the historian Rollin, the English divines Sherlock and Collyer, and many other writers of note. The third explanation is that which is now prevalent, and was promulgated by Bayle, and supported by Van Dale and Fontenelle.

The remarks already made will show that the first and second of these solutions are deemed unsatisfactory, and that the third is considered an incomplete interpretation of the enigma. It is not denied that imposture was common; and this was fully recognized by the ancients in the height of their belief in oracles. Thucydides affords his testimony to the fact, and Aristophanes ridicules the collections of forged oracles which were in vogue during the Peloponnesian wars. It was not among the Jews only that four hundred false prophets might have been found for one wise one. But all oracles were not at all times deliberate forgeries. The existence and the credit of oracular responses, and the eminent influence which they long possessed, were due to original appetencies and hallucinations of the uninformed and undeveloped mind of man. Do not children still half or wholly believe.that their little misdeeds are reported by the birds, or by whispers in the air? The pious cheat which the mother practices on her wondering offspring reveals at once the origin and the permanence of the belief in oracular communications much more satisfactorily than either of the first two theories specified above, or than the third adopted without addition or limitation. This instinctive credulity furnishes the foundation on which concealed ingenuity or miserable fraud erected imposing structures. That the element of fraud increases in such annunciations with the increasing intelligence of the community, and with the decline of unquestioning superstition, is not to be doubted; and that the ignorant trust of unenlightened races in the official promulgation of divine counsels is deluded by formal arrangements for the use or abuse of such trust must also be admitted. Yet certainly there is no consistency in charging to willful  deception all oracular utterances, while Mesmerism and Millerism still attract thousands of earnest and honest believers.

A superstitious tendency habitual to the uneducated mind, and confirmed by associations in regard to spiritual influences incident to that stage, would appear to be the truest explanation of the origin of oracles. A prophetic or priestly class, identical or partially distinct, by the very transmission of its functions, makes a trade of what was previously a mental infirmity, a morbid enthusiasm. The function, sustained by the enduring popular faith, is converted into an instrument of rule, of guidance, of police, and of instruction, and is employed by the authorities, or by an association of sagacious men, for the government and elevation of the community. As other titles to control, other modes of regulation, other schemes of popular culture, come into use, and more effectually discharge the like offices, the need of oracular direction diminishes; the hands that moved the puppets are withdrawn, and the agency long imagined to be divine ceases to act, or is transferred to pretenders, who trifle with the remnants of credulity for the secret power or the petty gains which may thus be achieved. A due estimate is rarely made of the large capacity of man for the belief in marvels and prodigies which superstitious terror or superstitious hope may incline him to believe.

It will be noticed that a large share in the production of oracles is conceded to design and to deliberate contrivance — let it not be called merely imposture — during that phase of their existence when they exerted the most methodical influence. This was pre-eminently the case during the ascendency of the Delphic shrine. The power exercised over the whole Hellenic world from that mysterious and splendid center of oracular inspiration was amazing, and was rendered more amazing by the discordant and repellent attitude of the numerous Greek communities towards each other. Curtius may be guilty of nothing worse than exaggeration in attributing to the Delphic oracle, and to the prominence thus conferred on the Dorian Apollo, the rapid advancement of Spartan power and the moral culture of the contemporaneous Greeks. Certainly, consummate wisdom, wondrous sagacity, extensive knowledge, and unprecedented ethical purity were displayed in the Pythian responses. Whoever inspired the Pythoness must have been greatly superior to the contemporary populations in statesmanship, in information, and in morals. The Homeric Hymn to Apollo, which has all the air of being a Delphic production, startles us as much as does the Prometheus Vinctus by the marked elevation of its  sentiments and by its singular adumbrations of Christian doctrine. Apollo, the son of Jove, the peculiar god of prophecy and lord of the oracle, assumes the office of teacher of his people, and breathes a higher and more vital air into the lungs of his votaries.

A long series of changes and transmutations in the character and conduct of oracles is thus admitted and accounted for. They are just such changes, too, as are consonant with the whole order of human development, and illustrated by the whole progress of society. The changes, however, are by no means confined to the human agencies in the production of oracular intelligence. The oracular divinities themselves were subject to the same empire of mutability.

Among all races, the supernal powers, in their primitive character, are invoked exclusively for the purpose of portending, preventing, removing, or redressing evils, which they are themselves believed to inflict. Jupiter Α᾿λεξίκακος, or Opitulus, was probably the earliest distinct appearance of the Olympian Jove. In the exercise of their functions, the deities united, like country apothecaries in old time, all therapeutic offices in themselves, and prescribed for all ailments of mind, body, and estate. It was only gradually, by the application of the doctrine of the division of labor, that Jupiter devolved sundry of his duties upon Apollo, as subsequently Apollo did upon Esculapius, as. he upon his sons Machaon and Podalirius, by whom they were turned over to their supposed descendants, the Asclepiadiae. The same process of segregation and differentiation, as Herbert Spencer would say, was manifested by the divinities as by their special ministers, the prophets. These, at first and through long generations, protected against witchcraft, adverse spirits, the evil eye, and other obscure afflictions; they averted or relieved pain by incantation; they cured wounds and mended broken bones; they brought rain, like Jupiter Pluvius; they discovered lost cattle and missing goods; they detected thieves; they announced the mollia tenpora fandi et agendi; they treasured up or invented the past; they foretold the future; they held confidential intercourse with their patron or paternal gods; they became the habitual interpreters of their will, the exponents of their wisdom, and the accredited channels of communication with them. The last and highest office was not separated from the rest till the rest had sunk into such secondary importance as to be entrusted to the ordinary acolytes of “the schools of the prophets,” or to other professional gentry. The progressive discrimination of the prophetic function is equally displayed in the prophets and in the divinities. The Father of gods and men  is obscured in oracular eminence by his son Apollo, who becomes the special deity of plague and physic and music and song and prophecy. In the latest Hellenic ages Apollo is himself eclipsed by the deified mortals Amphiaraus and Amphilochus. Thus oracle-mongering was not only withdrawn from the department of the general practitioner, but declined into the keeping of subordinate persons.

3. Attention will now be directed to this distinct phase of oracular manifestation, and will be concentrated on those celebrated oracles of classical antiquity which alone ordinarily present themselves. All notice of the Sibyls and the Sibylline oramcles will be deferred to a separate article, as, notwithstanding their superior interest and importance, they had an entirely distinct origin and character. SEE SIBYL and SEE SIBYLLINE ORACLES.

The most ancient known oracle of Greece was that of Jupiter at Dodona, where communications were made from hollow oaks, or by the clatter of the sacred kettles suspended in the sacred grove. The answers, accordingly, were not direct, but conjectural, and were determined by the arbitrary interpretations of the priests. Dodona is mentioned by Homer, once in the authentic text, and once in the Catalogue of the Ships; but in neither place does the oracle seem known to the poet. He does not seem to be acquainted with any oracular locality. With him the individual seer, directly inspired by Apollo, is the depositary of the prophetic gift. This is a striking evidence of the great antiquity of the Homeric rhapsodies, for Dodona was certainly much more ancient than Delphi, and Delphi had reached or passed its zenith of eminence when Pindar wrote. The oracle of the Pythian Apollo, in a glen of Parnassus, was much the most famous of all the Hellenic seats of prophecy, and threw completely into the shade the Dodondean Grove and the other oracles of Jupiter. The eclipse was probably due to migrations and changed relations among the Greek races, and may be plausibly connected with the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus. But the altered mode of transmitting the divine replies evinces a change of intellectual condition and an advance in civility. At Delphi the prophetic medium was a female, called the Pythoness, who was thrown into convulsions and incoherent ejaculations by gases supposed to issue from crevices in the rock. These utterances were professedly taken down by the attendant priest, and delivered to the postulants, originally, and usually in all periods, in the form of hexameter verses, but occasionally in iambics  after Athenian supremacy had disseminated Attic fashions and an acquaintance with the Attic dialect.

Dodona and Delphi are the most noted of Greek oracles; but they lead a long array of names of greater or lesser renown in both Greece and Italy, as well as in other lands reached by Greek influences or open to Greek interpretation. Nor is there any reason to suppose that even the names of all the oracles of temporary or local celebrity have been preserved. Besides the great oracle of Jupiter at Dodona, there was one in Boeotia, one in Elis, and one of much brief fame in the sandy deserts of Libya — that of Jupiter Ammon, consulted by Lysander and by Alexander the Great. Apollo had a much longer list of oracular shrines — at Argos, at Corinth, at Lacedaemon, at Claros, at Branchidae, at Antioch, at Patara, in Arcadia, in Cilicia, in Troas, at Baiae, and at many other places. Other divinities, both Dii Majores anid Dii Matinores, had their seats of vaticination scattered throughout the Hellenic settlements and beyond them. Diana had oracles at Ephesus, in Cilicia, and in Egypt. Juno gave comfort at Corinth, at Nysa, and elsewhere. Minerva responded at Mycenae, on Mount AEtna, in Colchis, and in Spain. Saturn, Neptune, Pluto, Mars, Venus, Pan, Hercules, and AEsculapius, all kept offices for prophetic intelligence. Even inferior immortals shared in the publication of the secrets of Fate. Fortune deceived her suitors at Antium; Castor and Pollux were in partnership at Sparta; the Nymphs received anxious visitors at the Corycian Cave; Machaon welcomed inquirers in Laconia; Trophonius, at Lebadea; Tiresias, at Orchomenos. Ulysses, Mopsus, Aristeus, Sarpedon, Calchas, Amphiaraus, Autolycus, and many others, male and female, had establishments in various quarters. Carmenta and her sister Camenee had their cells of inspiration on the Capitoline Hill at Rome,. and in the neighborhood. Faunus was consulted at Tibur, in Latium; and near by was the grove of the oracular nymph Albunea-domus Albuneoe resonantis. Both are commemorated in conjunction by Virgil, and the latter is noted as a tenth Sibyl by Lactantius, who states that her predictions (sortes) were deposited in the Capitol by the Roman Senate. But it would be tedious to extend the list still further, and impossible to complete it. The number of oracles multiplied as they became vulgarized and discredited. Their multitude furnished a poor compensation for their loss of authority.

4. From the time of the Peloponnesian War the oracles ceased to exert any considerable influence over the more intelligent Greeks. They were still consulted, and were treated with external respect. They might be employed  for the furtherance of political and religious aims, and to operate on the multitude; but there could be little genuine faith in them when the temples to which they were attached were unscrupulously plundered for the maintenance of domestic wars. Moreover, oracle was weighed against oracle; contradictory replies were expected from rival establishments; and the unsatisfactory reply of one divinity was set aside for the more encouraging response of another. This discord in heaven was turned into ridicule by Aristophanes.

The decay of reputation naturally promoted and attended the decline of oracles. The diminution of respect commenced early, as even before the Persian wars the Pythoness was alleged to have been corrupted by the Alcmaeonidae. But popular superstitions expire slowly, especially when supported by organized institutions, and by a special class interested in their maintenance. The image-makers and carvers and jewelers and silversmiths and priests, who live by the temple, will long succeed in making the multitude cry out, “Great is Diana of the Ephesians.” The Epicureans, in the Macedonian period, might laugh at the Delphic responses, and jeer at Apollo, the god of poetry, for composing verses far inferior to those of Homer, whom he was believed to have inspired. Indeed, the halting metres and loose composition of the oracles were among the earliest causes of the contempt into which they fell and gave as little evidence of supernatural agency as do the seances of modern spiritualists. Still, however, oracular instructions continued to be vented and vended, and were received with wondering faith by the multitude, however suspicious they might be in the estimation of the wise.

It is not easy to determine precisely the period of the actual cessation of oracles. Such uncertainty is inevitable, as they were only gradually extinguished. An old and popular tradition is that they were silenced at once by the Advent; and this opinion was employed in a very serious manner by Milton in his juvenile Hymn on the Nativity. The same statement is made in the solemn prose of Isaac Barrow in his eighteenth Sermon on the Creed: “At the appearance of Jesus and his doctrine, his (Satan's) altars were deserted, his temples fell down, his oracles were dumb, his arts were supplanted, all his worship and kingdom were quite subverted.” This story of the cessation seems to have been started by Eusebius in the 4th century, and perhaps to have been adopted in a more unrestricted form than was designed by him. It is apparently connected with the fable of the death of the god Pan, and with the myth of Thammuz, which was  commented on by the rabbi Maimonides. No weight, however, can be attached to the representation. The oracles had been decaying for centuries before the Christian aera, as they prolonged their existence in a more and more languishing condition for centuries after it. Cicero remarks that the Delphic shrine was no longer veracious, and declares that as long ago as the times of Pyrrhus Apollo had ceased to make verses (De Div. I, 19:37; III, 56:176). Juvenal (Sat. 6:555-6) notes the silence of the oracle of Delphi:

“Quoniam Delphis oracula cessant, Et genus humanum damnat caligo futuri.”

But Juvenal's allusion is to the temporary suppression of the oracle by Nero. It was restored by Hadrian, and consulted for two hundred vears more. Plutarch, in a special inquiry into the failure of oracles (De Defectu Oraculorum) does not deny their contemporaneous existence. He says that the oracles of Boeotia were silent. He would not have particularized Boeotia if they had been extinct everywhere else. Indeed, the emperor Trajan, the contemporary and supposed patron of Plutarch, consulted the oracle at Heliopolis previous to the Parthian expedition, with little faith apparently; but he could not have consulted it at all if the oracles had become entirely mute. The story is a curious one, and exhibits the half- believing incredulity of times when old faith has withered into feeble superstition. Trajan sent his inquiry by letter to Heliopolis. The god directed the reply to be made by a sealed letter. When opened, it was found blank. Trajan's inquiry had been a blank epistle. Pausanias, in the third or fourth quarter of the 2d century, mentions that the oracle of Amphilochus at Mallus, in Cilicia, was then in the highest repute. Its superiority could not have been asserted if there had been, no others with which to compare it; yet its solitary existence would disprove the absolute extinction of oracular communications. Lucian also, in several of his spicy brochures, mentions oracles still consulted. Even after Christianity had become the religion of the empire, the belief in oracles still survived, and was not allowed to hunger altogether without gratification. The evidence is furnished by an incident recorded by Sozomen (Hist. Ecc 5:20). The Caesar Galls, in the latter part of the reign of Constantius, succeeded in crushing out the oracle of Apollo at Daphne, near Antioch, by transporting thither the relics of St. Babylas. When Julian the Apostate endeavored to revive the oracle, he was informed by it that it was silenced by the dead bodies which closed its mouth. The final extirpation of oracles and oracular  cells may with great probability be ascribed to the measures of Theodosius the Great, which deprived the temples of their endowments, and withdrew from the Pagan priesthood, prophetic and unprophetic, their means of subsistence. Their mouths were closed at last, not by dead bodies, but by the want of anything to put into them. See Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Critique (Index, s.v. Oracles); Van Dale, Disputationes (1683); Moebius, Tract. Philologico Theolog. (1685); Fontenelle, Traite Historique des Dieux et des Demons du Paganisme (Delft, 1696); Baltus, Reponse a l'Histoire des Oracles of Fontenelle (1709); Hullmann. Wiirdigung des Delphischen Orakels (Bonn, 1837); Klausen, in Ersch u. Gruber's Encyklopadie, s.v. Orakel; Mitford, History of Greece; Grote, History of Greece, pt. ii, ch. 2:(G. F. H.)

## Oral Confession[[@Headword:Oral Confession]]

             (confessio oris). SEE PENITENCE.

## Oral Law[[@Headword:Oral Law]]

             SEE TRADITION.

## Oral Manducation[[@Headword:Oral Manducation]]

             SEE LORDS SUPPER; SEE SACRAMENT.

## Orale[[@Headword:Orale]]

             (from ora, a stripe), or FANON, an ornament of the pope, introduced by pope Innocent III (cir. 1200) as a substitute for the amict, which then began to be worn inside the alb. It is of thin silk, striped in four colors, and edged with gold lace, and worn double, the inner part serving as a tippet over the alb, and. the duplicate being laid on the pope's head until after the chasuble is put on, and then turned over the back, chest, and shoulders.

## Orandi Disciplina[[@Headword:Orandi Disciplina]]

             SEE PENANCE.

## Orange (River) Free State[[@Headword:Orange (River) Free State]]

             is the name assumed by the republic of Dutch Boers, who, after, retiring from Natal when declared a British colony, established themselves in that portion of the country in the interior of South Africa lying between the two great branches of the Orange River, the Ky and the Gariep, known to the colonists as the Vaal and Orange rivers, and situated north of the Cape Colony. It consists of vast undulating plains, sloping gently down from the Maluti Mountains to: the Vaal River, dotted over, however, in many places by rocky hills, although to the northward hundreds of miles are found so entirely level as to present scarcely a break on the horizon. The population consists principally of English and Dutch settlers, besides a considerable number of native Kaffres (q.v.) and Hottentots (q.v.). In common with all new countries, the want of religious ordinances was for some time severely felt in the Orange Free State, but of late, years ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church, Wesleyan missionaries, and Episcopalian clergymen have, been appointed to this field of labor, and the population is gradually being transformed into a Christianized community. See The Missionary World (N.Y. 1875, 12mb), p. 529, No. 1104; Grundemann, Missions- Atlas, No. 1.

## Orange, Council of[[@Headword:Orange, Council of]]

             (Concilium Arausicanun),

(1), an ecclesiastical gathering which convened on Nov. 8, 441, at Orange, a city of Provence, France; was presided over by St. Hilary of Aries, and  was attended by seventeen bishops, from three Gaulish provinces, among them Eucherius of Lyons, Ingenius of Embrun, Claudius (bishopric unknown), and Maximus of Riez. Thirty canons were published, substantially as follows:

“1. Declares that priests may, in the bishop's absence, confirm (by administering the holy chrism and the blessing) heretics, who, being in danger of death, desire to be reconciled.

“2. Directs that ministers when about to baptize shall have the chrism ready, with which they shall anoint the neophytes immediately after baptism, according to their custom of only anointing with the chrism once, That if any one by chance shall not have been anointed with the chrism of baptism, it shall be made known to the bishop at confirmation, but not as being absolutely necessary, since, there being but one benediction of the chrism, that which is given to the baptized person at confirmation is sufficient. SEE CHRISM.

“3. Directs that penitents when dangerously ill shall be received to communion without the imposition of hands; that if they survive they shall remain in a state of penance until, having fully accomplished it, they may, rightly receive the communion after reconciliation by imposition of hands.

“4. Directs that penance be permitted to those clerks who desire it. “

5. Forbids to deliver up criminals who have taken refuge in a church. “

6. Exconmunicates those who seize upon the slaves of the clergy in the place of their own, who have taken sanctuary in the church.

“7. Excommunicates those who treat persons set free by the Church as slaves.

“8. Forbids a bishop to ordain any one living in another diocese.

“9. Directs that if a bishop shall desire to ordain persons belonging to another Church, of irreproachable character, he shall either bring them to live in his own Church, or obtain leave of their own bishop.

“10. Directs that where a bishop has built a church within the territory of another bishop with the latter's permission, he shall suffer him to consecrate it, and the bishop of the place shall on his part grant to the  bishop who built the church the right of ordaining, as clerks to serve it, such persons as the bishop of the place shall present to him, or of approving his choice if they be already ordained.

“11. Forbids bishops to receive persons excommunicated by their own bishop until they are reconciled.

“12. Directs that persons suddenly deprived of the power of speech shall be reconciled or baptized if they give, or shall have given beforehand, a sign that they wish it.

“13. Directs that all pious offices (‘quxcumque pietatis sunt') be performed towards insensible persons.

“

14. Directs that the communion shall be given to baptized enerrgunens, who do all in their power to become healed, and who follow obediently the counsels of the clergy, because the virtue of the sacrament may strengthen them against the attacks of the devil and purify them.

“15. Directs that in cases of necessity holy baptism may be administered to energumens.

“16. Forbids to ordain those who have been openly possessed by an evil spirit, and deprives of all their functions those who become so after ordination.

“17. Directs that the chalice be offered with the ‘capsa,' and be consecrated with the eucharistical mixture (‘cum capsa et calix ofierendus est et admixtione eucharistiae consecrandus').

“18. Orders that thenceforwards in all the churches of the province the Gospel should be read to the catechumens.

“19. Forbids catechumens to enter the baptistery.

“20. Forbids to suffer catechumens to receive the blessing with the faithful, even in family prayers, and directs that they be warned to come separately for the blessing, and to receive the sign of the cross.

“21. Enacts that in the case of two bishops only consecrating a bishop, without the participation of the other bishops of the province, if the bishop was consecrated against his own will he shall be put into the place of one of the consecrating bishops, and some one consecrated to  fill the place of the latter; but if his consecration was done with his own free consecrant, he shall be deposed, as well as the two consecrating bishops.

“22. Declares that in future married men shall not be ordained deacons, except they will.make a vow of chastity.

“23. Directs that married destoals who will not live in a state of continence be deprived (comp. Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 79).

“24. Excepts from this law those who had been previously ordained, but forbids to confer any higher order upon them.

“25. Forbids to elevate a person twice married to any higher degree than that of subdeacon.

“26. Forbids the ordination of deaconesses in future, and directs that those actually ordained shall receive the benediction together with lay persons.

“27. Directs that the widows shall make profession of chastity, and wear the proper dress.

“28. Directs, that they who have broken their profession of virginity shall be put to penance.

“29. Confirms the regulation of the council.

“30. Directs that when a bishop is unable to discharge his duties, he shall commit the performance of them to another bishop, and not to a mere priest.”

In this council, moreover, certain bishops were censured who had broken the canons of the Council of Riez in 439, by refusing to allow the annual provincial councils with the others as ordered. See Labbe, Concil. 3:1446; Harduin, Concil. 1:1187.

(2) Another Church council was convened on July 3, 529, by Caesarius of Arles; and was attended under his presidency by thirteen' bishops. Twenty- five articles concerning grace and free-will, and directed against the semi- Pelagian doctrines then prevalent, were drawn up and signed, and subsequently confirmed by pope Boaifacius II:

“1. Condemns those who maintain that the sin of Adam has affected only the body of man by rendering it mortal, and has not affected the soul also.

“2. Condemns those who maintain that the sin of Adam hath injured himself only, or that the death of the body is the only effect of his transgression which has descended to his posterity.

“3. Condemns those who teach that grace is given in answer to the prayer of man, and who deny that it is through grace that he is brought to pray at all.

“4. Condemns those who teach that God waits for our wish before purifying us from sin, and that he does not by his Spirit give us the wish to be purified.

“5. Condemns those who maintain that the act of faith, by which we believe in him, who justifieth, is not the work of grace, but that we are capable of doing so of ourselves.

“7. Condemns those who maintain that man can think or do anything good, as far as his salvation is concerned, without grace.

“8. Condemns those who maintain that some come to the grace of baptism by their own free-will, and others by the supernatural help of divine mercy.”

The seventeen other canons are, properly speaking, sentences taken out of the works of SS. Augustine and Prosper, recognizing the necessity of grace, prayer, and humility. To these were appended the following propositions:

“(1.) That all baptized persons can, if they will, work out their salvation.

“(2.) That God hath predestinated no one to damnation.

“(3.) That God, by his grace, gives to us the first beginning of faith and charity, and that he is the author of our conversion.”

See Labbe, Concil. 4, 1666; Harduin, Concil. 2; 1110. See also, on both councils, Dollinger, Lehrb. der Kinchengesch. 1, 114 sq.; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 2, 274, sq., 705, 714, 716.

## Orangemen[[@Headword:Orangemen]]

             is the name given by the Irish Roman Catholics to their Protestant countrymen, on account of their faithful adherence to the house of Orange. It has come to be one of the unhappy party designations which for nearly a century has largely helped to create and keep alive religious and political divisions of the worst character throughout the British empire, but especially in Ireland.

Origin. — The Orange organization was provoked by the animosities which subsisted between Protestants and Roman Catholics in Ireland from the Reformation downwards, reaching their full development after the Revolution of 1688, and the wholesale confiscations of Catholic property by which that event was followed. From that time the Romanists of Ireland may be said legally to have lost all social, political, and religious status in Ireland. Some attempts which were made in the latter part of the 18th century to ameliorate their condition excited, especially in the north, the alarm of the Protestant party, who regarded the traditionary “Protestant ascendency” as endangered. Acts of violence became of frequent  occurrence; and, as commonly happens, combinations for aggressive and defensive purposes were formed, not alone by the Protestants, but also by their Catholic antagonists. The members of the Protestant associations appear at first to have been known by the name of ‘“Peep-o'-day Boys,” from the time at which their violences were commonly perpetrated; the Catholics who associated together for self defense being called “Defenders.” Collisions between armed bodies of these parties became of frequent occurrence. In 1785 a pitched battle, attended with much bloodshed, was fought in the county of Armagh. The steps taken to repress these disorders were at once insufficient in themselves to prevent open violence, and had the effect of diverting the current into the still more dangerous channel of secret associations. The rude and illiterate mob of Peep-o'-day Boys made way for the rich and influential organization of the Orange Society, which, having its first origin in the same obscure district that had so long been the scene of agrarian violence, by degrees extended its ramifications into every portion of the British empire, and into every grade of society from the hovel to the very steps of the throne. The name of the Orange association is taken from that of the prince of Orange, William III, and was assumed in honor of that prince, who, in Ireland, has been popularly identified with the establishment of that Protestant ascendency which it was the object of the Orange association to sustain.

Development. — The first “Orange Lodge” was founded in the village of Loughgall, county Armagh, Sept. 21, 1795. The immediate occasion of the crisis was a series of outrages by which Roman Catholics were forcibly ejected from their houses and farms, twelve or fourteen houses being sometimes, according to a disinterested witness, wrecked in a single night; terminating, September, 1795, in an engagement, called, from the place where it occurred, the battle of the Diamond. The association, which began among the ignorant peasantry, soon worked its way upwards. The general disaffection towards English rule, which at that time pervaded Ireland, and in which the Romanists, as a natural consequence of their oppressed condition, largely participated, tended much to identify in the mind of Protestants the cause of disloyalty with that of popery; and the rebellion of 1798 inseparably combined the religious with the political antipathies. In November of that year the Orange Society had already reached the dignity of a grand lodge of Ireland, with a grand master, a grand secretary, and a formal establishment in the metropolis; and in the following years the organization extended over, the entire province of Ulster, and had its  ramifications in all the centers of Protestaintism in the other provinces of Ireland. In 1808 it extended to England. A grand lodge was founded at Manchester, from which warrants were issued for the entire kingdom. The seat of the grand lodge was transferred to London in 1821. The subject more than once was brought under the notice of Parliament, especially in 1813; and, in consequence, the grand lodge of Ireland was dissolved; but its functions in issuing warrants, etc., were discharged vicariously through the English lodge. The most memorable crisis, however, in the history of the Orange Society was the election of a royal duke (Cumberland) in 1827 as grand master for England; and on the re-establishment of the Irish grand lodge in 1828, an imperial grand master. The “Catholic Relief Act” of the following year stirred up all the slumbering antipathies of creed and race, and the Orange association was propagated more vigorously than ever. Emissaries were sent out for the purpose of organizing lodges, not alone in Wales and Scotland, but also in Canada. in the Mediterranean, and in the other colonies.

But the most formidable part of this zealous propagandism was its introduction into the army. As early as 1824 traces of this are discoverable, and again in 1826. No fewer than thirty-two regiments were proved to have received warrants for holding lodges in Ireland, and the English grand lodge had issued thirty-seven warrants for the same purpose. The organization of this strange association was most complete and most extensive. Subject to the central grand-lodge were three classes — county, district, and private lodges each of which corresponded, and made returns and contributions to its own immediate superior, by whom they were transmitted to the grand lodge. Each lodge had a master, deputy-master, secretary, committee, and chaplain. The only condition of membership was thattthe party should be Protestant, and eighteen years of age. The election of members was by ballot, and each lodge also annually elected its own officers and committee. The general government of the association was vested in the grand lodge, which consisted of all the great dignitaries, the grand masters of counties, and the members of another body called the grand committee. This lodge met twice each year, in May and on November 5 — the day pregnant with associations calculated ito keep alive the Protestant antipathies of the body. All the dignitaries of the society, as well as its various committees and executive bodies, were subject to annual re-election. In 1835 the association numbered 20 grandlodges, 80 district lodges, 1500 private lodges, and from 200,000 to 220,000 members. The worst result of the Orange association was the constant incentive which it supplied to party animosities and deeds of violence. In the north of Ireland  the party displays and processions were a perpetually recurring source of disorder, and even of bloodshed; and the spirit of fraternity which pervaded its members was a standing obstacle to the administration of the law. It was known or believed that an Orange culprit was perfectly safe in the hands of an Orange jury; and all confidence in the local administration of justice by magistrates was destroyed. These facts, as well as an allegation which was publicly made of the existence of a conspiracy to alter the succession to the crown in favor of the duke of Cumberland, led to a protracted parliamentary inquiry in 1835; and the results of this inquiry, as well as a very shocking outrage perpetrated soon afterwards by an armed body of Orangemen on occasion of a procession in Ireland, tended so much to discredit the association, and to awaken the public mind to a sense of the folly and wickedness of such associations, that its respectability has since that time gradually diminished. So great was the popular distrust of the administration of justice in party, questions, that for several years the lord chancellor laid down a rule by which no member of the Orange association was admitted to the commission of the peace; and although the association still exists, it is comparatively without influence, except among the very lowest classes in the north of Ireland.

Of the colonial offshoots of the Orange association, those of Canada have at all times been the most active and the most flourishing. The Canadian Orangemen, being, for the most part, Irish emigrants, carried with them all the bitterness of the domestic feud with the Roman Catholics. Outrages directed against Catholic churches, convents, and other institutions were of not unfrequent occurrence until recently; and in 1860, on occasion of the visit of the prince of Wales to Canada, an attempt was made to force from his royal highness a recognition of the association, which was only defeated by his own firmness, and by the judicious and moderate counsels of his advisers. See Reports of the Orange Association, presented to Parliament in 1895, from which the history of the society, down to that year, is for the most part taken.

In the United States the Orangemen are also largely represented. In 1871 they encountered much opposition from the Romanists, and on July 12, when on parade in New York City, a bloody riot was provoked, which was fortunately suppressed by military interference, after sixty lives had been sacrificed, mainly Romanists.

## Orantes[[@Headword:Orantes]]

             (praying men), a class of catechumens, the same as the Genuflectentes (q.v.).

## Orarium[[@Headword:Orarium]]

             in some of the ancient churches, a scarf or tippet worn by deacons on their left shoulder, and by bishops and presbyters on both shoulders, the use of which was for giving signals for prayers by the bishops and presbyters to the deacons, and by the deacons to the congregation; hence its name. Ambrose, Augustine, and other writers, speak of the orarium only as a handkerchief to wipe the face with; but from the records of the ecclesiastical councils of Braga (A.D. 563) and Toledo it is made clear that it was a distinguishing badge of the clergy, the former ordaining that priests should wear the orarium on both shoulders when they ministered at the altar, and the latter that the deacons were to wear but one orarium, and that on the left shoulder, wherewith they were to give the signal of prayers to the people. Subdeacons, and all other unordained officials, were, by proscription of the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 366), not privileged to wear this clerical appendage. In modern times the priests of the Western churches wear it scarf or sash wise from the shoulder to the right side; those of the Greek Church wear it hanging behind and before. See Eadie, Ecclesiastes Cyclop. s.v.; Martigny, Dictionnaire des Antiquites Chretiennes, s.v.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v. SEE STOLE.

## Orate, Fratres[[@Headword:Orate, Fratres]]

             (i.e. Pray, Brethren), is the technical term of the Romanists applied to the celebrant priest's exhortation at mass when the Church is about to engage in secret prayer for God's acceptance of the sacrifice offered. It precedes the Preface (q.v.), and follows immediately after the celebrant has pronounced this prayer:

“Receive, holy Trinity, this oblation, which we offer to thee in commemoration of the suffering, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ our Lord, and to the honor of blessed Mary ever Virgin, and of blessed John the Baptist, and of holy apostles Peter and Paul, and not only of those, but also of all saints; that it may profit them unto honor, but us unto salvation: and that they may deign to intercede for us in heaven; whose memory we celebrate on  the earth. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.” The celebrant then says the words “Orate, Fratres,” with his voice a little elevated; but the remainder [“that my and your sacrifice may be acceptable with God the Almighty Father”] is said inaudibly, or “in a perfectly under tone.” Then the priest turns round to the altar and joins his hands before his breast; and the attendant or bystanders answer, or otherwise the priest himself — “May the Lord receive the sacrifice from thy (or my) hands, to the praise and glory of his name, to our profit also, and that of all his own holy Church.” The priest, with a loud voice, says “Amen.” The secret prayer or prayers which follow are variable, and correspond with the collects for the day or occasion. At the conclusion of these the priest says in a distinct voice, or sings, “Per omnia scecula sceculorum” (=Through all the ages of ages, i.e. world without end); the choir answers, “Amen” the priest follows, “Dominus vobiscum” (=The Lord be with you); the response is, “it cum spiritu tuo (=And with thy spirit); the priest says, “Sursum corda” (=Lift up your hearts); and is answered, “Habemus ad Dominunm” (=We have, unto the Lord); then the priest, “Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro” (=Let us give thanks to the Lord our God); and the choir, “Dignum etjustum est” (=It is proper and right); after which he says or sings the preface. See Barnum, Romanism as it is, p. 434.

## Orations, Funeral And Pulpit[[@Headword:Orations, Funeral And Pulpit]]

             SEE FUNERAL; SEE SERMON.

## Orator[[@Headword:Orator]]

             the rendering in the A. V. of one Hebrew and one Greek word.

1. It stands for lachash. a whisper, or “incantation,” joined with nebon, “skillful” (נְבוֹן לִחִשׁ, Sept. συνετὸς ἀκροατής; Vulg. and Symm. prudens eloquii mystici; Aquila, συνετὸς ψιθυρισμῷ; Theodot. συνετὸς ἐπωδῇ), Isa 3:3, A. V. “eloquent orator,” marg. “skillful of speech.” The phrase appears to refer to pretended skill in magic (see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 202, 754; comp. Psa 58:5). SEE DIVINATION.

2. It stands for ῥήτωρ, the title applied to Tertullus (q.v.), who appeared as the advocate or patronus of the Jewish accusers of the apostle Paul before Felix (Act 24:1). The Latin language was used, and Roman  forms observed in provincial judicial proceedings, as, to cite an obviously parallel case, Norman-French was for so many ages the language of English law proceedings. The trial of Paul at Caesarea was distinctly one of a Roman citizen; and thus the advocate spoke as a Roman lawyer, and probably in the Latin language (see Act 25:9-10; comp. Val. Max. 2:2, 2; Cicero, Pro Coelio, c. 30; Brutus, c. 37, 38,41, where the qualifications of an advocate are described; see Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1:3; 2:348). SEE ADVOCATE.

## Oratorio[[@Headword:Oratorio]]

             (from Ital. oratorio, chapel or oratory, after the place where these compositions were first performed) is the term applied to a sacred musical composition, bearing the same relation to Church music which the opera does to secular music, and, like it, consisting of airs, duets, choruses, etc. It is, in short, a spiritual opera, and holds an intermediate place between religious and secular compositions. The text is generally a dramatized religious poem, as Handel's Samson and Cimarosa's Sacrifizio d'Abramo. Sometimes it takes the form of a narrative, as Israel in Egypt; and occasionally it is of a mixed kind, as Haydn's Creation. The Messiah is a collection of passages from our received translation of the Scriptures.

Concerning the origin of the oratorio, Dr. Brown, Sir John Hawkins, and others seem to have misunderstood the pere Menestrier, who, in his work Des Representations en Musique, attributes to the pilgrims, on their return from the Holy Land, not the introduction of what we term oratorios, as those writers supposed, but of the sacred dramas called Mysteries (q.v.). The learned Jesuit is perhaps himself in error on this subject. It is Wharton's opinion that about the 8th century the merchants who frequented the fairs, employing every art to draw numbers together, were accompanied by jugglers, minstrels, and buffoons, who were the source of great amusement to the people. The clergy, thinking that such entertainments tended to irreligion, proscribed them; but their censures and fulminations being disregarded, they took into their own hands the management of popular recreations — they turned actors — and, instead of profane mummeries, presented stories taken from legends, or from the Bible (Hist. of Poetry). Voltaire conjectures that religious dramas came from Constantinople, where, about the 4th century, archbishop Gregory of Nazianzum, one of the fathers of the Church, banished plays from the stage of that city, and introduced stories from the O. and N.T. As the ancient Greek tragedy was originally a religious representation, a transition was made on the same plan, and the choruses were turned into Christian hymns. “This opinion,” says the candid Wharton, “will acquire probability if we consider the early commercial intercourse between Italy and Constantinople.”

Admitting this, we need seek no farther for the original source of the sacred musical drama.  As regards the more recent introduction of the oratorio, Crescimbeni, in his Commentario, tells us that it is attributable to San Filippo Neri (q.v.), who in his chapel (nel suo oratorio), after sermons and other devotions, in order to allure young people to pious offices, and to detain them from earthly pleasures, had hymns and psalms sung by one or more voices. Bourdelot is rather more circumstantial on this subject. He says S. Filippo de Neri, a native of Florence, founder in 1540 of the Congregation of the Priests of the Oratory in Italy, observing the taste and passion of the Romans for musical entertainments, determined to afford the nobles and people the means of enjoying them on Sundays and festivals in his church, and engaged for this purpose the ablest poets and composers, who produced dialogues in verse on the principal subjects of Scripture, which he caused to be performed by the most beautiful voices in Rome, accompanied by all sorts of instruments.

These performances consisted of airs, duets', trios, and recitatives for four voices; the subjects were, Job and his Friends, the Prodigal Son received by his Father, the Angel Gabriel with the Virgin, and the Mystery of the Incarnation. Nothing was spared to render these attractive; the novelty and perfection thereof drew a crowd of auditors, who were delighted with the performances, and contributed largely, by admission money, to the expenses incurred. Hence are derived what we now call oratorios, or sacred representations (Hist. de la Musique [1743], 1:256). Some of these poems were printed under the title of Ludi Spirituali, and among the first authors of them was P. Agostino Manni. One of the most remarkable was entitled Rappresentatione di Anima e di Corpo, del Signior Emilio del Cavalieri, per recitar cantando. It was the first attempt in the recitative style, and performed in action on a stage erected in the church of Santa Maria della Vallicella, at Rome, with scenes, dances, etc., as appears from the editor's dedication to cardinal Aldobrandini, and the composer's instructions for the performance. From the latter Dr. Burney (Hist. of Music, 4:88) gives some curious extracts, among which are the following: The accompanying instruments, namely, a double lyre, a harpsichord, a large guitar, and two flutes — to be behind the scenes; but the performers are desired to have instruments in their hands, as the appearing to play would help the illusion. The books of the words were printed. Instead of the modern overture, a madrigal, with all the parts doubled, and fully accompanied, is recommended. When the curtain rises, two youths, who recite the prologue, appear. Then Time, one of the characters, comes on, and has the note with which he is to begin given him by the instruments behind the scenes. The chorus is to be placed  on the stage, part sitting and part standing; and when they sing they are to be in motion, with gestures. II Corpo (the body), at the words Si che hormai alma via, throws away his ornaments. The World and Human Life are to be gayly dressed, and when divested of their trappings are to appear poor and wretched, and finally as dead carcasses. The performance may conclude with or without a dance. If without, the last chorus is to be doubled in all its parts. But if a dance is preferred, a verse beginning “Chiostri altissismi” is to be sung, accompanied reverentially by the dance. During the ritornels the four principal dancers are to perform a ballet, saltato con capriole (danced with capers), without singing. They may sometimes use the gailliard step, sometimes the canary, and sometimes the courant.

The name of Oratorios was given, some think, to these performances because they owed their birth to the Priests of the Oratory; we are, however, as already stated, more inclined to derive the term from the place, the oratorio (oratorium, oratory or small chapel), in which they were first heard. But the word does not appear to have been in use till about the year 1630, when Balducci applied it to two of his sacred poems. The unfortunate Stradella was one of the first of those who distinguished themselves in this exalted kind of composition; his Oratario di San Giovanni Battista, produced about the year 1670, is analyzed and much praised by Burney (4:105). A fine chorus from this, in five parts, is printed in the fourth volume of “The Fitzwilliam Music.” The increasing popularity of the sacred drama at length induced poets of eminence to employ their pens in its service. Apostolo Zeno, the imperial poet-laureate, produced seventeen works of this kind, under the title of Azioni Sacre, most of which were set by Caldara, imperial vice-chapelmaster to Leopold I, whose reputation as a composer of sacred music stands deservedly high. The first of them, Sisara, was performed in 1717. Metastasio wrote seven Azioni, of which Caldara set two; the first, La Passione, in 1730. This was reset by Jomelli, and is justly reckoned among the best of his works. Sebastian Bach's Passions-Musik was a species of oratorio, originally performed during the service of the church, the congregation joining in the chorals. Its form arose out of the practice prevalent in the Lutheran Church of having the gospels of the day repeated on Good-Friday, and some other festivals, by different persons, in a recitative and dialogue style. SEE PASSION.

The oratorio was introduced into England in 1720, when Handel set Esther — Racine's tragedy abridged and altered by Mr. Humphreys — for the  chapel of the duke of Chandos (Pope's Timon) at Cannons. Previous to this time Handel had produced an oratorio entitled La Resurrezione, which he brought out at Rome when only twenty years of age, but Esther was his first brought out in England. In 1731 it was performed by the children of the Chapel-Royal at the house of their master, Bernard Gates. The next year it was publicly produced, as appears from the following advertisement in the Daily Journal: “By his majesty's command. at the King's Theatre in the Haymarket, on Tuesday, May 2, will be performed the sacred story of Esther, an oratorio in English, formerly composed by Mr. Handel, and now revived by him, with several additions, and to be performed by a great number of voices and instruments. N. B. — There will be no acting on the stage, but the house will be fitted up in a decent manner for the audience.”

The success of this was of the most decided and encouraging kind. The custom of performing oratorios on the Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent is to be dated from 1737, from which time they were, with few intermissions, continued till a very recent period. By Handel himself no oratorio was produced after the appearance of Esther, until, in his fifty-third year, he became afflicted with blindness. From this his declining period of life date the great oratorios which have made his name immortal. These were performed for the most part in the Old Haymarket Theatre. Deborch was first performed in 1733; Athaliah, in 1734; Israel in Egypt, in 1738; The Messiah, in 1741; Samson, in 1742; Judas Maccabaeus, in 1746; Joshua, in 1747; Solomon, in 1749; and Jephthah, in 1751. The two crowning works were Israel in Egypt and The Messiah-the former ranks highest of all compositions of the oratorio class. The Messiah-which, ill consequence of its text being taken entirely from Scripture, was called by Handel The Sacred Oratorio, — ranks very near it in point of musical merit, and has attained an even more universal popularity; from the time when it was first brought out, down to the present day, it has been performed for the benefit of nearly every important charitable institution in Britain, and also in the U. S., though somewhat less frequently for the same purpose. Judas Maccabaeus is perhaps best known from the flowing and martial grace of that unrivalled military march, “See the Conquering Hero comes;” and Saul is associated in every one's mind with the most solemn of all funeral marches. The orchestra was but imperfectly developed in Handel's time, and his oratorios had therefore originally but meagre instrumental accompaniments; they have since been generally performed with additional accompaniments written by Mozart. Handel was succeeded in this musical speculation by his friend, J. C. Smith, who was followed by Stanley and the  elder Linley. Linley and Dr. Arnold then in conjunction most successfully carried on the oratorios, which were continued by the latter on the retirement of his colleague. An opposition was now started by Ashley, who had been active as a subordinate agent at the commemoration of Handel in 1784. This person soon transformed the performances into secular and often vulgar concerts, though retaining the original name; and from that time the oratorios began to degenerate.

Great masters of oratorios are Haydn, Mendelssohn, Bach, Cimarosa, and Jomelli. Haydn composed three oratorios, The Return of Tobias, The Seven Last Words, and The Creation. The first-named work is full of sweetness and of energy, but it hardly answers to the common conditions of an oratorio; the second is rather a series of symphonies, intended to follow as many short sermons on the sentences uttered by Jesus on the cross. the text being a subsequent addition by the composer's brother, Michael Haydn. The chef-d'oeuvre, The Creation, originated in a visit to London in 1791, when Haydn heard for the first time some of Handel's compositions, then unknown in the great musician's native country. Though less grand than the oratorios of this AnglicizedGerman musical master, The Creation is full of fresh, lovely songs, bright choruses, picturesque recitatives, and exquisite instrumentation. Beethoven's sole oratorio, The Mount of Olives, is a pure drama rather than the mixed composition generally designated as oratorio. Spohr's Last Judgment, produced in 1825, contains some grand music, especial in the choruses. Costa's Eli deserves mention. But the master of modern oratorios is Mendelssohn. Indeed, his greatest works are in this line of composition, as his St. Paul and Elijah. His great ambition was to reawaken an interest in the oratorio, especially in Great Britain; and since his day oratorios are performed on a large scale at Exeter Hall, London, and at the musical festivals throughout England, with a power, precision, and perfection before unheard of, and unknown anywhere else. The greatest oratorio performances probably in the world are those of the triennial festivals at the Sydenham Crystal Palace. In the United States musical societies are aiming for a like development, and in very recent times a number of oratorios have been printed and performed. Bradbury and Mason have labored in this direction, but the most successful compositions are by J. A. Butterfield, of Chicago, who has been called to different parts of this large country, and has trained a host of musical associations with extraordinary success. Among his best compositions are Belshazzar and Ruth and Naomi. See,  besides the works on music referred to, Penny Cyclop. s.nv.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Academy (Lond. 1872), p. 86; Presb. Qu. and Princet. Rev. Jan. 1875, art. viii.

## Oratorium[[@Headword:Oratorium]]

             SEE ORATORY.

## Oratory[[@Headword:Oratory]]

             is the Latin name which was anciently given to places of public worship in general, as being houses of prayer, SEE PROSEUCHA; but in later times, in contradistinction from ecclesia, has been applied to smaller or domestic chapels. Oratory is used among the Romanists to denote a closet or little apartment near a bedchamber, furnished with a little altar, crucifix, and other furniture, suited, in their view, to a place for private devotion. It is more correctly applied to such a place of worship as Luke refers to in Acts 13 — an upper chamber, in which the early Christians worshipped for safety, to preserve their secret discipline from the knowledge of the heathen, and in distinction from the pagan exhibition of graven images on the ground-floor of buildings, and also in memory of the place of the Last Supper. The rise of private places of worship, called εὐκτηρια, outlasted the times of persecution, and were permitted, under certain restrictions, by the councils of Saragossa (A.D.). 381) and Gangra. The name oratory is also applied to a chapel in which no mass may be said without permission of the ordinary. There are several kinds: 1, a monk's cell; 2, a private chapel, recognised by the Council of Ayde (506); 3, a chapel in the country without a district; 4, the private portion of a minster reserved for the use of the convent; the choir; a chapel attached to the chapter-house; 5, in the 6th or 7th century a burial chapel, or a chapel in a cemetery, in which mass was said at times, when the bishop sent a priest to celebrate; 6, a chantry chapel in a church. In 1027 Alexis, patriarch of Constantinople, condemned the abuse of oratories, in which persons of power had assumed to have baptism administered and to assemble congregations under a license. The private chapel of the dukes of Burgundy was rebuilt as the cathedral of Autun; the chateau of the Bourbons became that of Moulins. The ancient Cornish oratories are simple parallelograms, and contain a stone altar and well; they are sometimes raised on artificial mounds. In the Middle Ages oratories became a common appendage to the castles and residences of the nobility, and were of two kinds: the first simply for private and family  prayer and other devotions; the second for celebration of mass. The latter fell properly under the jurisdiction of the bishop or the parochial clergy, and many jealousies and disputes grew out of their establishment or direction. The Council of Trent (sess. 22, Di Reformatione) placed them under very stringent regulations, which have been enforced and developed by later popes, especially by Benedict XIV. See Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, , 703, 721. SEE CHAPEL.

## Oratory, Priests (Or Fathers) Of The[[@Headword:Oratory, Priests (Or Fathers) Of The]]

             is the name of two Roman Catholic congregations of devotees who flourished in Italy and France respectively. Their origin and early history has been largely detailed in the article on SEE NERI, ST. FILIPPO DE (q.v.). This celebrated religious enthusiast was the founder of the Italian congregation, but he never framed any rules for their government and direction. His scattered papers, from which his plans and intentions might have been collected had been burned by his orders a short time before his death. Soon after that event the fathers, at the instance of Baronius, after due counsel, compiled from the existing practices and from memory a rule for the congregation, framed so as to embody the spirit of their founder. This rule was approved by Paul V on Feb. 21, 1612. The Fathers of the Congregation are a body of priests living in community, but without vows, and under a constitution of a highly democratical character. They are at liberty to withdraw at any time. and to resume possession of the property which they brought with them at entrance; and even during their association each member manages his owl financial concerns, only contributing a fixed sum to the common expenses of the community. There is no superior-general, as in other orders. Each house is distinct and independent. In each the superior is elected only for three years, and his position does not give him any personal pre-eminence whatever. The members take their places according to seniority, not according to official rank, and the superior is compelled to take his turn in all the duties, even down to the semi-menial office of serving in the refectory. The main occupations of the fathers, beyond those of attending to the public service of the church, and the duties of the pulpit and the confessional, lie in the cultivation of theological and other sacred studies, of which “conferences” for the discussion, in common, of theological questions form a principal  feature. The congregation has produced many men of great eminence in sacred science, among whom may be named the great Church historian, cardinal Baronius, and his continuators. To these may be added the celebrated explorers of the Roman catacombs, Bosio. Severani, and Aringhi, and the no less eminent patristical scholar, Gallandi. The houses of the Oratory in Italy before the Revolution were numerous and in high repute. Few towns of any importance were without a house of the Oratory.

The Priests of the Oratory in France were established on the model of those in Italy, and owe their rise to Pierre, afterwards cardinal de Berulle, a native of Champagne, who resolved upon this foundation in order to revive the splendor of the ecclesiastical state, which was greatly sunk through the miseries of the civil wars, the increase of heresies, and a general corruption of manners. To this end he assembled a community of ecclesiastics in 1611, in the suburb of St. James. They obtained the king's letter patent for their establishment; and in 1613 pope Paul V approved this congregation, under the title of the Oratory of Jesus (see cut). This congregation consisted of two sorts of persons: the one, as it were, incorporated; the other only associates; the former governed the houses of the institute; the latter were only employed in conforming themselves to the life and manners of ecclesiastics. They also differed from the Italian in that the French Oratorians took charge of seminaries of theological teaching. They were decided opponents of the Jesuits; and, as many favored Jansenism, it was charged by Ultramontanes that the French Congregation of the Oratory was founded principally to spread the Jansenistic heresy. The truth is, the congregation embraced advocates of Jansenism; but they were only in the minority, and simply brought about an unhappy controversy in the society. The French Oratorians became distinguished for their many eminent scholars, as Thomassin, Malebranche, the eloquent Massillon, etc. The Revolution of 1789 put an end to this congregation as to other religious bodies; but they were reorganized in 1852 by six priests, under the guidance of abbe Petetot; and in 1864, finally, the new congregation, under the title of the Oratory of Christ our Lord and of Mary the Immaculate, was approved by the pope. It has a flourishing establishment at Paris, and has received its chief illustration from fathers Gratry and Perraud. It is known as the Oratory of the Immaculate Conception.

In 1847 the Oratorians were introduced on English soil by the Romish convert, Dr. John Henry Newman. This was the period of his secession from Anglicanism. To give strength to his Romanizing tendencies he  looked about for a moderate monastic body, and consequently established a house of the Oratorians (the members of which were for the most part ex-Anglicans like himself), first near, and finally at, Birmingham; soon afterwards a second at London, which has since been transferred to Brompton. The Oratorians have also representatives in the Low Countries, whither they spread from France. In the United States they have not as yet founded a congregation. There are houses at Madrid, Constantinople, and in Savoy. See Zeitschrift histor. theol. 1859, p. 142; Perraud, L'Oratoire dle France (Paris, 1865); Histoire du clergy 3:144 sq.; Meth. Qu. Rev. 1866. p. 289; Henrion. Monastic Orders, 2:247-254; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 1:250; Hallam, Literature, iii. 297; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 2:423.

## Orbison, Thomas[[@Headword:Orbison, Thomas]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Waringstown, county Down, Ireland, March 13, 1813. His parents were members of the Established Church. When thirteen years of age he was converted, and united with the Wesleyans. At seventeen he was licensed as an exhorter, and was ordained in Dublin June 22, 1844. In 1849 he removed to America. After his arrival here he united and labored in connection with the Wesleyan Church for a year and a half. A vacancy taking place about that time on the Wauwatosa Circuit of the Wisconsin Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, he was employed as supply, and at the close of the year joined that conference. His appointments were as follows: Wauwatosa, Kingston, Berlin, Plover, Brothertown, Utter's Corners, Footville, Sun Prairie, Weyauwega, Waupaca, and Stevens' Point. In 1863 he located, and lived in Appleton one year. In 1865 he preached on the Hartford charge, and at the next session of conference was readmitted, and stationed at New Berlin and Oneida Indian Mission. But failing health again obliged his retirement from active duties, and he returned to Appleton. He died in 1873. As a preacher, he was above mediocrity, as a man, he was esteemed for the purity of his character and his good common sense. See Minutes of Conferences, 1874, p. 140.

## Orcagna, Or LArcagnuolo[[@Headword:Orcagna, Or LArcagnuolo]]

             is the name by which ANDREA DI CIONE, a celebrated old Florentine artist, is generally known. He was painter, sculptor, and architect; was born at Florence in 1329, according to Vasari, or, according to other accounts,  about 1315 or 1320, and was probably first instructed in art by his father, Cione, who was a celebrated goldsmith; from him he passed into the school of Andrea Pisano. He painted several works, together with his brother Bernardo, in the churches of Florence, and also in the Campo Santo at Pisa, where the Triumph of Death and the Last Judgment were by Andrea, and the Hell by Bernardo; the Last Judgment and the Hell are engraved by Lasinio on a single plate in his Pitture del Campo Santo di Pisa: Orcagna repeated them in Santa Croce at Florence; he had painted previously in the Strozzi chapel, in Santa Maria Novella, a picture of Hell from Dante's Inferno, in which he introduced the portraits of several of his enemies. As an architect he built the elegant Loggia de' Lanzi in the Piazza Granduca at Florence, which is still in perfect condition — it and its sculptures are engraved by Lasinio in Miaserini's Piazza del Granduca di Firenze, coni i suoi Monumenti. (Florence, 1830). He built also the church of the monastery of Or San Michele, and designed the celebrated tabernacle of the Virgin of that monastery. It is a high Gothic pyramidal altar to the Virgin, free on all sides, is built of white marble, and is richly ornamented with tigures and other sculptures. It is engraved in Richa's Notizie delle Chiese di Firenze, after a drawing by Andrea himself. Orcagna generally signed himself painter upon his sculptures, and sculptor upon his pictures. He was also a poet. He died at Florence, according to Vasari, in 1389, but according to Manni in 1375. Orcagua had excellent architectural taste, and has the credit of having ben the first in those ages to adopt the semicircular arch in preference to the pointed; but to this merit, if one, he is not entitled, though his elegant Loggia de Lanzi may have contributed greatly towards the subsequent popularity of that firm of the arch in Italy: Arnolfo di'Lapo, however, and other earlier architects, used the semicircular arch. Those, says Lanzi. who are fond of minute detail in minute thing's, may consult Baldinucci, Bottari, and Mlanni concerning Andrea di Cione; Rumohr, however, vas the first to show his real name, of which' Orcagna is a contraction — Lo Archagnuolo, Lo ‘rchagnio, l'orchagno. In painting. Orcagna did not go beyond Giotto; in sculpture he was a worthy follower of the Pisani. His portrait, published in Vasari's work was taken from one of the figures of the apostles in the above-mentioned tabernacle of the Virgin, which is understood to be his own. See Vasari, Vite de' Pittori, etc., and the Notes to Schorn's German translation of Vasari; 'Rumor, Italienische ‘Forschungen.

## Orchard[[@Headword:Orchard]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of פִּרְדֵּס, pardes, a park or garden planted with trees (Ecc 2:5; Son 4:14; forest,” Neh 2:8); and of oliretium (“orchard of olives”), an olive-yard (2Es 16:29). SEE GARDEN; SEE OLIVE-YARD.

## Orchard, Nicholas[[@Headword:Orchard, Nicholas]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Helston, county of Cornwall, England, Nov. 14,1806. He was the son of pious parents, and was carefully trained under the influence of the Wesleyans. In his sixteenth year he was converted, and joined their society. He came to this country about 1837, and settled in Perth Amboy. New Jersey, where his labors as local preacher, class leader, etc., were:highly appreciated. In 1843 he removed to Brooklyn, and was soon employed by the presiding elder as pastor at Flatbush. The following two years he assisted on the Home Mission work in Brooklyn, and then, under the presiding elder, he ably served the societies on Good Ground Circuit. In 1852 he was received into the New York East Conference, and his successive appointments were as follows: Soutlold, Farmingdale, Riverhead, Northport, Port Jefferson, Patchogue and Sayville, Orient, Parkville, Orient, and, lastly, Bay Ridge and Unionville. He entered upon his last charge with broken health; and after a short term of labor at this charge was prostrated by paralysis, and died May 27, 1874. “As a preacher and pastor he was in labors abundant, and more than acceptable. In every appointment he was greatly beloved by his people, and men of learning held in high esteem his capabilities as a Bible student and a preacher. His touching appeals to his hearers came from the depth of a heart which longed for their salvation. He felt the sacredness of his calling, loved it, and was successful in it.” See Minutes of Conferences, 1875, p. 52.

## Ordeals, Or Ordeal-Trials[[@Headword:Ordeals, Or Ordeal-Trials]]

             otherwise termed “judgments of God,” a pretended mode of appeal to God's judgment, formerly permitted in criminal cases in the most civilized society of Europe. Ordeal is generally traced to the Anglo-Saxon ordoel. Spelman derives this word from or, “magnum,” and doel, “judicium,” which is also the derivation given by Ducange. Lye and Bosworth derive it  from or, privative, “without,” and doel, “difference,” an indifferent or impartial judgment, a judgment without distinction of persons. The German word urtheil, a judgment, is intimately related to it.

The earliest trace of any custom resembling the ordeals afterwards so largely-used among the northern tribes of Europe may be found in the waters of jealousy, which the Hebrew women, suspected of adultery, were compelled to drink as a test of innocence (Numbers 5). The alleged intention of it was to vindicate the truth when it could not in any other way be discovered, and to make way for the execution of law. A similar trial for incontinence is in use among the natives of the Gold Coast of Africa. SEE ADULTERY. Blackstone (Comm. on the Laws of England, 4, ch. 27, “Of Trial and Conviction”) says: “The several methods of trial and conviction of offenders established by. the laws of England were formerly more numerous than at present, through the superstition of our Saxon ancestors; who, like other northern nations, were extremely addicted to divination, a character which Tacitus observes of the ancient Germans (De Mor. Germ. x). They therefore invented a considerable number of methods of purgation, or trial, to preserve innocence from the danger of false witnesses, and in consequence of a notion that God would always interpose miraculously to vindicate the guiltless.” Throughout Europe in the dark ages the ordeal existed under the sanction of law and of the clergy. The four chief ordeals of the Middle Ages, to which our Saxon ancestors resorted in common with the rest of Europe, were:

a. That of hot iron, which was generally applied to persons of quality and to ecclesiastics, the latter being prohibited from claiming the judicial combat (or duel) in person, and yet wishing to avoid the ordeals by water, which were considered ignoble, and reserved for peasants. If impeached for a single crime, a piece of iron was to weigh one pound; if prosecuted on several charges, the weight of the iron was increased in proportion. The person accused was to hold the burning ball of iron in his hand. and move with it to a certain distance, or to walk barefoot on red-hot plowshares, placed about a yard from each other. If after this trial his hands and feet were uninjured, and he gave no indication of pain, he was discharged; otherwise he was considered guilty. In the Romish Church the accused was brought in after three days of fasting and prayer the priest appeared in his canonicals, taking up the iron which lay before the altar, and, repeating the hymn of the three Hebrews, put it into the fire. He then proceeded to some forms of benediction over the fire and iron; after this he sprinkled the iron  with holy water, and made the sign of the cross in the name of the blessed Trinity, upon which the test was applied. Ordinarily, the accused was to carry the hot iron over a space of nine feet. After this his hand was to be sealed up, and not inspected till the third night was passed; then, if it was clean, he was deemed innocent; but if it appeared festered on the mark of the iron, he was to be esteemed guilty. That species of the hot-iron ordeal which consisted in treading, blindfold and barefooted, over a certain number of red-hot plowshares laid lengthwise, at unequal distances, was no uncommon test of female chastity. Among the Greeks compurgation of accused persons by fire was practiced, as is manifest from Sophocles's Antigone. We are informed that there were but few escapes from this judicial system among the ancients, but that in the dark ages the clergy frequently connived with the friends of the accused, and thus secured acquittal. An instance generally quoted is that of queen Emma, mother of Edward the Confessor, who, when suspected of a criminal intrigue with Alwyn, bishop of Winchester, is said to have triumphantly vindicated her character by walking unhurt over red-hot plowshares (Rudborne, Hist. Maj. Winton, lib. 4, ch. 1). In this connection we may state the scientific fact that a person may with impunity handle red-hot or even molten iron, if careful; the vapor actually preventing immediate contact for a few moments.

b. Water-ordeal was performed either by plunging the bare arm up to the elbow in boiling water, and escaping unhurt thereby, or by casting the person suspected into a river or pond of cold water, and if he floated therein without any action of swimming, it was deemed an evidence of his guilt, but if he sank he was acquitted. In this trial by water, after the three days' fast and other preliminaries, the accused drank a portion of holy water, the priest pronouncing an imprecation against him in case he were guilty; then the water into which he was to be thrown was exorcised in the following manner: By the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and by the Christianity whose name thou bearest, and by the baptism in which thou wert born again, and by all the blessed relics of the saints of God that are preserved in this church. I conjure thee come not unto this altar, nor eat of this body of Christ, if thou beest guilty in the things that are laid to thy charge; but if thou beest innocent therein, come, brother, and come freely.” After the exorcism the accused was undressed, ordered to kiss the Gospels and the cross, and sprinkled with holy water, and then, all persons present fasting, the accused underwent the trial. At  the close of the adjuration holy water was tasted by all present, and the chamber sprinkled with it.

c. The corsned, or morsel of execration: this was a piece of bread or cheese, about an ounce in weight, which was consecrated in a peculiar form, in which the Almighty was called upon, and it was prayed that the bread might cause convulsions and paleness, and find no passage, if the man were really guilty, but might turn to health and nourishment if he were innocent. The corsned was then given to the suspected person, who received the holy sacrament at the same time: if indeed, as some have suspected, the corsned was not the sacramental bread itself. It is said that Godwin, earl of Kent, in the reign of king Edward the Confessor, on taking his oath that he had not caused the death of the king's brother, appealed to his corsned, “per buccellam deglutiendam abjuravit” (Ingulphus), which stuck in his throat and killed him.

Other kinds of ordeal were practiced in particular circumstances in different parts of Europe. In the ordeal of the bier, a supposed murderer was required to touch the body of the murdered person, and pronounced guilty if the blood flowed from his wounds. The ordeal of the Eucharist (Judiciun, Eucharistice, or Purgatio per Euchaistiam) especially was in use among the clergy: the accused party took the sacrament in attestation of innocence, it being believed that, if guilty, he would be immediately visited with divine punishment for the sacrilege by its choking him: it was a variety of the corsned. The trial of the cross (Examen s. Experimenturn s. Judicium crucis) consisted in the accused being made to hold up his arms horizontally in the form of a cross. In cases of difficulty, the one who held out longest was deemed to be in the right. The form of trial is thus described by Dr. Mackay in his Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions: “When a person accused of any crime had declared his innocence upon oath, and appealed to the cross for its judgment in his favor, he was brought into the church before the altar. The priests previously prepared two sticks exactly like one another, upon one of which was carved a figure of the cross. They were both wrapped up, with great care and many ceremonies, in a quantity of fine wool, and laid upon the altar or on the relics of the saints. A solemn prayer was then offered up to God that he would be pleased to discover, by the judgment of his holy cross, whether the accused person were innocent or guilty. A priest then approached the altar and took up one of the sticks, and the assistants unswathed it reverently. If it was marked with the cross, the accused  person was innocent; if unmarked, he was guilty. It would be unjust to assert that the judgments thus delivered were, in all cases, erroneous; and it would be absurd to believe that they were left altogether to chance. Many true judgments were doubtless given, and, in all probability, most Wittingly, for we cannot, but believe that the priests endeavored beforehand to convince themselves, by secret inquiry and a strict examination of the circumstances, whether the appellant were innocent or guilty, and that they took up the crossed or uncrossed stick accordingly. Although to all other observers the sticks, as enfolded in the wool, might appear exactly similar, those who unwrapped them could, without any difficulty, tell the one from the other.” This ordeal was abolished by Louis le Ddbonnaire in A.D. 816, on the ground that it betrayed irreverence towards the mystery of the cross. Another very common ordeal was that by lot, dependent on the throw of a pair of dice, one marked with a cross, the other plain. Another very frequent ordeal was that of single combats or duels. It is unlike any other ordeal practiced, for the result depended altogether on the personal strength or courage of the accused.

The ordeals of water and iron are first mentioned in the 77th law of Ina (Wilkins, Leg. Anglo-Sax. p. 27). See also the laws of Athelstan, Edward the Confessor, and the Conqueror (ibid. p. 198, 229). In the Domesday Survey the readiness of claimants to prove their title to land by ordeal or in battle occurs in a great variety of instances, as among the lands belonging to the monastery of Ely, at a place then called Photestorp, in Norfolk: “Hanc terram calumpuiatur esse liberam Vichetel homo Hermeri quocunque mode judicetur, vel bello vel juditio” (Domesd. tom. ii, fol. 212; see other instances, ibid. fol. 110 b, 137, 162,166, 172 b, 193, 208; 277 b, 332). The ordeal of hot iron is the only ordeal of the Donzesday Survey. The reason for this is given by Glanville (Tract. de Leg. et Consuet. Regni Anglice, lib. 14, ch. 1): “In such a case the accused is bound to clear himself by the judgment of God, namely, by hot iron, or by water, according to the difference of rank-that is, by hot iron if he should be a free man, and by water if he should be a villain” (si fuerit rusticus). Eadmer (Hist. Novor. p. 48) speaks of no fewer than fifty persons of Saxon origin who, in the reign of William Rufus, being accused of killing the king's stags, were at one time sentenced to the fire ordeal. It is probable that the trial by ordeal was not discontinued in England by any positive law or ordinance, although Sir E. Coke (9 Rep. 32), and after him Blackstone (4 Comm. p. 345), have expressed an opinion that it was finally abolished by  an act of Parliament, or rather an order of the king in council, in the 3d Henry III (1219). This order is to be found in Rymer, Federa, 1:228; Spelman, Glossary, s.v. “Judicium Dei;” and in Selden, Notes to Eadmesr. Spelman, however, thinks that it was merely a temporary law, without any general or permanent operation, and that the trial by ordeal continued to a later period. This opinion seems confirmed by a reference in the Cal. Rot. Pat. p. 15, to another order in council in the 14th Henry III, “Dejustitia facienda loco ignis et aquae.” As however it is only mentioned as a former custom, and not as an existing institution, by Bracton (lib. 3; ch 16), who wrote at the end of the reign of Henry III or the beginning of that of Edward I, it is probable that, in consequence of the judgments of the councils and the interference of the clergy, the trial by ordeal fell into disuse about the: middle of the 13th century; but this was long after it had disappeared from the judicial systems of most other European nations.

Efforts for the suppression of trial by ordeal were made as early as the beginning of the 11th century by influential members of the clergy, but: the custom, deeply rooted in antiquity, was not to be subverted at a blow. Conspicuous in this movement was in the zealous Agobard of Lyons, in his treatise Contra Judicium Dei. Pope Stephen VI (cir. 886) condemned both fire and water ordeals. He adds, “Spontanea enim confessione vel testium approbatione publicata delicta. commissa sunt regimini nostro judicare: occulta vero et incognita illi sunt relinquenda, qui solus novit corda filiorum hominum”. (Mansi, 18:25). On the other hand, the judicium aqua frigidae et calidae was defended even by Hincmar of Rheims (Opp. 2:667). In Scotland, in 1180, we find David I enacting, in one of the assemblies of the frank tenantry of the kingdom, which were the germ of parliaments, that no one was to hold an ordinary court of justice, or a court of ordeal, whether of battle, iron, or water, except in presence of the sheriff. or one of his sergeants; though if that official failed to attend after being duly summoned, the court might be held in his absence. The first step towards: the abolition of this form of trial in Saxon and Celtic countries seems to have been the substitution of compurgation by witnesses for compurgation by ordeal. The near relatives of an accused party were expected to come forward to swear to his innocence. The number of compurgators varied, according to the importance of the case; and judgment went against the party whose kin refused to come forward, or who failed to obtain the necessary number of compurgators. To repel an accusation, it was often held necessary to have double the number of  compurgators who supported it, till at length the most numerous body of compurgators carried the day. It is remarkable that “proof by duel,” which was abolished in Scandinavia by the introduction of Christianity, maintained its ground in England for centuries (Worsae, p. 167). It was also called the wager of battle, and was a natural accompaniment of a state of society which allowed men to take the law into their own hands. The challenger faced the west, the challenged person the east; the defeated party, if he craved his life, was allowed to live as a “recreant;” that is, on retracting the perjury which he had sworn to. The Council of Valence (855) strongly denounced it, under pain of excommunication (can. xii), which incapacitated the subject of it for performing any civil function. Yet, down to the very days of the Reformation, all through Europe, instances of trial by ordeal are encountered. Thus as late as 1498 we find the truth of Savonarola's doctrine put to the test by a challenge, between one of his disciples and a Franciscan friar, to walk through a burning pile.

Heathen Ordeals. — Among modern heathen nations we find the ordeal not unfrequently in practice. Thus in Siam, besides the usual methods of fire and water ordeal, both parties are sometimes exposed to the fury of a tiger set upon them; and if the beast spares either, that person is accounted innocent; if neither, both are held to be guilty; but if he spares both, the trial is incomplete, and they proceed to a more certain criterion (Mod. Univ. Hist. 7:266). The Asiatic Researches (1:389-404 [Caldutta, 1788, 4to]) contain a memoir on the trials by ordeal among the Hindus, by Ali Ibrahim Khan chief magistrate of Benares, communicated by Warren Hastings, Esq., nine in number: l, by the balance; 2, by fire; 3, by water; 4, by two sorts of poison; 5, by Gosha, in which the accused drinks of water in which the images of the sun and other deities have been washed; 6, by chewing rice; 7, by hot oil; 8, by hot iron; 9, by Dharmach, in which an image named Dharma, or the genius of justice, made of silver, and another of an antagonist genius, Adharma, made of clay or iron, or those figures painted respectively on white and black cloth, are thrown into a large jar, from which the accused is instructed to draw at hazard. The trial by ordeal seems to be prevalent throughout Africa too. “When a man says Dr. Livingstone, “suspects that any of his wives have bewitched him, he sends for the witch-doctor,' and all the wives go forth into the field, and remain fasting till that: person has made an infusion of the plant called 'goho.' They all drink it, each one holding up her hand to heaven in attestation of her innocency. Those who vomit it are considered innocent, while those whom  it purges are pronounced guilty, and are put to death by burning. The innocent return to their homes, and slaughter a cock as a thank-offering to their guardian spirits. The practice of ordeal is common among all the negro nations north of the Zambesi.” The women themselves eagerly desire the test on the slightest provocation; each is conscious of her own innocence, and has the fullest faith in the muavi (the ordeal) clearing all but the guilty. There are varieties of procedure among the different tribes. The Barotse pour the medicine down the throat of a cock or dog, and judge of the innocence or guilt of the person accused by the vomiting or purging of the animal.

Among the natives of Northern Guinea this species of ordeal is in use for the detection of witchcraft. It goes by the name of the red-water ordeal, the red-water used for this purpose being a decoction made from the inner bark of a large forest tree of the mimosa family. The mode in which this ordeal is practiced is thus described by Mr. Wilson: “A good deal of ceremony is used in connection with the administration of the ordeal; the people who assemble to see it administered form themselves into a circle, and the pots containing the liquid are placed in the center of the enclosed space. The accused then comes forward, having the scantiest apparel, but with a cord of palm-leaves bound around his waist, and seats himself in the center of the circle. After his accusation is announced, he makes a formal acknowledgment of all the evil deeds of his past life then invokes the name of God three times, and imprecates his wrath in case he is guilty of the particular crime laid to his charge. He then steps forward and drinks freely of the red-water. If it nauseates and causes him to vomit freely, he suffers no serious injury, and is at once pronounced innocent. If, on the other hand, it causes vertigo, and he loses his self-control, it is regarded as evidence of his guilt, and then all sorts of indignities and cruelties are practiced upon him. A general howl of indignation rises from the spectators. Children and others are encouraged to hoot at him, pelt him with stones, spit upon him, and in many instances he is seized by the heels and dragged through the bushes and over rocky places until his body is shamefully lacerated and life becomes extinct. Even his own kindred are required to take part in these cruel indignities, and no outward manifestation of grief is allowed in behalf of a man who has been guilty of so odious a crime. On the other hand, if he escapes without injury, his character is thoroughly purified, and he stands on a better footing in society than he did before lie submitted to the ordeal. After a few days, he  is decked out in his best robes, and, accompanied by a large train of friends, he enjoys a sort of triumphal procession through the town where he lives, receives the congratulations of his friends and the community in general, and not unfrequently presents are sent to him by friends from neighboring villages. After all this is over, he assembles the principal men of the town, and arraigns his accusers before them, who, in their turn, must submit to the same ordeal, or pay a large fine to the man whom they attempted to injure.” A similar process is followed in Southern Guinea for the detection of witchcraft. At the Gabun the root used is called nkazya. See Grimm, Deutsche Rechts-Alterthumer; Pierer, Universal-Encyklop. art. Gottesurtheil; Penny Cyclop. s.v.; Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Hardwick, Middle Ages; Lea, Studies in Church.Hist. p. 164; and his Superstition (see Index); Eclectic Magazine, July, 1876, art. vii, by E. B. Tyler.

## Order[[@Headword:Order]]

             a word synonymous with method, is applied to any methodical or regular process of performing a thing. .

1. Nothing can be more beautiful in religion and morals than order. The neglect of it exposes us to the inroads of vice, and often brings upon us the most perplexing events. Whether we consider it in reference to ourselves, our families, or the Church, it is: of the greatest importance.

(1.) As to ourselves, order should be attended to as respects our principles (Heb 13:9; Jam 1:8), our tempers (Pro 17:14; Eph 4:31), our conversation (Col 4:6), our business (Pro 22:29), our time (Psa 90:12; Ecc 3:1), our recreations, and our general conduct (Php 1:27; 2Pe 1:5), etc.

(2.) As regards our families, there should be order as to the economy or management of their concerns (Mat 12:25):, as to devotion, and the time of it (Jos 24:15), as to the instruction thereof (Eph 6:1; Gen 18:19; 2Ti 1:5).

(3.) In respect to the Church, order should be observed as to the admission of members (2Co 6:15), as to the administration of its ordinances (1Co 14:33; 1Co 14:40), as to the attendance on its worship (Psa 27:4), as to our behavior therein (Col 1:10;  Mat 5:16). To excite us to the practice of this duty, we should: consider that God is a God of order (1Co 14:33); his works are all in the exactest order (Eph 1:11; Psa 104:25; Ecc 3:11); heaven is a place of order (Rev 7:9). Jesus Christ was a most beautiful example of regularity. The advantages of order are numerous. “The observance of it,” says Dr. Blair,'“ serves to correct that negligence which makes us omit some duties, and that hurry and precipitancy which makes us perform others imperfectly. Our attention is thereby directed to its proper objects. We follow the straight path which Providence has pointed out to us, in the course of which all the varied business of life presents itself regularly to us on every side” (Serm. 2:23).

Philosophers lay great stress on man's right comprehension of order. They teach that while other beings tend blindly towards it, man knows the end of his being, and the place he holds, in the scheme of the universe, and can freely and intelligently endeavor to realize that universal order of which he is an exponent or constituent. “There is one parent virtue, the universal virtue, the virtue which renders us just and perfect, the virtue which will one day render us happy. It is the only virtue. It is the love of the universal order as it eternally existed in the divine reason, where every created reason contemplates it. The love of order is the whole of virtue, and conformity to order constitutes the morality of actions.” Such is the theory of Malebranche (Traite de Morale), and more recently of Jouffroy. In like manner, science, in all its discoveries, tends to the discovery of universal order. Art also, in its highest attainments, is only realizing the truth of nature; so that the true, the beautiful, and the good ultimately resolve themselves into the idea of order. For order is the intelligent arrangement of means to accomplish an end, the harmonious relation 'established between the parts for the good of the whole. The primitive belief that there is order in nature is the ground of all experience. In this belief we confidently anticipate that the same causes, operating in the same circumstances, will produce the same effects. This may be resolved into a higher belief in the wisdom of an infinitely perfect being who orders all things. See Krauths Fleming, Vocabulary of Philosophy, s.v.

2. The word order is also used to designate the rules or laws of a monastic institution; and in a secondary sense, the several monastics living under the same rule or order. Thus the Order of Clugni signifies literally the new rule of discipline prescribed by Odo to the Benedictines already assembled in the monastery of Clugni; but secondarily, and in the more popular sense,  the great body of monastic institutions, wherever established, who voluntarily subjected themselves to the same rule. SEEORDERS, RELIGIOUS.

3. In Classic Architecture the word order is used as synonymous with ordonnance, and comprises the column with its base and capital and the entablature. There are five orders:

(1) Tuscan,

(2) Doric,

(3) Ionic,

(4) Corinthian,

(5) Composite.

The first and fifth are Roman orders, and are simply modifications of the others. The remaining three are the Greek orders.

a. Of the Tuscan order little can be said, there being no regular example of it among the remains of antiquity. The best masters of classic architecture have failed to furnish the needed information. Piranesi has given a drawing of a Tuscan base, but of what date is uncertain; Vitruvius, in an indistinct manner, has mentioned the general proportions, but through his whole book does not refer to one structure of this order. SEE TUSCANS.

b. The Doric Order is the oldest and simplest of the three orders used by the Greeks, but it is ranked as the second of the five orders adopted by the Romans. The shaft of the column has twenty flutings, which are separated by a. sharp edge, and not by a fillet as in the other Orders, and they are less than a semicircle in depth; the molding below the abacus of the capital is an ovolo; the architrave of the entablature is surmounted with a plain fillet called the tenia; the frieze is ornamented by flat projections, with three channels cut in each, which are called triglyphs; the spaces between these arem called metopes; under the triglyphs and below the tenia of the architrave are placed small drops, or gutte; along the top of the frieze runs a broad fillet, called the capital of the triglyphs; the soffit of the cornice has broad and shallow blocks worked on it called mutules, one of which is placed over each metope and each triglypli; on the under surface are several rows of guttme or drops. In these respects the order as worked  both by the Greeks and Romans is identical; but in other points there is considerable difference. In the pure Grecian examples the column has no base, and its height rises from about four to six and a half diameters; the capital has a perfectly plain square abacus, and the ovolo is but little if at all curved in section, except at the top, where it is quirked under the abacus; under the ovolo are a few plain fillets and small channels, and a short distance below them a deep narrow channel is cut in the shaft; the flutes of the shaft are continued up to the fillets under the ovolo. In the Roman Doric the shaft is usually seven diameters high, and generally has a base, sometimes the Attic and sometimes that which is peculiar to the order, consisting of a plinth and torus with an astragal above it; the capital has a small molding round the top of the abacus, and the ovolo is in section a quarter circle, and is not quirked; under the ovolo are two or three small fillets, and below them a collarino or neck. According to the Roman method of working this order, the triglyphs at the angles of buildings must be placed over the center of the column, and the metopes must be exact squares. Sometimes the mutules are omitted, and a row Of dentels is worked under the cornice.

c. The Ionic Order. The most distinguishing feature of this order is the capital, which is ornamented with four spiral projections called volutes; these are arranged, in the Greek examples, and the best of the Roman, so as to exhibit a flat face on the two opposite sides of the capital, but in later; works they have been made to spring out of the moldings under the angles of the abacus, so as to render the four faces of the capital uniform, the sides of the abacus being worked hollow like the Corinthian; the principal molding is an ovolo, or echinus, which is overhung by the volutes, and is almost invariably carved; sometimes also other enrichments are introduced upon the capital: in some of the Greek examples there is a collarino, or necking, below the echinus ornamented with leaves and flowers. The shaft varies from eight and a quarter to about nine and a half diameters in height; it is sometimes plain, and sometimes fluted with twenty-four flutes, which are separated from each other by small fillets. The bases used with this order are principally varieties of the Attic base, but another of a peculiar  character is found in some of the Asiatic examples, the lower moldings of which consist of two scotiae, separated by small fillets and beads, above which is a large and prominent torus. The members of the entablature in good ancient examples are sometimes perfectly plain, and sometimes enriched, especially the bed-moldings of the cornice, which are frequently cut with a row of dentels. In modern or Italian architecture, the simplicity of the ancient entablature has been considerably departed from, and the cornice is not unfrequently worked with modifications in addition to dentels.

d. The Corinthian Order is the lightest and most ornamental of the three orders used by the Greeks. “The capital,” says Rickman, “is the great distinction of this order; its height is more than a diameter, and consists of an astragal, fillet, and apophyges, all of which are measured with the shaft, then a bell and horned abacus. The bell is set round with two rows of leaves, eight in each row, and a third row of leaves supports eight small open volutes, four of which are under the four horns of the abacus, and' the other four, which are sometimes interwoven, are under the central recessed part of the abacus, and have over them a flower or other ornament. These volutes spring out of small twisted husks, placed between the leaves of the second row, and are called caulicoles. The abacus consists of an ovolo, fillet, and cavetto, like the modern Ionic. There are various modes of indenting the leaves, which are called from these variations acanthus, olive, etc. The column, including the base of half a diameter, and the capital, is about ten diameters high.” The base which is considered to belong to this order resembles the Attic, with two scotiae between the tori, which are separated by two. astragals; the Attic base is frequently used, and other varieties sometimes occur. The entablature of this order is often very highly enriched, the flat surfaces as well as the moldings being sculptured with a great variety of delicate ornaments. The architrave is generally formed into two or three faces or facile; the frieze in the best examples is flat, and is sometimes united to the upper fillet of the architrave by an apophyge the cornice has both modillions and dentels.

e. The Composite Order, called also Roman, being invented by that people, and composed of the Ionic grafted upon the Corinthian, is of the same proportion as the Corinthian, and retains the same general character, with the exception of the capital, in which the Ionic volutes and echinus are  substituted for the Corinthian caulicole and scrolls. It is one of the five orders of classic architecture, when five are admitted; but modern architects allow of only three, considering the Tuscan and the Composite as merely varieties of the Doric and Corinthian. See Parker, Glossary of Architecture, s.v.; Elme, Dict. of the Fine Arts, s.v. SEE ARCHITECTURE.

## Ordericus, Vitalus[[@Headword:Ordericus, Vitalus]]

             a noted mediaeval English ecclesiastical historian, was born at Attingesham, now Atcham, near Shrewsbury, in 1075. His parents were of Norman descent, and belonged to the nobility. But few particulars are extant regarding the life of Ordericus. From incidental notes in his own writings it appears that he was sent to France in his infancy, and there placed under monastic instruction. His first French home was in the abbey of Ouche, at Lisieux, in Normandy. In 1086 he received the tonsure, and changed his English name of Ordericus for that of Vitalis, using only the latter name himself; but custom has joined the two in writing of him. He devoted himself to study, and did not take priest's orders till 1107. He never quit the convent but three times: he once attended a chapter of the order; once went to England, visiting Worcester and Croyland; and once went to Cambray-the last two visits being apparently for the purpose of procuring materials for his work, Historia Ecclesiastica. This history, which consists of thirteen volumes, is brought down to 1141, in which year, or the succeeding one, it is most probable that Ordericus Vitalis died. The Ecclesiastical History begins with the birth of Christ, and gives in two books a rapid summary, not always correct, of the succession of the Roman emperors and popes. These two books were an after-thought, and are of no great value. It is with the third book that the interest of the work commences. The early history of the dukedom of Normandy, with the collateral relations of France and Brittany, are given in minute detail. Then follows the narrative of the conquest of England. But by far the most valuable portion of the work is the last half of it, treating of the events of which Ordericus was a contemporary observer. The first edition of the Historia Ecclesiastica. was published by Duchesne, in his Hist. Norm. Script. Antiq. (Paris, 1619, fol.). It has also been printed by the French Historical Society (1840, 2 vols.), and was translated into French by Dubois (1825-27,4 vols.). An English translation was prepared and brought out by Forester in Bohn's Antiquarian Library (Lond. 1853-54, 4 vols. 12mo). To the French edition of 1825-27 M. Guizot wrote an  introduction, in which he says of the work: “No book contains so much and such valuable information on the history of the 11th and 12th centuries; on the political state, both civil and religious, on society in the west of Europe; and on the manners of the times, whether feudal, monastic, or popular.” See Piper, Monumental-Theologie, § 114; Wright, Biog. Lit. (A.N. Period) p. 111 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Lappenberg, Gesch. von England, 2:378-393; Cave, Hist. Lit. 2:220; Oudin, Comment. de Script. Eccles. 2:209; and the sketches prefaced to the different editions of his works.

## Orders, Holy[[@Headword:Orders, Holy]]

             is an expression used to denote the sacred character or position peculiar to ministers of the Christian religion, and to which they are admitted at the time of their ordination. SEE ORDINATION. The following is the prelatical view of the subject: “It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church-bishops, priests, and deacons; which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority” (Preface to the English Ordinal). In the ancient Church the (three) orders of ministry established by Christ and his apostles universally prevailed. But along with them there were gradually introduced into most of the churches other ecclesiastical persons of inferior rank, who were allowed to take part in the ministrations of religion. The three belong to the sacred, or major orders; the others to the petty, or minor orders, the number of which varies in the different churches, and even at times in the same Church. In the Romish Church there are seven orders, including, in addition to the three sacred orders, doorkeeper, exorcist, reader, and acolyth. All these the Council of Trent enjoins to be received and believed on pain of anathema. The priesthood is the principal order, and is supposed to impress an indelible character on those who receive it. The origin of the inferior orders is obscure, and they are not mentioned before the days of Cyprian and of Tertullian; and, indeed, although some modern Romanists count five (including subdeacons), and sometimes have assigned mystical reasons for so doing, the number varied in different periods. The reputed Ignatius (Ep. ad Antioch. 12) excludes acolyths, and yet, by adding singers and copiatae,  swells the list to six; the constitutions bearing the name of Clemens Romanus (3:11) count but four-subdeacons, readers, singers, and doorkeepers.

The Apostolical Canons, as they are called (69), name only the first three; and, in a word, the number five is perhaps less selected than any other by the majority of ancient Church writers, whether authentic or pseudonymous. Their use in early times was to form a nursery for the regular clergy, and to assist in the performance of certain lower and ordinary offices, to which laymen, if authorized by the bishop, were equally competent. More than one council, indeed, prohibited those who had once embarked even in this inferior ministry from returning to secular employments; nevertheless they were esteemed insacrati by the ancient canons. They did not receive any ordination at the altar, nor, for the most part, any imposition of hands. By the fifth canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, subdeacons, on their appointment, were to receive an empty cup from the hands of the bishop, and a ewer and towel from the archdeacon — a ceremony implying their duties, namely, the preparation of the sacred utensils for the service of the altar.

But they were not allowed in any way to minister at the altar, to step within its rails, nor even to place the holy vessels upon it. So the duties of the acolyths were symbolized when the archdeacon presented them with a taper in a candlestick and an empty pitcher: they were to light the Candles in the church, and to supply wine for the Eucharist. Concerning the duty of the exorcists, from the obscurity attaching to the history of the energumens entrusted to their care, it is difficult to speak with certainty; it is thought that peculiar sanctity and especial reservation must have been required in persons who were to exercise so important a gift as the adjuration of evil spirits. Nevertheless, some of the occupations of the exorcists, as noticed by the ninetieth canon of the fifth Council of Carthage, belong rather to inferior keepers than to spiritual guardians of the doemoniacs. Thus, although at times in which the Church was not assembled they were enjoined to pray over their unhappy charges, they were also to take heed that they were busied in wholesome exercises, such as sweeping the church pavement, etc., by which idleness might be banished, and the tempter thereby be deprived of favorable opportunities for assault. They were also to look after the daily meals of their patients. The bishop, on their appointment, presented them with a book containing the forms of exorcising. The readers, as their name implies, read the Scriptures publicly, not, however, at the bema of the altar, but at the pulpitum in the body of the church; and the bishop's words, upon placing in their hands the Bible, by which he conferred the privilege,  sufficiently denote their separation from the regular clergy: “Accipe, et esto lector verbi Dei, habiturus, si fideliter et utiliter impleveris officium, partem cum eis qui Verbum Dei ministraverunt” (IV Conc. Carth. c. viii). To the ostiarii the bishops delivered the keys of the church; and they appear to have had about as much claim to the spiritual gifts conferred by ordination on the regular ministry as is possessed by the beadle or pew-openers of a modern chapel. Besides them, at different periods of ecclesiastical history, we read of psalmistae, or singers, sometimes called ὑποβολεῖς ', because as precentors they prompted and suggested the musical parts of the service to the remainder of the congregation; of copiatae (κοπιᾶσθαι, to labor), or fossarii, who looked after funerals, and seem to have united in one the functions both of a sexton and an undertaker; and of parabolani, who undertook the dangerous work (παράβολον ἔργον) of attending the sick.

The Church of England declines admitting orders as a sacrament, for the reasons stated in her twenty-fifth article: “For that they have not like nature of sacraments with baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.” The doctrine of the Church of Rome on the subject of orders is thus given:

“Canon I. If only one shall say that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the the body and blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sins, but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all: let him be anathema. Canon II. If any one shall say that, besides the priesthood, there are not in the Catholic Church other orders, both greater and lesser, by which, as by certain steps, advance is made into the priesthood: let him be anathema. Canon III. If any one shall say that orders or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a certaint human figurment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or that it is only a certain kind for choosing ministers of the Word of God and of the sacraments: let him be anathenma. Canon IV. If any one shall say that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given: and that the bishops do therefore vainly say, receive ye the Holy Ghost; or that a character is not thereby imprinted; or that he who has once been a priest can again become a layman: let him be anathema.”  In all episcopal churches, including under that general description the Church of England, the Protestant Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, and Romish churches, three ranks of clergy are recognized: the bishop (q.v.), the priest or presbyter or pastor (q.v.), and the deacon (q.v.). The various higher officials in the episcopal churches — archbishop, primate, metropolitan, etc. — all belong to the order of bishop; and the lower officials curate, rector, parson, etc. — all belong to the order of priests or presbyters. The non-episcopal churches, i.e. the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, some Lutherans, and others, recognize only one order, the presbyterate, no other officers being considered ministers, although lay elders and deacons are sometimes set apart by the imposition of hands. In no Reformed Church are there more than three orders — bishops, priests, and deacons. In the primitive Church the word ordo simply denoted the distinction between the clergy and the laity, the former being the ordo ecclesiasticus. SEE ORDO.

Different opinions prevail as to the source whence the authority of Holy Orders is derived. Some, who hold there is in Holy Orders a sacramental virtue which is indispensable for all the Christian ordinances and means of grace, maintain also that this virtue is inherent indefeasibly in each individual, who (according to this system) has derived it in no degree from any particular community, but solely from the bishop whose hands were laid on him; who derived his power to administer this sacrament altogether from consecration by another bishop, not necessarily a member of the same particular Church, but obtaining his power again from another; and so on, up to the apostolic times; a system, this, it will be seen, which makes the Church a sort of appendage to the priesthood, not the ministry to the Church. The opponents of this system consider that it is an error to make the authority of a Church emanate from that of its ministers; and place the title of the latter on the secure basis of a clear sanction given, once for all, to every regularly appointed minister of any Christian community constituted on Gospel principles, instead of being made to depend on a long chain, the soundness of many of whose links cannot be ascertained. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Eden, Ch. Dict. s.v.; Watson, Bible Dict . s. v; Hook, Ch. Dict. s.v.; Buck, Ch. Dict. s.v. See also Bergier, Dict. de Theologie, s.v.; Watson, Institutes, 2:572-575; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines; Siegel, Christliche Alterthumer; M'Elhinney, Doct. of the Ch. p. 192-194, 201; Palmer, Orig. Lit. 2:49, 257, 258; Walcott, Sacred Archaeol. s.v.; Burnet, Articles of the Ch. of  England; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, p. 102; and his Ritualism and Prelacy, p. 153; Willett, Synop. Pap. s.v.; Proctor, Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer; Calvin, Institutes; Princet. Rev. 15:314; and the literature in Malcom, Theol. Index, s.v., SEE OFFICE; SEE ORDINATION; SEE PRELACY.

## Orders, Religious[[@Headword:Orders, Religious]]

             are conventual communities comprehended under one rule, subject to. one superior, and wearing the same dress. Religious orders may be reduced to five kinds, viz. monks, canons, knights, mendicants, and regular clerks. They are, however, generally classified simply as monastic, military, and mendicant. White order denotes the order of regular canons of St. Augustine. Black order denotes the order of St. Benedict. Religious military orders are those instituted in defense of the faith, privileged to say mass, prohibited from marriage, etc.

The earliest comprehension of monastic societies under one rule was effected by St. Basil, archbishop of Caesarea, who united the hermits and coenobites in his diocese, and prescribed for them a uniform constitution, recommending at the same time a vow of celibacy. The Basilian rule subsists to the present day in the Eastern Church. Next in order of time was the Benedictine Order, founded by St. Benedict at Nursia, who considered a mild discipline preferable to excessive austerity. The offshoots from the Benedictine Order include some of the most important orders in ecclesiastical history, among others the Carthusians, Cistercians, and Praemonstrants. The Order of Augustinians professed to draw their rule from the writings of St. Augustine; they were the first order who were not; entirely composed of laymen, but of ordained priests, or persons destined to the clerical profession. The military orders, of which the members united the military with the religious profession, arose from the necessity under which the monks lay of defending the possessions which they had accumulated, and the supposed duty of recovering Palestine from the Saracens, and retaining possession of it. The most famous orders of this kind were the Hospitallers or Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, the Knights Templars and the Teutonic. Order. Many other military orders existed, and not a few continue to exist, particularly in Spain and Portugal. The phraseology of the old military orders is preserved in the orders of knighthood of modern 'times, into which individuals are admitted in reward for merit of different kinds, military and civil. The three mendicant orders  of Franciscans, Dominicans, and Carmelites were instituted in the 13th century. Their principal purpose was to put down the opposition to the Church, which had begun to show itself, and also to reform the Church by example and precept. At a later period the Order of the Jesuits was founded, with thee object of increasing the power of the Church and putting down heresy. Chambers, Cyclop. s.v. Notices of the more important orders, monastic, military, and mendicant, will be found underseparate articles. SEE KNIGHTS; SEE MONASTICISM; SEE MENDICANTS.

## Ordibarii[[@Headword:Ordibarii]]

             a sect of the Catharists, who held that a Trinity only began to be when Jesus Christ was born — that is, Jesus became Son of God by his reception of the Word; and when this preaching attracted others the Holy Ghost began to exist. In their patois, that of the south of France, their adherents were called “bos homes,” good men, and “credentes,” believers: these last at a later period joined the bos ordo, whence probably the name. See Neander, Church Hist. 3:366; Kuirtz — Manual of Ch. Hist. sec. 138. SEE ALBIGENSES; SEE BOGOMILES; SEE CATHARI; SEE ORTLIBENSES.

## Ordinal[[@Headword:Ordinal]]

             is the name of the book which contains the forms observed in the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church for the ordination and consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons. It was prepared by a commission appointed in the third year of Edward VI (1550), and was added to the Book of Common Prayer, after approval by Parliament. It was slightly modified in the reign of Elizabeth, and was again revised by the Convention of 1661.

The English ordinal, in its general structure, resembles the ancient services used for a like purpose, but possesses much greater simplicity, and has some features — e.g. the numerous questions addressed to the candidates — peculiar to itself. There are separate services for the “making of deacons” and the “ordering of priests,” but these are practically joined in one, and used on the same day. The service for the consecration of bishops is altogether distinct. The ordination takes place at one of the Ember seasons, and during the public service, after morning prayer and a sermon on the subject, and begins with the presentation of the candidates by the archdeacon. The bishop inquires as to their fitness, and commends them to  the prayers of the congregation. — The litany is then said, with special petitions for the candidates for each order, and the communion service commences with a special collect, epistle, and gospel. Between the epistle and gospel the oath of supremacy is administered, and the candidates for deacons' orders are questioned by the bishop and ordained. The gospel is read by one of the newly ordained deacons. The candidates for priests' orders are then solemnly exhorted and interrogated, and the prayers of all present are asked for the divine blessing upon them. For this purpose a pause is made in the service for private prayer. After this: the hymn Veni Creator Spiritus. (Gome; Holy Ghost, our Souls inspire) — a composition of great antiquity, supposed to be as old as the 4th century is sung, and, the candidates kneeling before the bishop, he and the assistant presbyters lay their hands upon the head of each, with the words, “Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God,” etc. — The only other ceremony is the presentation of each candidate with the Bible in token of authority to preach; as the deacons had been before presented with the New Testament in token of authority to read the Gospel. The service concludes with the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In the office for the ordering of deacons the bishop lays on his hands, but does not use the words, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” etc., or grant authority to forgive or retain sins. The consecration of bishops is performed by an archbishop, or some bishop appointed in his place, and two or more of his suffragans, and may take place on any Sunday or holy day. In the service for the consecration of bishops the form is this:

“Then the archbishop and bishop present shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected bishop, kneeling before them upon his knees, the archbishop saying, 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the lying on of our hands, in the huine of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And member that thou stir up the grace of God which is given the by the imposition of our hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power and love and soberness.” See Procter, Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer; M'Elhinney, Doct. of the Church, p. 164, 167, 305; Hook, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Churton, Defence of the English Ordinal (Lond. 1873, 8vo).

## Ordinance[[@Headword:Ordinance]]

             an institution established by lawful authority. Religious ordinances must be instituted by the great institutor of religion, or they are not binding: minor regulations are not properly ordinances. Ordinances once established are not to be varied by human caprice or mutability.

Human ordinances, established by national laws, may be varied by other laws, because the inconveniences arising from them can only be determined by experience. Yet Christians are bound to submit to these institutions, when they do not infringe on those established by divine authority; not only from the consideration that if every individual were to oppose national institutions no society could subsist, but by the tenor of Scripture itself. Nevertheless, Christianity does not interfere with political rights, but leaves individuals, as well as nations, in full enjoyment of whatever advantages the constitution of a country secures to its subjects.

The course of nature is the ordinance of God; its laws are but “the ordinances of heaven;” and every planet obeys that impulse which the divine Governor has impressed on it. (Jer 31:36).

## Ordinances Of The Gospel[[@Headword:Ordinances Of The Gospel]]

             are institutions of divine authority relating to the worship of God; such as,

1, baptism (Mat 28:19);

2, the Lord's Supper (1Co 11:24, etc.);

3, public ministry, or preaching and reading the Word (Rom 10:15; Eph 4:13; Mar 16:15);

4, hearing the Gospel (Mar 4:24; Rom 10:17);

5, public prayer (1Co 14:15; 1Co 14:19; Mat 6:6; Psa 5:1; Psa 5:7);

6, singing of psalms (Col 3:16; Eph 5:19);

7, fasting (Jam 1:9; Mat 9:15; Joe 2:12);

8, solemn thanksgiving (Psalms 1:14; 1Th 5:18). See these different articles; also SEE MEANS OF GRACE.

## Ordinances, Christian[[@Headword:Ordinances, Christian]]

             SEE ORDINANCES OF THE GOSPEL.

## Ordinary[[@Headword:Ordinary]]

             (Lat. ordinarius) is a word used in common and canon law to designate one who has regular or immediate jurisdiction, in opposition to those who are extraordinarily appointed. In England the bishops: conmonly the ordinary fora diocese, and the archbishop for a province. Says Coke, in his Second Institute, p 398, “This word signifieth a bishop, or he or they iht have ordinary jurisdiction, and is derived ab'ordine and gives this quaint reason, that the name was selected for the purpose of keeping the individual who bears it in perpetual remembrance of “the high order and office that he is called unto.” When the word is used at the present day, it generally, denotes either the individual who has the right to grant letters of administration of the effects of deceased persons, or him who has the right of ecclesiastical visitation. The ordinary of assizes and sessions was formerly a deputy of the bishop appointed to give malefactors the neck- verse — i.e. the verse which was read by a party to entitle him to the benefit of clergy. The ordinary of Newgate is a clergyman who attends on condemned culprits, and, as it is commonly expressed, prepares them for death.

## Ordination[[@Headword:Ordination]]

             in a common, but limited and technical sense, is the ceremony by which an individual is set apart to an order or office of the Christian ministry; As the laying on of hands is usually a distinctive feature of that ceremony, many persons have very inadequately treated of ordination to the Christian ministry as identical with it; whereas imposition of hands (q.v.) has various other uses, and only belongs to the ceremony in question as a symbolic act indicative of the bestowment of spiritual gifts or power. In a broader, and in fact its only important sense, ordination signifies the appointment or designation of a person to a ministerial office, whether with or without attendant ceremonies. The term ordination is derived directly from the Latin ordination signifying, with reference to things or affairs, a setting in order, an establishment, an edict, and with reference to men, an appointment to office. It is used in all languages derived from the Latin, and chiefly in application to this one idea of induction to the- ministerial office. As used in the English language, the term is not fixed and invariable  in its signification. In fact it has many variations of meaning, as it is made to represent the peculiar theories and practices which have prevailed in different periods and churches with reference to the character and effect of ordination; yet all these variations of meaning may be harmonized under the general idea of ministerial appointment, whether by the Savior's command, or through multiplied ceremonies of human devising.

It is but just to consider the subject of ordination one of no small intrinsic interest, since, by the consent and practice of the Christian world, it is an act, or the peculiar feature of a series of acts, by which all ministers have received their order or office, in distinction from the laity of the Church. Nevertheless much of the prominence which has been given to it in theological controversy has not arisen from its intrinsic importance, but from the accident of its being a pivotal question in reference to the dogma of a lineal apostolical succession, and the consequences supposed to flow through it as a channel of transmitted grace. It has also entered largely into the sacramentarian controversies of the past. Whoever would properly comprehend the subject of ordination as now defined should give primary attention to whatever teachings the Scriptures contain respecting it. Of necessity the Word of God, rightly interpreted, is the one source of authority in reference to a subject so closely connected with the establishment of Christ's kingdom upon the earth. Hence any theory or practice that is not sustained by inspired precept or example cannot be regarded as of religious authority, or deserving attention other than as a matter of history or curiosity.

A scriptural investigation of this subject can hardly fail to impess any ingenuous mind with the great significance The fact that neither the Lord Jesus Christ nor any of his disciples gave specific commands or declarations in reference to ordination. The facts of the institution of the ministerial office in the Church and of the ordination, in the sense of the appointment, of faithful believing men to serve in that office, stand forth prominently through out the New Testament. But the manmer in which those facts are stated suggest the inference that ministerial ordination, like the more comprehensive subject of Church organization itself, was not designed to be a matter of minute prescription or of constrained uniformity, but rather was to be left open, within the range of certain great principles, to minor variations of detail that might be appropriate to the circumstances of the future. Had any particular form of ordination been essential to the perpetuity of the Church, the validity of the sacraments, or the salvation of  men, it seems but reasonable to infer that the Head of the Church himself would have appointed that special form, and have given precepts for its continuance. In the absence of any such appointment by the Lord Jesus, we have to ascertain to what extent the apostles became the instructors of the Church in reference to the subject in question; and, finding in their writings an absence of specific precepts, it is necessary to collate the several examples of ordination which they have recorded, and to draw from them impartial inferences as to their import and bearing upon the future practice of the Church. When once the canon of Scripture is closed nothing remains but to follow the course of history, and to observe how different churches, at different periods, have sought to improve upon the simplicity and godly sincerity of the apostolic practices, and with what results, inclusive of far- reaching corruptions. As the subject essentially demands historic treatment, attention is first invited to —

I. The Analogies and Counter-Analogies of Judaism — Many writers, without due consideration, have assumed that Christian ministerial ordination was derived directly from Judaism, whereas the whole system of induction into the office of the Jewish priesthood is in marked contradistinction to that practiced by Christ and his apostles in reference to the Christian ministry.

1. The consecration of Jewish priests was by means of the anointing oil upon their persons and their garments. (see Exo 28:40-41; Exo 29:1; Exo 29:19; Exo 29:30; Lev 8:12; Lev 8:30; Lev 10:7; Lev 21:12). The Levites, as assistants to the priests, were consecrated by the sprinkling of the water of purification, washing their clothes, and the offering of sacrifice (Num 8:6-22). The laying on of hands appointed for the Levitical consecration was performed by the. people, not as conferring an office or spiritual gifts, but as symbolical of the transmission of their sins to the Levites, who, in turn, transmitted the same by laying their hands upon the heads of the bullocks offered for a sin-offering and a burnt-offering (Num 8:10-12).

2. The appointment of the Jewish prophets was by direct command or inspiration from God, without any ceremonial induction to their sacred office. In this feature the appointment of the holy prophets prefigured the Messianic period, and Christ's own mode of appointing his disciples to their ministry.

3. The most direct, if not the only real analogy of the Old-Testament Scriptures to the Christian custom of ordination to the office of the ministry is found in the ceremony by which, under the command of God, Moses transferred to Joshua a portion of his responsibilities as a leader and guide to the congregation of Israel (see Num 27:15-23). In this narrative it may be seen that Moses, prior to his departure from the people whom he had been appointed to lead out of Egypt to the land of promise, prayed to the Lord to “set a man over the congregation, . . . that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd. And the Lord said unto Moses, Take the Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him'. . And Moses did as the Lord commanded him: and he took Joshua, and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation; and he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge, as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses.” In this transaction the office of the Christian pastor, his necessary spiritual qualification, his mode of appointment, and his duty as an under-shepherd of Christ's flock, are beautifully prefigured.

II. The Example of Christ and the Practice of the Apostolical Church. —

1. In the introduction of the Christian dispensation no exterior act of ordination was practiced by Christ. The calling, appointing, and ultimate commissioning of the twelve apostles was his personal act, unattended, so far as the inspired record shows, with any symbolical action or ceremony. When it is narrated (Mar 3:14) that “he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach,” the original word employed is ἐποίησε, signifying he made,-in the sense of constituted or appointed. When to the same disciples he declared (John 15, 16), “Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye 'should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain,” the word rendered ordained is ἔθηκα, I have set or appointed you. In Luk 10:1, where it is recorded that he “appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face,” the Greek word rendered appointed is ἀνέδειξεν, literally signifying ‘he pointed out or appointed by designation. In all. these cases. Christ illustrated the divine authority which he asserted in his preface to the great and final commission given prior to his ascension: “And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have  commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world” (Mat 28:18-20). “He needed not that any should testifyj of man, for he knew what was in man” (Joh 2:25).

Hence, while he rem'ained on earth as the visible Head of his own Church, he chose and ordained his own ministers in the exercise of his omniscience and kingly power. If it be: objected that one of the original twelve apostatized and betrayed him, the proper answer is that ministers of the Lord Jesus are in this melancholy fact admonished of the danger of yielding to temptation and falling into the snare. of the devil, notwithstanding the grace imparted in an unquestionably divine appointment. Although in other acts the Savior employed symbolical actions, as when in healing lepers he touched them (Mat 8:3; Mar 1:41; Luk 5:13), or when in healing blind men he touched their eyes (Mat 9:29), spit on their eyes and put his hands upon them (Mar 8:23), anointed the eyes of the blind with clay (Joh 9:6-7; Joh 9:11), and in curing a deaf man he put his fingers in his ears and touched his tongue (Mar 7:33), yet in no case of his ordination of his disciples to their ministerial or apostolic office is it recorded that he laid his hands upon them. Nevertheless, in the final period of his earthly sojourn, between his resurrection and ascension, when about to bestow upon his disciples a higher manifestation of spiritual power “he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost” (Joh 20:22). By this symbolic action he illustrated the nature of the spiritual influence which was to come upon them in its full manifestation at the Pentecost. It was in this connection that he also uttered the words, so often and so grossly perverted, “Whosesoever sins ve remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” A literal and materializing construction of the above passage, together with the kindred passages in Matthew relating to the keys, and the power of binding and loosing (Mat 16:19; Mat 18:18), became at an early period of the history of the ancient Church a great fountain of error in reference to the office and power of the clergy. That the design of our Lord in employing these strong figures was not to confer upon the disciples a divine prerogative, but rather to impress upon them the responsibility of their office, and their essential need of a constant reliance on the aid of the Holy Ghost to enable them to discharge their duties as ministers of the Gospel, is evident, not only from a just interpretation of the passages themselves, but specially so from the practical illustration of their meaning, given by the actions and teachings of the apostles throughout all their subsequent ministry. In pursuance of the Savior's instructions they proceeded, not to  assume personal or official prerogatives, but to employ the Gospel plan of salvation as the one and only agency for securing the remission of sins. In so doing they faithfully warned the wicked of their certain condemnation and ruin outside of the provisions of the Gospel, while they: taught all men the necessity of prayer and personal faith in Christ as the indispensable condition of pardon and salvation.

2. In the whole apostolic history not a single intimation is given of the possibility of the absolution of sin by human or priestly power. On the contrary, that idea was terribly rebuked in the case of the ex-sorcerer Simon, who, although a baptized believer, committed a heinous sin by thinking “that the gift of God might be purchased with money” or imparted by ceremonial acts. For this Peter charged him, saying, “repent of this thy wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee” (Act 8:13-24). In this transaction, as well as in his address to the Jews at Jerusalem, and in fact throughout his entire ministry, the teachings of the apostle Peter illustrate the scriptural doctrine that God only can remit sin through the merits of Christ (see Psa 130:4; Dan 9:9; Act 5:31; Act 13:38; Act 26:1; Act 26:8). Moreover, in his denunciations of sin and encouragements to righteousness, Peter showed precisely the nature and extent of the apostolic prerogative of the keys, and of binding and loosing, which was no more nor less than that of organizing the Christian Church, and administering its government on the strict principles of moral purity established by the Gospel itself.

It was a sad and ominous day for the cause of Christianity when a different interpretation began to be put upon the Savior's instructions, and men, lacking the essential elements of Christian experience and all claim to the Holy Spirit's influence, began to imagine and proclaim themselves competent to remit sins, on account. of some magical power acquired by clerical ordination. That there was no scriptural foundation for such errors, and that in fact they might have been corrected by due attention to the teachings of the New Testament, may be shown from .the recorded examples of ordination as practiced by the apostles.

3. The Appointment of Matthias to the Apostleship.The peculiar feature in this transaction (see Act 1:21-26) was a pervading anxiety to ascertain whom the Lord had chosen for the vacant place among the commissioned witnesses of his resurrection. Hence the election or nomination by the Church of two candidates, prayer by the apostles, and the casting of lots to  determine which of the two should be numbered with the eleven apostles. In this case, as in those of the Lord's direct appointment, there was no imposition of hands.

4. The Ordination of the Seven Deacons. — This marked event in the history of the Church occurred in immediate sequence of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost at the Pentecost, and from the space allotted to it in the sacred record (Act 6:2-6), as well as from the fact that all the apostles were present, it may now be considered, as it doubtless was during the whole apostolic period, a model ordination for the subsequent Church. Its characteristic features were:

(1) A demand for men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom;

(2) An election or choice by the Church “on that basis;

(3) Prayer by the apostles;

(4) The laying on of hands, presumably by several of the apostles, as representative of the whole body.

In this act the apostles illustrated their ideas of the proper functions of the Church in reference to its future ministers, and established a precedent of perpetual authority. It was a precedent moreover, in obvious harmony with the precept of our Lord, given in connection with his appointment of the seventy (Luk 10:2), “Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest.” The apostles evidently regarded this as the standing commission and perpetual duty of the Church in reference to the promotion of Christ's kingdom in the earth. In it they saw that the Lord claimed the work of evangelizing the world as his own, and also the prerogative of calling and sending forth laborers, while at the same time he charged the Church with the responsibility of prayer and cooperation. This, too, was in harmony with the Savior's promised gift of the Holy Ghost as the guide of then Church when he should no longer be present as its visible Head. The Spirit's influence was specially promised in answer to prayer, and it was only a praying Church endowed with the Holy Ghost that could become the light of the world and the agency of its salvation. So long as the Church illustrated these characteristics it gloriously fulfilled its mission. It grew rapidly by the addition of regenerated believers, many of whom, in proportion to the demands of its  widening work. were called of God and moved of the Holy Ghost to preach to others the same Gospel that had become to them the power of God unto salvation. The function of the Church, therefore, as to ordination was not to create or bestow the gift of the ministry, but simply to recognize and authenticate it when bestowed by the Head of the Church. Hence ensued prayer that the Lord would show the men whom he had chosen for that work, and the laying on of hands, to express the cooperative action and benediction of the Church.

5. These principles were illustrated in the experience and ordination of Paul. On no subject did the great apostle speak more emphatically and repeatedly than that of his divine call, in the absence of which he would have regarded himself no true minister or apostle, whatever ceremonies might have been enacted over him: “Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God” (Rom 1:1); “Paul, an apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead)” (Gal 1:1). Such were the terms in which the apostle to the Gentiles expressed his personal consciousness of the divine call, and vet he submitted himself to ordination on the part of the Church, and that in company with a brother of lower degree, and at the hands of prophets (preachers) and teachers who were not numbered among the apostles.

6. Ordination of Barnabas and Saul. — The full inspired account of this transaction is worthy of special attention: “And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark. Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas. and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleuicia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus” (Act 12:25; Act 13:1-4). The events above narrated occurred some ten years after the commission of Saul of Tarsus, following which “straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues” (Act 9:20). Becoming associated with Barnabas, he also “spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus” at Jerusalem. Both these men seem to have labored as evangelists whenever they had opportunity, and their ministry having been  given of God, was honored by his blessing. They were now called to higher responsibilities. They were to go forth “under the sanction of the Church, and not only to proclaim the truth, but also to baptize converts, to organize Christian congregations, and to ordain Christian ministers. It was therefore proper that, on this occasion, they should be regularly invested with the ecclesiastical commission.

In the circumstantial record of this proceeding, in the Acts of the Apostles, we have a proof of the wisdom of the Author of Revelation. He foresaw that the rite of the laying on of hands would be sadly abused; that it would be represented as possessing something like a magic potency; and that it would at length be converted, by a small class of ministers, into an ecclesiastical monopoly. He has therefore supplied us with an antidote against delusion by permitting us, in this simple narrative, to scan its exact import. And what was the virtue of the ordination here described? Did it furnish Paul and Barnabas with a title to the ministry? Not at all. God himself had already called them to the work, and they could receive no higher authorization. Did it necessarily add anything to the eloquence, or the prudence, or the knowledge, or the piety of the missionaries? No results of the kind could be produced by any such ceremony. What, then, was its meaning? The evangelist himself furnishes an answer. The Holy Ghost required that Barnabas and Saul should be separated to the work to which the Lord had called them, and the laying on of hands was the mode or form in which they were set apart or designated to the office. This rite, to an Israelite, suggested grave and hallowed associations. When a Jewish father invoked a benediction on any of his family, he laid his hand upon the head of the child; when a Jewish priest devoted an animal in sacrifice he laid his hand upon the head of the victim; and when a Jewish ruler invested another with office, he laid his hand upon the head of the new functionary. The ordination of these brethren possessed all this significance. By the laying on of hands the ministers of Antioch implored a blessing upon Barnabas and Sail, and announced their separation or dedication to the work of the Gospel, and intimated their investiture with ecclesiastical authority” (Killen, Ancient Church, p. 71 sq.).

It is sometimes asserted that this ordination was a special one to the missionary work. Nevertheless it is the only one recorded as having been received by either of the apostles named, and it illustrates the conditions observed in the ordination of the deacons, viz. (1) The candidates were men called of the Holy Ghost; (2) They were separated unto the work of  the Lord by prayer, accompanied with fasting; (3) Hands were laid upon them by representative men of the Church, doubtless the elders. among whom no apostle was present, and as yet the office of bishop had not been instituted.

7. The Ordination of Elders. — When Paul and Barnabas went forth upon their mission, it is recorded of them that “they ordained them (i.e. for the disciples) elders in every Church” (Act 14:23). As to the ceremonies employed in these ordinations, only prayer, fasting, and commending the persons ordained to the Lord, on whom they believed, are mentioned. But in the narrative the word χειροτονήσαντες. (ordained) is for the first time introduced. It is again used in 2Co 8:19, where Paul speaks of Titus as “the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches.” “And not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord.” Being chosen of the churches signifies elected or appointed, and implies ordination by the laying on of hands, as well as being elected by the holding up of hands. The employment of the word quoted, and the subsequent use of it by Christian writers as signifying all that belonged to ministerial ordination (see subscriptions to the 2d Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus), implies that the ordination of elders throughout the churches involved the cooperative action of those churches. In so important a matter the apostles obviously did not act arbitrarily or alone; but when, for the confirming of the souls of the disciples, they judged it important to ordain elders in every Church, they doubtless called on the several churches to determine by prayer, attended with fasting, whom among their number the Holy Ghost would make their spiritual overseers. Upon those designated they doubtless, in connection with other elders, laid their hands, with corresponding prayer, and thus ordained them to the special service of the Lord. A comparison of several passages in Paul's epistles will show that this view of the apostolic custom of ordination is by no means conjectural. In 1Ti 4:14, he says, “Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.” The word prophecy in this verse may be understood in the sense of the divine gift or designation. Again, in 2Ti 1:6, referring to the same subject, he says, “Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.” Comparing the two verses quoted, it becomes evident that ordination, even by al apostle, was not an  individual act, but one participated in by the elders of the Church, who, in connection with the apostle, laid their hands upon the head of the subject. Hence, when the apostle in his charge to Timothy says (1Ti 5:22),” Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins,” we may understand that he warns his son in the Gospel alike against hasty and individual action, in which he might be deceived. Again he-says (Tit 1:4-5), “To Titus, mine own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior. For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.” He then proceeds, as he had already done in his letters to Timothy, to state in detail the essential qualifications of ministers, those which he had himself required, and those which he demanded that his successors should require; and by reference to his own example in both cases (see Act 16:2; 2Co 8:19) he clearly intimates their duty of enlisting the prayers and the godly judgment of the churches ill the selection and ordination of ministers of the Word and administrators of the ordinances of God.

Such was apostolic ordination, so far as we can know from the inspired writers, and since they have written nothing on the subject further for our learning, we may safely infer that nothing more is essential. A few points involved in the above scriptural examples may be summarily noted:

(1.) Christ ordained in the sense of appointing his disciples to ministerial service by his own authority, and without employing any exterior ceremony.

(2.) In the election of Matthias to the place in the apostolate from which Judas fell, it was deemed sufficient to ascertain by prayer and the lot whom the Lord had chosen; and in like manner, without any exterior ceremony, “he was numbered with the eleven apostles.”

(3.) The laying on of hands as a ceremony of ministerial ordination was first practiced by the apostles. in the case of the seven deacons, in immediate sequence of the miracle of the Pentecost.

(4.) It was subsequently practiced in the ordination of Paul and Barnabas, and the elders of the New-Testament Church.

(5.) No account is given of any one having been ordained to the office of bishop in distinction from that of elder, still less is there any intimation that bishops were or were to become the only officers in the Church competent to ordain ministerial candidates; whereas elders were frequently, if not always, associated even with apostles in the act of ordination.

Such, as to form and ceremony, was ministerial ordination as practiced in the apostolic Church. As to effect, it claimed only to separate, by solemn acts on the part of the Church, holy men, already called of God to the exclusive work of the ministry. No intimation is given that ordination conferred priestly functions or prerogatives in any form or degree, while, on the other hand, various cautions are given, both in the example and precepts of the apostles, against such an idea. That a large body of ministers thus ordained and instructed were at the head of the various Christian churches at the close of the apostolic period is a matter of the clearest inference both from the sacred record and the earliest accounts we have of the post-apostolic Church. Then followed a shadowy period of Church history, in which, by persecution from without and dissensions and corruptions within, many changes were wrought in the customs and theories of Christians.

II. Introduction of Corrupt Theories and Practice. The greater part of these changes originated in a tendency, itself the result of a decline in spirituality, to incorporate with the ritual of the Church certain ceremonies of Judaism, while corresponding ideas from Greek and Roman paganism were not rigidly excluded. Most startling among these corruptions, and most prolific of other outflowing errors, was the idea of a Christian priesthood parodied from the Jewish. There not having been one word or act in all the teachings of Christ or his apostles to countenance such an idea, we may well be amazed that before the end of the 3d century such declarations as the following were put forth in the name of the apostles for the teaching -and guidance of the Church. The subjoined extracts are from the so-called Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, SEE CANONS, ECCLESIASTICAL, a notorious collection of disciplinary prescriptions and forms which, although, as seen in the light of modern criticism, obviously spurious, nevertheless were circulated and received both as authentic and authoritative for centuries. Having been put forth at a period when literary criticism was unknown, and having been adroitly harmonized with the drift of corrupt practice then gaining currency in the Greek and Roman churches, neither the literary nor the religious authority of this strange  collection of documents was questioned for more than a thousand years. The lowest and the true view to be taken of these documents is that they are descriptive of theories and practices that prevailed when they were written, and from that time forward:

Pretended Authorship. — “The apostles and elders to all those who, from among the Gentiles, have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ” (bk. i, § 1).

“We who are now assembled in our place, Peter and .Andrew, James and John, sons of Zebedee, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew, James the son of Alphasns, and Lebbeeus, who was surnamed Thadduens, and Simon the Canaanite, and Matthias who, instead of Judas, was numbered with us, James the brother of the Lord and bishop of Jerusalem, and Paul the teacher of the Gentiles, the chosen vessel — all being present, have written to you this catholic doctrine fior the confirmation of you to whom the oversight of the Church universal is committed” (bk. 6 §14).

Pretended Establishment of the Hierarchy. — “As to those things which have happened amonug us, ye yourselves are not ignorant. For ye know perfectly that those who are by us named bishops and presbyters and deacons were made by prayer and by the laying on of hands, and that' by the difference of the names is indicated the difference of their employments. For not everyone that will is ordained, as the case was in that spurious and counterfeit priesthood of the calves under Jeroboam. For if there were no rules or distinction of orders, it would suffice to perform all the offices under one name. But being taught by the Lord the series of things, we distributed the functions of the high-priesthood to the bishops, those of the priesthood to the presbyters, and the ministration under them both to the deacons, that. the divine worship might be performed in purity. For it is not lawful for a deacon to offer the sacrifice, or to baptize, or to give the blessing, either small or great. Nor may a presbyter perform ordination, for it is not agreeable to holiness to have order overturned. For such as these do not fight against us nor against the bishops, but against the universal bishop, even the high-priest of the Father, Jesus Christ our Lord. High-priests, priests, and Levites, were ordained by Moses, the most beloved of God. By on Savior we, the thirteen apostles, were ordained; and by the apostles St. James and St. Clement, and others with us (that we may not make the catalogue of all those bishops over again). Moreover, by us  all in common were ordained presbyters and deacons and subdeacons and readers” (bk. 8, § 46).

Affirmation of Priestly Prerogatives and Emoluments. “Ye, therefore, at the present day, O bishops, are to your people, priests and Levites, ministering to the holy tabernacle, the holy Catholic Church; who stand at the altar of the Lord your God, and offer to him reasonable and unbloody sacrifices through Jesus the great high-priest. Ye are to the laity prophets, rulers, governors, and kings the mediators between God and his faithful people, whc receive and declare his Word, well acquainted with the Scriptures. Ye are the voice of God and witnesses of his will, who bear the sins and intercede for all” (bk. 2, § 25).

Episcopal Assumptions. — “The bishop is the minister of the Word, the keeper of knowledge, the mediator between God and you in the several parts of your divine worship. He is the teacher of piety, and next after God he is your father, who hath begotten you again to the adoption of sons by water and the Spirit. He is your ruler and governor; he is your king and potentate; he is next after God your earthly god, who hath a right to be honored by you” (bk. 2:26). Let the above strange language be contrasted with the inspired utterances of the apostle Peter himself (see 1Pe 5:1-4): “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the. oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.”

Concerning Ordination— “Wherefore we, the twelve apostles of the Lord, who are now together, give your in charge these our divine constitution oncerning every ecclesiastical form; there being present with us Paul the chosen vessel, our fellow-apostle, and James the bishop and the rest of the presbyters, and the seven deacons.

“In the first place, therefore, I Peter say that a bishop to be ordained is to be, as we have already all of us appointed, unblamable in all things, a select person, chosen by the whole people. And when he is named and approved, let the people assemble, with the presbytery and bishops that are present, on the Lord's day, and let them give their consent. And let him who is preferred among the rest ask the presbytery and the people whether this is  the person whom they desire their ruler. And if they give their consent, let him ask further whether he hath a good testimony from all men, etc. And if all the assembly together do, according to truth and not according to prejudice, testify that he is such a one, let theon the third time ask again whether he is truly worthy of this ministry; and if they agree the third tine tlhat he is worthy, let them all be demanded their vote; and when they all give it willingly, let them be heard. And, silence being made, let one of the principal bishops, one with two others, stand near the altar, the rest of the bishops and presbyters praying silently, and the deacons holding the holy Gospels open upon the head of him that is to be ordained; and say no God—”

The form of prayer prescribed is a long one, but contains the following passages:

“'Grant to him (the bishop), O Lord Almighty, through thy Christ, the communion of the Holy Spirit, that so he may have power to remit sins according to thy command; to distribute clerical offices according to thine ordinance; to loose every bond according to the power which thou gavest to the apostles; that he may please thee, in meekness and a pure heart, steadfastly, inblamably, irreproaclably, while he offereth to thee a pure and unbloody sacrifice, which by thy Christ thou hast appointed as the mystery of the new covenant... 'And when he hath prayed for these things, let the rest of the priests add Amen, and, together with them, all the people. And after the prayer, let one of the bishops elevate the sacrifice upon the hands of him that is ordained; and early in the morning let him be enthroned, in a place set apart for him, among the rest of the bishops- they all giving him the kiss in the Lord” (bk. 8, § 4, 5).

I. “Let a bishop be ordained by two or three bishops.

II. “Let a presbyter be ordained by one bishop as also a deacon and the rest of the clergy”' (bk. 8, § 47).

The above are merely specimen extracts from the Apostolical Constitutions, nevertheless sufficient to show that in the ancient Church not only were bishops and priests ordained to offer “the unbloody sacrifice” of the mass and to remit sin, but also that the number of officers in the Church admitted to ordination was beginning to be increased. (For  the forms of ordination for subdeacons, deaconesses, and readers, see bk. 8, § 19, 20, 21, 22.) Other parts of the same Constitutions prescribe the preparation by ordained bishops of the mystical oil, the mystical water, and the mystical ointment to be used in baptism, and also prayers to be offered for the dead. On the enthronement of bishops, the practice of singing hosannas to them, and many customs in reference to ordination, consult Bingham's ‘Antiquities of the Christian Church, bk. 2 and 4. His explanation, that every bishop having liberty to frame his own: liturgy tended to the multiplication and variation of the ceremonies employed, finds many confirmations in fact, and accounts for some differences of a minor character between the Greek and Roman churches. Although he finds the signing of the cross and the kiss of peace added to the ancient ceremonial, he affirms that the use of anointing oil, the presentation of the sacred utensils in clerical ordination, and the exclusive practice of the rite during Ember weeks (q.v.) are modern inventions, i.e. inventions of the medieval period.

Another practice, however, that of forcible ordination, is thus described by Bingham:

“'Anciently, while popular elections were indulged, there was nothing more common than for people to take men by force, and have them ordained against their wills. For though many men were too ambitious in courting the preferments of the Church, yet there were some who ran as eagerly from them as others ran to them; and nothing but force could bring such men to submit to an ordination. Ecclesiastical history furnishes many instances of this, including some who were plainly ordained against their wills. It was a common practice in those times for persons that fled to avoid ordination by their own bishop, to be seized by any other bishop to he ordained by them, and then returned to the bishop from 'whom they were fled.' ‘Nor was it any kind of remonstrance or solicitation whatsoever which the party could make that would prevent his ordination in such cases, except he chanced to protest solemnly upon oath against such ordination.' To hinder this protest, cunning and violence were employed. At the ordination of Macedonius by Flavian, bishop of Antioch, 'they durst not let him know what they were about till the ceremony was over; and when he came to understand that he was ordained presbyter, he broke forth into a rage.' Pauliniaus, Jerome's brother, fled from ordination, but  Epiphamius caused his deacons to seize him, and to hold his mouth, that he might not adjure them in the name of Christ to set him free. 'Such ordination stood good, and was accounted as valid as any other.' Even when in the following age the sentiment of the Church was so far modified as to permit deacons and presbyters ordained against their wills to 'be set at liberty as if they had never been ordained,' bishops were excluded from this reasonable provision. 'Though the imperial law gave liberty to all inferiors, so ordained, to relinquish their office that was forced upon them, if they pleased, and betake themselves to a secular life again, yet it peremptorily denied the privilege to bishops, decreeing that their ordination should stanid good, and that no action brought against their ordainers should be of force to evacuate or disaannul their consecration'“ (Antiq. bk. 4, ch. 7).

Could it have been certain that these forced ordinations were conferred only on good men, such proceedings would by no means have been so bad as the more common act of ordaining men of unquestioned vileness of character, who by intrigue or simony secured clerical offices, and consequently the so-called sacrament of orders, and “the indelible mark” by which the pretended apostolical (?) succession was to be handled down to remote generations.

When under ecclesiastical sanction the attempt was fully inaugurated to improve on the simplicity of the apostolical customs as to ordination by the multiplication of materialistic ceremonies, it was not likely soon to stop. So, in fact, between bishops emulous of ceremonial splendor and the enactments of rival councils, the process of adding ritual forms went forward in steps parallel to increasing corruptions of doctrine until a culmination was reached in the fully developed —

IV. Sacerdotal System of the Roman Catholic Church. — That system, as practiced from about the 10th century and fully restated by the Council of Trent, as well as in the formularies of the Roman pontifical, has the following with other less objectionable characteristics:

1. It affirms that clerical orders constitute a sacrament, the sixth of the seven enumerated by that Church. of which the pope is supreme in authority. The seven orders are those of priest, deacon, subdeacon, acolyth, exorcist, reader, and porter.

3. It affirms that bishops only are competent to confer ordination.

4. That the effect of ordination is to impress on the recipient an indelible mark or character, so that he who has once been a priest cannot again become a layman.

5. That ordination to the priesthood confers the power of offering sacrifice in the Church for the living and for the dead.

The above positions are sufficiently supported by the following extracts from the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent:

On the Sacrament of Orders. —

“Canon If any one shall say that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood, or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sin, but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel, or that those who do not preach are not priests at all: let him be anathema.

“Canon II. If any one shall say that, besides the priesthood, there are not in the Catholic Church other orders, both greater and lesser, by which, as by certain steps, advance is made into the-priesthood: let him be anathema.

“Canon III. If any one shall say that orders or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a certain human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters, or that it is only a certain kind for choosing ministers of the Word of God and the sacraments: let him be anathema.

“Canon IV. If any one shall say that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given; and that the bishops do therefore vainly say, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; or that a character is not thereby given; or that he who has once been a priest can again become a layman: let him be anathema.”

Touching the Sacrifice of the Mass. — sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it avails him only that receiveth, and that it ought not to be offered for- the living and the dead for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be anathema.”

It is true that Roman Catholic theologians have differed not a little in their discussions of some of these topics, as, for instance, in reference to the number of the sacraments and the matter and form of the sacrament of orders; but in the main they have acquiesced in the points stated above, and in the sequences inseparable from them. It may be added that the formula of ordaining a priest corresponds to the last-quoted canon. It is this: “Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate masses as well for the living as for the dead, in the name of the Lord. Amen.”

The principal features of the above-stated theory of ordination were developed before the separation of the Greek and Roman churches, and the ceremonies with which, the rite was administered differed in the two churches only in unimportant particulars, such as that of anointing the ordained person with oil, which the Roman Church practiced and the Greek Church did not. In the Roman Church, in particular, great stress is laid upon the presentation of sacred utensils and symbols as a part of the ceremony of ordination. To the priest is presented a chalice and paten (a small plate used to hold the host or consecrated wafer); to the bishop a ring, a crosier, and a pallium (q.v.) are given; and to the cardinal a hat, as symbolical of their functions and obligations. While, theremore, both churches propagated in its essentially erroneous features a common theory as to ordinations, it was the Romish Church which carried out the greatest extreme of ceremonies, and made the worst uses of the theory in connection with the dogma and assumptions of papal supremacy — a system of sacerdotalism that embodied blasphemous pretensions, and that was often prostituted to the most wicked and selfish purposes. Examination shows that this very theory of the Roman Church as to orders and sacraments lies at the center of the system referred to, and is the fountain-head of some of its worst corruptions. Once grant that ordination in direct line and by direct sanction from the pope of Rome is the one essential channel for the descent of God's grace to man, and there is conceded a power as far-reaching and dangerous as it is far removed from scriptural truth. That the Roman see made this claim without disguise, and  enforced it during successive centuries by the most unscrupulous measures, is proved by multitudinous facts of history. As a specimen, take the following statement concerning pope Boniface IX:

“At first Boniface did not publicly take money for the higher promotions; he took it only in secret, and through trustworthy agents. At length after ten years, at once to indulge, palliate, and to establish this simony, he substituted as a permanent tax the Annates (q.v.), or first-fruits of every bishopric and rich abbey, calculated on a new scale, triple that in which they stood before in the papal books. This was to be paid in advance by the candidates for promotion, some of whom never got possession of the benefice. That was matter of supreme indifference to Boniface, as he could sell it again. But as these candidates rarely came to the court with money equal to the demand, usurers, with whom the pope was in unholy league, advanced the sum on exorbitant interest. The debt was sometimes sued for in the pope's court. The smaller benefices were sold from the day of his appointment with shameless and scandalous notoriety. Men wandered about Lombardy and other parts of Italy searching out the ages of hoary incumbents, and watching their diseases and infirmities. For this service they were well paid by the greedy aspirants at Rome. 'On their report the tariff rose or fell. ‘Bennefices were sold over and over again. Graces were granted to the last purchaser, with the magic word 'Preference,' which cost twenty-five florins.' That was superceded by a more authoritative phrase (at fifty florin), a perogative of precedence. Petitions already sometimes cancelled in favor of a higher bidder; the pope treated the lower offer as an attempt to defraud him. In the same year the secretary, Theodoric a Niem, had known the same benefice sold in the course of a one week to several successive claimants. The benefices were so openly sold that, if money was not at hand, the pope would receive the price in kind — in wine, sheep, oxen, horses, or grain. The officers were as skillful in these arts as himself. His auditors would hold twenty expectatives, and receive the first-fruits. The argus-eyed pope, however, watched the death-bed of all his officers. Their books, robes, furniture, money, escheated to the pope. No grace of any kind, even to the poorest, was signed without its florin fee. The pope, even during mass, was seen to be consulting with his  secretaries on these worldly affairs. The accumulation of pluralities on unworthy men was scandalous even in those times” (Milman's Latin Christianity, vol. 7, bk. 13, ch; 3).

It is obvious that such a shameless traffic in clerical ordinations and appointments could only have been maintained in a Church in which and in an age when the people had been taught to believe that their salvation depended on the absolution of priests fitted for their task by the indelible mark of papal ordination irrespective of moral character. The same idea made the theories of purgatory and indulgence sources of illimitable pecuniary exactions, while it also made the power of the popes terrible in their long struggle with emperors in reference to the right;of investiture (q.v.) and temporal sovereignty. In those struggles monarchs and nations were reduced to submission by the culmination of bulls, bans, and interdicts, which, aside from the fundamental idea of divine grace flowing solely through the-channel of papal ordination and authority, would have been as powerless as they are now seen to be absurd.

V. Protestant Reaction. — The above-stated theory of ordination, attended by corresponding practice, may be said to have had universal and unquestioned prevalence throughout the Christian world from the 6th to the 16th century. Irrespective of its gradual and insidious beginnings, it was fully developed in the ritual of Gregory the Great (A.D. 595-606), and it reached its present form of administration in the Pontficale Romanum (q.v.) of pope Clement VIII, in 1596. A prominent feature of the great Reformation was a violent and general reaction against the dogmas and abuses of the Roman system of ordinations. Without exception, Protestants rejected the five factitious sacraments of the Roman Church, including orders. The Reformed churches not only rejected the doctrines but the ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church in reference to ordination, falling back on scriptural precedents as their sole guide in reference to the modes, of appointing and ordaining their clergy. A partial exception has to be stated in reference to the Church of England, which retained a portion of the Roman ritual of ordination. In reference to this as well as many other subjects, different interpretations of Scripture prevailed, and consequently different customs of ordination were established. Most of the Reformed churches, doubtless owing to the great abuses so long associated with the name and character of bishop, rejected the episcopal office entirely, although the Lutheran Church retained it under the name of superintendent. There was great unanimity in accepting the ordination by  elders as appropriate and valid, but in some of the churches two classes of elders were recognized — teaching (clerical) and ruling (lay) elders. In some, as in the Church of Scotland, the clerical presbyters only join in the imposition of hands. Among the Independents and Baptists the power of ordination is considered to inhere in any given congregation of believers. The qualifications of a candidate are first ascertained and approved by a Church, which, having called him to its ministry, and he accepting, proceeds to confer ordination upon him by prayer and the imposition of hands.

The Protestant churches of Germany, Holland, Switzerland, France; Denmark, Poland, Hungary, Scotland, etc., have only presbyterial ordination, and place no reliance on the derivation of their clerical orders, from the fact that their founders, such as Luther, Calvin, and others, had been episcopally ordained as presbyters. They all unite in considering the call of God expressed through the suffrage of the Church as the essential prerequisite to true ministerial character, while ordination is simply an appropriate ceremony designed to authenticate that call, and to publicly separate ministers to the sacred office. In most of the churches named, as welt as- in the American Presbyterian, Baptist, and Congregational churches, deacons are only lay officers of the Church, and do not receive the imposition of hands.

As we have not thought proper to allot space for the formulae of the Greek and Roman ordinations, so now we deem it unimportant to introduce details as to ceremonies and variations in the practice of ordinations among Protestants. Such variations find their prototype in the scriptural ordinations, of which no two recorded were conducted in all respects alike, a fact that plainly indicated the non-essentialits of fixed forms, as well as the Christian liberty of adapting forms to circumstances. With a single exception, substantial unity may be said to prevail throughout the Protestant world in the view that the validity or propriety of ministerial ordinations does not hinge on any form of ceremony, or any, pretense of tactual succession, and this, unity of sentiment is sustained by a corresponding charity and mutual respect. The exception referred to, though not stated in the creed of any Protestant Church, has nevertheless existed from the period of the Reformation, and has resulted in a voluminous, and not seldom acrimonious controversy, which passes to descend to future generations.

VI. High-Church Controversy on Ordination. — In order to comprehend the nature and bearings of this controversy, it is necessary to take into view some well-known facts respecting the peculiar constitution of the Church of England. They are indicated in the following, language, abridged from lord Macaulay's introduction to his History of England.

“Henry VIII attempted to constitute an Anglican Church differing-from the Roman Catholic-Church on the point of the supremacy, and on that point alone. His success in this attempt was extraordinary. The English Reformers were eager to go as far as their brethren on the Continent. They unanimously condemned as anti-Christian numerous dogmas and practices to which Henry had stubbornly adhered, and which Elizabeth reluctantly abandoned. Many felt a strong repugnance even to things indifferent which had formed part of the polity or ritual of the mystical Babylon. Thus bishop Hooper, who died manfully at Gloucester for his religion, long refused to wear the episcopal vestments. Bishop Ridley, a martyr of still greater reknown, pulled down the ancient altars of his diocese, and ordered the Eucharist to be administered in the middle of churches, at tables which the papists irreverently termed oyster-boards. Bishop Jewell pronounced the clerical garb to be a stage-dress, a fool's coat, a relique of the Amorites, and promised that he would spare no labor to extirpate such degrading absurdities. Archbishop Grindal long hesitated about accepting a mitre from dislike of what he regarded as the mummery of consecration. Bishop Parkhurst uttered a fervent prayer that the Church of England would propose to herself the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community. Bishop Ponet was of opinion that the word bishop should be abandoned to papists, and that the chief officers of the purified Church should be called superintendents. When it is considered that none of these prelates belonged to the extreme section of the Protestant party, it cannot be doubted that, if the general sense of that party had been followed, the work of reform would have been carried on as unsparingly, in England as, in Scotland. But as the government needed the support of the Protestants, so the Protestants needed the protection of the government. Much was therefore given up on both sides; a union was effected, and the fruit of that union was the Church of England. The man who took the chief part in settling the conditions of the alliance which produced the Anglican Church was Thomas Cranmer. He was the representative of both the parties, which at that time needed each other's assistance. He was at once a divine and a courtier. In his character of divine he was perfectly ready to  go as far in the way of change as any Swiss or Scottish Reformer.' In his character of courtier he was desirous to preserve that organization which had during many ages admirably served the purposes of the bishops of Rome, and might be expected now to serve equally well the purposes; of the English kings and of their ministers. Ton this day the constitution, the doctrines, and the services of the Church retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprang. She occupies a middle position between the churches of Rome and Geneva. The Church of Rome held that episcopacy was of divine institution, and that certain supernatural graces of a high order had been transmitted by the imposition of hands through fifty generations, from the eleven who received their commnission on the Galilean mount to the bishops who met at Trent. A lagre body of Protestants, on the other hand, regarded prelacy as positively unlawful, and persuaded themselves that they found a very different form of ecclesiastical government prescribed in Scripture. The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course. They retained episcopacy, but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the sacraments. Cranmer, indeed, on one important occasion, plainly avowed his conviction that in the primitive times there was no distinction between bishops and priests, and that the laying on of hands was altogether superfluous.”

This formidable array of antitheses — by no means exhausts the list of practical contradictions embodied in the Church of England. Rejecting, the supremacy off the pope, she accepted, or, rather, had forced upon her, that of the temporal Sovereign, subjecting her to the most extravagant assumptions of an unscrupulous monarch. — Macaulay, on this point, says, “What Henry and his favorite counselors meant at one time by supremacy was certainly nothing less than the whole power of the keys. The king was to be the pope of his kingdom, the vicar of God, the expositor of catholic verity, the channel of sacramental graces. He arrogated to himself the right of deciding dogmatically what was orthodox doctrine” and what was heresy, of drawing up and imposing confessions of faith, and of giving religious instruction to his people; He proclaimed that all jurisdiction; spiritual as well as temporal, was derived from him alone, and that it was in his power to confer episcopal authority and to take it away. He actually ordered his seal to be put to commissions by which bishops were appointed, who were to exercise their functions as his deputies and during his pleasure... As he appointed civil officers to keep his seal, to collect his  revenues, and to dispense justice in his name, so he appointed divines of various ranks to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments. It was unnecessary that there should be any imposition of hands. The king- such was the opinion of Cranmer, given in the plainest words might, in virtue of authority derived from God, make a priest, and the priest so made needed no ordination whatever.”

Under Edward VI there was a speedy revolt from such extreme absurdities, and a form of ordination by the imposition of hands was incorporated in the ritual. But even in that ritual, which is generally considered to represent the best Protestantism of the English Reformation, whilethe mass is rejected, yet the idea and order of a priesthood is retained in a form for ordaining all ministers of second grade as priests. Notwithstanding that serious error, the ritual in question is specially distinguished for the prominence it gave the scriptural idea of a personal divine call — an idea that had been obscured, if not obliterated, in the rituals of the Church for a thousand years previously. It required a solemn declaration on the part of every candidate for holy orders of his personal conviction that he is “moved by the Holy Ghost” to take upon himself this sacred ministration. Bishop Burnet explains the action of the British Reformers in this regard in the following language:

“Our Church intended to raise the obligation of the pastoral care higher than it was before, and has laid out this matter more fully and more strictly than any Church ever did in any age, as far, at least, as my inquiries can carry me... No Church before ours at the Reformation took a formal sponsion at the altar from such as were ordained deacons and priests. That twas, indeed, always demanded of bishops, but neither in the Roman nor Greek pontifical do we find any such solemn vows and promises demanded or made by priests or deacons, not does any print of this appear in the constitutions or the ancient canons of the Church. Bishops were asked many questions, as appears by the first canon of the fourth Council of Carthage. They were required to profess their faith and to promise to obey the canons, which is still observed in the Greek Church. The questions are more express in the Roman pontifical, and the first of these demands a promise that they will instruct their people in Christian doctrine according to the 'Holy Scriptures,' which was the foundation upon which our bishops justified the Reformation, since, the first and chief of all their vows binding  them to this, it was to take place of all others, and if any other parts of those sponsions contradicted this, such as their obedience and adherence to the see of Rome, they said that these were to be limited by this... Our Reformers, observing all this, took great care in reforming the office of ordination, and they made both the charge that is given and the promises that are to be taken to be very express and solemn, so that both the ordainers and the ordained might be rightly instructed in their duty, and struck with the awe and dread that they ought to be under in so holy and so important a performance;... yet to make the sense of these promises go deeper, they are ordered-to be mimde at the altar, and in the nature of a stipulation or covenant... OurChurch, by making our Savior's words the form of ordination, must be construed to intend by that that it is Christ only that sends, and that the bishops are only his ministers to pronounce his mission.”

Yet the very ritual which required the candidate for ordination to solemnly profess that he was “inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him this office and ministration to serve God,” and that he was truly called “according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ,” also required him, in the “Oath of the-King's Supremacy,” to swear, “I from henceforth will accept, repute, and take the king's majesty to be the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England.”

To embody in any system such a series of contradictions and oppugnances was to plant the seeds of interminable strife, and to such a strife has the Church of England been subjected from the days of the Reformation downward. Nor has the strife been limited to words. In its earlier periods, persecutions, bloodshed, and martyrdoms were frequent results. Sometimes one party was in the ascendency, sometimes the other, and in the progress of extents the controversy of which our subject was the center assumed a variety of phases. Sometimes the issue was direct, as between popery and Protestantism. Sometimes it was triangular, as between the papacy, Protestant prelacy, and Puritanism. At length various forms of dissent and independency began to appear, only to multiply forms of discussion, into nearly all of which questions relating to ordination entered more or less prominently. While separation led forth into distinct organizations perhaps the greater part of the more pronounced anti- prelatists, there has always remained in the Church of England an influential body of evangelical or Low Churchmen, who, while they accept  episcopacy as a scriptural form of Church government, and episcopal ordination as both appropriate, expedient, and scriptural, nevertheless disclaim its exclusive validity, its uninterrupted prelatical suecession, and its claims to be of special divine appointment de jure divino. On the other hand, the same Church has never lacked prelatists of the highest pretensions who, notwithstanding their own clerical orders are scouted by the Romanists as null, both on the ground of irregularity and illegality, nevertheless zealously assert the main principle of the Romish theory of succession. Indeed, the bigotry and pretensions of the Anglican High- Churchmen have rarely found a parallel, unless in the groundlessness of their claims, both as judged from opposite points by Romanists and other Protestants. The debate between them and their brethren of lower views, as well as with those larger branches of the Protestant Church whose orders and ministry they have affected to despise, has never known an intermissions; yet the excitement attending it has gradually decreased in proportion as the principles of tolerance have become recognized in the legislation of the kingdom. It was exceedingly bitter in the days of the vestment controversy, when ministers were constrained by law to wear garments- symbolical of a priestly office which they rejected as unchristian, and also bindd thr Act of Uniformity, by which thousands of good ministers rejected from their churches and their livings because they declined an oath of conform it to requirements with which their consciences forbade compiances. Fdresu severities had toned down under the advance of general enlightenment, the subject was debated more as a matter of opinions and ecclesiastical partisanship; in which tastes and associations largely governed individual action.

The 18th century Witnessed a new phase of this old controversy, growing out of the rise of Methodism. When John Wesley, as an evangelical clergyman, found himself providentially called on to provide for the administration of the Christian ordinances to the religious societies which he had been instrumental in organizing, first within the Church of England, and subsequently in America, he first applied to the bishop of London for the ordination of sons of his lay-preachers. Having been repeatedly refused he associated with himself other presbyters; and preceeded to ordain deacons, elders, and a superintendent or bishop for America. “In justification of this act he pleaded the urgency of the providential necessitys his conviction, of the utter baselessness Of the theory of ininterrupted lineal succession, and the precedent established by the apostolical Church of  Alexandria; in which, as recorded by Jerome, the presbyters elected their whole line of bishops, from the days of Mark the Evangelist downward, for one hundred and fifty years. From this action of Wesley there not only arose the Wesleyan Methodist churches of Great Britain, Canada, and Australia, in which presbyterial ordination is practiced, but also the Methodist Episcopal churches of the United States and Canada. In the last- named churches the episcopal office, apart from any prelatical idea or assumptions, has had a wide, field of action, and, in connection with an earnest spirit of evangelical effort, has been attended with a measure of success worthy of apostolic times. In the Methodist Episcopal churches the formula of ordination is that of the Church of England expurgated of the word priest and of every term that might be constituted to express the idea of sacerdotalism, or any temporal headship of the Church of Christ. — Two, clerical orders only are recognized, those of deacon and elder. The bisphorric is regarded not as a third order, but as an office to which an elder having been elected is consecrated by prayer and the imposition of hands by other bishops and presbyters. It is a special function of the bishop to ordain ministers, not singly, but its cooperation with presbyters. In all this the churches in question claim to follow ancient, if not strictly apostolical usage. They also insist with great urgency upon the personal conviction of each candidate for any form of the ministerial office-that he is moved thereto by the Holy Ghost.

In America the High-Church controversy as respecting ordination has had but a limited range, and a corresponding influence. -It was inherited by the Protestant Episcopal Church as a direct legacy from the mother Church of England, but, having been wholly disassociated from questions of temporal 'sovereignty and state emolument, it was for a long period entirely quiescent, merely arising as a matter of opinion between clergymen of different altitude in the same Church, or between zealons representatives of that Church and those of other Protestant churches, all agreeing in opposition to the prelatical claims of Romanists.

A new phase of this controversy arose about 1830 in connection with the issue of the Oxford Tracts (q.v.) in England. Although the days of persecution were then past, the spirit of intolerance was by no means extinct, and the attempt to secure a Romanistic reaction in England and other Protestant countries was so determined and so skillfully urged that a somewhat formidable movement towards the Romish Church was actually secured. In England scores of clergymen from the Established Church, and  in the United States some dozens from the Protestant Episcopal Church, became (to employ a phrase that then came into common use) perverts to Romanism, and both countries became rife with the controversy. One of the first objects of the Tractarian movement, sometimes called Puseyism, from the prominience of Dr. E. B. Pusey, of Oxford, as one of the Tract writers, was to reassert the importance of ordination in the line of a lineal and tactual succession direct from the apostles. Assuming the prerogatives of such an ordination for themselves, they unscrupulously attacked the validity of all other ordinations, except those of the Greek and Roman churches, and thus with as little charity as consistency, presumed to denounce the greater part of Protestant Christians throughout the world as irregular and schismatic, if not heretical. The eagerness with which many ministers of hhe Protestant Episcopal Church caught up or gave prominence to similar assumptions, and proceeded, under the stimulus from Oxford, to flaunt their claims of superiority in the face of the other Protestant churches of America, caused the controversy to be more extensively opened in this country than it had ever been before. Ministers of other churches who felt that the validity of their ministerial character was impugned by these pretensions were not slow to accept the discussion, which, by aid of free pulpits and a free press, became very general. Every phase of the argument — from the Scriptures, from the fathers, from history, and from the nature of the case, was reopened. While in many instances the result of the discussion of doubtless was to confirm the disputants and partisans on both sides in their old opinions, yet it can hardly be doubted that the effect of the discussion as a whole was largely to influence the public mind both of England and the United States against the prelatical claims, and in favor of the inherent right of churches; to establish their own minor ceremonies as well as their forms of Church government, subject to the cardinal principles of God's Word. In short, the principle and spirit of exclusiveness and of hierarchical pretension were effectually rebuked in a contest of their own provoking. While such principles yet has numerous adherents, still it cannot be questioned that they stand reprobated before the popular mind as unsustained by scriptural precedent or precept, and unworthy of the spirit of an enlightened age. Nevertheless the mediaeval theories of ordination, both as to its magical effect, its indelible mark, and its lineal descent from the apostles, however polluted the line through which, it has come down, still have their advocates.

The Roman Catholic Church is bound by the canon and decrees of the Council of Trent, while its Anglican imitators struggle to maintain  similarly far less consistency. In. their emergency they seek, affiliations with the Greek Church and the Old Catholics, without direct acknowledgment from either. — Meantime, the logic of events is working out very important demonstrations, by showing, on the one hand, how little the truth and power of Christianity are dependent on external ceremonies, and, on the other, not only how powerless, but how misguiding, ceremonies are as a substitute for divine grace in the hearts and lives of professed ministers of Christ. A survey of the active and progressive agencies of Christianity in the world. shows that, a very large proportion of them are sustained by churches which reject as baseless the theory that covenanted grace descends solely through a series of ceremonial ordinations. When, indeed, a comparison as, to purity of life, zeal in Christian good works, and fruits following is instituted between churches practicing presbyterial ordination and those making high assumptions of ecclesiastical prerogative, based on a line of ordinational succession, running through the worst popes of Rome, the former certainly are not found wanting. To the ordinary mind such facts are more convincing than theoretical arguments, whether based on questionable precedents or on quotations from the fathers; and the more such facts are multiplied the less need there will be of a perpetual reproduction of the arguments so often stated and restated during the last three hundred years. Nevertheless a knowledge of the controversy, is more or less a necessity to every candidate for ordination, not only as a means of satisfying his own mind, but also of being prepared for any new phase the controversy may assume hereafter.

The most recent phase of High-Church development as won for itself the title of Ritualism (q.v.). Ritualists, as such, are usually identical with high pretenders to the importance of successional ordinations, but in their, extreme attention to the reproduction of medieval ceremonies they are not followed by. all who accept the theory of tactual succession. The attempts of the ritualistic party of the Church of England to reintroduce Roman Catholic ceremonies into the worship of Protestant churches has been greatly held in check by certain laws. of the realm. In America similar attempts have found but in the favor before an eminently practical people, who, so far as they choose Romanism at all, evidently prefer the system without disguises to a feeble imitation.

The most active controversy in reference to the question of ordination prevailing in the United States at the present time is between the high and  low churchmen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The former appear to have been advancing within recent years both in numbers and the assertion of principles of exclusiveness and intolerance. As a result a new organization was formed in 1873, entitled the Reformed Episcopal Church. That Church, organized under the supervision of the late bishop George D. Cummins, claims to represent the Protestant views and practices of the Church of England as understood and vindicated by the Reformers of the period of Edward VI, and prior to the papal reaction under Bloody Mary. While professing and practicing episcopal ordination, it does not deny the validity of other forms following Scripture precedent and applied to godly men. On the principle of succession, whatever of validity inhered in the orders of the Protestant Episcopal Church was handed down to the Reformed Episcopal Church by episcopal ordinations from the seceding. bishop before the attempt to invalidate his authority by excommunication could be' consummated. Thus a somewhat new form of issue pertaining to the question of ordination is opened between prepresentative classes or grades of Episcopalians.

VI. The literature of the subject of ordination and orders is mingled from first to last with that of the Roman Catholic and High-Church controversies, being rarely find in direct and separate, treatises on either side in an exhaustive list would require altogether too much space, the classified section herewith give an with be found sufficient for any: ordinary extent of investigation.

1. Historical. — Schaff, Hist. of the Apostolic Church; Killen, Ancient Church; Mosheim, Hist. of the First Three Centuries; The, “Apostolic Constitutions;” Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church; Coleman, Christian Antiquities; Campbell, Lectures on Ecclesiastical History; The Bible, the Missal, and the Breviary. ‘

2. Romanistic. — Bellarmine, De Ordine; Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent; Catechism of the Council of Trent; Kenrick, On the Primacy; id. On Anglican Ordinations; Wiseman, On High-Church Clainms Milner, End of Controversy.

3. Anti-Romanistic, — Beza, De Ecclesia; Willet, Synopsis. Papismi; Cramp, Text-Book of Popery; Elliott, Romanism; Barrow, On the Supremacy; Palmer, Letters to Wiseman on the Errors of Romanisn Hopkins, “End of Controversy”, Controverted.

4. Anglican Prelatical. — Bancroft, Survey of the Pretended. Holy- Discipline.; Hooker, — Ecclesiastical Polity; Bishop Hall, Episcopy by Divine Right; Mason, Defence of the Church of England Ministry; Courayer, Validity of Angilican Ordinations; Jeremy Tayior, Oe Episcopacy; Cave, Ancient Church; Wheatley, On Conmmon Prayer; Percival, On Apostolic Succession Jeremy Collier, Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain; Palmer, On the Church; “The Oxford Tracts;” Wordsworth, Theophilus Anglicanus; Manning, Unity of the Church; Pusey. Eirenikon; Stubb, Episcopal Succession; Marshall, Notes on Episcopacy; Wordsworth, The Christian Ministry.

5. Anglican Anti-Prelatical. — Jewell, Apology of the Church of England; “Field of the Church;” Lord King, Prinmitive Church; Bishop Burnet, Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England; also Church of Scotland; Stillingfleet, Irenicuz; Isaac Taylor, Ancient Christianity; Archbishop Whately, Kingdom of Christ; also Origin of Romish Erors; Litton, On the Church of Christ; Harrison, Whose are the Fathers? Bridges, On the Christian Ministry; Nolan, Catholic Character of Christianity; Goode, Divine Rule of Faith and Practice.

6. Puritan, Presbyterian, etc. — Rutherford, Due Right of Presbyteries; Drury, Model of Church Government; Seamen, Vindictaion of the reformed Churches; Milton, Prelatical Episcopacy; also Reason of Church Government; Prynne, Testimonies of Bishops and Presbyters; Baxter, Treatise of Episcopacy; also English Non-Confoirmity; Calamy, Defence of Non-Conformity; James:Owen, Plea for Scripture Ordination; Nichol, Vindication of Dissenters;. Ayton, Oritintal Constitution of the Christian Church; Campbell, Vindication of the Presbyterians of Ireland; M'Crie, Unity of the Church; Conder, Protestant Non-Conformity; Vaughan, Polity of Congregationalism; Powell. On Apostolical Succession; sundry Ministers of old, On the Divine Right of Church Government; Brown, Puseyite Episcopacy.

7. American Prelatical. — Wilmer, Episcopal Manual; Hobart, On Apostolic Order; How, Vindication of the Protestant Episcopal:Church; Bowden, ‘Apostolic Origin of Episcopacy; Carnochan, Early Fathers; Ogilby, Catholic Church in England and America; Chapin, Prinitive Chuch; Kip, Double ‘Witness of the Church'; Doane, Sermons and Charges; Ewer, Protestantism a Failure; Mines, Presbyterian Clergyman Looking for the Church.

8. Arminian and Prelatical.— Dickinson, Defence of Presbyterian Ordination; Welles, Divine Right of Presbyterian Ordination; Mason (John M.). Essays on Episcopary; Miller, On the Christian Ministry Wilson, Primitive Government of Christian Churches; Sparks, Letters on the Ministry and Ritual of the Episcopal Church; Wood, Objections to Episcopacy; Emory, Episcopal Controversy Reviewed; Bangs, Ordinal Church of Christ; Duffield, On the Claims of Episcopal Bishops; Snodgrass, On Apostolical Succession; Barnes, On the Apostolic Church; M'Ilvaine, on the Oxford Divinity; Hopkins, Novelties which Disturb our Peace; Shimeal, End of Prelacy; Smyth, On Apostolical Succession; also Presbytery and Prelacy; also Ecclesiastical Republicanism; Tydings, Apostolical Succession; Abbe, Apostolical Succession; — Gallagher, Primitive Eirenicon; Cheever, Hierarchical Despotismm; Upham, Ratio Disciplinae; Punchard, Congregationalism; Magoon, Republican Christianity; Kidder, Christian Pastorate; Coleman, Manual of Prelacy; New-Englander, Oct. 1873, art. 3. (D. P. K.)

## Ordination of Ministers[[@Headword:Ordination of Ministers]]

             The members of the synod were at first inclined, as a general thing, to content themselves with restoring apostolical or primitive simplicity in the Episcopal Church; but, after the arrival of the Scottish commissioners and the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant, the synod became predominantly Presbyterian in its views. The Presbyterial constitution was recognized as originating with Christ and being the only scriptural form of Church organization. Toleration was opposed; and uniformity was strenuously insisted on. Liberty of conscience was stigmatized as the outgrowth of blameworthy indifference and betrayal of the truth. In these tenets the majority was zealously opposed, however, by the Independents led by Dr. Thomas Goodwin, who insisted upon the divine right of each congregation to govern itself under the Word of God; and by the Erastians, who wished to relegate the power to punish ecclesiastical as well as civil offences altogether to the secular authorities, and, in general, advocated the subordination of the Church to the State as the only trustworthy means for doing away with spiritual tyranny and also of obviating all conflict between Church and State. The leaders of the Erastian party were the celebrated Orientalists and antiquarians Lightfoot and Selden, etc. When the Presbyterian party prevailed, the Independents and Erastians withdrew from the synod; but Parliament adopted the Scotch-Presbyterian constitution with an Erastian proviso, and with the declaration that it should be set aside if, after trial, its provisions should be found impracticable. The event proved that England was not ripe for such a Church organization. Independency and other forms of dissent conquered the Westminster Assembly and made an end of all its endeavors towards conformity.

## Ordo[[@Headword:Ordo]]

             (order), as applied to the clergy, has been the occasion of controversy. Many contend that it is adopted from the Roman language, and used by Tertullian and others of the classic sense, to exhibit the patrician rank of the clergy, like the ordo senatorius of the Romans. The fact is, that the word is used to denote the difference between the clergy and the people- the ordo ecclesiasticus and the laity; and in this sense it has been understood since the close of the second century. See Riddle, Christiati Antiquities, p. 203, 212.

## Ordo Romanus[[@Headword:Ordo Romanus]]

             is the name given to every rule of the Romish Church in general, and particularly to the rules concerning worship. Like τάξις, διάταξις, the rule and its exposition, or τακτικός (τακτική sc. βίβλος,), or ordo or ordinarius (sc. liber), or ordinale and ordinalis' (sc. liber) (Du Fresne), signifies a collectioii of rules for worship. In the course of time there appeared many such libelli, which in so far as they related to the same subject, were compiled together. The exact time when these different libelli appeared is not ascertanined, nor that of their compilation. As early as the 5th century there was a distinction between the sacramentarium, containing the prayers for the Eucharist, the antiphonarius (liber), with the  liturgic chants, and finally the ordo, constituting the ritual. See F. Probst, Verwaltung d. hochheiligen Eucharistie (Tiibing, 1853), p. 9 sq.

Various ordines appeared in the different churches, but they were gradually all superseded by the Roman ordo, for the popes as early as the 5th century used every exertion to have the worship conducted everywhere according to the usages of Rome. The subsequent publishers of rituals often confounded the Roman with other rituals, hence the number of those which were published. See Mabillon, In Ordinem Romanum commentarius, preceding his edition of the Atiqui libri rituales sanctae Romanae ecclesiae, in the Museum Italicum, t. ii (Paris, 1724, 4to). The oldest Ordo Romanus is attributed to bishop Gelasius († 496) by Mabillon (as above) and Muratori, Liturgia Romana vetus (Venice, 1748), 1:289 sq. Yet from the Epist. I of Innocent I, Ad Decentium, in 416 (in cap. 11, dist. 11), there appears to have existeld an older ordo. which is now lost. The ordo attributed to Gelasius, although it often refers to Leo I, seems to have been written by an unknown author in the time of Felix III, the predecessor of Gelasins (Bahr, D. christlich-ronmische Theologie, p. 364). This ordo, as well as that published by Mabillon annd Muratori as No. 1, was in general use in the 9th century, as is proved by the use made of it by Amalarius. These two ordines, together with those published as Nos. 3 and 4 by Mabillon, and which are of somewhat later date, treat of the missa potificalis. The ordines 5 to 10 of Mabiilon, which are of much later origin, aind belong probablly in part at least to the 11th century, refer to the missa episcopalis, the ordo scutinii ad electos, qualiter debeat celebrari (in baptism), the forms of ordination from the different degrees, as also the ordo, qualiter agendum sit quinta feria in cesna Domi, feria sexta. Parasceve, in sabbato stincto, ad-reconciliandum poenitentem, ad visitandunm infirmlum, ad consignandum pueros-sive iinfntes, ad ungendum infiimos, ad coinmunicandum- infirmos, ordo sepeliendi cle- icos Romance fraternitatis. We now possess but fragments of most of these ordines. It is therefore doubtful whether Bernard of Pavia, who quotes numerous passages of the Ordo Romanus in his Breviarnium Extravagantium (which are also given in the collection of decretals of Raymundus a Pennaforte, c. 9, De officio archidiaconi,1, 23; c. 9, De officio-primicerii 1; 25; c. 9. De officio custodis,1, 27), obtained or obrrowed them from an ancient Ordo Romanus or from a later one. At any rate, those passages are not to be found in any of the printed ordines.  Among the oldest published Ordines Romani are those of George Cassander (Colon. 1559,1561; also in his works, Paris, 1616), Melchio Hittorp (Colon. 1568). and G. Ferrarius (Romans 1591; Paris, 1610, 1624. fol.). About 1143 Benedict, a canon and chorister of St. Peter's, compiled an ordo entitled Liber pollicitus ad Guidonem de Castello (the fiuture pope Celestine II, then cardinal of St. Marc). He describes the divine worship forn the whole ecclesiastical year, with special reference to the papal affairs (published in Mabillon, No. 11). At the Council of Pavia, in 1160; the clergy made use of aliber de vita et ordinatione Romanorum pontificum (Pertz, Monumenta Germ. 4:126). The Ordo Romanus contained also the forms to be used at the coronation of the emperor. On the form used in 1192 see Pertz. (p. 187 sq.), Mabillon, and Martene. This form was adopted inn the ordo written in 1192 by cardinal Cencius (Mabillon, No. 12). Since the 13th century the expression Ceremoniale Romanum seems to have gradually taken the place of that of Ordo Romanus. Gregory X (1272) caused a new one on the election and the functions of popes to be compiled (Mabillon, No. 13). A subsequent one appeared in the middle of the 14th century (Mabillon, No. 14), which Mabillon attributes to cardinal Gaietanus. One on the ecclesiastical functions of the Roman clergy was compiled by Petrus Amelius, bishop of Sinigaglia († 1398); a larger work of the same kind, by Augustinus Piccolomini, was published at Venice in 1516, with the sanction of Leo X under the title of Rituum ecclesiasticorum sive sacrarum ceremoniarum libri tre. The Pontificale Romanum of Clement VIII (1596), and his Ceremoniale Episcoporum (1600, often reprinted and revised) have finally taken the place of the old Ordines Romani. At present there is an ecclesiastical calendar published each year in every diocese, which fills the place of an Ordo Romanus, and generally bears the title Ordo offici divini juxta ritum Romanum, or Juxtan rubricas breviarii et missalis Romani atqque denreta sacrae rituum congregationis.

See Hoffmann, Nova scriptorum ac monumentorum collectio, 2:16 sq. (Leips. 1733, 4to); Rheinwald, Ordo Romanus, in Ersch u. Gruber, Allgem, Encyklopadie, sec. iii, pt. v; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9. 693 sq. (J.N. P.)

## Ordo Salutis[[@Headword:Ordo Salutis]]

             SEE SALVATION.

## Ore[[@Headword:Ore]]

             SEE GOLD; SEE METAL.

## Oreads[[@Headword:Oreads]]

             were nymphs who presided over the mountains, daughters of Jupiter. They were very numerous, Diana having a thousand to attend her. These nymphs were accredited with having first reclaimed men from devouring each other, by teaching them to subsist on acorns and chestnuts.

## Oreb[[@Headword:Oreb]]

             (Heb. Oreb', עוֹרֵב[Jdg 7:25; Isa 10:26, עֹרֵב, a raven; Sept. ᾿Ωρήβ v. r. Ο᾿ρήβ; Josephus, ᾿Ωρηβός, Ant. v. 6, 5), the name of a sheik of the Midianites, who, with Zeeb (“the wolf”), invaded Israel and was defeated and driven back by Gideon. B.C. cir. 1362. SEE GIDEON. The title given to them ( שָׂרַים, A. V. “princes”) distinguishes them from Zebah and Zalmunna, the other two chieftains, who are called “kings” (מלכים), and were evidently superior in rank to Oreb and Zeeb. “They were killed, not by Gideon himnself, or the people under his immediate conduct, but by the men of Ephraim, who rose this entreaty and intercepted the flying horde at the fords of the Jordan. This was the second act of that great tragedy. ''It is but slightly touched upon in the narrative of Judges, but the terms in which Isaiah refers to it (Isa 10:26) are such as to imply that it was a truly awful slaughter. He places it in the same rank with the two most tremendous disasters recorded in the whole of the history of Israel — the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, and of the army of Sennacherib. Nor is Isaiah alone among the poets of Israel in his reference to this great event. While it is the terrific slaughter of the Midianites which points his allusion, their discomfiture and flight are prominent in that of the author of Psalms 83. In imagery both obvious and vivid to every native of the gusty hills and plains of Palestine, though to us comparatively unintelligible, the Psalmist describes them as driven over the uplands of Gilead like the clouds of chaff blown from the threshing-floors; chased away like the spherical masses of dry weeds which course over the plains of Esdraelon and Philistia — flying with the dreadful hurry and confusion of the flames that rush and leap from tree to tree and, hill to hill when the wooded mountains: of a tropical country are by chance ignited (Psa 83:13-14). The slaughter was concentrated around the rock at which Oreb fell, and which was long known by his name (Jdg 7:25; Isa 10:26). This spot appears to have been in the valley of the Jordan, from whence the heads of the two chiefs were brought to Gideon to encourage him to furtler pursuit after the fugitive Zebah and Zalmunna.” See below.

## Oreb (2)[[@Headword:Oreb (2)]]

             (Lat. O-eb), the Occidiental form (2Es 2:33) of the name of Mount HOREB SEE HOREB (q.v.).

## Oreb (3)[[@Headword:Oreb (3)]]

             SEE RAVEN.

## Oreb, The Rock[[@Headword:Oreb, The Rock]]

             (צוּר עוֹרֵב; Sept. in Judges Σούρ, v. r. Σουρείν; in Isaiah, τόπος θλίψεως; Vulg. Petra Oreb, and Horeb), the “raven's crag,” the spot at which the Midianitish chieftain Oreb, with thousands of his countrymen, fell by the hand of the Ephraimites. and which probably acquired its name therefrom. It is mentioned in Jdg 7:25, and Isa 10:26. Some have inferred that the rock Oreb and the winepress Zeeb were on the east side of the Jordan (Gesenius, Rosenmüller, etc.). Perhaps the place called Orbo (ערבו), which in the Bereshith Rabba (Reland, Palaest. p. 913) is stated to have been in the neighborhood of Bethshean, may have some connection with it. Rabbi Judah (Ber. Ra'bba, ib.) was of opinion that the Orebim (“ravens”) who ministered to Elijah were no ravens, but the people of this Orbo or of the rock Oreb, an idea upon which even St. Jerome himself does not look with entire disfavor (Comm. in Isa 15:7), and which has met in later times with some supporters. But a more careful examination' of the same narrative renders it clear that the locality of Oreb's death was on the west side of the Jordan, and that the Ephraimites, having there intercepted the Midianites, afterwards brought the heads of the foe to Gideon after he had crossed the Jordan (see Keil, Comment. ad loc.). A writer in Fairbairn's Dictionary, s.v. Keiz, suggests the low projecting point opposite the Jericho ford, still bearing the, equivalent title of Eshel- Ghirah, “the Raven's Nest” (Robinson, Later Bib. Res. p. 293).; but this is rather far south, and needs further examination.

## Oreb, The Rock (2)[[@Headword:Oreb, The Rock (2)]]

             Tristram (Bible Places, page 230) acquiesces in the identification of this with the remarkable peak two and a half miles north of Riha (Jericho), called Osh el-Ghurah, which is the most prominent of all the conical peaks that terminate the terrace running down into the Jordan valley, and is about five hundred feet above the plain (Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey, 3:167).

## Orebites Or Horebites[[@Headword:Orebites Or Horebites]]

             SEE HUSSITES

## Oregim[[@Headword:Oregim]]

             SEE JAARE-OREGIM.

## Oregio, Agostino[[@Headword:Oregio, Agostino]]

             a learned Italian prelate, was born in 1577 at Santa Sofia, in Tuscany. Sent to Rome to pursue his studies, he ran there the same risk as Joseph in the house of Potiphar, and had, like him; sufficient force of character to overcome the temptation. This virtuous act touched the heart of cardinal Bellarmine so vividly that he became quite well affected towards the young pupil, and was induced to place him in a noble college at his private expense. It is said Oregio learned the Greek language by means of seeing and hearing his patron write and dispute in that tongue. After being theological counselor to pope Urban VIII, he was made cardinal Nov. 18, 1633, and archbishop of Benenvento, where he died, July 12, 1656. The collection of his works has been published by his nephew (Rome, 1637, fol.), in which are distinguished a dissertation entitled Aristotelis vera de rationalis animae immortalitate sententia, written at the request of cardinal Barberini, afterwards Urban VIII. In it Oregio takes pains to defend Aristotle against the reproach of materialism. Other noteworthy treatises of his are, De Deo: — De Trinitate: — De Incarnatione: — De Angelis: — De Peccatis, etc., which, frequently reprinted, have for a long time been used in the Italian Roman Catholic seminaries.

## Oremus[[@Headword:Oremus]]

             (Let us pray) is an exclamation mused in the early Christian Church to invite the different classes of praying ones to worship. It was usually followed by Flectamus genua, and at the conclusion of the praver was heard the exclamation Levate from the mouth of the deacons. See Siegel, Christliche Alterthume, 3:241, 242.

## Oren[[@Headword:Oren]]

             (Heb. id. אֹרֶן, ash-tree, as in Isa 44:14; Sept. Α᾿ράν, v. r. Α᾿ράμ, and Α᾿μβράμ), third named of the five sons of Jerahmeel, of the house of Judah (l Chronicles 2:25). B.C. ante 1658.

## Oren (2)[[@Headword:Oren (2)]]

             SEE ASH-TREE.

## Orenburg[[@Headword:Orenburg]]

             one of the eastern frontier governments of European Russia, is bounded. on the south-east by the River Ural, and extends between the governments of Tobolsk on the north-east and Samara on the southwest, covering an area of 73,885 square miles, and containing a population of 1,198,360. This is the government proper; but the so-called Orenburg Country, including the recently organized government of Samara, the, lands of the Orenburg and Ural Cossacks, and of Khirghiz tribes, under different names, extends over an area of 539,830 square miles, from the Volga, to the Sir-Daria and the Amu-Darima, has 2,370,275 inhabitants. The populations, the surface, soils, flora, and fauna of this extensive country are of the most various kinds. The country is traversed by numerous navigable rivers, by means of which and by canals it is in communication with the Caspian and Baltic seas and with the Arctic Ocean. The main streams are the Kama, a branch of the Volga, with its affluents the Bielaia and Tchussovaia; the Tobol, a branch of the Obi, and the Ural. Forests abound, except in the south; the soil is fertile, but is not yet much cultivated; and other natural, especially mineral, resources are rich, but in great part undeveloped. The climate is in general healthy. The government is divided into nine districts; the center of the governor-generalship is at Orenburg, though the chief town is Ufa.

The inhabitants of Orenburg are made up of Russsians, Kalmucks, and Bashkir, Tartar, Khirghiz, and certain Finnish tribes. The trade, mainly in the hands of the Bashkir tribes, is chiefly with Bokhara, Khiva, Tashkent, and the Khirghiz (q.v.); the exports are gold, silver, and other metals, corn, skins, and manufactured goods; the imports cattle, cotton — the demand for and supply of which have greatly increased since the American rebellion — and the other articles of Asiatic trade. The imports are either disposed of to Russian merchants in the custom-house on the frontier, or are carried by Asiatic traders into Russia, and sold at the great national market of Nijni- Novgorod. See Daniel, Handbuch der Geographie, 2:926, 927; Brooks, The Russians of the South (1854); Haxthausen, The Russian Empire (1856). .

## Orenburg-Tartar Version Of The Scripture[[@Headword:Orenburg-Tartar Version Of The Scripture]]

             As the name indicates, this version is intended for the Tartars in the vicinity of Orenburg. The version made into that dialect is not an original translation, but merely an accommodation of Mr. Brunton's Karass Version (q.v.) to the peculiar idioms and orthography of the Kirghisian Tartars, residing in the Russian government of Orenburg. Mr. Charles Frazer, one of the Scottish missionaries at Astrachan, prepared a translation of the New Test., which left the mission-press at Astrachan in 1820, at the  expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Since 1871 a part of the Old Test. has also been published. (B.P.)

## Oresme, Nicolas[[@Headword:Oresme, Nicolas]]

             a learned French prelate, was born at Caen, Normandy, in the 13th century. He was educated at the university in Paris, and was appointed grand master  of the College of Navarre in 1355, and was finally made bishopof Lisieux in 1377. He died in 1382. He published several scientific treatises, translated the Ethics and Politics of Aristotle into French, and contributed to theological literature the following work: Liber de Anti-Christo ejusque ministris ac de ejusdem indventu, signis propinquis simul ac remotis IV continens particulas, and several Sermons. He has also been credited with a French popular version of the Scriptures, but there is no ground for such assertion. See Du Pin, Bibliotheque des Aut. Eccles. 14ieme Seicle; Moreri, Grand. Dict, Hist s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Orestes[[@Headword:Orestes]]

             (Ο᾿ρέστης), a Christian physician of Tyana, in Cappadocia, called also Arestes, suffered martyrdom during the persecution under Diocletian, A.D. 303, 304. An interesting account of his tortures and death is given by Simeon Metaphrastes (ap. Suriam, De Probat. Sancto: Histor. 6, 231), where he is named Aresters. See also Menolog. Graec. 1:178 (ed. Urbin. 1727). Orestes has been canonized by the Greek and Roman churches, and his memory is celebrated on Nov. 9. See Bzovius, Nomenclator Sanctor. Profess. Medicor.

## Orfand, Jacinto[[@Headword:Orfand, Jacinto]]

             a Spanish Dominican, noted as a missionary, was born at Jana in 1578. He early took an interest in religious life, and finally entered the Dominican Order in Barcelona. In 1605 he asked to be sent to the Philippines. In 1607 he went to Japan, and there he labored about fifteen years. He wrote an account of the progress of Christianity in that country, entitled Historia ecclesiastica de los successos de la Cristiandad de Japon (Madrid, 1633, 4to). It was originally prepared to cover only the years 1602-1621, but Collado brought it down to 1622. Orfand was put to death by the Japanese in 1622. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Fernandez, Hist. Eccles. de Nuestros Tiempos, p. 289; Echard, Scriptor. ord. Praedic. 2:425.

## Organ[[@Headword:Organ]]

             occurs in the Authorized Version as the rendering of the Hebrew ugab', עוּגָב (Gen 4:21; Job 21:12), or uggab', עֻגָּב (Job 20:31; Psa 150:4), which properly means that which is inflated or blown,  from עָגִב, to blow; hence, a wind instrument. It was applied to a reed or pipe, either simple or complex, and is so understood by most interpreters (see Dudelsack, Hist. Trin. p. 301;, Gesenius, Thesaur, p. 988). Thus the Septuagint, in Psalms 150, renders . ὄργανον, which means properly an instrument for any purpose; but is applied by Plato (Lact. 188 D.) and others to the pipe; and from which comes our word “organ.” In Job the Sept. vaguely renders by ψαλμός; but in the other passages this version renders κιθάρα, the word from which guitar is corrupted. This cannot be right, for many reasons; indeed, in two of the passages quoted it is named in connection with the cithara or lyre (Heb. כַּנּוֹר) as a different instrument (Gen 4:21; Job 30:31). “In Gen 4:21 it appears to be a general term for all wind-instruments opposed to kinnor (A. V. 'harp'), which denotes all stringed instruments. In Job 21:12 are enumerated the three kinds of mystical instruments which are possible, under the general terms of the timbrel, harp, and organ. The ugab is here distinguished from the timbrel and harp, as in Job 20:31, compared with Psa 150:4. Our translators adopted their renderinig, ‘organ,' from the Vulgate, which has uniformly organum, that is, the double or multiple pipe. The Chaldee in every case has אִבּוּבָא abbuba, which signifies 'the pipe,' and is its rendering of the Hebrew word so translated in our version of Isa 30:29; Jer 48:36.

Joel Bril, in his second preface to the Psalms in Mendelssohn's Bible, adopts the opinion of those who identify it with the Pandean pipes, or syrinx, an instrument of unquestionably ancient origin, and common in the East. It was a favorite with the shepherds in the time of Homer (Il. 18:526), and its invention was attributed to various deities: to Pallas Athene by Pindar (Pyth. 12:12-14), to Pan by Pliny (7:57; comp. Virg. Ecl. 2:32; Tibull. 2:5, 30), by others to Marsyas or Silenus (Athen. 4:184). In the last-quoted passage it is said that Hermes first made the syrinx with one reed, while Silenus, or, according to others, two Medes, Seuthes and Rhonakes, invented one with many reeds, and Marsyas fastened them with wax. The reeds were of unequal length, but equal thickness, generally seven in number (Virg. Ecl. 2:36), but sometimes nine (Theocr. Id. viii). Those in use among the Turks sometimes numbered fourteen or fifteen (Calmet, Diss. in Mus. Inst. Haebr., in Ugolini Thes. 32, p. 790). Russell describes those he met with in Aleppo. The syrinx, or Pan's pipe, is still a pastoral instrument in Syria; it is known also in the city, but very few of the performers can sound it tolerably well. The higher notes are clear and pleasing, but the longer reeds are apt, like the dervis's flute, to  make a hissing sound, though blown by a good player. The number of reeds of which the syrinx is composed varies in different instruments from five to twenty-three (Aleppo, 1:155,2d ed.).” SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

ORGAN (ὄργανον, an instrument of any kind), THE, is the noblest and most powerful species of musical instruments. It appears, however, that the word organ was applied indiscriminately to almost every kind of musical instrument used in religious worship by the early Church. But after a time the word came to be reserved to a wind instrument consisting of reeds or pipes, which. the Greeks and the Romans, and also the Eastern Christians, used in civil and private festivals, and which since the 8th century has been used in religious worship in the Western churches. The name is in all probability derived from the fact of its being the instrument of all instruments. It was often called organs, in the plural, and only at a later date in the singular, organ. The original of this kind of instruments is traced back to the syrinx, or pipes of Pan (according to Virgil), and the hydraulos, or water-flute; which was the invention of Ctesibius, a mathematician of Alexandria, B.C. 520, and also noted as a machinist. He is reported to have written several works on hydraulics, which are lost, but his inventions are noticed by Vitruvius (x 13). (See the preceding article.)

I. Description and History. — The musical instrument now known as organ is played by finger-keys, and in general partly also by foot-keys, and consists of a large number of pipes of metal and wood made to sound by a magazine of wind accumulated by bellows, and admitted at will by the player. The following description is unecessarily restricted to the most fundamental arrangements of this very complicated instrument:

“As met with in cathedrals and large churches, the organ comprises four departments, each in most respects a separate instrument with its own mechanism, called respectively the great-organ, the choir-organ, the swell- organ, and the pedal-organ. Each has its own clavier or keyboard, but the different clanvers are bought into juxtaposition, so as to be under the control of one performer. Claviers played by the hands are called manuals; by the feet, pedals.ῥ Three manuals, belonging to the choir, great, and swell-organs respectively, rise above each other like steps, in front of  where the performer sits; while the pedal-board by which the pedal-organ is played is placed on a level with his feet. The condensed air supplied by the bellows is conveyed through wooden tubes or trunks to boxes, called windchests, one of which belongs to each department of the organ. Attached to the upper part of each wind-chest is a sound-board, an ingenious contrivance for conveying the wind at pleasure to any individual pipe or pipes exclusively of the rest. It consists of two parts, an upper board and an under board. On the upper board rest the pipes, of which a number of different quality, ranged behind each other, belong to each note. In the under board is a row of parallel grooves, running horizontally backwards, corresponding each to one of the keys of the clavier. On any of the keys being pressed down, a valve is opened which supplies wind to the groove belonging to it. The various pipes of each key stand in a line directly above its groove, and the upper surface of the groove is perforated with holes bored upwards to them.

Were this the whole mechanism of the sound-board, the wind, on entering any groove, would permeate all the pipes of that groove; there is, however, in the upper board another series of horizontal grooves at right angles to this of the lower board, supplied with sliders, which can, to a small extent, be drawn out or pushed in at pleasure by a mechanism worked by the draw-stops placed within the player's reach. Each slider is perforated with holes, which, when it is drawn out, complete the communication between the wind-chest and the pipes; the communications with the pipes immediately above any slider being, on the other hand, closed up when the slider is pushed in. The pipes above each slider form in continuous set of one particular quality, and each set of pipes is called a stop. Each department of the organ is supplied with a number of stops, producing sounds of different quality. The great-organ, some of whose pipes appear as show-pipes in front of the instrument, contain the main body and force of the organ. Behind it stands the choir-organ, whose tones are less powerful, and more fitted to accompany the voice. Above the choir-organs is the swell-organ, whose pipes are enclosed in a wooden box, with a front of louvre-boards like Venetian blinds, which may be made to open and shut by a pedal, with a view of producing crescendo and diminuendo effects. The pedal-organ is sometimes placed in an entire state behind the choir-organ, and sometimes divided, and a part: arranged on each side. The most usual compass of the manuals is from C on the second line below the bass staff to D on the third space above the treble staff; and the compass of the pedals is from the same C to the D between the bass and treble- staves. The real compass of notes is, as will be seen, much  greater. Organ pipes vary much in form and material, but belong to two great classes, known as mouth-pipes (or flute-pipes) and reed-pipes. A section of one of the former is represented in the figure. Its essential parts are the foot a, the body, b. and a flat plate, c, called the language, extending nearly across the pipe at the point of junction of foot and body. There is an opening, de, in the pipe, at the spot where the language is discontinuous.

The wind admitted into the foot rushes through the narrow slit at d. and, in impinging against e, imparts a vibratory motion to the column of air in the pipe, the result, of which is a musical note, dependent for its pitch on the length of that column of air, and consequently on the length of the body of the pipe: by doubling the length of the pipe we obtain a note of half the pitch, or lower by an octave. Such is the general principle of all mouth-pipes, whether of wood or of metal, subject to considerable diversities of detail. Metal pipes have generally a cylindrical section; wooden pipes a square or oblong section. A mouth-pipe may be stopped at the upper end by a plug called a tompon, the effect of which is to lower the pitch an octave, the vibrating column of air being doubled in length, as it has to traverse the pipe twice before making its exit. Pipes are sometimes half-stopped, having a kind of chimney at the top. The reedpipe consists of a reed placed inside a metallic or occasionally a wooden pipe. This reed is a tube of metal, with the front part Cut away, and a tongue or spring put in its place. The lower end of the spring is free, the upper end attached to the top of the reed; by the admission of air into the pipe the spring is made to vibrate, and, in striking either the edge of the reed or the air, produces a musical note, dependent for its pitch on the length of the spring, its quality being determined to a great extent by the length and form of the pipe or be within which the reed is placed. When the vibrating spring does not strike the edge of the reed, but the air, we have what is called the free reed, similar to what is in use in the harmonium. To describe the pitch of an organ pipe, terms are used derived from to standard length of ann open mouth-pipe of that pitch. The largest pipe in use is the 32-feet C, which is an octave below the lowest C of the modern piano-forte, or two octaves below the lowest C on the manuals and pedal of the organ: any pipe producing this note is called a 32-feet C pipe, whatever its actual length may be. By a 32-feet or 16-feet stop, we mean that the pipe which speaks on the lowest C on which that stop appears has a 32-feet or a 16-feet tone.

“The stops of an organ do not always produce the note properly belonging to the key struck; sometimes they give a note an octave, or, in the pedal-  organ, even two octaves lower, and sometimes one of the harmonics higher in pitch. Compound or mixture stops. — have several pipes to each key, corresponding to the different harmonics of the ground-tone. There is an endless variety in the ground-tone. There is an endless variety in the number and kinds of stops in different organs; some are and some are not continued through the whole range of manual or pedal. Some of the more important stops get the same of open or stopped diapason (a term which implies that they extend throughout the whole compass of the clavier): they are for the most part 16-feet, sometimes 32-feet stops; the open diapason chiefly of metal, the close chiefly of wood. The dulciana is an 8-feet mannal stop, of small diameter, so-called from the sweetness of its tone. Among the reed-stops are the clarion, oboe, bassoon, and vox humana, deriving their names from real or fancied resemblances to these instruments and to the human voice. Of the compound stops, the most prevalent in Britain is the sesquialtera, consisting of four or five ranks of open metal pipes, often a 17th, 19th; 22d, 26th, and 29th from the ground-tone. The resources of the organ are further increased by appliances called couplers, by which a second clavier and its stops can be brought into play or the same clavier can be united to itself in the octave below or above.”

Instruments of a rude description, comprising more or less the principle of the organ, seem to have existed early. But they were much -smaller in size, and they were supplied with wind in various ways. At first a person was employed to blow into the pipes; later; to:avoid this difficulty, a leathern wind-pouch was attached to the instrument, which pouch was worked by being held under the arm (tibia utriculariac); then, for larger instruments, water-power was used to compress the air in a suitable receptacle (organum hydraulicum); and, finally (some say earlier), the bellows (organum pneumaticum) was employed. Besides these large instruments there was also a small portable organ, sometimes called a “pair of Regals,” formerly in use, and this was occasionally of such a size as to admit of its being carried in the hand and inflated by the player; one of these is represented among the sculptures in the cornice of St. John's, Cirencester, and another on the crosier of William of Wykeham, at Oxford.

Nero greatly admired the water-organ (Sueton? c 41: “Reliquam diei partem per organma hydraulica novi et ignoti generis circumdixit”). In ecclesiastical history pope Vitalian I figures as the introducer of the organ,  and the date assigned is A.D. 666. St. Augustine and Isidore of Seville serve as authority for this statement. It appears, however, from the records of the Spanish Church, that the organ was used there two centuries previous to this date. In Africa the organ had been in common use for some time previous, and it is from that country probably that is was introduced into Spain. In the West the organ was not common until the 10th century. St. Aldhelm, who died A.D. 709, describes one with golden pipes in England; but as late as 757; when Pepin the Short received from Constantine Copronymus an organ as a present, it is mentioned as a great wonder. It was placed in the church of St. Corneille, at Compiegne, but whether that instrument was then used for ecclesiastical purposes is a matter of controversy. On the other hand, it is well known that Charlemagne caused an organ to be placed in the cathedral of Aix-la- Chapelle. This organ, which is described by Walafrid Strabo, was undoubtedly the same which was sent him from Constantinople by Constantine Michael, and of which the chronicler of St. Gall said (De Carol. M. 2:10),'“ Musicorum organum praestantissimum, quod doliis ex aere conflatis follibusque taurinis per fistulas aereas mire perflantibus ru.gitu quidem tonitrui boatum, garrulitatem vero lyrae vel cymbali dulcedine coeqiuabat.” Organ-building was now followed in Germany with such success that in the second half of the 9th century pope John VIII got an organ and singers sent from thence to Rome through the bishop of Freysingen. In the middle of the 10th century organs became quite common in England; and, among others, the Benedictine monks of Winchester became possessed of a large organ with four hundred pipes, and twelve upper and fourteen lower bellows, requiring seventy strong men to work them.

The time when the wind-organ took the place of the water-organ is not ascertained; some say in the 7th century. We have no trustworthy evidence of any improvement having been made in the 'rgan from that time until the 15th century, when the pedals were invented in Italy by Bernhard, a German organist at the court of the doge of Venice. In the 11th century a monk, named Theophilus, wrote a curious treatise on organ-building, but it was not until the 15th century that the organ began to be anything like the noble instrument which it now is. In the 16th century the system of pipes was divided into registers. The family of Antigriati, in Brescia, had a great name as organ-builders in the 15th and 16th centuries. The organs of England were also in high repute, but the puritanism of the civil war  doomed most of them to destruction; and when they had to be replaced after the Restoration it was found that there was no longer a sufficiency of builders in the country. Foreign organ-builders were therefore invited to settle in England, the most remarkable of whom were Bernhard Schmidt (generally called Father Schmidt) and his nephews, and Renatus Harris. Christophet Schreider, Snetzler, and Byfield succeeded them; and at a later period Green and Avery, some of whose organs have never been surpassed in tone, though in mechanism those of modern builders are an immense advance on them. The German organs are remarkable for preserving the balance of power well among the various masqes, but in mechanical contrivances they are surpassed by those of England. In the United States organ-building has been carried to a perfection rivalled only by England. The largest organ in this country is at Boston; it was built by a German, Walcker, of Ludwigsbourg, and has 4 manuals, 89 stops, and 4000 pipes. Many of the large churches have organs built by Americans which nearly rival the great instrument at Boston. One of the largest organs used in churches is that of the Roman Catholic cathedral at Montreal. It was built by R. S. Warren, of that city. The largest organ in the world is in Albert Hall, London, was built by Henry Willis in 1870, and contains 138 stops, 4 manuals, and nearly 10,000 pipes, all of which are of metal. The wind is supplied by steam-power. Thirteen couplers connect or disconnect the various subdivisions of the organ at the will of the performer.

II. Opposition to the Use of the Organ in Christian Worship. — The question as to the propriety of using the organ in Christian song in churches has been debated from the days of Hospinian down to our own. It was never adopted in the Eastern Church. In the West it is to the present day excluded from the papal chapel. In the 16th century the abuse which had been made of it was so great as to lead to a strongly supported motion being presented to the Council of Trent for its suppression. It was retained, however; through the influence of emperor Ferdinand. The Reformed Church discarded the organ from the first, and although it has since been reinstalled in the Reformed churches of Basle and some other places, it has never been resumed by the denomination at large. In the Lutheran Church, on the contrary, it has always been used, notwithstanding Luther's prejudice against it. SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS, in vol. 6, p. 762, col. i (3). The Presbyterian churches of Scotland have made stout and continued resistance against the use of organs. In the Church of Scotland the matter was discussed in connection with the use of an organ by the  congregation of St. Andrew's, Glasgow. The case was brought before the Presbytery of Glasgow, and no appeal was made. On Oct. 7, 1807, the following motion was carried:

“That the presbytery are of opinion that the use of the organ in the public worship of God is contrary to the law of the land, and to the law and constittion of our Established Church, and therefore prohibit it in all the churches and chapels within their bounds.”

In 1829 the question was brought up in the Relief Synod, as an organ had been introduced into Roxburgh Place Chapel, Edinburgh. The deliverance, given by a very large majority, was as follows:

“It being admitted and incontrovertibly true that the Rev. John Johnston had introduced instrumental music into the public worship of God in the Relief Congregation, Roxburgh Place, Edinburgh, which innovation the synod are of opinion is unauthorized by the laws of the New Testament, contrary to the universal practice of the Church in the first and purest periods of her history, contrary to the universal practice of the Church of Scotland, and contrary to the consuetudinary laws of the synod of Relief, and highly inexpedient, the synod agree to express their regret that any individual member of their body should have had the temerity to introduce such a dangerous innovation into the public worship of God in this country, which has a manifest tendency to offend many serious Christians and congregations, and create a schism in the body, without having first submitted it to the consideration of his brethren according to usual form. On all these accounts the synod agree to enjoin the Rev. John Johnston to give up this practice instater, with certification if he do not, the Edinburgh Presbytery shall hold a meeting on the second Tuesday of September next, and strike his name off the roll of presbytery, and declare him incapable of holding office as a minister in the Relief denomination. And further, to prevent the recurrence of this or any similar practice, the synod enjoin a copy of this sentence to be sent to every minister in the synod, to be laid before his session, and read after publlic worship in his congregation, for their satisfaction, and to deter others from following similar courses in all time coming.”

An organ having been erected in the new Claremont Church, Glasgow, the same question came up in 1856 before the United Presbyterian Synod, with  which the Relief Synod had been for some years incorporated. Again more formally in 1858, when the following motion was carried alike against one for toleration, which had many supporters, and against another, which certainly had few supporters, and contained the assertion, “Instrumental music was one of the carnal ordinances of the Levitical economy.” The motion which passed into law was:

“That the synod reaffirm their deliverance of 1856 respecting the use of instrumental music in public worship, viz., 'The synod refused the petition of the memorialists, inasmuch as the use of instrumental music in public Worship is contrary to the uniform practice of this Church, and of the other Presbyterian churches in this country, and would seriously disturb the peace of the churches under the inspection of this synod: and at the same time enjoined sessions to employ all judicious measures for the improvement of vocal psalm and the synod now declare said deliverance to be applicable to diets of congregational worship on weekdays as well as on the Lord's day.”

It is to be observed that in each of these three instances a constitutional principle of Presbyterianism was violated, the organ was introduced, and the innovation made without consulting the brethren, without asking the advice or sanction of the presbytery. Presbyterians, Independents, and Methodists now, however, use organs, so that they have ceased to be a denominational characteristic. And why not? The question is one of taste rather than conscience or Scripture. The passage in Eph 5:19, so often appealed to by both parties, says nothing for either (see Eadie, Commentary on the place, and the works of Alford, Ellicott, Meyer, Hodge). Instrumental music was no Jewish thing in any typical sense, the choristers and performers of David's orchestra were no original or essential element of the Levitical economy. The music of the Temple stood upon a different basis from sacrifice, which has long been formally superseded. The service of song is not once alluded to in the Epistle to the Hebrews as among the things which “decayed and waxed old.” Its employment in the Christian Church is therefore no introduction of any point or portion of Jewish ritual, nor any digression into popish ceremonial. Indeed, the employment of an organ to guide the music is properly not ritualistic at all. The leader has his pitch-pipe, and the hundred pipes of the organ only serve to guide and sustain the voice of the people. Nobody wishes to praise God by the mere sound of the organ: its music only helps and supports the  melody and worship of the church. It has been abused certainly, but the sensuous luxury, of some congregations should: be no bar to the right and legitimate use of it by others. In fact, the proper employment of it might be pleaded for on the same grounds as scientific education in music. Both are simply helps to the public worship of God. See Cromar, A Vindication of the Organ (Edinb. 1854, 12mo); Campbell, Two Papers on Church Music, read before “The Liverpool Eccles. Musical Society” (Liverpool, 1854).

III. Objections against its Use in modern Jewish Worship. — The introduction of the organ in the Jewish religious service, especially in Germany, has excited great and fierce discussion, and a small library could be. filled with the works written pro and con. About the year 1818 an organ was introduced into a temple at Hamburg, When twenty-two rabbins, among them Mordecai Benet and Moses Sopher, gave their decision against such innovation in a work entitled אלה דברי הברית. On the other hand, Shem Tob Samun, a noted rabbi, supported by rabbins of Jerusalem, J. C. Ricanati, of Verona, and the renowned A. Chorin, published an opinion in נרגה הצדקand אור נגהin favor of reforms and the introduction in the organ. The first works for and against the reform were in Hebrew. At a later time the reformers and their opponents continued their debates mostly in German, in periodicals and pamphlets. The objections against the introduction of the organ are of three classes.

(1.) It is prohibited to play music on the Sabbath. A Jew is not allowed to play on the Sabbath, and everything prohibited to a Jew we are not allowed to have done by a Gentile.

(2.) In obedience to the prohibition of the Torah, “In their statutes thou shalt not walk;” and, as the organ is a specific Christian invention used in churches, we are prohibited from its use.

(3.) In obedience to a Talmudical law (Sotah, 49; also copied in Orach Chayim, 560), that, in memory of the destruction of the Temple, Jews should not play any musical instrument.

The first of these objections has been refuted by Wiener in his Referate uber die der ersten israel. Synode zut Leipzg uberreichten Antrige (1871). He argues that “to play music on the Sabbath is not among the thirty-nine kinds of labor enumerated in the Talmud Sabbath, nor even among those derived from that class. To play a musical instrument is called an art, and  no labor חכמה ואינו מלאכה(Rosh Hashanah, 29, c). Music is not only not prohibited, but even commanded for the holidays by the Torah. The Talmud (Erubim, 102) allows repairing a musical instrument in the Temple, but not in any other place: 'It is allowed to fix a broken string (on the Sabbath) in the Temple, but not outside.'“ From this prohibition, Dr. Wiener concludes “that to make music must have been allowed, במדינה, otherwise the Talmud would have used the words 'as to make music is prohibited, the more so is repairing,”' and he considers this omission as an evident proof that music was allowed. A prohibition is deduced from the Talmud (Beza, 36, c) by those who are opposed to the use of the organ, but this is an expression whose meaning is differently understood by Maimonides and Josaphath; the latter even allowed the playing of musical instruments. Among the rabbinical authorities we find a great difference of opinion. Thus the Shulchan Aruch, or, rather, Moses Isserles, prohibited playing a musical instrument (Orach Chayim, 349, 3). Rabbi Nissim allowed manual work (מלאכה גדולה) unto be done by a Gentile if it were necessary for a religious function. Rema (R. Moses Isserles) also stated (Orach Cchayinz, 276), “Some allow a Gentile to light lamps on the Sabbath for a religious meal, and in consequence of such permission some even went so far as to allow this for every meal and festivity.” And (ib. 338),” Some allow a Gentile to play musical instruments on the Sabbath in honor of a wedding, but in our times they are inclined to lighten the precepts(!).” Of Mehril it is related that, at the time he made the nuptials of his son, it was forbidden by the government to make music, and he sent the bridal party to another city in order that they might enjoy music there on the Sabbath (see Rema, 339, and Eliah Rabah).

To the second objection it is replied by those who favor its use in the synagogue that the organ did not come to be generally used in the churches until musical instruments were used in the synagogue of Bagdad, as reported by the German traveler Petachya, of. Regensburg. The venerable Alt-Neu synagogue of Prague possessed an organ in the commencement of the 17th century, while for some time previous to this a similar instrument existed in several synagogues in Spain and Corfu, as authentically reported. Certainly song and music formed an essential part of the religious service of the Temple, and was highly esteemed by the Jewish sages (see Erubim, ch. ii). The Talmudists declare religious singing a Biblical precept, and מהרשאexplain the importance of that command, that singing disperses melancholy, as we see with Saul, and excited a divine spirit, as seen with  Elisha. Music must therefore be pronounced an ancient institution with the Israelites, and by no means an imitation of the worship of other creeds. The organ also forms no part of any religious statute with other creeds, and the objection חקת הגויםcannot be raised for that reason. But even if such were the case, or would still cause some scruples, there is against it all answer in the Talmud (Sanhedrin, 39, c). While Ezekiel in one passage reproached the Israelites. “Neither have ye done according to the judgments of the nations that are round about you” (Eze 5:7), in another passage he says, “And ye have done after the mannere of the nations that are round about you” (Eze 11:12). This apparent contradiction the Talmud reconciles by paraphrasing, “You have conformed with those that are bad, and disregarded those that are good.” Rashi, in explaining that passage of the Talmud, remarks. “Good acts are such as that of Eglon, king of Moab, who honored the name of God by rising from his seat” (Jdg 3:20), which is recommended for imitation, although a heathen custom. Rabbenu Nissim says positively, “The law does not prohibit or imitating idolatrous customs, except foolish acts, but customs founded in reason are admissible” (To Aboda Sara, 33).

Against the third objection, that the Talmud (Sotah, 49; Gittin, 7) prohibits the playing of a musical instrument because of the destruction of the Temple, it is answered that the enjoyment of music was at all times allowed without any objection by the rabbinas. Rabbi Shem Job Samun, of Leghorn, in his decisions, published in ניגה הצדק, relates, “In Modena, a very pious and important city, where many learned and wise Italian and German rabbins lived, among them Padubah, Lipschitz, and Ephraim Cohen — the latter German scholars of great renown — existed a musical society, without any objection from the rabbins. One of the most esteemed and learned rabbins, R. Ismael Cohen, gave permission, on inquiry, to a person to attend the performance of that society on the night of Hoshana Raba.” The whole literature of the Middle Ages, moreover, proves that, wherever song and music were cultivated, the Jews participated and showed great talents, and, according to the assertion of D'Israeli, the Jewish race is peculiarly fond of music. Even a pious scholar, author of the book of the pious, who lived at a very dark time, asserted that the practice of music is allowed on Chanuka, Purim, and at weddings. The practice of music was also allowed to disperse melancholy in hard times, and to incite to the study of the law, which formed the center of all activity. See Deutsch, Die Orgel in der Synagoge.  See, for a full account of the structure of the organ, Hopkins and Reinbault, The Organ, its History and Construction (2d ed. Lond. 1870); Topfer, Lehrbuch d. Orgelbaukunst (Weimar, 1855, 4 vols. 8vo); and the literature referred to under MUSIC.

## Organ-Cases[[@Headword:Organ-Cases]]

             are not earlier in date than the 15th century. At St. James's, Liege, is an early example of the beginning of the 16th century; that of Amiens was made 1422 to 1429; one at Old Radnor is carved, and of the early part of the 17th century; In Spain the organ-pipes are arranged in specified compartments, with those of one stop projecting from the prinicipal range. They often have printed wings or shutters.

## Organa, Andrea[[@Headword:Organa, Andrea]]

             a noted Italian painter, was born at Florence in 1329. In his youth he devoted himself to the study of sculpture, and later to architecture. Only in middle life did he take up the brush, but he soon secured a very enviable reputation as an artist in this branch. He died in 1389. Some of Organa's paintings are among the most noted of the 14th century. Most of them are at Pisa. A very remarkable production of his is The Universal Judgment. In it he painted his friends as in heaven, and his enemies as the residents of hell.

## Orgia[[@Headword:Orgia]]

             Engl. ORGIES (probably from Gr. ἔρδω, in the perfect ἔοργα, to sacrifice), or MYSTERIES, are the secret rites or customs connected with the worship of some of the pagan deities; as the secret worship of Ceres, and the festival of Bacchus, which was accompanied with mystical customs and drunken revelry. These festivals are the same as the Bacchanalia, Dionysia, etc., which were celebrated by the ancients to commemorate the triumph of Bacchus in India. The word orgies is now applied to scenes of drunkenness and debauchery.

## Oriel Or Oriole[[@Headword:Oriel Or Oriole]]

             (Lat. Oratoriolum, or little place for prayer, its original meaning) was a portion of an apartment set aside for prayer, and in the mediaeva houses it  was not an uncommon practice to arrange the domestic oratory so that the sacrarium was the whole height of the building, while there was an upper floor looking into it for the lord and his guests to attend to the service. This upper part more especially received the name of Oriole. Thus any projecting portion of a room, or even of a building, was called an oriole, such as a penthouse, or such as a closet, bower, or private chamber, an upper story, or a gallery; and the term became last of all applied to a projecting window, hence oriel window; also called bow or bay window.

## Orient[[@Headword:Orient]]

             ST., a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Huesca, on the frontier of Aragon, near the middle of the 4th century. After the death of his parents, who were wealthy, he gave all his goods to the poor, and lived a time as a hermit in the valley of Lavedan. His reputation caused him, however, to be appointed bishop of Auch about 410. He at once applied himself to uprooting heathenism in his diocese: he destroyed a temple of Apollo at Atch, and erected a church over the ruins. Theodoric I, king of the Goths, and an Arian, sent him as ambasador to the Roman general Aetius, and to his lieutenant Littorius. Orient died soon after his return at Auch, May 1, 439. One of the parishes of Amch bears his name. Part of his remains was transferred as relics to Huesca, Sept. 16, 1609. He wrote a Latin poem in elegiac verses, entitled Commonitorium, which is mentioned by Fortunatus of Poitiers. Although not equal to some of the poetry of the early part of the 5th century, it is forcible and fluent, and the language is good. The work is divided into two books. The first was published at Antwerp in 1599 or 1600 (12mo), with notes by the Jesuit Martin Delrio, who had discovered it in a MS. of the abbey of Auchin. It was afterwards republished at Salamanca in 1604 and 1664 (4to); at Leipsic in 1651 (8vo), with notes by Andrew Rivinus; at Cologne in 1618 in the Bibl. Pair., and afterwards at Paris and Lyons in similar collections. Dom Martene having discovered a MS. of the whole work, some 800 years old, in the convent of St. Martin, at Tours, had it published in the new collection of ancient writers (Rouen, 1700, 4to) in his Thesaurus Anecdotorum (1717, fl., vol. v), together with some. small pieces of Orient found in the same MS. The Memoires de Trevoaux, July and September, 1701, contain remarks and corrections by Commire. A new edition was published by Schurtzfleisch (Wittemberg, 1706, 4to), and a supplement, containing variations derived from a MS. in the Oxford library, at Weimar, in 1716. An edition in Latin and French, preceded by a life of the author according to the Bollandists,  was published under the title of Commonitoire by Z. Collombet (Lyons, 1839, 8vo). Some writers, deceived by the resemblance of the name, have attributed this work to Orese, bishop of Urgel, known for his correspondence with Sidoniuis Apollinaris. See Bollandists, Acta Sanct. May 1; La Vie du glorieux Saint Orens, eveque d'Auch, composee sur les memoires tirez des anciennes legendes et des plus fideles historiens (Toulouse, no date); Gallia Christiana, 1:973; Hist. litter. de la France, 2:251-256.

## Oriental Churches[[@Headword:Oriental Churches]]

             SEE EASTERN CHURCH; SEE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

## Oriental Languages[[@Headword:Oriental Languages]]

             SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.

## Oriental Literature And Languages[[@Headword:Oriental Literature And Languages]]

             is the common designation for the languages and literatures of all the peoples of Asia, as well as of those of Moslem Africa and Europe. Even during the Middle Ages the attention of European savants was turned towards the Oriental languages, especially the Arabic, and this for two main reasons. In the first place, it was religious zeal which, by the knowledge of the Arabic, intended to refute the Mohammedans and convert them to Christianity. For this purpose pope Innocent IV ordered that chairs for instruction in Arabic should be founded at Paris, and popes Clement IV and Honorius IV Showed also a great interest in the matter. Under Clement V, the synod held at Vienne, in 1311, resolved that professors of Arabic and Chaldee should be appointed at Paris, Rome, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca. Pope John XXII especially instructed the bishop of Paris to see that these languages were taught in the Sorbonne. In the second place, it was a scientific interest which led to the study of Oriental literature, in order to make the Western nations acquainted with the medical, astronomical, and philosophical writings of the Arabs, and with the works of Aristotle, which were extant only in Arabic translations. Towards the end of the 12th century we meet with Latin translations from the Arabic, which increased during the Middle Ages, and were printed in the 15th century. The Reformation revived the study of Oriental languages by their application to Biblical exegesis. For the. Church of Rome the study of Oriental languages be. came a matter of necessity, because of her missionary stations in the East, and thus pope Urban VIII founded, in 1627, at Rome, the Collegium pro Fide Propaganda, where the Oriental languages were taught. Through the Jesuits in China and Japan, Europe became acquainted with the eastern languages of Asia and their literature. In a more scientific manner the study of the Oriental languages was taken up in the middle of the 18th century. The Englishman, William Jones,. while a resident in East India (1780-90), called special attention to the riches of the Indian literature, and. founded at Calcutta, in 1784, the Asiatic Society. At Paris, Silvestre de Sacy made the study of Arabic of special interest, and attracted students from all parts of Europe. Till towards the end of the 18th century the study of the Oriental languages had only occupied a subordinate position in the curriculum of sciences; but with the formation of the different Asiatic societies the study of Oriental  languages had become a specialty. The societies for promoting this study are as follows, of which the first three are the most important in Europe:

1. The Asiatic Society of Bengal, founded in 1784, by Sir William Jones, at Calcutta, published the Asiatic Researches (Calcutta, 1788-1832, 17 volumes), which were partly translated into French and German. Since 1832 the Asiatic Researches have been superseded by the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, which is published monthly. Under the auspices of this society, but at the expense of the Anglo-Indian government, since 1846 the Bibliotheca Indica, a collection of Oriental works in the original, with a translation, of which at the beginning of the year 1880 more than five hundred numbers had already appeared, is published. Besides the Asiatic Society there exist a great many branch societies, which also have their own periodicals.

2. The Societe Asiatique, at Paris, founded in 1822 by Silvestre de Sacy (q.v.), Klaproth (q.v.), Abel Remusat, Jomard, Chezy, and others, which, besides editing the Journal Asiatique, since 1823, also publishes Oriental works, partly in the original, partly in translations.

3. The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, which was opened by Colebrooke, March 19, 1823. In the place of the Transactions (1824-34, 3 volumes), it now publishes the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

4. The Deutsche morgenldndische Gesellschaft, founded, in 1845. Its journal is Zeitschrift der deutschen Gesellschaft.

5. The Societi Orientale de France, at Paris, with the Revue de l'Orient as its organ since 1845.

6. The Syro-Egyptian Society, at London, with Original Papers as the journal since 1850.

7. The Koningli1ike Institilt voor de Taal Land en Volkenkunde van Neederlandsch Indie, at Amsterdam, which publishes the Bijdragen since 1853.

8. The American Oriental Society, at Boston, founded in 1842, with the Journal, since 1843, for its organ.

See Benfey, Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft und orientalischer Philologie in Deutschland (Munich, 1869); Zenker, Bibliotheca Orientalis  (Leipsic, 1846-61, 2 volumes); Tribner, Oriental Literary Record (Lond. 1865 sq.); Friderici, Bibliotheca Orientalis (Leipsic, 1876-83); Klatt u. Kuhn, Literatur-Blatt fur orientalische Philologie (ibid. 1883 sq.). (B.P.)

## Oriental Liturgy[[@Headword:Oriental Liturgy]]

             SEE LITURGY.

## Oriental Philosophy[[@Headword:Oriental Philosophy]]

             is an ancient system seeking to explain the nature and origin of all things by the principle of emanation from an eternal fountain of being. SEE MAGI.

Those who professed to believe the Oriental philosophy were divided into three leading sects, which were subdivided into others. Some imagined two eternal principles, from whence all things proceeded the one presiding over light, the other over matter; and by their perpetual conflict explaining the mixture of good and evil that appears in the universe. SEE MANICHAEANS; SEE ORMUZD.

Others maintained that the being which presided over matter was not an eternal principle, but a subordinate intelligence; one of those which the Supreme God produced. They supposed that this being was moved by a sudden impulse to reduce into order the rude mass of matter which lay excluded from the mansions of the Deity, and at last to create the human race. A third sect entertained the idea of a triumvirate of beings, in which the Supreme Deity was distinguished both from the material evil principle and from the Creator of this sublunary world. From blending the doctrines of the Oriental philosophy with Christianity, the Gnostic sects, which were so numerous in the first centuries, derived their origin. SEE GNOSTICISM.

Other sects arose which aimed to unite Judaism with Christianity. Many of the pagan  philosophers, who were converted to the Christian religion, exerted all their art and ingenuity to accommodate the doctrines of the Gospel to their own schemes of philosophy. In each age of the Church new systems were introduced, till, in process of time, we find the Christian world divided into that variety of heretical sentiment which is exhibited under the various articles in the Cyclopedia. SEE PHILOSOPHY.

## Orientation[[@Headword:Orientation]]

             As Christians from an early period turned their faces eastward when praying, so Christian churches, especially in the Western countries, for the most part were placed east and west, in order that the worshippers, as they looked towards the altar, might also look towards the east. The Council of Milan gave approval to this custom, and pope Virgilius even ordered the priests to celebrate towards the east. The custom seems at first thought a very foolish one, for God is everywhere present. Yet the east is, as it were, his proper dwelling-place, and that quarter where heaven seems to rise. Then, too, the window in the ark is believed to have faced the east. In the primitive Church prayer was made to the east, according to Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Origen, Augustine and Basil: (1) in allusion to Psa 132:7; Zec 14:4, “His feet shall stand in the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east;” (2) as the day-spring (Luk 1:78); (3) as the place of light; and (4) of Paradise (Genesis 52:8); and (5) of in the crucifixion and ascension, Pentecost, and second advent. Not only did churches, therefore, face the east, but the dead were laid with their faces to the east. The altar represents the Holy of Holies of the Temple; at it the death of Christ is commemorated; and from it the sacred food is administered to the faithful. Leo I (A.D. 443) condemned the custom of the people at Rome who used to stand on the upper steps in the court of St. Peter's and bow to the rising sun; partly out of ignorance, and partly from a lingering paganism. In later times the custom continued of turning eastward before entering St. Peter's, but with the intent of praying to God. To avoid, however, any suspicion of superstition, in the time of Boniface VII a mosaic of the ship which is one of the symbols of the early Church for Christ, SEE INSCRIPTIONS, was erected, towards which devotions were to be made. Urban VIII placed it over the outer great door. In some early churches (as those of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem, erected by Constantine, and Tyre, built by Paulinus at the beginning of the 4th century) — three great gates faced the east, the central being the loftiest, like a queen between her attendants.

The arrangement adopted was that of  the Jewish Temple. Modern investigation has determined that few churches stand exactly east and west, the great majority inclining a little either to the north or to the south. Thus, of three ancient churches in Edinburgh, it was ascertained that one (St. Margaret's Chapel in the Castle) pointed E.S.E.; another (St. Giles's Cathedral), E. by S.1/2S.; a third (Trinity College Church, now destroyed), E.1/2S. The cause of this variation has not been satisfactorily explained. Some have supposed that the church was turned not to the true east, but to the point at which the sun rose on the morning of the feast of the patron saint. But, unfortunately for this theory, neighboring Churches, dedicated in honor of the same saint, have different orientations. Thus, All-Saints' at West Beckham, in Norfolk, points due east; while All-Saints' at Thwaite, also in Norfolk, is 80 to the north of east. There are instances, too, in which different parts of the same church have different orientations; that is to say, the chancel and the nave have not been built in exactly the same line. This is the case in York Minister and in Lichfield Cathedral. Another theory is that orientation “mystically represents the bowing of our Savior's head in death, which Catholic tradition asserts to have been to the right [or north] side.” But his theory is gainsaid by the fact that the orientation is as often to the south as to the north. Until some better explanation is offered, it may perhaps be safe to hold that orientation has had no graver origin than carelessness, ignorance, or indifference. In several early Roman churches, and in the western apses of Germany, the altars face westward, but the celebrant fronts the congregation.

## Oriflamme[[@Headword:Oriflamme]]

             (Auri flamma, or fanon. i.e. flame of gold) was a red flag of sendal, carried on a lance shafted with gilt-copper. It was preserved in the abbey of St. Denis, to which it belonged; and was taken by the kings of France, on occasions of great emergency, from, the altar of that abbey, and on such occasions it was always consecrated and blessed. Louis VI received the oriflamme A.D. 1119 and 1125, and a writer of that period speaks of this as an ancient custom of the French kings. The consecration of a knight's pennon or gonfanon was indeed an essential feature in the solemn religious ceremonial by which he was elevated to the rank of knighthood in those ages. The consecration of standards for an army or a regiment is merely a different form of the same general idea. SEE KNIGHT-HOOD. The oriflamme is said to have been lost at Agincourt, in the Flemish wars, by Philip de Valois. It passed with the county of Vexin, the counts having  been the protectors of the Church, and became the standard of France in the time of Phiip I. Other accounts state that it was last seen in the battle- field in the time of Charles I; and Felibrin says that in 1535 it was still kept in an abbey, but was almost devoured by moths. The oriflamme was charged with a saltire wavy, or with rays issuing from the center crossways. In later times it became the ensign of the French infantry. The name seems also to have been given to other flags; according to Sir N. H. Nicolas, the oriflamme borne at Agincourt was an oblong red flag, split into five parts. See Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.; Student's History of France, p. 132. SEE JOAN OF ARC.

## Origen[[@Headword:Origen]]

             (᾿Ωριγένης, .from . ἐν ὄρει γενηθείς, because he was born in the mountain region, to which his parents had retired to escape persecution),' also surnamed ADAMANTIUS, on account of his remarkable firmness and iron assiduity, is called the father of Biblical criticism and exegesis in the Church. But it is not only in this line of literary activity that he has distinguished himself. Origen may well be pronounced one of the ablest and worthiest of the Church fathers — indeed, one of the greatest moral prodigies of the human race. He is universally regarded as one of the most laborous and learned scholars that has appeared in Christendom, and although his orthodoxy has on some important doctrinal points been called in question, his fame and influence will endure to the end of time, and his memory be revered among all followers of Jesus Christ.

Life. — Origen was born, according to the most trustworthy computation, at the city of Alexandria, in Egypt, in A.D. 185. His father, Leonidas, who was a Christian, is reputed to have been a man of culture and of piety; and while he sought to imbue the mind of the youth, whose first instructor he was, with the love of letters and the sciences, which every free Greek was to be conversant with, he yet paid particular attention to sacred knowledge, so that Origen might truly understand the contents of the Scriptures; and before the boy had reached maturity he evinced that his mind had not only been filled with knowledge, but that his bosom glowed with an equal zeal for the practice of the truths he had learned from the sacred pages. In A.D. 202, during the persecution under Severus, which raged through all the churches, but fell with most tremendous devastation on the Church at Alexandria, many of the most distinguished Christians from other parts were brought to suffer martyrdom in this conspicuous city. Instead of  hiding his own convictions, Origen boldly came forward, and exposed himself to a savage multitude by ministering to these holy men; and when his own father, too, was for his fidelity to the Christian religion imprisoned, and likely to suffer martyrdom, Origen was with great difficulty prevented by his mother from sharing his father's fate. Indeed, so firmly were his convictions rooted that he sent exhortation after exhortation to the prison of his parent to buffer death rather than recant. “Take heed,” wrote the beardless youth of seventeen — “take heed, father, that you do not change your mind for our sake.”

Leonidas remained firm and was beheaded; and Origen, his mother and younger brothers — six in all — were left destitute of protection, and of property too, as the estate which they owned was confiscated. In this forlorn condition Origen found a noble patron and supporter in a rich lady, who longed to be taught the truths of Christianity. But he did not long depend on her, for in the following year he 'abandoned' her home because she entertained a renowned heretic, whom, though high in repute for his learning; Origen would not consider a fit associate. He supported himself for a while by teaching the Greek language and literature, and by copying MSS. In A.D. 203 bishop Demetrius, afterwards his opponent, placed him in charge of the catechetical school left vacant by the flight of Clement (q.v.), whose inistructions Origen had enjoyed, and whose friendship and esteem he had secured while a pupil. To worthily fill this important office Origen made himself acquainted with the various heresies, especially the Gnostic, and with the Grecian philosophy. He was not even ashamed to study under the Heathen Ammonius Sacas (q.v.) the celebrated founder of Neo-Platonism (q.v.). Of course such a faithful application to research was rewarded with popular applause, and crowds of people flocked to his lectures. Among his pupils were many of the weaker sex; and as in his studies he employed females as copyists, he decided to put away every possible appearance of evil by his own emasculation, basing this unwarranted act upon the words of Christ (Mat 9:12), which Origen interpreted in a literal sense at that time, though in a later period of life he greatly regretted his early views. He also in this early period of life sought strict conformity with the doctrine preached by Paul in 1Co 7:25, and practiced voluntary poverty, and led a strictly ascetic life. He made it a matter of principle to renounce every earthly thing not indispensably necessary; refused the gifts of his pupils had but one coat, no shoes, and took no thought of the 'morrow. He rarely ate flesh, never drank wine; devoted the greater part of the night to prayer and study, and slept on the bare floor. By these means he commanded the respect of both  the learned and the unlearned in an age and country where such a mode of life was held in the highest repute both by Christians and heathen, and thus, in connection with his public and private instruction, he made a multitude of converts from all ranks of pagans. Among those whom his preaching, backed by a life so replete with consistency, reclaimed was one Valentinian heretic, a wealthy person, named Ambrose, who afterwards assisted Origin materially in the publication of his Commentaries on the Scriptures.

It was a little while preceding these important acts (about A.D. 211) that Origen visited Rome in order to acquaint himself with the doctrines, practices, and general character of its truly ancient Church. The Alexandrian and Roman views of the Church were widely different. By the latter, the one Church and body of Christ were contemplated as a visible organization, by the former as an invisible. In Rome and Carthage nepotism was dreaded as the worst of evils, and the baptized were looked upon as constituting the Church. In Alexandria the alienation of the mind and of the heart from the truth was regarded as the chief evil, and the holy, both in heaven and on earth, were viewed as constituting the true Church. Origen's opinions in regard to ecclesiastical organization and discipline were substantially the same as those which are most commonly entertained by evangelical Christians. They were far more spiritual and rational than those held by the Roman Church, and by Cyprian and Augustine. (The chapter in which Redepenning presents a summary of Origen's system of practical Church discipline is a very valuable treatise, on the subject for practical purposes in general; the golden mean between formalism and latitudinarianism is happily chosen: still it appears that Origen admitted a modified supremacy of the Church of Rome.) Origen's stay at Rome was short. Upon his return to Alexandria, by request of bishop Demetrius, he resumed his lessons, and then met with the remarkable and blessed results in his labors above referred to. Troubles likely to lead to serious dissension which broke out in that city in A.D. 215 made it evident that Christian teachers could not effectually prosecute their work, and Origen retired secretly to Palestine. This incensed the bishop; and when the clergy of that province asked Origen to expound the Scriptures in public, Demetrius wrote to expostulate with them, on the ground that such a mission should not be entrusted to one who was not an ordained priest. Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theocritus of Casarea defended their conduct on the ground that bishops had always employed for that purpose such as were best qualified for it by their learning and piety, without inquiring whether  they were priests or laymen. Demetrius finally recalled Origen and afterwards sent him to Greece to oppose some new heresies which had arisen in Achaia. On his way thither, in 228, he was ordained a presbyter at Caesarea, in Palestine, by Theocritus. This so displeased Demetrius that he held two councils (A.D. 231 and 232) at Alexandria, by which Origen was forbidden to teach, and excommunicated. He was accused, 1. of having castrated himself; 2, of having been ordained without the consent of his regular bishop; 3, of teaching erroneous doctrines, such as saying that the devil would be saved, and be redeemed from the torments of hell, etc. Origen denied the correctness of these accusations, and withdrew to Caesarea in 231, where he was received with great honor by Theocrituis; for the churches of Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, and Achaia, which were too well informed regarding Origen, disapproved of this unrighteous sentence, in which envy, hierarchical arrogance, and blind zeal for orthodoxy joined. The Roman Church, always ready to anathematize, alone concurred, without further investigation. Jerome states that the proceedings of the councils were not due to any belief in Origen's guilt of heresy, but solely to jealousy of his eloquence and reputation.

While resident in Caesarea, Origen there opened a new philosophical and theological school, which soon outshine that of Alexandria. The Caesarean institution was resorted to by persons from the most distant places, who were anxious to hear his interpretations of the Scriptures. Among his disciples were several who afterwards rose to great eminence in the Church. With the death of Demetrius all opposition to Origen died out, and thereafter his advice was everywhere eagerly sought for. He was called into consultation in various ecclesiastical disputes, and had an extensive correspondence; even his personal attendance was frequently asked for. Thus Mammaea, mother of the emperor Alexander Severus, sent for him to Antioch, that she might converse with him on religion; and at a later period he had a correspondence with the emperor Philip and his wife Severa. The persecutions renewed under Maximin against the Christians, and particularly against priests and teachers caused Origen to retire into quiet for two years. When peace was restored by Gordian in 237, Origen availed himself of it to visit Greece. He remained for some time at Athens; and having returned to Caesarea he went at the request of the bishops of Arabia to take part in two synods held in that country. Here he enjoyed the success (rare, indeed, in religious controversy) of convincing his opponents: these were Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, in Arabia, who denied  the pre-existence of Christ; and some who held that the soul dies with the body, to be revived with it at the resurrection. When about sixty years of age Origen permitted his discourses to be taken down in shorthand, and in this way over a thousand of his homilies were preserved. In the Decian persecution (A.D. 250) Origen was again imprisoned, endured great torture, and came near suffering martyrdom. He was, however, finally released, but died shortly after, some say at Tyre, in 253 or 254, probably in consequence of violence inflicted while in prison. He belongs, therefore, as Schaff has aptly said, “at least among the confessors, if not among the martyrs” (Ch. Hist. 1:504). His tomb, near the high-altar of the cathedral at Tyre, was shown for many centuries, until it was destroyed during the Crusades.

Origen is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable men among the ancient Christian writers. His talents, eloquence, and learning have been celebrated not only by Christian writers, but also by heathen philosophers, including Porphyry himself. Jerome calls him “a man of immortal genius, who understood logic, geometry, arithmetic, music, grammar, rhetoric, and all the sects of the philosophers, so that he was resorted to by many students of secular literature whom he received chiefly that he might embrace the opportunity of instructing them in the faith of Christ” (De Vir. Illust. c. 54). Elsewhere he calls him the greatest teacher since the apostles. We find this same Jerome, however, at a later period of his life violently attacking Origen, and approving of the persecution against his followers. “Origen,” says Prof. Emerson (in the Biblical Repository, Jan. 1834, art. i, p. 47), “is one among the few who have graced the annals of our race, by standing up as a living definition of what is meant by a man of genius, learning, piety, and energy. All these he possessed in amiable combination. Any subject that was worth mastering he had mastered, and when he had done it would devote the acquisition to a specific purpose for which he sought it. Thus he learned music, philosophy, and heathen literature, that he might gain the esteem and win the souls of the devotees to such accomplishments. Thus he studied Hebrew, that he might impart the Scriptures and meet the Jews; and then he wrote commentaries without end. He pursued nothing without a design. The soul of man was his great object; the world was his theater; it was his purpose to make himself at home everywhere and in all things, that he might gain all men. Like the great apostle, we find him everywhere true to his purpose and prepared for his work: at Alexandria, in the school and amid its philosophers, and multifarious population; in Arabia, in Palestine,  in Athens; among Christians and among heathen; among persecutors and heretics as well among friends. It was worse than in vain for opposition to do anything to such a man short of putting him to death. Drag him, half dead, to the heathen temple, and bid him distribute the emblems of heathen rites, and you hear him preaching Jesus to those who approach to grasp the sacred branches. Let Demetrius and his councils expel and expose him, he does but retire to Caesarea, where he opens a new school of greater numbers, and 'myriads' throng around him. He is the stamp of a truly great and good man. Sacrificed to the world in his youth, and the world to him, there remained nothing in the world to do except to kill him — and even this he courted, instead of dreading. He wished for no excuse to cease from his Christian toils; they were his meat and drink.” Indeed, his whole life was occupied in writing and teaching, and principally in explaining the Scriptures. No man — certainly none in ancient times — did more to settle the true text of the sacred writings, and to spread them among the people; yet, whether from a defect in judgment or from a fault in his education, he applied to the Holy Scriptures the allegorical method which the Platonists used in interpreting the heathen mythology. He says himself that “the source of many evils is the adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture. Those who do so shall not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us, therefore, seek after the spirit and the substantial fruit of the Word, which are hidden and mysterious.” Again, “the Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written.” In the 4th century the writings of Origen led to violent controversies in the Church. Epiphanius, in a letter preserved by Jerome, enumerates eight erroneous opinions.

Works. — All the extant works of Origen have been very much corrupted, either intentionally or accidentally, by copyists and annotators, etc. The number of his works is stated by Epiphanius and Rufinus to have exceeded 6000, and although this is probably only meant as an exaggerated round number, yet. the amount of writings that issued from his always busy brain and hands cannot but have been enormous. Seven secretaries and seven copyists, aided by an uncertain number of young girls, are by Eusebi's reported to have been always at work for him. The great bulk of his works is lost; but among those that have survived the most important by far is his elaborate attempt to rectify the text of the Septuagint by collating it with the Hebrew original and other Greek versions. On this he spent twenty- eight years, during which he traveled through the East collecting materials. The form in which he first issued the result of his labors was that of the  Tetrapla, which presented in four columns the texts of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, and Thedotion. He next issued the Hexapla, in which the Hebrew text was given, first in Hebrew and then in Greek letters. Of some books he gave two additional Greek versions, whence the title Octapla; and there was even a seventh Greek version added for some books. The arrangement was in columns, in the following order: Hebrew in its proper characters; Hebrew in Greek characters; Aquila; Symmachus; Sept.; Theodotion; 5th version; 6th; 7th. Unhappily this great work, which extended to nearly fifty volumes, was never transcribed, and so perished. It had been placed in the library at Caesarea, and was still much used in the times of Jerome. It was probably destroyed by the Saracens in 653. Extracts from it, however, had been made, and of these some are preserved. They were collected by Montfaucon, entitled Hexaplorum quae supersum, multis partibu. auctiora, quam a Flaminio Nobilis et Jonne Drusio edita fueint. Ex MSS. et ex libris editis eruit et notis illustravit' D. Bernardus de. Montfaucon, Monachus Benedictinus (Paris, 1713, 2 vols. fol.). This edition was brought out in a revise by Bahrdt, entitled Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt. Edidit, notisque illustravit C. F. Bahrdt (Leips. 1769-70, 2.Yols.8vo), A few additions have been made to this collection since by various editors. Had this great work been preserved, it would have done more for the criticism of the Bible than Origen's exegetical works have done for its interpretation; for though at first he followed the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, he soon abandoned it for the allegorical, in which he indulged to a pernicious extent. We think Waddington (Eccles. Hist.) has best estimated Origen: “His works exhibit the operation of a bold and comprehensive mind, burning with religious warmth, unrestrained by any low prejudices or interests, and sincerely bent on the attainment of truth. In the main plan and outline of his course he seized the means best calculated to his object; for his principal labors were directed to the collection of correct copies of the Holy Scriptures, to their strict and faithful translation; to the explanation of their numerous difficulties. In the first two of these objects he was singularly successful; but in the accomplishment of the last part of his noble scheme the heat of his imagination and his attachment to philosophical speculation carried him away into error and absurdity; for he applied to the explanation of the Old Testament the same fanciful method of allegory by which the Platonists were accustomed to veil the fabulous history of their gods. This error, so fascinating to the loose imagination of the East, was rapidly propagated by numerous disciples, and became the foundation of  that doubtful system of theology called philosophical or scholastic.” SEE ORIGENISTS.

1. Origen's commentaries covered almost all the books of the Old and New Testaments, and contained a vast wealth of profound suggestions, with the most arbitrary allegorical and mystic fancies. They were of three kinds:

(a) Short notes on single difficult passages for beginners; all these are lost.

(b) Extended expositions of whole books, for higher scientific study; of these we have a number in the original.

(c) Hortatory or practical applications of Scripture for the congregation ( ῾Ομιλίαι), which are important also to the history of pulpit oratory.

But we have them only in part, as translated by Jerome and Rufinus, with many unscrupulous retrenchments and additions, which perplex and are apt to mislead investigators.

2. Next to his Biblical works stand his apologetic and polemic works. Of these, the Κατὰ Κέλσου τόμαι ή, or in Latin entitled ‘Contra Celsum (libri 8), which is a refutation of Celsus, (q.v.), or, better, Origen's defense of the Christian faith against the objections of that Platonist, in eight books; written in his old age, about 249, is preserved complete in the original, and is one of the ripest and most valuable productions of Origen, and of the whole ancient apologetic literature. It exists also in an English version, entitled Origen against Celsus, translated from the originial into English by James Bellamy, Gent. (Lond. 8vo, n. d.). His other and quite numerous polemic writings against heretics are all gone.

3. Of Origen's dogmatic writings we have, though only in the inaccurate Latin translation of Rufinus, his juvenile production, Περὶ ἀρχῶν (De Principiis), on the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, in four books. This was the first attempt in the Christian Church at a complete dogmatic; but it is full of the author's peculiar Platonizing and Gnosticizing errors, some of which he retracted in his riper years. Before Origen there existed no system of Christian doctrine. The beginnings of a systematic presentation were contained in the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The necessity of reducing the teachings of the Bible and the doctrines developed in the course of controversies against  heretics and non-Christians to a systematic form was first felt by the teachers in the school for catechists, and they, in going to work to meet this necessity, were guided by the baptismal confession and the Regula Fidei. In the writings of Clement the subjects of his Gnosis are loosely combined, and the treatises disclose no plan followed in detail; they are only labors preparatory to a system. Setting out with these materials, Origen laid the foundation of a regular system of Christian dogmas. Yet his order was not very exact, and the gain of a systematic doctrinal form was not secured without material loss. The doctrine relating to the premundane existence of God, being placed first in the regular scholastic order, concealed those living germs seated in man's religious feeling or contained in the history of religion, which might otherwise have influenced beneficially the historical development of Christian doctrine; and the doctrine of Soteriology was left comparatively undeveloped. Origen says, “The apostles taught only what was necessary; many doctrines were not announced by them with perfect distinctness; they left the more precise determination and demonstration of many dogmas to the disciples of science, who were to build up a scientific system on the basis of the given articles of faith” (De Princ. Praef. p. 3.sq.).

The principle that a systematic exposition shall begin with the consideration of that which is naturally first is expressly announced by Origen (Tom. in Joan. 10:178), where, in an allegorical interpretation of the eating of fishes, he says “In eating, one should begin with the head, he should set it from the highest and most fundamental dogmas concerning the heavenly, and should stop with the feet, he should end with those doctrines which related that realm of existence which is farthest removed from the heavenly source, whether it be that which is most material or to the subterranean, or to the evil spirits and impure daemons.” The order of presentation in the four books respecting fundamental doctrines is (according to the outline given by Redepenning (Orig. 2:276) as follows: “At the commencement is placed the doctrine of God, the eternal source of all existence, as a point of departure for an exposition in which the knowledge of the essence of God, and of the unfoldings of that essence, leads on to the genesis of the eternals in the world, viz. the created spirits, whose fall first occasioned the creation of the coarser material world. This material is without difficulty arranged around the ecclesiastical doctrines of the Father, Son, and Spirit, of the creation, the angels, and the fall of man. All this is contained in the first book of Origen's work on fundamental doctrines. In the second book we set foot upon the earth as it is new we see it arising out of the ante-  mundane though not absolutely eternal matter, in time, in which it is to lead its changing existence until the restoration and emancipation of the fallen spirits; Into this world comes the Son of God, sent by the God of the Old Testament, who is no other than the Father of Jesus Christ; we learn of the incarnation of the Son, of the Holy Ghost as he goes forth from the Son to enter into the hearts of men, of the pyschical in man as distinct from the purely spiritual in him, of the purification and restoration of the physical man by judgment and punishment, and of eternal salvation. In virtue of the inalienable freedom belonging to the spirit, it fights its way upward in the face of evil powers of the spiritual world and against temptations from within, supported by Christ himself, and by the means of grace, i.e. by all the gifts and operations of the Holy Ghost. This freedom, and the process by which man becomes free, are described in the third book. The fourth book is distinct from the rest and independent, as containing the basis on which the doctrine of the preceding books rests, viz., the revelation made by the Holy Scriptures” (whereas later dogmatists have been accustomed to place the doctrine before the other contents of the system).

4. Among Origen's practical works are specially noteworthy his treatise on prayer, with an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, and exhortation to martyrdom. It was written during the persecution of Maximinus. Besides these works, Origen wrote many letters, Ε᾿πιστολαί (Epistoli), of which Eusebius collected over eight hundred. We have, too, a few fragments of answer to Julius Africanis on the authenticity of the history of Susanna. Delarue has given (1:1-32), whether complete or fragmentary, all that remains of them. Among the works of Origen is also usually inserted the Philocalia (Φιλοκαλία), a collection of extracts from his writings on various exegetical questions. The compilation was made, however, by Gregory of Nazianizum and Basil the Great. It is entitled Philocalia, de obscuris S. Scripturae locis, a SS. PP. Basilio Magno et Gregorio theologo, ex va-iis ‘Oregenis comnmenfaiis excerpta, Omnia nunc'primum Greece edita, ex Bibliotheca Regia, opere et studio Jo. Tarini, Andegavi,: qui et Latine fecit et notis illustravit (Paris, 1619' 4to).

The completest edition of Origen's works has been published under the style, Opera omnian quae Greece vel Latine tantun extanu t et ejus nomine circumferuntur, ex variis editionibus et codicibus nmanu exaratis, Gallicanis, Italicis, Germanicis, et Anglicis, collecta, recensita, Latine versa, atque annotatiosnibus illustrata, curm copiosis indicibus, vita auctoris, et multis- dissertationibus. Opere et studio Domini Caroli  Delarue, Presbyteri et Monachi Benedictini b Congregatione S. Mauri (Paris, 1733-59, 4 vols. fol.); but a more critical edition is that entitled, Opera omniza quac Grece vel Latine tanztui extant. Edidit C. H. E. Lommatzsch (Berlin, 1831-48, 25 vols. 8vo). 'Other good editions are: Opera [Latine, studio J. Merlini] (Paris,: 1512, 4 vols. fol.); Contra Celsum, libri viii, Ejusdem Philocalia, Gr. et' Lat. cum annotatiouibus Gul.' Spenceri (Cantab. 1658, 4to; reprinted 1677).

Doctrines — Ecclesiastical history, as Fabricius observes, cannot furnish another instance of a man who has been so famous through good report and ill report as Origen. The quarrels and disputes which arose in the Church after his death, on account of his person and writings, seem scarcely credible to any who have not examined the history of those tirmes. The universal Church was split into two parties; and these parties fought as furiously for and against Origen as if the Christian religion had itself been at stake. SEE ORIGENIAN CONTROVERSY.

Huetius has employed the second book of his Origeniana, which consists of above 200 pages in folio, in pointing out and adverting on such dogmas of this illustrious father as are either quite inexcusable or very exceptionable. Cave (Hist. Liter. Oxon. 1740) has collected within a short compass the principal tenets which rendered him obnoxious; and thence we learn that Origen was accused of maintaining different degrees of dignity among the persons of the Holy Trinity; as that the Son was inferior to the Father, and the Holy Spirit inferior to both, in the same manner as rays emitted from the sun are inferior in dignity to the sun himself; that the death of Christ was advantageous, not to men only, but to angels, devils, nay, even to the stars and other insensible things, which he supposed to be possessed of a rational soul, and therefore to be capable of sin; that all rational natures, whether devils, human souls, or any other, were created by God from eternity, and were originally pure intelligences, but afterwards, according to the various use of their free will, dispersed among the various orders of angels, men, or devils; that angels and other supernatural beings were clothed with subtle and ethereal bodies, which consisted of matter, although in comparison with our grosser bodies they may be called incorporeal and spiritual; that the souls of all rational beings, after putting off one state, pass into another, either superior or inferior, according to their respective behavior; and that thus, by a kind of perpetual transmigration, one and the same soul may successively, and even often, pass through all the orders of rational beings; that hence the souls of men  were thrust into the prison of bodies for offenses committed in some former state, and that when loosed from hence they will become either angels or devils, as they shall have deserved; that, however, neither the punishment of men or devils, nor the joys of the saints, shall be eternal, but that all shall return to their original state of pure intelligences, to begin the same round again, and so on forever. Says Schaff (Ch. Hist. 1:270): “Origen felt the whole weight of the Christological and Trinitarian question, but obscured it by his foreign speculations and wavered between the homoousian, or orthodox, and the subordination theories, which afterwards came into sharp conflict with each other in the Arian controversy. On the one hand he brings the Son as near as possible to the essence of the Father; not only making him the absolute personal wisdom, truth, righteousness, reason (αὐτοσοφία, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοδιχαιοσύνη, αὐτοδύναμις, αὐτόλογος, etc.), but also expressly predicating eternity of him, and propounding the Church dogma of the eternal generation of the Son. This generation he usually represents as proceeding from the Will of the Father; but he also conceives it as proceeding from his essence; and hence, at least in one passage, in a fragment on the Epistle to the Hebrews, he already applies the term ὁμοούσιος to the Son, thus declaring him coequal in substance with the Father. This idea of eternal generation, however, has a peculiar form in him, from its close connection with his doctrine of an eternal creation.

He can no more think of the Father without the Son, than of an almighty God without creation, or of light without radiance (De Princip. iv,28: 'Sicit lux numquam 'msine splendore esse potuit' ita nec Filius quidem sine Patre intelligi potest'). Hence he describes this generation not as a single, instantaneous act, but, like creation, ever going on. But on the other hand he distinguishes the essence of the Son from that of the Father; speaks of a difference of substance (ἑτερότης τῆς οὐσίας,or τοῦ ὑποκειμενου which the advocates of his orthodoxy, probably without reason, take as merely opposing the Patripassian conception of the ὁμουσία); and makes the Son decidedly inferior to the Father, calling him, with reference to Joh 1:1 merely θεός without the article, that is God in a relative sense (Deus de Deo), also δεύτερος θεός, but the Father God in the absolute sense, ὁ θεός (Deus per se), or αὐτόθεος, also the fountain and root of the divinity (πηγή, ῥίζα τῆς θεότητος). Hence he also taught that the Son should not be directly addressed in prayer, but the Father through the Son in the Holy Ghost. This must be limited, no doubt, to absolute worship, for he elsewhere recognizes prayer to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. Yet this  subordination of the Son formed a stepping-stone to Arianism, and some disciples of Origen, particularly Dionysius of Alexandria, decidedly approached that heresy.”

“In his Pneumatology,” says Schaff, “Origen vacillates still more than in his Christology between orthodox and heterodox views. He ascribes to the Holy Ghost eternal existence, exalts him, as he does the Son, far above all creatures, and considers him the source of all charisms (not as ὕλη τῶν χαρισμάτων, as Neander and others represent it, but as ν ὕλην τῶν χαρισμ. παρέχον, as offering the substance and fullness of the spiritual gifts; therefore as the ἀρχή and πηγή of them [In Joh, ii, § 6].), especially as the principle of all the illumination and holiness of believers under the Old Covenant and the New. But he places the Spirit in essence, dignity, and efficiency below the Son, has far as he places the Son below the Father; and though he grants in one passage (De Princip. 1:3, 3) that the Bible nowhere calls the Holy Ghost a creature, yet, according to another somewhat obscure sentence, he himself inclines towards the view, which, however, he does not avow, that the Holy Ghost had a beginning (though, according to his system, not in time but from eternity), and is the first and most excellent of all the beings produced by the Logos (In Joh. ii, § 6: Τιμιώτερον — this comparative, by the way, should be noticed as possibly saying more than the superlative, and perhaps designed to distinguish the Spirit from all creatures- πάντων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ Χριστοῦγεγεννημένων). In the same connection he adduces three opinions concerning the Holy Ghost: one, regarding him as not having an origin; another, ascribing to him no separate personality; and a third, making him a being originated by the Logos. The first of these opinions he rejects, because the Father alone is without origin (ἀγέννητος) thoc); the second he rejects, because in Mat 12:32 the Spirit is plainly distinguished from the Father, and the Son; the third he takes for the true and scriptural view, because everything was made by the Logos (according to Joh 1:3). Indeed, according to Mat 12:32, the Holy Ghost would seem to stand above the Son; but the sin against the Holy Ghost is more heinous than that against the Son of Man only because he who has received the Holy Ghost stands higher than he who has merely the reason from the Logos” (Ch. Hist. 1:280).

These errors, and others connected with and flowing from these, together with that “furor allegoricus” above mentioned, which pushed him on to turn even the whole law and Gospel into allegory, are the foundation of all  that enmity which has been conceived against Origen, and of all those anathemas with which he has been loaded. His damnation by Romanists has been often decreed in form; and it has been deemed heretical even to suppose him saved. John Picus, earl of Mirandula, having published at Rome, among his 900 propositions, that it is more reasonable to believe Origen saved than damned, the masters indivinity censured him for it, asserting that his proposition was rash, blamable, favoring of heresy, and contrary to the determination of the Catholic Church. This is what Picus himself relates in his Apolog. c. 7.

 Stephen Binct, a Jesuit, published a book at Paris in 1629, concerning the salvation of Origen, in which he took the affirmative side of the question, but not without diffidence and fear. This work is written in the form of a trial; witnesses are introduced and depositions taken, and the cause is fully pleaded pro and con. The witnesses for Origen are Merlin, Erasmus, Genebrard, and Picus of Mirandula: after this, cardinal Baronius, in the name of Bellarmine, and of all who are against Origen, makes a speech to demand the condemnation of the accused. After having expatiated on Origen's heresies, the cardinal adds “Must I at last be reduced to such an extremity as to be obliged to open the gates of hell, in order to show that Origen is there? otherwise men will not believe it. Would it not be enough to have laid before you his crime, his unfortunate end, the sentence of his condemnation delivered by the emperors, by the popes, by the saints, by the fifth general council, not to mention others, and almost by the mouth of God himself? Yet, since there is no other method left but descending into hell and showing there that reprobate, that damned Origen, come, gentlemen, I am determined to do it, in order to carry this matter to the highest degree of evidence: let us, in God's name, go down into hell to see whether he really be there or not, and to decide the question at once.”

The seventh general council has quoted from the Platum Spirituale (Baron. Annal. ad ann. 532), and by quoting it has declared it to be of sufficient authority to furnish us with good and lawful proofs to support the determination of the council with regard to Origen. “Why should not we, after the example of that council, make use of the same book to determine this controversy, which besides is already but too much cleared up and decided? It is said there that a man being in great perplexity about the salvation of Origen, after the fervent prayers of a holy old man, saw plainly, as it were, a kind of hell open; and, looking in, observed the heresiarchs, who were all named to him one after another by their own names; and in the midst of them he saw Origen, who was there damned among the others, loaded with horror, flames, and confusion.”

Protestants have always revered his memory. The orthodox and heterodox have frequently quarreled over his relative position in the Church. It would be difficult for us to determine his relation to the Church at large better than it has already been done by Dr. Schaff. We therefore prefer to let this learned Church historian speak. “Origen,” says Schaff, “was the greatest scholar of his age, and the most learned and genial of all the ante-Nicene fathers. Even heathens and heretics admired or feared his brilliant talents. His knowledge embraced all departments of the philology, philosophy, and theology of his day. With this he united profound and fertile thought, keen penetration, and glowing imagination. As a true divine, he consecrated all his studies by prayer, and turned them, according to his best convictions, to the service of truth and piety. It is impossible to deny a respectful sympathy to this extraordinary man, who, with all his brilliant talents and a host of enthusiastic friends and admirers, was driven from his country, stripped of his sacred office, excommunicated from a part of the Church, then thrown into a dungeon, loaded with chains, racked by torture, doomed to drag his aged frame and dislocated limbs in pain and poverty, and long after his death to have his memory branded, his name anathematized, and his salvation denied; but who nevertheless did more than all his enemies combined to advance the cause of sacred learning, to refute and convert heathens and heretics, and to make the Church respected in the eyes of the world. Origen may be called in many respects the Schleirmacher of the Greek Church. He was a guide from the heathen philosophy and the heretical Gnosis to the Christian faith. He exerted an immeasurable influence in stimulating the development of the catholic theology and forming the great Nicene fathers, Athanasius, Basil, the two Gregories, Hilary, and Ambrose, who consequently, in spite of all his Deviations, set great value on his services. But his best disciples proved unfaithful to many of his most peculiar views, and adhered far more to the reigning faith of the Church. For, and in this, too, he is like Schleiermacher — he can by no means be called orthodox, either in the Catholic or in the Protestant sense. His leaning to idealism, his predilection for Plato, and his noble effort to reconcile Christianity with reason. and to commend it even to educated heathens and Gnostics, led him into many grand and fascinating errors” (Ch. Hist. 1:504, 505). “Christian science,” says Pressense (Heresy and Christian Martyrs, p. 297 sq.), “is in Origen's view the full faith or knowledge, which rises to the direct contemplation of its object. and ascends from the visible Christ, 'known after the flesh,' to the Eternal Word. He falls into the same error as Clement in thinking too lightly of the  foundation of this transcendent knowledge that historical Gospel which is the very substance of the truths and in treating the letter of the Scriptures as a seal that needs to be broken.

It remains none the less true that speculation is never with him a mere mental feat; that it is rather the aspiration of the entire being after the living and complete possession of the truth. Origen spoke the philosophical language, of his time. He resolutely dealt with the problems which occupied the minds of his contemporaries. In order rightly to estimate and understand him, we must bear constantly in mind that sublime and subtle pantheism which was the primary inspiration both of Valentinian Gnosticism and of Platonism. If his mind frequently forsakes the solid ground of psychological observation and exact history, to soar into vague regions which are neither heaven nor earth, it is because he is desirous to occupy a sphere as wide as that of his adversaries. Anxious to excel them in science no less than in faith he will not abandon to them any vantage ground. Like them, he peoples the infinite void with the creations of his imagination. To the AEons he opposes good and bad angels; he does not hesitate to invent a sort of mythology, of which the inspiration is Christian, but which in its bold additions to the positive statements of revelation necessarily becomes visionary. Herein is not the strength and beauty of his system. These are found in that bold vindication of liberty which is its central and vital principle. It may be said that the vast theological edifice reared by him is, as it were, the temple of liberty.

Liberty is its foundation and its topstone; nay, it is more, it is the animating soul of the whole doctrine taught therein. Pantheistic naturalism had struck the whole world with a death chill. Origen reawakened it with the breath of liberty, restored it to life, and snatched it from the petrfying grasp of fatalism. In the boldness of his thought he denies the existence of necessity altogether. All the phenomena of the material world are free acts. Bodies owe their existence to the motions of the will. If matter gravitates or ascends, it is not by a simple physical law, but is connected with moral action. Liberty is the explanation of all things. The great merit of Origen is his endeavor to trace back all the diversity of things to one and the same idea. Unhappily his conception of liberty was incomplete, and his error on this fundamental point produced results all the more serious because of the close logical coherence of his system.” “But such a man might in such an age,” says Schaff, “hold heretical opinions without being a heretic. For Origen propounded his views always with modesty, and from sincere conviction of their agreement with Scripture, and that in a time when the Christian doctrine was as yet very indefinite in many points.” For this  reason even unprejudiced Roman divines, such as Tillemont and Mohler, have shown Origen the greatest respect and leniency; a fact the more to be commended, since the Romish Church has steadily refused him, as well as Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, a place among the saints and the fathers in the stricter sense. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. bk. 6:1-6 et pass.; Hieronymus, Cat. c. liv, and Ep. 29, 41; Gregorius Thaumat. Oratio panegyrica in Ori.qenenm; Pamphilus, Apologia Orig. (all in the last vol. of Delarue); Huetius, Origeniana (Par. 1679, 2 vols.); Lardner, Credibility, pt. ii, ch. 38; Thomasius, Origenes, ein Beitrag z. Dogmengeschichte (Nuremberg, 18-37); Ritter, Gesch. d. christlichen Philosophie, I, 465 sq.; Baur, Gesch. d. Dreieinigkeitslehre, 1:186-243, 560566; Meier, Trinitatslehre; Dr. Kahnis, Monographie (1847); Mohler, Patrologie; Alzog, Patrologie, § 33, 34;.and especially Redepenning, Origenes, eine Darstellungs. Lebens u. s. Lehre (1841-1846, 2-vols.). See also Schaff, Ch. Hist. i, 501-509 et pass.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1:693 sq., et pass.; id. Dognzaf, p. 21 sq.; Pressense, Early Years of Christianity Heresy and Doctrine, bk. ii, ch. iv; Martyrs. and Apologists, bk. ii, ch. ii, § ii); Killen, Anc, Ch. p. 375 sq.; Hagenbach, Gesch. der ersten 3 Jahrh. — ch. xiii, xiv.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. i; Bohringeri Kiircheiiesch. 1:104 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. Doctrines (see Index in vol. ii); Sefirockh, Kirchengesch. 4:29 sq. — ; Guericke, Ch. Hist. 1:104 sq.; Alzog, Kirchengesch. vol, i; Neale Hist. East. Ch. (Patriarchate. of Alexatdna;, bk.i,-§ 53)-; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol.; v.; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 50 sq.,; 285, 404, 457, 460; Ueberweg, Hist. Philos. 1:315 sq.; Donaldson, Literature (see Index in vol. ii); Tillemont, — Memoires Eccles.; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Eccles. 2:130 sq.; Rust, Origen and his Chief Opponents; Taughn's Life and Writings of Origen; Bampton Lectures, 1813, 1824,-1829, 1839; Amer. Bibl. Repos. 4:833 sq.' Bib.Sac. 2:378 sq.; Brit. Qu. Rev. 2:491 sq.; Christian Examiner, 10:306; 11:22; Meth. Qu. Rev. 11:645; Lond. Qu. Rev. July, 1851; Amer. Ch. Rev. Oct. 1868; Mercersburg Rev. Oct. 1871, art. ii; Univ. Qu. April, 1874, art. vii; April, 1875, art. iv.

## Origenian Controversy[[@Headword:Origenian Controversy]]

             So distinguished a man as Origen could not fail to have great influence on the Church, not only while living, but even after his death. As during his lifetime he had opponents as well as partisans, so two parties continued in the Church a long time afterwards. As late as the 3d century we find bishop Methodius (d. 311) opposing the doctrine of Origen, and asserting the  absoluteness of God, in opposition to Origen, who teaches the creation as having had no beginning. Methodius also combated Origen's realistic views, particularly his eschatological doctrines, i.e. his spiritualizing tendencies. Many of his arguments, however, like those of other opponents of Origen, were based on a misunderstanding of his doctrines. On the other hand, the learned and pious Pamphilus of Caesarea, in Palestine († 309), in collaboration with his friend Eusebius, wrote in prison an apology for Origen. In this work the writers reveal and oppose the narrow-mindedness which led to the accusations of heresy preferred against Origen. It contains six books: the last is the work of Eusebius alone, being written after Pamphilus's martyrdom, and defended by him against the attacks of Marcellus of Ancyra. We now possess only the first book, in the incorrect translation of Rufinus, and a few fragments of the Greek text (published in Delarue's edition of Origen.; Gallandi, Bibl. Patr.; and Routh, Reliq. sacrae).

Origen's name was also drawn into the Arian controversies, and used and abused by both parties for their own ends. The question of the orthodoxy of the great departed became in this way a vital issue of the day, and increased in interest with the increasing zeal for pure doctrine and the growing horror of all heresy. Upon this question three parties arose: free, progressive disciples, blind adherents, and blind opponents.

1. The true, independent followers of Origen drew from his writings much instruction and quickening, without committing themselves to his words, and, advancing with the demands of the time, attained a clearer knowledge of the specific doctrines of Christianity than Origen himself, without thereby losing esteem for his memory and his eminent services. Such men were, in the 4th century, Pamphilus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Didymus of Alexandria, and in a wider sense Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa; and among the Latin fathers, Hilary, and at first Jerome, who afterwards joined the opponents. Gregory of Nyssa, and perhaps also Didymus, even adhered to Origen's doctrine of the final salvation of all created intelligences.

2. The blind and slavish followers, incapable of comprehending the free spirit of Origen, clung to the letter, held all his immature and erratic views, laid greater stress on them than Origen himself, and pressed them to extremes. Such mechanical fidelity to a master is always apostasy from his spirit which tended towards continual growth in knowledge. To this class  belonged the Egyptian monks in the Nitrian mountains; four in a particular Dioscurus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, who are know in by the name of “the tall brethren” (Α᾿δελφοὶ μακροί, on accountof their bodily size), and were very learned.

3. The opponents of Origen, some from ignorance, others from narrowness and want of discrimination, shunned his speculations as a source of the most dangerous heresies, and in him condemned at the same time all free theological discussion, without which no progress in knowledge is possible, and without which even the Nicine dogma would never have come into existence. To these belonged a class of Egyptian monks in the Scetic desert, with Pachomius at their head, who, in opposition to the mysticism and spiritualism of the Origenistic monks of Nitria, urged grossly sensuous views of divine things, so as to receive the name of Anthropomorphites. The Roman Church, in which Origen was scarcely known by name before the Arian disputes, shared in a general way the strong prejudice against him as an unsound and dangerous writer.

The leaders in the crusade against the bones of Origen was the bishop Epiphanius of Salamis (Constantia), in Cyprus († 403), an honest, well- meaning, and by his contemporaries highly respected, but violent, coarse, contracted, and bigoted monastic saint and heresy hunter. He had inherited from the monks in the deserts of Egypt an ardent hatred of Origen as an arch-heretic; and in his Panarion, or chest of antidotes for eighty heresies, branded Origen as the father of Arianism and many other errors (Hoer. 64); Epipnanius gave to documentary justification for this hatred from the numerous writings of Origen. Not content with this publication, he also endeavored, by journeying and oral discourse, to destroy everywhere the influence of the long-departed teacher of Alexandria, and considered himself, as doing God and the Church the greatest service thereby. With this object the aged bishop journeyed in 394 to Palestine, where Origen was still held in the highest consideration, especially with John, bishop of Jerusalem, and with the learned monks Rufinus and Jerome, the former of whom was at that time in Jerusalem and the latter in Bethlehem. Epiphanius delivered a blustering sermon in Jerusalem, excited laughter, and vehemently demanded the condemnation of Origen. John and Rufinus resisted; but Jerome, who had previously considered Origen the greatest Church teacher after the apostles, and had learned much from his exegetical writings, without adopting his doctrinal errors, yielded to a solicitude for the fame of his own orthodoxy, passed over to the  opposition, broke off Church fellowship with John, and involved himself in a most violent literary contest with his former friend Rufinus, which belongs to the chronique scandaleuse of theology. The schism was terminated indeed by the mediation of the patriarch Theophilus in 397, but the dispute broke out afresh. Jerome condemned in Origen particularly his doctrine of pre-existence, of the final conversion of the devils and of demons, and his spiritualistic sublimation of the resurrection of the body. Rufinus, having returned to the West (398) to meet this opposition, translated several works of Origen into Latin.

He proceeded with great caution, altering occasionally the text, so as not to depart too greatly from the doctrine then prevailing in the Church, and succeeded in satisfying orthodox taste. Origen was accused by Jerome of being the originator of the Arian doctrine concerning the Trinity that it should not be said that the Son could see the Father, or the Spirit the Son; but this charge was certainly most unjust. True, his Christology had in it contradictory elements. He, on the one hand, attributed to Christ eternity, and other divine attributes which logically lead to the orthodox doctrine of the identity of substance; so that he was vindicated even by Athanasius, the two Cappadocian Gregorien, and Basil. But, on the other hand, in his zeal for the personal distinctions in the Godhead, he taught with equal clearness a separateness of essence between the Father and the Son, and the subordination of the Son, as a second or secondary God beneath the Father, and thus furnished a starting-point for the Arian heresy. The eternal generation of the Son from the will of the Father was, with Origen, the communication of a divine but secondary substance, and this idea, in the hands of the less devout and profound Arius, who, with his more rigid logic, could admit no intermediate being between God and the creature, deteriorated of the notion of the primal creature. But in general Arianism was much more akin to the spirit of the Antiochian school than to that of the Alexandrian, Origen was also accused of holding the doctrine of pre- mundane existence, and regarding the body as the prison of the soul; of teaching the resurrection of the corporeal body with different sexes; the unhistorical signification of paradise and of the history of creation; and the assertion of the loss of the divine image in man. The object of both was principally to defend themselves against the charge of Origenism, and to fasten it upon each other, and this not by a critical analysis and calm investigation of the teachings of Origen, but by personal denunciations and miserable invectives (comp. the description of their conduct by Zockler, Hieronymus, p. 396 sq.). The result of this controversy was that Rufinus  was cited before pope Anastasius (398-402), who condemned Origenism in a Roman synod, notwithstanding that Rufinus sent a satisfactory defense. Rufinus thereafter sought an asylum in Aquileia. He enjoyed the esteem of such men as Paulinus of Nola and Augustine, and died in Sicily (410).

Meanwhile a second act of this controversy was opened in Egypt, especially by the theologians of Alexandria, among whom the unprincipled, ambitious, and intriguing bishop Theophilus of Alexandria plays the leading part. This bishop at first as an admirer of Origen, and despised the anthropomorphite monks, but afterwards, through a personal quarrel with Isidore and “the four tall brethren,” who refused to deliver the Church funds into his hands, he became an opponent of Origen, attacked his errors in several documents (399-403) (in hisispistola Synodica ad episcopos Palestinos et ad Cyprios, 400, and in three successive Epistole Paschales, from 401-403, all translated by Jerome, and forming Ep. 92, 96, 98, and 100 of his Epistles, according to the order of Vallarsi), and pronounced an anathema on Origen's memory, in which he was supported by Epiphanius, Jerome, and the Roman bishop Anastasius. At the same time he indulged in the most violent measures against the Origenistic monks, and banished them from Egypt. Most of these monks fled to Palestine; but some fifty, among whom were “the four tall brethren,” went to Constantinople, and found there a cordial welcome with the bishop, John Chrysostom, in 401.

But in this way that noble man, too, became involved in the dispute. As an adherent of the Antiochian school, and as a practical theologian, he had no sympathy with the philosophical speculations of Origen. Yet Chrysostom knew how to appreciate Origen's merits in the exposition of the Scriptures, and was impelled by Christian love and justice to intercede with Theophilus in behalf of the persecuted monks, though he did not admit them to the holy communion till they proved their innocence. Theophilus at once set every instrument in motion to overthrow the long-envied Chrysostom, and employed even Epiphanius, then almost an octogenarian, as a tool of his hierarchical plans. This old man journeyed in midwinter in 402 to Constantinople, in the imagination that by his very presence he would be able to destroy the thousand-headed hydra of heresy; and he would neither hold Church fellowship with Chrysostom, who assembled the whole clergy of the city to greet him, nor pray for the dying son of the emperor, until all Origenistic heretics should be banished from the capital, and he might publish the anathema from the altar. But he found that injustice was done to the Nitrian monks, and soon took ship again to Cyprus, saying to the  bishops who accompanied him to the seashore, “I leave to you the city, — the palace, and hypocrisy; but I go, for I must make great haste.” He died in the ship in the summer of 403. However, what the honest coarseness of Epiphanius failed to effect was accomplished by the cunning of Theophilus, who now himself traveled to Conlstantinople, and immediately appeared as accuser and judge. He well knew how to use the dissatisfacton of the clergy, of the empress Eudoxia, and of the court with Chrysostom on account of his moral severity and his bold denunciations. In Chrysostom's own diocese, on an estate “at the oak” (πρὸς τὴν δρῦν, Synodus ad Quercum) in Chalcedon, he held a secret council of thirty-six bishops against Chrysostom, and there procured, upon false charges of immorality, unchurchly conduct, and high-treason, his deposition and banishment in 403' (see Hefele; 2:78 sq.). Chrysostom was recalled indeed in three days in consequence of an earthquake and the dissatisfaction of the people, but was again condemned by a council in 404, and banished from the court. SEE CHRYSOSTOM.

The age could not indeed understand and appreciate the bold spirit of Origen, but was still accessible to the narrow piety of Epiphanius and the noble virtues of Chrysostom. Yet in spite of this prevailing aversion of the time to free speculation, Origen always retained many readers and admirers, especially among the monks in Palestine, two of whom, Domitian and Theodorus Askidas, came to favor and influence at the court of Justinian I; But under this emperor the dispute on the orthodoxy of Origen was renewed about the middle of the 6th century, in connection with the monophysite controversy; and, notwithstanding Theodorus's influence, his opponents, with the assistance of Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, caused Origen to be condemned in the σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα in 544. That this judgment was confirmed by the fifth oecumenical synod is highly improbable. But as the reading of Origen's writings had been made a heretical act by reason of their condemnation, no one ventured until very recent times he raised his voice for Origen, and his works and doctrines have gone out of sight, or passed out of existence. Says Schaff: “The vehement and petty personal quarrels over the orthodoxy of Origen brought no gain to the development of the Church doctrine. Indeed, the condemnation of Origen was a death-blow to theological science in the Greek Church, and left it to stiffen gradually into a mechanical traditionalism and formalism.”
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## Origenians[[@Headword:Origenians]]

             SEE SKOPTSI.

## Origenism [[@Headword:Origenism ]]

             SEE ORIGENISTS.

## Origenists a title of two entirely distinct classes of heretics[[@Headword:Origenists a title of two entirely distinct classes of heretics]]

             1. It is the name of certain heretical Christians who professed to adopt the theological views of the Church father Origen (q.v.). They developed as a body in the 4th century, and taught —

(1.) A pre-existent state of human souls, prior to the Mosaic creation, and perhaps for eternity which souls were clothed with ethereal bodies suited to their original dignity. SEE PRE-EXISTENTS.

(2.) That souls were condemned, to animate mortal bodies, in order to expiate faults they had committed in a pre-existent state; for we may be assured, from the infinite goodness of their Creator, that they were at first joined to the purest matter, and placed in those regions of the universe which were most suitable to the purity of essence that they then possessed. For that the souls of men are an order of essentially incorporate spirits, their deep immersion into terrestrial matter, the modification of all their operations by it, and the heavenly body promised in the Gospel, as the highest perfection of our renewed nature, clearly evince. Therefore, if our souls existed before they appeared as inhabitants of the earth, they were placed in a purer element, and enjoyed far greater degrees of happiness. And certainly he whose overflowing goodness brought them into existence would not deprive them of their felicity, till by their mutability they rendered themselves less pure in the whole extent of their powers, and became disposed for the susception of such a degree of corporeal life as was exactly answerable to their present disposition of spirit. Hence it was necessary that they should become terrestrial men.

(3.) That the soul of Christ was united to the Word before the incarnation; for the Scriptures teach us that the soul of the Messiah was created before the beginning of the world (Php 2:5; Php 2:7). This text must be understood of Christ's human soul, because it is unusual to propound the Deity as an example of humility in Scripture. Though the humanity of Christ was so godlike, he emptied himself of this fullness of life and glory to take upon him the form of a servant. It was this Messiah who conversed with the patriprs under human form; it was he who appeared to us on the holy mount; it was he who spoke to the prophets under a visible appearance; and it is he who will at last come in triumph upon the clouds to restore the universe to its primitive splendor and felicity.

(4.) That at the resurrection of the dead we shall be clothed with ethereal bodies; for the elements of our terrestrial composition are such as almost fatally entangle us in vice, passion, and misery. The purer the vehicle the soul is united with, the more perfect are her life and operations. — Besides, the Supreme Goodness who made all things assures us he made all things best at first, and therefore his recovery of us to our lost happiness (which is the design of the Gospel) must restore us to our better bodies and happier habitations, which is evident from 1Co 15:49; 2Co 5:1; and other texts of Scripture.

(5.) That, after long periods of time, the damned shall be released from their torments, and restored to a new state of probation; for the Deity has such reserve in his gracious providence as will vindicate his sovereign goodness and wisdom from all disparagement. Expiatory pains are a part of his adorable plan; for this sharper kind of favor has a righteous place in such creatures as are by nature mutable. Though sin has extinguished or silenced the divine life, yet it has not destroyed the faculties of reason and understanding, consideration and memory, which will serve the life which is most powerful. If, therefore, the vigorous attraction of the sensual nature be abated by a ceaseless pain, these powers may resume the goods of a better life and nature. As in the material system there is a gravitation of the lesser bodies towards the greater, there must of necessity be something analogous to this in the intellectual. system; and since the spirits created by God are emanations and streams from his own abyss of being, and as self- existent power must needs subject all beings to itself, the Deity could not but impress upon intimate natures and substances a central tendency towards himself; an essential principle of reunion to their great original. (This doctrine, in a somewhat modified form, is now advocated by some English divines. — Very recently the Rev. Edward Eliot has come out as the advocate of conditional immortality in his Life in Christ [Lond. 1875; See Brit. and For. Evang. Rep. Jan. 1876.)

(6.) That the earth, after its conflagration, shall become habitable again, and be the mansion of men and animals, and that in eternal vicissitudes. For it is thus expressed in Isaiah: “Behold, I make new heavens and a new earth,” etc.; and in Heb 1:10; Heb 1:12, “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed,” etc. Where there is only a change, the substance is not destroyed, this change being only as that of a garment worn out and decaying. The fashion of the world passes away like a turning scene, to exhibit a fresh and new representation of things; and if only the present dress and appearance of things go off, the substance is supposed to remain entire. SEE MILLENARIANS.

By the 6th century the Origenists had completely subsided, and there have been no attempts in the Church at revival. — SEE ORIGEN; SEE ORIGENIAN CONTROVERSY.

2. Origenists is also the name given to a sect of heretical Christians who, as appears from Epiphanius, were followers of some unknown Origen, a  person quite different from the father of the 2d and 3d centuries. In one place indeed Epiphanius (a very bitter opponent of Origenistic opinions) says he is ignorant whether or not the sect was derived from him. (Epiph. Panar. 63, 64); but in another he speaks of them without doubt as followers of some other Origen (Anacephal.). These Origenists are spoken of as given to shameful vices, but nothing further is mentioned of them. There was an Alexandrian philosopher of the same name, contemporary with the great Origen, but there is nothing known which connects him with the sect. Philaster is silent about them, while Augustine and Praedestinatus are only able to repeat the statement of Epiphanius.

## Origin of Evil[[@Headword:Origin of Evil]]

             SEE EVIL; SEE SIN.

## Origin of Man[[@Headword:Origin of Man]]

             SEE MAN; SEE PREADAMITES.

## Origin of Species[[@Headword:Origin of Species]]

             SEE CREATION; SEE SPECIES.

## Original Antiburghers[[@Headword:Original Antiburghers]]

             is the name usually given to those Scotch Presbyterians who seceded in 1806 from the General Associate (Antiburgher) Synod of Scotland. SEE ANTIBURGHERS. The occasion of their secession is generally called the “Old and New Light Controversy.” This was a consideration of the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. The early seceders had held what is commonly termed the Establishment principle. Gradually a change of opinion came over a part of the body, and some were disposed to question, the expediency and New-Testament authority for national Church establishments. In 1793 it became a subject of debate in the General Associate Synod, and from that time New-Light or Anti-Establishment principles gained many advocates. Year after year the subject was keenly discussed, and in 1804 the Narrative and Testimony, or a new Secession Testimony, embodying these proposed views as those of the secession body, was adopted by the General Synod. A small number of members, however, headed by Dr. Thomas M'Crie, protested against the New Testimony as embodying, in their view, important deviations from the original principles of the first seceders.

When at length the Narrative and  Testimony came to be enacted as a term of communion, Dr. M'Crie, and the brethren who adhered to his sentiments, felt that it was difficult for them conscientiously to remain in communion with the synod. They were most reluctant to separate from their brethren, and accordingly they retained their position in connection with the body for two years after the New Testimony had been adopted by the synod. At length the four brethren, Messrs. Bruce, Aitken, Hogg, and M'Crie, finding that they could no longer content themselves with mere unavailing protests against the doings of the synod, solemnly separated from the body, and constituted themselves into a presbytery, under the designation of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery. But though they had taken this important step, they did not consider it prudent to make a public announcement of their meeting until they had full time to publish the reasons for the course they had adopted. Yet, as they did not affect secrecy in the matter, intelligence of the movement reached the General Associate Synod, then sitting in Glasgow, which accordingly, without the formalities of a legal trial, deposed and excommunicated Dr. M'Crie. The points of difference between the original Secession Testimony and the “Narrative and Testimony” which led to the secession of the four protesters and the formation of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery cannot be better stated than in the following extract from the explanatory address which Dr. M'Crie delivered at the time to his own congregation:

“The New Testimony expressly asserts that the power competent to worldly kingdoms is to be viewed as respecting only the secular interests of society, in distinction from their religious interests. It is easy to see that this principle not only tends to exclude nations and their rulers from all interference with religion, from employing their power for promoting a religions reformation and advancing the kingdom of Christ, but also virtually condemns what the rulers of this, land did in former times of reformation), which the original Testimony did bear witness to as a work of God. Accordingly this reformation is viewed as a mere ecclesiastical reformation; and the laws made by a reforming Parliament, etc., in so far as they recognized, ratified, and established the Reformed religion, are either omitted, glossed over, or explained away. In the account of the first Reformation the abolition of the laws inl favor of popery is mentioned, but a total and designed silence is observed respecting all the laws made in favor of the Protestant Confession and Discipline, by which the nation in its most public capacity stated itself to be on the side of Christ's cause; and  eves the famous deed of civil constitution; settled on a reformed footing in 1592, is buried and forgotten. The same thing is observable in the account of the second Reformation. On one occasion it is said that the king gave his consent to such acts as were thought necessary for securing the civil and religious rights of the nation, without saying whether they were right or wrong. But all the other laws of the reforming parliaments during the period, which were specified and approved in the former papers of the secession, and even the settlement of the civil constitution in 1649, which was formerly considered as the crowning part of Scotland's Reformation and liberties, is passed over without mention or testimony. Even that wicked act of the Scottish Parliament after the restoration of Charles II., by which all the laws establishing and ratifying the Presbyterian religion' and covenants were rescinded, is passed over in its proper place in the acknowledgment of sins, and when it is mentioned is condemned with reserve; nor was this done inadvertently, for if the Presbyterian religion ought not to have been established by law, it is not easy to condemn a Parliament for rescinding that establishment.

“Another point which has been in controversy is the national obligation of the religions covenants entered into in this land. The doctrine of the New Testimony is that ‘religions covenanting is entirely an ecclesiastical duty;' that persons 'enter into it as members of the Church, and not as members of the State;' that those invested with civil power have no other concerne with it than as Church members; and accordingly it restricts the obligation of the covenants of this land to persons of all ranks only in their spiritual character and as Church members. But it cannot admit of a doubt that the National and Solemn League and Covenant were national oaths in the most proper sense of the word; that they were intended as such by those who framed them, and that they were thus interpreted by the three kingdoms; the civil rulers entering into them, enacting them, and setting them forward in their public capacity, as well as the ecclesiastical. And the uniform opinions of Presbyterians from the time they were taken has been that they are binding in a national as well as ecclesiastical point of view. I shall only produce the testimony of one respectable Writer (principal Forrester): “The binding force'' says he, “of these engagements appears in the subjects they affect; as, first, our Church in her representatives, and, in their most public capacity, the general assemblies in both nations: second, the state representatives and parliaments. Thus all assurances are given that either civil or ecclesiastical laws can afford; and the public faith of Church and  State, is plighted with inviolable ties, so that they must stand while we have a Church or State in Scotland. Both as men and as Christians, as members of the Church and State, under either a religions or civil consideration, we stand hereby inviolabliy endangered; and not only representatives, bult also the incorporations (or body) of Church and State are under the same. On this broad ground have Presbyterians stated the obligation of the covenants of this kind. And why should they not? Why should we seek tomorrow their obligation? Are we afraid that these lands should be too closely bound to the Lord?

If religious covenanting be a moral duty, if oaths and vows are founded in the light of nature as well as in the Word of God, why should ot men be capable of entering into them, and of being bound by them in every character in which they are placed under the moral government of God, as men and as Christians, as members of the Church and of the State, whenever there is a call to enter into such covenants as have respect to all these characters, as was the case in the covenants of our ancestors, which seceders have witnessed for and formally renewed? In the former Testimony witness was expressly borne to the national obligation of these covenants. In speaking of the National Covenant, it says, 'By this solemn oath and covenant this kingdom made a national surrender of themselves unto the Lord.' It declares that the Solemn League and Covenant was entered into and is binding upon the three kingdoms; that both of them are binding upon the Church and lands, and the Church and nations. The deed of civil constitutions is said to have been settled in consequence of the most solemn covenant engagements, and the rescinding of the law in favor of the true religion is testified against as an act of national perjury.

Yet by the New Testitmony, all are bound to declare that religions covenanting is entirely an ecclesiastical duty, and binding only on the Church and her members, as such; and that those invested with civil power have no other concern with it but as Church members. Is it any wonder that there should be seceders who cannot submit to receive such doctrine? The time will come when it will be matter of astonishment that so few have appeared in such a cause, and that those who have appeared, should have been borne down, opposed, and spoken against. It is not a matter of small moment to restrict the obligation of solemn oaths, the breach of which is chargeable upon a land, or to explain away any part of that obligation. The quarrel of God's covenant is not yet thoroughly pleaded by him against these guilty and apostatizing lands, and all that have any due sense of the inviolable obligation of them should tremble at touching or enervating them in the smallest point.”  At the request of the brethren Dr. M'Crie drew up and published a paper explanatory of the principles involved in the controversy which had led to the breach. This work appeared in April, 1807, and was regarded by those who took an interest in the subject as exhibiting a very satisfactory view of the principles of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery. But, however able, this treatise attracted little attention at the time, although copies of it. were eagerly sought many years after, when the Voluntary Controversy engrossed much of the public interest. The Constitutional Presbytery continued steadfastly to maintain their principles, along with the small number of people who adhered to them, and from all who sought to join them they required an explicit avowal of adherence to the principles of the secession as contained in the original Testimony. For twenty-one years the brethren prosecuted their work and held fast their principles in much harmony and peace with one another, and to the great edification of the flocks committed to their care. In 1827 a change took place in their ecclesiastical position, a cordial union having been effected between the Constitutional Presbytery and the Associate Synod of Protesters, under the name of the Associate Synod of Original Seceders. SEE ORIGINAL SECEDERS (ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF).

## Original Burghers[[@Headword:Original Burghers]]

             is the name of that body of secessionists from the Scotch Establishment who in the schism of 1747 remained steadfast to the oath obligation, and favored the National Establishment, though they did not form a part of it. SEE ANTIBURGHERS.

In the agitation regarding the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion, and the binding obligation of the covenants upon posterity, towards the close of the 18th century, the Associate General (Antiburgher) Synod had deemed it necessary to remodel the whole of their testimony, a proceeding which led to the formation of the Original Antiburghers (q.v.). The Associate (Burgher) Synod, however, did not proceed so far as to remodel their Testimony, but simply prefixed to the formula of questions proposed to candidates for license or for ordination a problem or explanatory statement not requiring an approbation of compulsory measures in matters of religion, and, in reference to the covenants, admitting their obligation on posterity, without defining either the nature or extent of the obligation. The introduction of this preamble gave rise to a violent controversy in the Associate (Burgher). Synod, which commenced in 7195, and has usually been known by the name of the Formula Controversy. The utmost keenless and even 'violence'  characterized both parties in the contention, the opponents of the preamble declaring that it involved a manifest departure from the doctrines of the original standards of the secession, while its favorers contended with equal vehemence that the same statements as those which were now objected to had already been given forth more than once by the Church courts of the secession. At several successive meetings of the synod the adoption of the preamble was strenuously resisted, but at length, in 1799, it was agreed to in the following terms:

“That whereas some parts of the standard of this synod have been interpreted as' favoring compulsory measures in religion, the synod hereby declare that they do not require an approbation of any such principle from any candidate for license or ordination. And whereas a controversy has arisen among us respecting the nature and kind of the obligation of our solemn covenants on posterity — whether it be entirely of the same kind upon us as upon, our ancestors who swore them the synod hereby declare that, while they hold the obligation of our covenants upon posterity, they do not interfere with that controversy which has arisen respecting the nature and kind of it; and recommend it to all their members to suppress that controversy as tending to a general strife rather than godly edifying.”

The adoption of this preamble having been decided upon by a large majority of the synod, Messrs. William Fletcher, William Taylor, and William Watson, ministers, with ten elders, dissented from this decision; and Mr. Willis gave in the following protestation, to which Mr. Ebenezer Hyslop and two elders adhered:

“I protest in my own name, and in the name of ail ministers, elders, and private Christians who adhere to this protest, that as the synod has obstinately refused to remove the preamble prefixed to the Formula, and declare their simple and unqualified adherence to our principles I will no more acknowledge them as over me in the Lord until they return to their principles.” Messrs. Willis and Hyslop having thus, in the very terms of their protest, declared themselves no longer in connection with the synod, their names were erased from the roll; and those who adhered to them were declared to have cut themselves off from the communion, of the Associate body. Accordingly, on Oct. 2, 1799, the two brethren who had thus  renounced the authority of the synod met at Glasgow, along with William Watson, minister to Kilpatrick, and solemnly constituted themselves into a presbytery, under the name of the Associate Presbytery. This was the commencement of that section of the secession formerly known by the name of “Old Light” or “Original Burghers.” In the course of the following year the brethren who had thus separated themselves from the Associate Burgher Synod were joined by several additional ministers, who sympathized with them in their views of the preamble as being fan abandonment of secession principles. Gradually the new presbytery increased in numbers until, in 1805, they had risen by ordinations and accessions to fifteen. They now constituted themselves into a synod, under the name of the “Associate Synod;” but the name by which they have been usually known is the Original Burgher Synod. In vindication as well as explanation of their principles, they republished the “Act, Declaration, and Testimony” of the Secession Church. They also published, in a separate pamphlet, an Appendix of the Testimony, containing “A Narrative of the origin, progress, and consequences of late innovations of the Secession, with a Continuation of that Testimony to the present time.”

In course of time a union was proposed to be effected between the Original Burgher and Original Antiburgher sections of the secession, and, with a view to accomplishing an object so desirable, a correspondence was entered into between the synods of the two denominations, committees were appointed, and conferences held to arrange the terms of union. But the negotiations, though continued for some time, were fruitless, and the project of union was abandoned. In 1837 a formal application was made by the Original Burgher Synod to be admitted to communion with the Established Church of Scotland. The proposal was favorably entertained by the General Assembly and a committee was appointed to cope with a committee of the Original Burgher Synod and to discuss the terms of union. The negotiations were abducted in the most amicable manner; and a General Assembly having transmitted an overture to presbyteries on the subject, the union was approved, and in 1840 the majority of the Original Burghet Synod became merged in the National Church of Scotland. A small minority of the synod declined to accede to the union, preferring to maintain a separate position, and to adhere to the secession Testimony, still retaining the name of the Associate or Original Burgher Synod. On May  18, 1842, most of the Original Burghers who remained after their brethren had joined the Established Church, united with the synod of Original Seceders, henceforth to form one association for the support of the covenanted Reformation in the kingdoms, under the name of Synod of United Original Seceders. It had previously been agreed that the Testimony adopted by the Synod of Original Seceders in 1827, with the insertion in it of the alterations rendered necessary by the union, was to be held as the Testimony of the United Synod, and made a term of religions fellowship in the body. The Synod of Original Burghers was understood to approve of the acknowledgment of sins and bond appended to: the Testimony, and it was agreed to by the Synod of Original Seceders that the question of the formula regarding the burgess-oath should be dropped. On these conditions the union was effected, and the Synod of Original Burghers as then constituted ceased to exist.

At the present time, however, there appear to remain in existence twenty- seven. congregations of Original Burghers. They have arranged upon the preliminaries for union with a small body in Ireland holding identical views, and calling themselves the Associate Secession Synod. This body consists of only eleven congregations. These Original Burghers have to this day continued consistently to maintain the views upon which the secession was at its origin based. They strongly vindicate the duty and necessity of national religion, and are therefore in favor of national establishments in opposition to the United Presbyterians and other advocates of the voluntary system. They are consequently also opposed to schemes for reunion among all Presbyterians, as these would involve the admission of voluntaryism in making the principle of establishment an open question. But their establishment must be one which is based upon the Solemn League and Covenant, which was declared to be binding at the union of the two bodies in 1840, and in 1866 was solemnly renewed by the synod. They are Calvinists of the strictest type, holding the doctrine of a limited atonement that Christ suffered only for the elect. They are opposed to the use of hymns and instrumental music in public worship. The Original Secession Magazine, a periodical which appears once in two months; is the authorized organ of the views and proceedings of the synod. See Original Secession Magazine; Oliver and Boyd's ‘Edinb. Almanac; Marsdeni, Hist. of Churches and Sects, ii 293 sq.; Gardner, Faiths of the, World, vol. ii, s.v.; and the references under SEE SCOTLAND and SEE SCOTCH PRESBYTERIANISM.

## Original Seceders (1) (Associate Synod Of)[[@Headword:Original Seceders (1) (Associate Synod Of)]]

             is the name of a body of Scotch Presbyterians who originated in 1827 by union of what was then the Constitutional Associate Presbytery and the Associate (Antiburgher): Synod, now generally known as Protesters (q.v.) because they took exception in 1820 to the Basis of Union between the two great branches of the secession. SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE PRESBYTERIANISM IN SCOTLAND.

The articles agreed upon as such a basis were drawn up by Dr. M'Crie, on the one side, and Prof. Paxton on the other. The Testimony, which was enacted as a term of fellowship, ministerial and Christian, in the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, was drawn up in the historical part by Dr. M'Crie, and nowhere do we find a more noble, luminous, and satisfactory view of the true Seceders, and of their contendings for the Reformation in a state of secession. Dr. M'Crie shows that the four brethren who formed the first Seceders, though soon after this deed of secession they formed themselves into a presbytery (Dec. 6, 1733), still for some time acted in an extra- judicial capacity, and in this capacity they issued, in 1734, a “Testimony for the Principles of the Reform Church of Scotland.” It was not, indeed, until two years more had elapsed that they resolved to act in a judicative capacity, and accordingly, in December, 1736, they published their judicial Testimony to the principles and proceedings of the Church of Scotland, and against the course of defection from them. This Testimony, as Dr. M'Crie shows, was not limited to those evils which had formed the immediate ground of secession, but included others also of a prior date, the condemnation of which entered into the Testimony which the faithful party in the Church had all along borne. The whole of that Testimony they carried along with them to a state of secession. In prosecuting their Testimony, they deemed it their solemn duty to renew the national covenants, the neglect of which had often been complained of in the Established Church since the Revolution. The points of difference between the Original Seceders and the Cameronians or Reform Presbyterians are thus admirably sketched by Dr. M'Crie in the historical part of the Testimony of 1827:

“1. We acknowledge that the fundamental deed of constitution in our reforming period, in all moral aspects, is essentially unalterable, because of its agreeableness to the Divine will revealed in the Scriptures, and because it was attained to and fixed in the presence of our solemn covenants; and that the, nation sinned in overthrowing it.

2. We condemn the conduct of the nation at the Revolution in leaving the Reformed Constitution buried and neglected; and in not looking out for magistrates who should concur with them in the maintenance of true religion, as formerly settled, and rule them by laws subservient to its advancement.

3. We condemn not only the conduct of England and Ireland, at that period, in retaining episcopacy, but also the conduct of Scotland in not reminding them of their obligations, and in every way competent exciting them to reformation, conformably to a prior treaty and covenant; and particularly the consent which this kingdom gave at the union to the perpetual continuance of episcopacy in England, with all that flowed from this and partakes of its sinful character.

4. We condemn the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown as established by laws in England and Ireland and all the assumed exercise of it in Scotland, particularly by dissolving the assemblies of the Church, and claiming the sole right of appointing fasts and thanksgivings, together with the practical compliances with it on the part of Church courts or ministers in the discharge of their public office.

5. We condemn the abjuration-oath, and other oaths which, either in express terms or by just implication, approve of the complex constitution.

6. We consider that there is a great difference between the arbitrary and tyrannical government of the persecuting period and that which has existed since the Revolution, which was established with the cordial consent of the great body of the nation, and in consequence of a claim of right made by the representatives of the people, and acknowledged by the rulers; who, although they want (as the nation does) many of the qualifications which they ought to possess: according to. the Word of God and our covenants, yet perform the essential duties of magistratical office by maintaining justice, peace, and order to the glory of God, and protecting us in the enjoyment of our liberties and the free exercise of our religion. Lastly, holding these views, and endeavoring to act according to them, we can, without dropping our testimony in behalf of a former reforming period, or approving of any of the evils which cleave to the constitution or administration of the state, acknowledge the present civil government, and yield obedience to all  its lawful commands, not for wrath but for conscience sake; and in doing so we have this advantage, that we avoid the danger of partially disregarding the numerous precepts respecting the obedience to magistrates contained in the Bible — we have no need to have recourse to gloss upon these, which, if applied to other precepts running in the same strain, would tend to loosen all the relations of civil life — and we act in unison with the principles and practice of the Christians of the first ages who lived under heathen or Arian emperors; of Protestants who have lived under popish princes; of our reforming fathers in Scotland under queen Mary, and of their successors during the first establishment of episcopacy, and after the Restoration down to the- time at which the government degenerated into an open and avowed tyranny.”

On the question as to the lawfulness of taking the burgess-oath, which so early as 1747 rent the secession body into two sections, the Original Seceders avowed in their Testimony a decided coincidence in statement with the Antiburghers. This is plain from the following explanations given by Dr. M'Crie, in which the religious clause in the oath is shown to be inconsistent with the secession Testimony:

“

1. As it is a matter of great importance to swear by the great name of God, so the utmost caution should be taken to ascertains the lawfulness of any oath which we are required to take; and it is the duty of ministers and Church courts to give direction and warning to their people ins such cases, especially when the oath embraces a profession of religion, and more especially when the persons required to take it are already under the obligation of another oath sanctioning an explicit profession of religion, in consequence of which they may be in danger of involving themselves in contradictory engagements.

2. We cannot be understood as objecting to the clause in question on account of its requiring an adherence to the true religion, and in an abstract view of it as determined by the standard of the Scriptures (if it could be understood in that sense), in opposition to the Romish, which is renounced, or an adherence to the Confession of Faith, and any part of the standards compiled for uniformity in the former Reformation, so far a these are still approved of by the acts of the Church- of Scotland, and authorized by the laws. In these respects we account the Revolution settlement and the present laws a privilege, and agree to all  which the Associate Presbytery thankfully expressed in commendation of them in their Testimony, and in the declaration and defense of their principles concerning the present civil government.

3. The profession of religion required by the burgess-oath is of a different kind. If this were not the case, and if it referred only to the true religion in the abstract, and every swearer were left to understand this according to his own views, the oath would not serve the purpose of a test, nor answer the design of the imposer. The Romish religion is specially renounced; but there is also a positive part in the clause, specifying in the religion professed in this realm and authorized by the laws of the land; while the word presently will not admit of its applying to any professions different from that which is made and authorized at the time when the oath is sworn.

4. The profession of the true religion made by Seceders, agreeing with that which was made in this country in and authorized by the laws between 1638 and 1650, is different from, and in some important points inconsistent with that profession which is presently made by the nation and authorized by the laws of the land. The judicial Testimony finds fault with the national profession and settlement made at the Revolution, both materially and formally considered, and condemns the state for excluding, in its laws authorizing religion, the divine right of presbytery and the intrinsic power of the Church — two special branches of the glorious leadership of the Redeemer over his spiritual kingdoms — and for leaving the covenanted reformation and the covenants under rescissory laws; while it condemns the Church for not asserting these important parts of religion and reformation. On these grounds we cannot but look upon the religions clause in question as inconsistent with the secession Testimony; and accordingly must disapprove of the decision of the synod commended in the swearing of it by Seceders.

5. As that which brought matters to an extremity, and divided the body, was a vote declaring that all might swear that oath, while at the same time it was condemned as unlawful, we cannot help being of opinion that this held ont a dangerous precedent to Church courts to give a judicial toleration or allowance to do what they declare to be sinful; but provided this were disclaimed, and proper measures taken to prevent the oath from being sworn in the body for the future, and as the use of  the oath has been laid aside in most burghs, we would hope that such an arrangement may be made, so far as regards this question, as will be at once agreeable to truth and not hurtful to the conscience of any. With respect to the censures which were inflicted, and which had no small influence in embittering the dispute, we think it sufficient to say that they were transient acts of ill discipline, aid that no approbation of them was ever required from. ministers or people. If any difference of opinion as to the nature or effects of Church censure exist, it may be removed by an amicable conference.''

At the formation of the United Secession Church, in 1820, by the union of the “Associate (Burgher) Synod” and the “General Associate (Antiburgher) Synod,” a number of ministers belonging to the latter body protested against the Basis of Union. And one of them formed themselves into a separate court, under the name of Associate Synod. This body of Protesters, as they were generally called, having merged themselves in 1827 in the body which took the name of the Synod of Original Seceders, it was only befitting that the Testimony then issued should speak in decided language on the defects of the Basis of Union, which led the Protesters to occupy a separate position. Dr. M'Crie accordingly thus details the chief points protested against:

1. The Basis is not laid on an adherence to the covenanted Reformation and Reformed principles of the Church of Scotland. In seceding from the established jurisdictions, our fathers, as we have seen, espoused that cause; declared their adherence to the Westminster standards as parts of the uniformity in religion for the three nations; declared the obligation which the ranks in them were under to adhere to these by the oath of God; testified against several important defects in the Revolution settlement of religion; and traced the recent corruptions of which they complain to a progressive departure from the purity obtained in the second period of Reformation. The United Synod, on the contrary, proceeds in the Basis on the supposition that the Revolution settlement was faultless — agreeably to it they receive the Westminster Conference and Catechisms, not as subordinate standards of uniformity for the three nations, but merely (to use their own words) 'as the confession of our faith, expressive of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures;' they exclude entirely from. their Basis the propositions concerning the Church government and the Directory for public worship drawn up by the Westminister Assembly; and they merely recognize presbytery as the only form of government which  they acknowledge as founded upon the Word of God, although the first Seceders, in their Testimony, condemned the Church at the Revolution for not asserting expressly the divine right of the Presbyterian government. Besides, the exception which they made to the confessions and catechisms is expressed in such a manner as to give countenance to an unwarranted stigma on these standards as teaching persecuting principles: and as it was well known that this was offensive to not a few, by agreeing to it they on that matter perpetrated two divisions in attempting to heal one.

2. The testimony to the continued obligation of the National Covenant and the Solemn League is dropped. These deeds are not so much as named in the Basis. When the United Synod approved of the method adopted by our reforming ancestors for mutual excitement and encouragement, by solemn confederation and vows to God, this can never be considered as a recognition of the present and continued obligation of our national covenants; and still less can we regard in this light the following declaration, including all they say on the subject: ‘We acknowledge that we are under high obligations to maintain and promote the work of reformation begun and to great extent carried on by them.'

3. Though the morality of public religious covenanting is admitted by the Basis, yet the present seasonableness of it is not asserted; any provision made for the practice of it is totally irreconcilable with the Presbyterian principles, being adapted only to covenanting on the plan of the Congregationalists or Independents, and not for confining the conforming the profession of the united body; and in the bond transmitted by the general synod, and registered by the general synod, and to be taken by, those who choose all idea of the renovation of the covenants of our ancestors is set aside, and the recognition of their obligations, formally made, is expounded.

4. By adoption the Basis, any testimony which had been formerly borne against sinful oaths, and other practical evils inconsistent with pure religion and a scriptural and consistent profession of it, was dropped; and all barriers against the practice of what is called free communion, which has become so general and fashionable, are removed.

5. With respect to the burgess-oath, we have already expressed our views, and candidly stated what we judge to best way of accommodating the difference which is occasioned in the Associate Body. Of the method adopted for this purpose in the Basis we shall only say that, while. on the  one hand, by making no provision fair preventing the sealing of an oath, which all along has been viewed as sinful by one half of the secession, it tends to bring all contending against public evils, and for purity of communion, into discredit with the genernation; so, oan the other hand, by providing that all in the united body shall carefully abstain from agitating the questions which occasioned the breach, it retains ministerial and Christian liberty in testifying against sin, and on that matter absolves the ministers and elders of one of the synods from an express article in their ordination vows.” At the meeting of the synod in 1828, the Original Seceders enacted that all the ministers of their body, together with the preachers and students of divinity under their inspection, should enter into the bond for renewing the covenants at Edinburgh on the 18th of the following September. Two years thereafter the synod authorized a committee of their number to prepare and publish an address to their people on the duty of public covenanting and on practical religion. In 1832 a controversy arose in Scotland, which is usually known by the name of Voluntary Controversy (q.v.), involving important principles touching the duty of nations and their rulers to recognize, countenance, and support the true religion. In the heat of the controversy, the Synod of Original Seceders deemed it right to issue an address on the subject. This production, entitled “Vindication of the Principles of the Church of Scotland, in Relation to the Questions presently agitated,” was published in 1834. It condemned the voluntary system on various grounds:

1, On account of its atheistical character and tendency;

2, as at variance with sound policy;

3, as unscriptural;

4, as directly opposed to one important design of supernatural relations — the improvement of human society;

5, as striking at the foundation of God's moral government, so far as regards nations or bodies politic.

While thus maintaining in the strongest and most decided manner the principles of establishments in opposition to the voluntary principle, the Originial Seceders took occasion, in the course of the same pamphlet, to lay down with equal distinctness the ground on which they felt themselves  excluded from all prospect of an immediate return to the communion of the Established Church.

“Our objections,” they say, “to the Established Church of Scotland are not confined to the administration: we cannot unreservedly approve of her constitution as it is established in the Revolution. Though our fathers were in communion with that Church, yet they, together with many faithful men who died before the secession, and some who continued in the Establishment after that event, were all along dissatisfied with several things in the settlement of religion at the Revolution, and in the ratification of it at the union between Scotland and England. The first Seceders, in their 'Judicial Testimony and Declaration of Principles,' specified several important points,with respect to which that settlement involved a sinful departure from the previous settlement of religion in Scotland (that, namely, between 1638 and 1650), which they distinctly held forth as exhibiting the model, in point of scriptural purity and order, of that reformed constitution to which they sought by their contending to bring back the Church of their native land. This synod occupy the same ground with the first seceders. They are aware that the Established Church of Scotland has it not in her power to correct all the evils of the Revolution settlement which they feel themselves bound to point out; but they cannot warrantably quit their position of secession until the Established Church shows a disposition to return to that former constitution by using metans to correct what is inconsistent with her, in the use of those powers which belong to her as an ecclesiastical and independent society under Christ, her Head, and by due application to the state for having those laws rescinded or altered which affect her purity and abridge her freedom. It will be found, on a careful and candid examination that a great part of the evils, in point of administration, which are chargeable on the Church of Scotland may be traced, directly or indirectly, to the defects and errors cleaving to her establishment at the Revolution; and as it is her duty, so it will be her safety seriously to consider these, and, following the direction of, Scripture and the example of our reforming ancestors, to confess them before God, and seek for their removal.”

The evils to which the document here refers were chiefly a want of a formal recognition of the national covenants, of the divine right of presbytery, and of the spiritual independence of the Church.  The year in which the “Vindication” appeared formed an important aera in the history of the Established Church. of Scotland, since from that date commenced that line of policy in the General Assembly which resulted at length in the disruption in 1843. It was not to be expected that the Original Seceders, feeling, as they did, a lively. interest in every movement of the National Church, could look with indifference on the crisis of her history upon which she was entering. In the following year, accordingly, a pamphlet was drawn up, remarkable as being the last production which issued from the pen of the venerable Dr. M'Crie, entitled “Reasons of a Fast,” appointed by the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, and containing several remarkable allusions to the peculiar circumstances of the Church of Scotland. Nor were such allusions inappropriate or. unreasonable. From that period the struggles of the Established Church to maintain spiritual independence, and to protect the rights of Christian people against the intrusion of unacceptable ministers, became the all- engrossing subject of attention in Scotland. The views of the Original Seceders were in harmony with the majority of the General Assembly; and the important proceedings from year to year of that venerable court were watched with deep and ever-increasing anxiety. At length, in 1842, a change took place in the position of the Original Seceders, a union having been formed between that body. and the Associate Synod, commonly called the Synod of Original Burghers, which gave rise to a new denomination, entitled the Synod of United Original Seceders (see next article).

## Original Seceders (2) (Synod Of United)[[@Headword:Original Seceders (2) (Synod Of United)]]

             is that body of Scotch Presbyterians organized in 1842, as was seen in preceding article, by union of the Synod of Original Burghers with the Synod of Original Seceders. Previous to the final act for this union it had been agreed that the Testimony adopted by the Synod of Original Seceders in 1827, with the insertion in it of several alterations rendered necessary by the union, should be taken as the Testimony of the United Synod. One important alteration agreed to by the Synod of Original Seceders was that the question in the formula regarding the burgess-oath should be dropped. To understand the position which the United body of Original Seceders occupied after the union, it must be borne in mind that the Testimony of 1827, which was drawn up in its historical part by Dr. M'Crie, was essentially Antiburgher in its whole nature and bearings. This element was dropped in the Testimony of 1842, and thus the character of the.  Testimony underwent an important change. On this the united body gave the following explanation in the historical part of the Testimony of 1842: “The Synod of Original Seceders, in their Testimony, published in 1827, after stating their reasons for not continuing to approve of the decision condemning the swearing of the oath by seceders, suggest it as their opinion that an agreement might be made of the subject of difference which would be at once agreeable to truth and not hurtful to the conscience of any.”

This suggestion was readily and cordially met by the Synod of Original Burghers, and joint measures were in consequence adopted, with the view of ascertaining the practicability of such an arrangement. In concluding the negotiation, both parties proceeded on the principle that, desirable as union is, if the reality of the thing is sought, and not the appearance merely, this would be secured more effectually, and with more safety to truth, by candid explanations on the points of question, than by studiously avoiding the agitation of them — a plan which, while it makes greater pretensions to charity and peace, lays a ground for subsequent irritation and dissension. “In the course of explanation, it was found that the only difference of opinion between the two bodies related to the exact meaning and necessary application of certain terms of the oath, which, as the question originally came before the session courts as a question of practice, did not appear to be an insuperable obstacle to a spiritual adjustment of the dispute. After repeated conferences, it was satisfactorily ascertained that the members of both synods were agreed on all points with the judicial Testimony of the first Seceders, particularly in its approval of the profession of religion made in this country, and authorized by the laws between 1638 and 1650, on the one hand, and its disapproval of the defects in the settlement of religion made at the Revolution on the other. Encouraged by this harmony of settlement as to the great cause of reformation, so much forgotten and so keenly opposed from various quarters in the present time. and feeling deeply the solemn obligations under which they in common lie to support and advance that cause; and the burgess-oath, the original ground of separation, being now in the providence of God, abolished, and both parties having now for various reasons seen it to be their duty to refrain from swearing that oath, shall it be re-enacted? the two synods agreed to unite upon the following explanatory declarations and resolutions, calculating, in their judgment, to remove the bars in the way of harmonious fellowship: and cooperation, and to prevent, through the blessing of God, the recurrence of any similar difference in future:

1. That when the Church of Christ is in danger from adversaries who hold persecuting principles, or who are employing violence or insidious arts to overturn it, the legislature of a country may warrantably exact an oath from those who are admitted to official and influential stations calculated for the security of the true religion; and that, in these circumstances, it is lawful and proper to swear.

2. That no Christian, without committing sin, can on any consideration swear to maintain or defend any known or acknowledged corruption or defect in the profession or establishment of religion.

3. That a public oath can only be taken according to the declared, and known sense of the legislature or enacting authority, and no person is warranted to swear it in a sense of his own, contrary to the former. 4. That no Church court can warrantably give a judicial toleration or allowance to do what they declare to be sinful, or what there is sufficient evidence from the Word of God is sinful.'“

Those who hold high Antiburgher views maintain that the ruling element of the Original Secession Testimony of 1827 involves the decision come to by the Antiburgher party of the secession in 1746, viz. that “those of the secession cannot safely of conscience and without sin swear any burgess- oath with the said religious clause: while matters, with reference to the profession and settlement of religion, continue in such circumstances as at present; and particularly that it does not agree unto or consist with an entering-into the bond for receiving our solemn covenants.” So strongly did the Antiburgher Synod of that time regard this decision as virtually comprehending the whole secession clause, that they declared that the Burghers who had opposed this decision “had materially dropped the whole Testimony among their hands, allowing of, at least for a time, a material abjuration thereof.” Thus it is plain that the Antiburgher Synod made the decision of 1746, in regard to the burgess-oath, the exponent of the judicial Testimony, as well as of the declinature and the act of renewing the covenants. Hence the Original Seceders, in uniting with the Original Burghers, and adopting the Testimony of 1842, might be regarded as acting in opposition to the decision of 1746, which was the ruling expository element of the Testimony of 1827. Another peculiarity which distinguished the secession Testimony was the formal recognition and actual renewing of the covenants. To this peculiarity the original secession body steadfastly adhered, allowing no student to be licensed and no  probationer to be ordained who had not previously joined the bond, or solemnly promised that he would so on the very first opportunity that offered. The descending obligation of the covenants was distinctly maintained according to the Testimony in 1827, and the same doctrine as avowed also by the United Original Seceders in their Testimony of 1842. In this respect they were only following in the steps of the first seceders, who had no sooner broken off their connection with the Established Church of that day than they fell back upon the Church of the former period, and proceeded to identify their cause with that of the Reformed Covenanted Church, and this they did by actually renewing the covenants. By their act relating to this subject, published in 1743, “they considered the swearing of the bond was called for and rendered necessary by the strong tide of defection from the Reformation cause which had set in,” and that by so acting they would make themselves heirs to the vows of their fathers.

Dr. M'Crie accordingly, in referring to this part of the history of the first seceders, tells us in the historical part of the Testimony of 1827: “The ministers having entered into the bond, measures were taken for having it administered to the people in their respective congregations; and at a subsequent period (1744) they agreed that all who were admitted to the ministry should previously have joined in renewing. the covenants, while such as opposed or slighted the duty should not be admitted to sealing ordinances.” Thus both the formal recognition and the actual renewing of the covenants came to be necessary terms of fellowship in the early Secession Church. The work of renewing the covenants had, in the summer of 1744, been gone through in only two settled congregations, when a stop was put to it by the synod having forced upon it the settlement of the question, “Whether those in communion with them could warrantably and consistently swear the following clause in some burgess- oaths: 'Here I protest, before God and your lordships, that I profess and allow with my heart the true religion professed within this realm, and authorized by the laws thereof.” The question involved in swearing the burgess-oath respected the character of the Revolution settlement or legally authorized profession of religion. It was on this point that the secession body became divided into two conflicting synods. From the Testimony of 1827 it is plain that the Original Seceders regarded both the principle and practice as inherited by them from the first seceders. Nor does there seem to be any moral difference between the Testimony of 1827 and that of the United Original. Seceders in 1842, insofar as regards the question as to the descending obligation of the covenants. But in the latter Testimony a  clause occurs which seems to indicate a somewhat modified view of the necessity of actually renewing the covenants. The clause in question reads thus: “It is also agreed that while all proper means are used for stirring up and preparing the people of their respective congregations to engage in this important and seasonable duty, there shall be no undue haste in those congregations where it has not been formerly practiced.” The clause marked in italics is not found in the Testimony of 1827, and must therefore be considered as one of those alterations in the Testimony of the Original Seceders which was deemed necessary in order to the accomplishment of the union of the Original Burghers.

The year which succeeded the formation of the Synod of Original Seceders was the year of the disruption of the Established Church of Scotland, an event which was one of deepest interest to the Christians of Scotland, if not of the world, but more especially to the representatives of the first seceders. The formation of the Free Church of Scotland, in a state of entire independence of all state interference and professing untraveled to prosecute the great ends of Christ's Church, submissive to the guidance and authority of her Great Head alone, was hailed by the newly formed body of United Original Seceders as realizing the wishes, the hopes, and the prayers of their forefathers, who had concluded the protest which formed the basis of the secession in these remarkable words: “And we hereby appeal unto the first free, faithful, and reforming General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.” As years passed on, after the memorable events of 1843, the conviction was growing stronger and stronger in the minds of many both of the ministers and people of the United Original Seceders that in the Assembly of the Free Church they could recognize the General Assembly to which the first fathers of the secession appealed, and that therefore the time had come when the protest of. Nov. 16, 1733, must be fallen from. At length it was resolved in the synod of the body to lodge a representation and appeal on the table of the Free Church Assembly, with a view to the coalescing of the two bodies. The union thus sought was accomplished in May, 1852, on the express understanding that the brethren of the United Original Secession Synod who thus applied for admission into the Free Church of Scotland should be allowed to retain their peculiar views as to the descending obligation of the covenants, while at the same time the Free Church did not commit itself, directly or indirectly, in any way, either to a positive or negative opinion upon these views. Several ministers and congregations connected with the United Original Seceders eftsed to  accede to the union with the Free Church, and preferred to remain in their former position; and accordingly a small body of Christians still exists holding the principles and calling, themselves by the name of the United Original Seceders. One congregation of Original Seceders in Edinburgh, under the ministry of the Rev. James Wright, with not a few adherents in various parts of the country, disclaims all connection with those who adhered to the Testimony of 1842, and professes to hold by the Testimony of 1827, thus claiming, in the principles which they avow, to represent the first seceders in so far as in the advanced state of the secession cause they held their principles to be identical with those of the Reformed Covenanted Church of Scotland. See Marsden, Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects, ii, 290 sq.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, ii, s.v.; Hetherington, Hist. of the Church of Scotland, p. 352, 361; Stanley, Lect. on the Hist. of the Church of Scotland, lect. ii Sq.; and the authorities quoted in the article. SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE PRESBYTERIANISM IN SCOTLAND.

## Original Sin[[@Headword:Original Sin]]

             This expression is frequently used in a twofold sense, to denote the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, and also that native depravity which we have derived by inheritance from our first parents. The first view of the subject — the imputation of Adam's first sin — has already been considered under the articles SEE IMPUTATION and SEE HOPKINSIANS. According to the second view we came into the world, in consequence of the sin of Adam, in a state of depravity. On this point the Westminster Confession of Faith explicitly declares: “By this sin,” referring to the sin of our first parents, “they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of the soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation.” Again, in another article the Confession teaches: “Man, by his fall into a state of sin, has wholly lost all ability to any spiritual good accompanying salvation, so that a natural man, being altogether averse from that good and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or prepare himself thereunto.” This doctrine pervades the whole of the sacred writings, and may be called indeed a fundamental and essential truth of revelation. Thus before the flood we find the inspired penman declaring (Gen 6:5): “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the  thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” Again, after the flood, the same statement is repeated (Gen 8:21): “The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth.” David also (Psa 51:5) declares: “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.” The original and innate depravity of man might be deduced from the doctrine of Scripture respecting the necessity of regeneration. Our blessed Lord affirms (Joh 3:3): “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” We are said to be “saved by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior.” Such language has no meaning if it be not true that we are utterly depraved by nature. How early does this innate corruption manifest itself in children! It is impossible for us to examine our own hearts, or look around us in the world, without having the conclusion forced upon us that the wickedness which everywhere prevails must have its seat in a heart that is “deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” The doctrine of original sin has been denied by heretics of different kinds. Socinians treat it as a foolish and absurd idea.

The followers of Pelagius maintain that, notwithstanding the results of the fall, a man still retains the power, independently of divine grace, of originating, prosecuting, and consummating good works. God, they allege, gives us the ability to believe, but we can experience the ability without further assistance. This doctrine has been revived in our own day by the members of the Evangelical Union, commonly called Morrisonians Some theologians admit that we were born less pure than Adam, and with an inclination to sin; but in so far as this inclination or concupiscence, as it is called, is from nature, it is not properly sin. It is merely the natural appetite or desire, which, as long as the will does not consent to it, is not sinful. Romanists believe that original sin is taken away by baptism, and maintain, like the above, that concupiscience is not sinful. The apostle Paul, however, holds a very different opinion, declaring in the plainest language that the proneness to sin is in itself sinful. Thus in Rom 7:7-8, he says: “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead.” A keen controversy concerning the nature of original sin arose in the 16th century in Germany. A party of Jena, led by Matthias Flacius, endeavored to prove that the natural man could never cooperate with the divine influence in the heart, but through the working of innate depravity  was always in opposition to it. Flacius met with a keen opponent in Victorinus Strigelius, and a public disputation on the subject of original sin was held at Weimar in 1560. On this occasion Flacius made the strong assertion that original sin was the very essence of man, language which was believed to imply either that God was the author of sin, or that man was created by the devil. Hence even the former friends of Flacius became his bitterest opponents. SEE SIN.

## Orioli, Bartolomeo[[@Headword:Orioli, Bartolomeo]]

             an Italian painter who devoted himself largely to the cultivation of sacred art, flourished at Trevigi about 1616. He executed numerous works for the churches in his native city, which are commended by Federici. Orioli was also a good portrait painter, and frequently introduced portraits into his pictures, instead of ideal forms. There is a painting of this class in the church of S. Croce, representing a numerous procession of the people of Trevigi. Laizi says he painted more pictures for public exhibitions at Trevigi than any other artist, and that he belonged to that “numerous tribe of painters who in Italy were ambitious of uniting in themselves the power of poetry and painting; but who, not having received sufficient polish, either in precept or in art, gave vent to their inspirations in their native place by covering the columns with sonnets, and the churches with pictures, but without exciting the envy of the adjacent districts.”

## Orion[[@Headword:Orion]]

             occurs three times (Job 9:9; Sept.῞Εσπερος, Vulg. Orion; 38:31, ᾿Ωρίων; Arctuus; Amo 5:8, μετασκευάζων Orion) in the A.V. as the rendering of the Heb. כְּסַילkesil ^from כָּסִל; to be fat, and hence either to be strong or to be dull, languid. The last sense prevails in most derivatives, and thus כְּסַיל, kesil, commonly means fool or impious person (as Psa 49:10; Ecc 2:14), but in Job 9:9 (comp. 38:31; Amo 8:5) is plainly applied to one of the greater constellations of the sky. It is here understood by most ancient interpreters to refer to the large and brilliant constellation Orion, or “the Giant,” situated in the southern hemisphere with respect to the ecliptic, but which is crossed near its middle by the equinoctial. It is known by the three bright stars in its belt. The “giant” of Oriental astronomy was Nimrod; the mighty hunter, who was fabled to have been bound in the sky for his impiety. The two dogs and the hare, which are among the constellations in the neighborhood of Orion,  made his train complete. There is possibly an allusion to this belief in “the bands of kesil” (Job 38:31), with which Gesenius (Jes. 1:458) compares Pro 7:22. It the Chronicon Paschale (p. 36) Nimrod is said to have been “a giant, the fouder of Babylon, who, the Persians say, was deified and placed among the stars of heaven, whom they call Orion” (comp. Cedrenus, p. 14) SEE NIMROD. In Isa 13:10 the word kesilim is rendered “constellations,” i.e. the Orions or giants of the sky, the greater constellations similar to Orion. Some Jewish writers, the rabbins Isaac Israel and Jonah among them, identified the Hebrew kesil With the Arabic sohail, by which was understood either Sirius or Canopus. The words of R. Jonah: (Abulwalid), as quoted by Kilm'chi (Lex. heb. s.v.), are, “Kesil is the large star called in Arabic Sohail, and the stars combined with it are called after its name kesilim.” The name Sohail, “foolish,” was derived from the supposed influence of the star in causing folly in men, and was probably an additional reason for identifying it with kesil. See Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 701; Niebuhr, Descript. Arabice, p. 112; Ideler, Ueber Ursprung und Bedeuturng der Sternnamen, p. 240, 263; Michaelis, in Suppl. p. 1319 sq. SEE ASTRONOMY.

## Orion (2)[[@Headword:Orion (2)]]

             a mythological personage of the Greeks, was represented as a gigantic hunter, and reputed the handsomest man in the world. His parentage is differently stated. According to the commonly received myth he was the son of Hyrieus, of Hyria, in Boeotia, and was called in his native country Kandaon. Another account makes him a son of Poseidon and Eurvale, while some say that he was Autochthonos, or “earthborn.” So immense was his stature that when he waded through the deepest seas he was still a head and shoulders above the water, and when he walked on dry land his stature reached the clouds. Origin was a general favorite, and soon rendered himself celebrated. Diana took him among her attendants, and even became deeply enamored of him. His gigantic stature, however, displeased Enopion, king of Chios, whose daughter Hero or Merope he demanded in marriage. The king, not daring to deny him openly, promised to make him his son-in-law as soon as he delivered his island from wild beasts. This task, which Enopion deemed impracticable, was soon performed by Orion, who eagerly demanded his reward. Enopion, on pretense of complying, intoxicated his illustrious guest, and put out his eyes on the sea-shore, where he had laid himself down to sleep. Orion, finding himself blind when he awoke, was conducted by the sound to a  neighboring forge where he placed one of the workmen on his back, and, by his directions, went to a place, where the rising sun was seen to the greatest advantage. Here he turned his face towards the luminary, and, as is reported, he immediately recovered his eyesight, and hastened to punish the perfidious cruelty of Enopion.

Aurora, whom Venus had inspired with love, carried him awav into the island of Delos, to enjoy his company with greater security; but Diana, who was jealous of this destroyed Orion with her arrows. Some say that Orion had provoked Diana's resentment by offering violence to Opis, one of her female attendants, or, according to others, because he had attempted the virtue of the goddess herself. According ton Ovid, Orion died of the bite of a scorpion, which the earth produced, to punish his vanity in boasting that there was not on earth any animal which he could not conquer. It is said that Orion was an excellent workman in iron, and that he fabricated a subterraneous palace for Vulcan. After death Orion was placed in heaven, where one of the constellations still bears his name. The constellation of Orion, situated near the feet of the bull, was composed of seventeen stars, in the form of a man holding a sword, which has given occasion to the poets often to 'speak' of Orion's sword. As the constellation of Orion, which rises about March 9, and sets about June 21, is generally supposed to be accompanied at its rising, with great rains and storms, it has acquired the epithet of aquosus, given it by Virgil. Orion was buried in the island of Delos, and the monument which the people of Tanagra, in Boeotia, showed, as containing the remains of this celebrated hero, was nothing but a cenotaph. The daughters of Orion distinguished themselves as much as their father, and when the oracle had declared that Boeotia should not be delivered from a dreadful pestilence before two of Jupiter's children were immolated on the altars, they joyfully accepted the offer and voluntarily sacrificed themselves for the good of their country. Their names were Menippe and Metioche.

## Orissa[[@Headword:Orissa]]

             an ancient Indian kingdom, now a province of India, is situated near the head of the Bay of Bengal, on its north-western shore, a short distance south-west from Calcutta, and is bounded on the north by Bengal east by the Bay of Bengal, south by the country of the Telugus, and west by Nagopore. It is irregularly shaped, about 300 miles long, and 240 wide, and had in 1872 a population of 4,317,999. It is supposed that the province was anciently much larger than it is now, and that its sovereigns formerly  sustained a rank much above that of most Hindu rajahs, and that it was numbered among the most powerful of the ancient Indian sovereignties.

Before the 6th century B.C., Orissa, Odra, or Ulkala, names whose very meaning is not yet fixed, must have been a land of swamps, lakes, and jungles, amid which few people cared to live. Its earliest dwellers appear to have been hill-tribes: and fishermen of the aboriginal non-Aryan stock, whose types are well preserved in the Savars and Khonds of the present day. At what time Aryan immigrants from Northern India settled in the country. it is not easy to say, but the rock inscriptions of a later Buddhist period date back to the middle of the 3d century B.C. The hills and wilds of Orissa abound in rock-hewn caves, shrines, and statues of Buddha, and the lonely dwelling-places of Buddhist monks have since been tenanted in their turn by worshippers and ascetics of the various Brahmanic schools that rose upon the ruins of the faith proclaimed by the semi-mythical Hindu reformer Sakya Muni, and were established by the Hindu Constantine Asoka. In Orissa the spread of Buddhism appears to synchronize curiously with the progress southward of the Yavanas, whose name at once suggests their identity with the Javan of Hebrew writ and the Ionian Greeks of history. There is no doubt, we think, with Dr. Hunter, who only follows up the clues furnished by former scholars, that the Yavanas who invaded Orissa in the 3d century, B.C. were chiefly descendants of the merin who under Alexander and his successors ruled Afghanistan and the Punjaub, whence they roved or were driven onwards into Behar, and down the Ganges to Orissa. One of Asoka's edicts carved on the rocks of the last- named country speaks of “Antvoko the Yona king,” or, in other words, of Antiochus, the Yavan, or Ionia. It is well known that a Yavan dynasty ruled Orissa for 146 years, from the early part of the 4th century A.D., and that with its final overthrow in A.D. 473 fell the supremacy of that Buddhist faith which for more than seven centuries had supplanted the older Brahmanic systems. It is worth noting that a like revolution from Buddhism to Brahminism marks the downfall of yet later Yavan dynasties in Central and Southern India. In the buildings of the Buddhists and their religious heirs the Jains, traces of Greek art are unmistakably visible wherever Buddhism and the Yavanas once held sway; strongest in the Puisjaub, and gradually growing fainter on its way to the Orissa shore. From the remains of sculptures, inscriptions, etc., we may infer that the early civilization of Orissa was high. The temple of the sun at Kanarak — erected about the 12th century — exhibits carvings representing the  planets, sculptured figures of animals, etc., which show that at that date the plastic and mechanical arts were in a more advanced state in that part of India than they are in England.

Orissa maintained its position as an independent monarchy till 1558, when, its royal line having become extinct, it was made an outlying province of the empire of the Great Mogul. On the breaking up of this empire, the more valuable portions of Orissa were seized by the nizam of Hydrabad. The French, who had taken possession of a part of the country long known as the Northern Circars, attempted to drive the English (who had also formed commercial settlements on the coast) out of India. The Mahrattas, who had seized a portion of Orissa in 1740, were forced to surrender it to the English in 1803. The soldiers of the East India Company were marched into Orissa at the opening of the present century, and an engagement was subsequently entered into between the company and the native chiefs and princes, by which the former bound themselves to perform certain services for the country (as maintaining the river-banks in good repair), while the latter engaged to pay a yearly tribute. Of the many principalities into which the country was divided, a large number got into arrears with the government, and the result was that numbers of the estates were sold, and the government, as a rule, became the purchaser. Much of the territory originally forming a portion of this kingdom thus fell into the hands of the British.

Orissa is divided into three civil districts, viz. Puru in the south, Cuttack in the center, and Balasore on the north. The sea-coast, which is the eastern part of the province, is level, and far more populous than the central and western divisions, which are mountainous and covered in many places with primeval forests, inhabited by wild beasts, or men almost as untamed and rude as they. The climate, soil, productions, animals, insects, birds, reptiles, and fish of Orissa are similar to those of Bengal and other adjacent portions of Hindostan lying near the tropic of Cancer. The villages, houses, food, clothing, dress, literature, and trades of the Orissans are also much like those of the Bengalese and the people of other large portions of India. The present population of Orissa is principally made up of Hindus, Mohammedans, Santals, and Bhumijas, the Hindus constituting by far the larger number. From its liability to inundation, the country is not much inhabited for three or four miles inland from the sea. Beyond this low tract the plains are sufficiently elevated for security, and are highly cultivated and densely peopled. Farther inland the country becomes mountainous,  covered in part by forests, where are found the Oriyas, Gonds, Koles, Surahs, Santals, and Bhumijas. The Gonds or Khonds are believed to be the descendants of the aboriginal inhabitants of the country. This tribe occupied an area extending from north of the Mahanaddi, south to the banks of the Godavari. Their mountain haunts are admirably suited for defense, as the districts which they inhabit are almost inaccessible; and although they do not yet appear to have adopted fire-arms, they manage their battle-axes and bows and arrows with an adroitness and courage that make them formidable enemies. The Khonds are a totally distinct race from the inhabitants of the plains, and there is but little resemblance between them and the other hilltribes. SEE KHONDS. Some ethnologists claim the Santals to have been the aborigines of Orissa, but there does not seem to exist very good ground for such assertion. SEE SANTALS.

In Orissa, as elsewhere in India, the history of the people resolves itself for the most part into the history of their religion. As Buddhism faded away, successive forms of Vishnu and Siva worship took its place. Bhuvaneswar, with its 7000 shrines, now reduced to less than 600, attested the prevalence of Siva-worship under the long line of Kesari, or Lion-kings, who displaced the Yavanas. Thousands of high-caste Brahmins imported from Oude commended the new worship to their future countrymen. In the twelfth century the milder worship of Vishnu rose into the ascendant under a new line of kings, and about the same period architecture reached its zenith, producing one of its noblest masterpieces in the temple of the sun at Kanarak. on the Orissa shore, In the holy city of Piri, sacred to Vishnu under his title of Jagannath, the Lord of the World, these and other religions find their common meeting place. “The fetichism and bloody rites of the aboriginal races, the mild flower-worship of the Bedas, and every compromise between the two, along with the lofty spiritualities of the great Indian reformers, have here found refuge.” Once every year the holy city of Puri is the attraction to the poor, ignorant natives, drawn thither simply by a superstitious veneration, which formerly cost the lives of millions. The humane policy of the British. has largely done away with human sacrifices in every form. But though the car of Jaggernaut (q.v.) no longer crushes out the lives of thousands, and the Meriah ( SEE KHONDS, Religious Rites and Sacrifices) victims are saved from a horrible death, thousands yet fall a prey to an impure atmosphere and unwholesome food to which the 90,000 pilgrims are subject while they are packed for weeks together into 5000 small lodging-houses of two or three windowless cells each, in the  very height of India's rainy season, with a temperature ranging from 90 to 1050 in the shade, in streets and alleys innocent of drainage, and fed for the most part on ill-cooked compounds of putrefying rice. And if any escape all this uninjured, they are sure to be further tried in their homeward journeys — oftentimes hundreds of miles long — through the pouring rain, sleeping many of them on the grass or mud, and consequently dying of exposure in numbers by the way, or carrying home with them the seeds of life-long suffering. It is reckoned that at least 10,000 people perish every year in Puri or on the way, and the number was far greater some years. ago, before the government took measures to alleviate the worst horrors of this deadly pilgrimage.

The natives of Orissa, composed, as we have seen, of different tribes, of course do not all speak in one tongue, but though there are a score or more of dialects, there are only three principal vernacular languages spoken by the Orissans.

1. The Oriya, one of the Hindui family of languages, derived principally from the Sanscrit. This is spoken by the greater part of the Hindu population.

2. The Hindostani, derived principally from the Arabic and Persian, and spoken by the Mohammedans.

3. The Sanital, with which may be classed the Bhumija, they both being dialects of the same language. The Oriya contains many religious and iterary works, some translated from the Sanscrit, and others original. Most of the religious books are poetical, and some of them possess a great degree of literary merit.

Missionary Labors. — Thus far comparatively little has been effected for Christianizing the natives of Orissa. The districts of Paru and Cuttack are occupied by the English General Baptist missionaries, who began labors there in 1821. Although they had to wait six years for their first convert, many followed, and this mission is now in a flourishing condition. It has furnished many native teachers and preachers. In 1888 there were 18 stations, with 9 ordained and 8 unordained foreign workers, and 22 ordained and 12 unordained native workers; 3816 adherents, 1344 communicants, and 25 schools with 1330 scholars. A carefully executed version of the Bible into the Oriya tongue was prepared by Mr. Sutton, one of the missionaries. He also prepared a dictionary and a grammar. The  district of Balasore is the site of the Free-will Baptist mission. This district lies on the west side of the Bay of Bengal. It is about eighty miles long, and on an average thirty or forty miles wide, and contains about 500,000 inhabitants. On its northern boundary lies a considerable tract belonging to the province of Bengal, which is inhabited by Oriyas. The Free-will Baptists began their labors in 1835, and now employ there 10 missionaries, 22 native preachers, 5 churches with 654 members, and several well- conducted schools. See Bacheler, Hinduism and Christianity in Orissa; Sterling, Orissa; Sutton, Narrative of the Orissa Mission: Hunter, Orissa under Native aind British Rule (1872, 2 vols. -12mo); Newcomb, Cyclop, of Missions, s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Aikman, Cyclop. of Christian Missions, p. 158, 339; Brit. Qu. Rev. July, 1872, p.120 sq.

## Orissa Version [[@Headword:Orissa Version ]]

             SEE URIYA VERSION.

## Orkney Islands[[@Headword:Orkney Islands]]

             (Norse, Orkneyar, from ork. “whale,” and eyar, “islands;” Latin, Orcades), a compact group, separated from Caithness by the Pentland Firth, and counted a Scottish possession, are situated between 58° 41' 24” and 59° 23' 2' N. lat., and-between 2° 22' 2”; and 3° 25' 10” W. long.; and cover an area of 244.8 square miles, or 156,672 acres. The surface is very irregular, and the land is indented by numerous arms of the sea. Previous to the middle of the last century the agriculture of Orkney was, in more than an ordinary degree for the time, in a primitive state. There was little communication then with the mainland, and improvements were slowly adopted. The spinning-wheel for instance, was not introduced there for half a century after it was in use elsewhere. Until towards the end of last century, little advance seems to have been made in the management of the land, the inhabitants deeming it more important and profitable to direct their attention to the manufacture of kelp. They suffered periodically from bad seasons and violent storms, when less help could be afforded to them from without. In recent times the agricultural and mechanical industries have been in a more healthy state, and their exports, which in 1848 amounted only to £49,308, now run up to £200,000 annually. The temperature of the Orkneys is comparatively mild, considering their northern latitude. This arises partly from the surrounding sea, but chiefly from the neighborhood of the Gulf Stream to the western ssres. the mean temperature in February, the coldest month, taking a series of thirty-three years from 1826, was 380, and in July 55.140. Only twice during that period did the mean monthly temperature fall below the freezing-point, in February, 1838 and 1855, when it fell to 310 and 31.640; and during the same period it was never so high as 600, except in 1852, when it reached 60.640. Of the 67 islands, only about 30 are inhabited, by 32,395 (in 1885) people. The principal of these inhabited islands are Pomona, or Mainland, Hoy, North and South Ronaldshay, Westray, Salida, Eday, Stronsay, Rorgsay, Ind Shapinshay. The chief towns are Kirkwall, the capital, and Stromness.

History.—The Orkneys, under the name Orcades (whence the modern adjective Orcadian), are mentioned by the ancient geographers, Pliny, Ptolemy; Mela, and by other classical writers, but of their inhabitants we know almost nothing till the dawn of the Middle Ages. They were most probably of the same stock as the British Celts. From an early period, however, the Norsemen resorted to these islands, as a convenient spot from which to make a descent on the Scotch and English coasts. In 876 Harald Haarfager conquered both them and the Hebrides. During the greater part of the 10th century they were ruled by independent Scandinavian jarls (earls), but in 1098 they became formally subject to the Norwegian crown. Thus they remain till 1488, when they were given to James III of Scotland as a security for the dowry of his wife, Margaret of Denmark. The islands were never redeemed from this pledge; and in 1590, on the marriage of James I with the Danish princess Anne, Denmark formally resigned all pretensions to the sovereignty of the Orkneys. During their long connection, however, with Norway and Denmark, all traces of the primitive Celtic population disappeared, and the present inhabitants are of the pure Scandinavian stock.

Religion. — Christianity was introduced into the Orkneys by the Norsemen in the beginning of the 11th century. Down to the time of the Reformation the Orkneys and Shetland Isles formed a separate bishopric, under the archbishop of Trondhjem, and the bishop's seat was Kirkevaag, the present Kirkwall. After the establishment of Presbyterianism Orkney was divided into 32 parishes, having 8 parishes of the Church of Scotland. At present, however, the -Orkneys are divided into 22 parishes, forming 3 presbyteries and 1 synod. There are also about 30 congregations belonging to the Free and United Presbyterian churches, besides 3 Independent, and one or two others. See Orkneyinga Saga; Munch, Det norske Folks Historie.

## Orlah[[@Headword:Orlah]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Orlandini, Niccolo[[@Headword:Orlandini, Niccolo]]

             one of the, most noted characters of the Order of the Jesuit, was born at Florence, Italy, in 155. He entered the society in 1572, where he was distinguished by the purity of his morals and proficiency in literature. He became rector of the college at Nola, and afterwards president of the seminary for novices at Naples. He died at Rome in 1606. He was engaged on a history of his order, but did not live to complete more than the first volume of it. It was afterwards continued by Sacchini, Everard, Jouvency, and Cordara; in all seven volumes. The work is published under the title Historiae Societatis Jesu prima pars (sive Ignatius, A.D. 1540-1556) (Romae; 1615, fol.). See Sacchini, Notice, which forms the introduction to the history above referred to.

## Orlando, Bernardo[[@Headword:Orlando, Bernardo]]

             a Piedmontese painter, flourished at Turin in the first part of the 17th century. At that time the rich collections of pictures and drawings in the royal galleries at the court were male subservient to the instruction of young artists, which was intrusted to a painter of the court. Orlandt was invested with this charge, and appointed painter to the duke in 1617. But we call attention to him here because he also painted some pictures for churches.

## Orlay, Bernard Van[[@Headword:Orlay, Bernard Van]]

             or Bernard of Brussels, a celebrated painter, largely devoted to the development of sacred art, was born in that city about the year 1490. He went to Rome when he was very young, where he had the good fortune to become a pupil of Raphael. On his return to Brussels he was appointed principal painter to the governess of the Netherlands, and was likewise employed for many years by the emperor Charles V. The style of his design was noble, and his tone of coloring agreeable. He very frequently painted on a ground of leaf-gold, especially if he was engaged on a work of importance, a circumstance which is said to have preserved the freshness and luster of his colors; in his hunting-pieces, in which he introduced portraits of Charles V and the nobles of his court, he usually took the scenery from the forest of Soignies, which afforded him ample variety. He was engaged by the prince of Nassau to paint sixteen cartoons, as models for tapestry, intended for the decoration of his palace. Each cartoon contained only two figures, a knight and a lady on horseback, representing  some members of the Nassau family. They were designed in an elevated style; and by the prince's order they were afterwards copied in oil by Jordaens. He painted for the chapel, of a monastery at Antwerp a picture of the Last Judgment, which was much admired. Bernard van Orlay died in 1560. Waagen mentions several excellent pictures by him in the collections in England, especially in those of the duke of Devonshire at Devonshire House, Piccadilly, and at Chiswick; at Keddieston Hall, the seat of the earl Scarsdale, where is a picture of the Virgin with the infant Christ, addressing St. John in the presence of Joseph and Elizabeth — the figures are three quarters the size of life — which is one of the finest remaining by Van Orlay; and at lord Spencer's, at Althorpe, where is a bust of Anne of Cleves, very carefully painted.

## Orleans[[@Headword:Orleans]]

             an important commercial town of France, capital of the department of Loiret, and formerly capital of the old province of Orlealnnais, which now forms the greater part of the departments of Loiret, Eure-et-Loir, and Loir- et-Cher, is situated on the right bank of the Loire, here crossed by a bridge of nine arches, and is seventy-five miles and a half south-south-west of Paris by railway. Close to the city is the forest of Orleans, one of the largest in the country, consisting of 94,000 acres planted with oak and other valuable trees. The city stands on the verge of a magnificent plain sloping towards the Loire, and watered by that river and the Loiret, and is surrounded on the land-side by a wall and dry ditches, on either side of which there are pleasantly shaded boulevards. Around it are eight prosperous and populous suburbs. Among its principal buildings are the cathedral, with two lofty and elegant towers, one of the finest Gothic edifices in the country; the tower; bishop's residence; the houses of Joan of Arc, of Agnes Sorel, of Diane de Poitiers, of Francois I, of Pothier; the churches and hospitals, which are numerous, etc. The place is noted in ecclesiastical history for the several Church councils which have been held there;

I. The FIRST COUNCIL OF ORLEANS (Conciliumn Aurelianense) was held July 10, 511, by order of Clovis. It was attended by the archbishops of Bordeaux, Bourges, Auch, Tours, and Rouen, with twenty-seven bishops, among whom were Quintianus, bishop of Rodez, near Clermont, Melanius, bishop of Rennes, and Theodosius of Auxerre. Thirty-one canons were published:

1. Establishes the inviolability of churches as places of refuge.

3. Declares that a runaway slave taking refuge in a church shall be given up to his master, an oath having been first made by the latter not to hurt him.

4. Forbids to ordain lay persons without the king's permission. The children of clerks are left to the bishop's discretion.

5. Directs that the revenue arising from property given to any church by the prince shall be employed (1) in the repair of the building, 2) for the support of the clergy, (3) for the relief of the poor, and (4) for the redemption of slaves.

7. Forbids clerks and monks to go to the prince to obtain favors without letters from their bishop.

8. Enacts that a bishop willfully ordaining a slave unknown to his master shall pay twice his price to the master.

12. Permits deacons and priests in a state of penance to baptize in cases of necessity.

13. Forbids the wife of a priest or deacon to marry.

17. Submits to the bishop's jurisdiction all churches built within his territory.

18. Forbids to marry a brother's widow, or a sister's widower.

19. Submits to the bishop's jurisdiction all abbots, and directs that they shall attend him once a year at the place which he shall appoint.

20. Forbids monks to use the stole or handkerchief (“tzangas”) in their monasteries.

21. Declares a monk who shall leave his monastery and marry to be forever excluded from taking orders.

24. Orders a fast of forty, and not fifty, days before Easter.

27,

28. Order the proper observation of the Rogation days.

29. Forbids all familiarity between clerks and women.

30. Excommunicates all who have dealings with diviners.

31. Enjoins bishops to attend the offices of the Church every Sunday in the nearest place of worship. See Pagi in Baromius, A.D. 507 x, xii; Labbe, Conc. 4:1403.

II. A SECOND COUNCIL was held in 533, on May 24, by order of Theodoric, Childebert, and Clothaire, the three kings of France. Twenty- six archbishops, and bishops attended from the provinces, Lyons, and Aquitaine. Twenty-one canons were published against simony and other abuses, most of which were old regulations renewed:

The 12th warns those persons who have made a vow to drink and sing and frolic in any church that they ought not to fulfill their vow.

13. Forbids abbots, chaplains, recluses, and priests to give letters dismissory to clerks.

15. Forbids to accept the bequests of suicides; permits those of persons killed in the commission of any crime.

20. Commands that they be excluded from communion who have eaten of meats offered to idols, or of things strangled, etc.

21. Excommunicates abbots who despise the orders of their bishops. See Labbe, Conc. 4:1779.

III. A THIRD COUNCIL was held at Orleans May 7, 538. Nineteen bishops attended, among whom were Lupus of Lyons, who presided, Pantathagus of Vienne, Leo of Sens, etc. Thirty-three canons were published:

1. Orders that a metropolitan who shall permit two years to pass without convoking a provincial synod shall be suspended from celebrating mass for one year, and also those bishops who neglect to attend it without just hinderance.

3. Directs that metropolitans be consecrated by a metropolitan in the presence of all the bishopis of the province, and the bishops of each province by the metropolitan.

7. Directs that clerks who have received orders of their own free will shall, if they marry afterwards, be excommunicated; that if they were ordained without their own consent they shall be only deposed; that clerks committing adultery shall be shut up in a monastery for life, without, however, being deprived of communion.

25. Orders that persons who fall back from a state of penance into a worldly life shall be deprived of communion until at the point of death.

28. Forbids to work in the fields on Sunday, but permits traveling on horseback or in a carriage, the preparation of food, and all things needful for the proper neatness of house and person: the denial of which things it states to belong rather to the Jewish than the Christian observance of the day.

29. Forbids lay persons to leave church at mass before the end of the Lord's Prayer, or if a bishop be present, before he has given his blessing.

30. Forbids Jews to mix with Christians from Holy Thursday to Easter-day. See Labbe, Conc. v. 294.

IV. A FOURTH COUNCIL was convened at Orleans in 541. Thirty-eight bishops and the deputies of twelve absent attended; Leontius, archbishop of Bordeaux, presided. Thirty-eight canons were published; most of them similar to those published in the preceding councils. The following are among those which differ:

1. Orders the celebration of Easter every year according to the table of Victorius (or Victor).

4. Orders that no one at the oblation of the holy chalice shall presume to offer anything but wine mixed with water, because it is held as sacrilegious to offer anything different from what the Savior instituted in his most holy commandments.

16. Excommunicates those who swear, after the fashion of pagans, upon the heads of beasts, or who invoke the names of false gods.

33. Declares that any person desirous of having a parish upon his property, must, in the first place, give a sufficient endowment for the clerks who shall serve it.

Such is supposed to have been the origin of Church patronage. See Labbe, Conc. v. 380.

V. A FIFTH COUNCIL was held at Orleans, October 28, 549, by Childebert, king of France. Fifty bishops (among whom were ten afterwards reverenced as saints) and twenty-one deputies of those who were absent attended, collected from the three kingdoms of France and all the provinces  of the Gauls, except that of Narbonne, which was still in the occupation of the Goths. Sacerdos, bishop of Lyons, presided. Twenty-four canons, for the most part renewing those of the preceding councils, were published:

1. Condemns the errors of Entyches and Nestorius.

2. Forbids excommunication for small offenses.

6. Forbids to ordain a slave without the master's consent.

11. Forbids to give the people a bishop whom they dislike, and declares that neither the people nor clergy ought to be intimidated in making their election.

20,

21. Direct that deacons shall visit prisoners every Sunday, and that bishops shall take care of lepers. See Labbe, Conc. v. 390.

VI. — A COUNCIL of less importance was convened at Orleans in 1022 by king Robert, at which several bishops were present. Several Manichaeans were condemned to be burned, among whom were Stephen (or Heribert) and Lysoye, ecclesiastics of Orleans. See Labbe, Conc. 9:836; Spicil. p. 740.

## Orley, Jean Van[[@Headword:Orley, Jean Van]]

             a Belgian painter, was born at Brussels in 1656. He first studied with his father, but afterwards devoted himself to historical painting with considerable success, and was much employed in painting for the churches in the Netherlands. In the church of St. Nicholas at Brussels is a picture by him representing St. Peter delivered from Prison, and in the parochial church of Asch a picture of the Resurrection, which are highly commended. His masterpiece is a large picture of the Adoration of the Magi in the refectory of the abbey of Dillighem. He etched a part of the plates, from his own designs, for the New Testament. He died in 1740.

## Orman, Samuel L.[[@Headword:Orman, Samuel L.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Williamson County, Tenn., March 22, 1838. He was converted Oct. 7. 1858, joined the Church in 1859, and was licensed to preach the year following; but his mother being a widow, and he the only son at home, he believed it to be his duty to remain with her, and did not join Conference until October, 1866, though he was employed one year on the Savannah  Circuit, beginning October, 1862, and one year on the Russellville Circuit, commencing in the autumn of 1865. After his admission into the Tennessee Conference, he filled successively the Moulton and Smithville circuits, and the Trinity Station. While at the latter charge his health failed, and he was the next year made supernumerary to the Elm Street Church, in Nashville; recovering his strength somewhat, he was stationed in Springfield at the session of the Conference held in 1870; but his health soon failed him here, and he died Dec. 25, 1871. He was greatly beloved by all who knew him. — He was intelligent, prudent, amiable, good. See Dr. J. B. McFerrin, in Nashville Christian Advocate, Jan. 27, 1872; Minutes of the Meth. Episc. Church, South, 1872, p. 717.

## Orme, William[[@Headword:Orme, William]]

             a noted Scotch divine, was born at Falkirk, Scotland, in 1787. He removed early to Edinburghs where he was apprenticed to a wheelwright in 1800. He then joined the Independents, and in 1805 entered as a student for the ministry in a class supported by Mr. Haldane. He became minister of a Congregational Church at Perth in 1807; removed afterwards to London, and was appointed minister of a congregation at Camberwell, and foreign secretary to the London Missionary Society. He died in 1830. He wrote Bibliotheca Biblica, a select list of books on sacred literature, with notices, etc. (Edinb. 1824, 8vo): — Life of Baxter (in Baxter's Practical Works [Lond. 1830, 23 vols. 8vo] vol. i): — Memoirs of the Life Writings,: and Religious Connections of John Owen, D.D. (ibid. 1820, 8vo): — Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Kiffin (ibid. 1823) Memoirs, including Letters and select Remains of John Urquhart (ibid. 1827, 2 vols. 12mo): — The Ordinance of the Lord's Supper illustrated (1826, 12mo): — Memoir of the Controversy respecting the Heavenly Witnesses, 1Jn 5:7, including Critical Notices of the Principal Writers on Both Sides of the Question by Criticus (1830, 12mo; new edition, with Appendix by Ezra Abbot, N. Y. 1866, 12mo). See Darling, Cyclop.B ibliog. 2:2248; Nicholls, 2:786, s.v.; Horne, Bibliotheca Biblica (see Index); Christian Examiner,: 1866 (May), p. 398. (J. N. P.)

## Ormerod, Oliver[[@Headword:Ormerod, Oliver]]

             a noted English Churchman of king James I's reign, flourished as rector of Huntspill, Somersetshire, and died in 1626. He was a great polemic, and wrote severely against Papists and Puritans. Among his works the most  noted is The Picture of a Puritane (Lond. 1605, 4to), which, though it deserves to be passed by as unworthy in tendency, claims the recognition of scholars because of the thorough knowledge of men and things which it exhibits. It is replete with classical allusions, and abounds in quotations from the Church fathers, the schoolmen, and other abstruse writers. Other noteworthy productions of Ormerod's are, The Picture of a Papist (1606):— A Discovery of Puritan Papisme and a Discovery of Popish Paganism (1612, 4to). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. 23:389. (J. H. W.)

## Ormond, William[[@Headword:Ormond, William]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Green County, N. C. Dec. 22,1769; was converted Dec. 11, 1787; entered the itinerancy in 1791; traveled and preached extensively from Maryland to Georgia; and died in Briunswick County, Va., Oct. 30.1803. He was a good and zealous man, and many souls were converted under his labors. See Minutes of Conferences, 1:116.

## Ormuzd And Ahriman[[@Headword:Ormuzd And Ahriman]]

             The most difficult religious problem for the mind to solve is that of the existence of evil in this world. If there be a God, then must that God be good; and as nothing can happen without his will, naturally we should expect that the world which he governs would be a place where everything would be good, virtuous, and happy. But the contrary is the case. The world, as a matter of fact, is full of evil, of sin, and of misery. Whence, then, comes this? Is the Deity not good? or is his power limited? or how is this conflict which we see actually going on in the world to be explained? Without the higher ideas given us by revelation, the problem could not be solved; but it is interesting to examine what were the conclusions to which the mind of man, unaided by the light. of revelation, came by the exercise of its own reasoning powers. It then attempted to solve the problem in two ways: the one was pantheism, the other dualism. In pantheism it is denied that there is .any real difference between good and evil. Things do not exist, but merely seem to exist. This whole external world is a mere illusion, in which the world-spirit develops itself in various ways, and which finally it will absorb back into itself. Just as the bubbles upon a stream seem to have a separate existence for a time, and float upon its surface, bright in the sunshine with reflected colors, and dark and lustreless in the shade, but finally as they break all fall back into the main flood of  waters, so is it with men. They seem to have a separate existence for a time, and live some in sunshine and some in shade, but really they are all portions of the world-spirit, and at death become again indistinguishable parts of his existence, none the better and none the worse for what happened to them in life, It is this same world spirit which makes the plants grow. They have no merit and no blame for their wholesome or noxious qualities. Beauty, richness of odors, utility earn them no praise; nor is the poisonous hemlock blamed when it destroys man's life. So human actions are bit higher developments of the activity of this same-world-spirit;. and as they are his doings, he cannot praise or blame them. Like want, squalor, and crime in a picture, they are unrealities, and nothing follows from them.

It was in India that pantheism was elaborated into a perfect system; but the religions both of Egypt and Babylon were based upon the same fundamental idea, which is at the root of pantheism, that good and evil are not essentially opposed, but in appearance only In the religion of the ancient Medes and Persians we find a totally different conception. Zoroaster, its reputed author, had views too high and noble to be contented with a solution which ignores the reality of this entire present state of things. On the other hand, he could not believe that the Deity, whom he conceived to be essentially good and altogether perfect, could himself have created evil, and admitted it into the world which he had created. There seemed, therefore, but one way to escape from the dilemma, and that was to suppose that evil also had an independent existence, and that there was a struggle in the moral world as well as in material nature. There cold and heat, light and darkness, tempest and sunshine seemed ever at variance, waging perpetual war for the ascendency; and so he conceived that in opposition to Ormuzd, the good god, and principle of goodness, there stood Ahriman, an evil god, and the author of all evil and sorrow and death. Ahriman likewise seemed to him an independent power, not called into being, but equally eternal with Ormuzd himself; eternal as regards his pre-existence, but not eternal in the future. Zoroaster could not bring himself to believe that this struggle was to go on forever; and therefore, not very logically, he taught that a being endowed with an infinite pre- existence was nevertheless finite. In distant ages three prophets, sprung from Zoroaster, were to bring into the world the three remaining books of the Zend-Avesta, and convert the world to the faith; and thereupon evil was to disappear, and the whole world become pure and happy, as it was  when first created by Ormuzd, before Ahriman had entered it, and marred it by his mischievous activity.

On closer examination, however, it appears that the Zend-Avesta is not all of the same date, and that this dualism is not found in its most ancient sections. There are very early chapters that contain traces even of a polytheistic nature-worship, in which the gods have no personal existence, but are mere powers, such as the sunshine, the wind, the earth, and fire. As the same sort of worship is found in the older religious basis of India, it seems as if this was the primitive religion of the whole Aryan stock. But this system was too sensuous to long satisfy men's minds, and the next stage in the Zend-Avesta is that in which we have a distinct recognition of deities who are real persons, possessed of self-consciousness and intelligence. These deities are some good and some bad, the former being called Asuras, “spiritual beings,” while the latter are the Devas, or Divs — a word etymologically the same as the Latin Deus, but originally signifying the sky. In Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and most languages the word has a good meaning, and signifies the Supreme Deity. But the Iranians, in their recoil from nature-worship, gave it a bad sense, and it soon became equivalent with them to fiends and devils.

The Zend-Avesta, however, soon went one step farther. In the old nature- worship there had been no attempt to subordinate one power to another. But when the deities were regarded as persons, the question soon arose, How did these various beings combine to act together? was there among them any order of agreement? or any superiority of one over another? Now here it is the especial glory of Zoroastrianism that it conceived of the existence of one supreme God. Ormuzd is the highest object of adoration, “the true Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the universe.” Mr. Rawlinson (Ancient. Monarchies, ii,3 24) spells the name Ahuro-Mazdao, and gives several explanations of it, the most probable being that of Haug, “the living wise.” He is set forth “as the source of all good, and the proper object of the highest worship. He is the creator of life, both the earthly and the spiritual. He made the celestial bodies, all earthly substances, all good creatures, and all things good and true.” “He is himself good, holy, pure, true, the holy God, the holiest of all, the essence of truth, the father of all truth, the best being of all, the master of purity.” Moreover “he is supremely happy, and possesses every blessing, health, wealth, virtue, wisdom, immortality.” From him comes all good to man. On the pious and the righteous he bestows not only earthly advantages, but precious spiritual  gifts, truth, devotion, “a good mind,” and everlasting happiness; and as he rewards the good, so he punishes the bad, though this is an aspect in which he is but seldom represented.

In this description of Ormuzd, gathered by Mr. Rawlinson from the Yacna, or Book of Sacrifice, a part of the Zend-Avesta, we are moving among thoughts grand as those of the Old Testament, though, as this writer remarks, the conception of Ormuzd is less spiritual and less awful than that of Jehovah. The ascription to him of health, and also of the physical qualities of brightness and lucidity, shows that they did not regard him as purely spiritual; while his being so predominantly the author only of good things in a great measure deprives him of Jehovah's most sublime attribute of justice.

But Zoroastrianism did not stop here. The contemplation of the evil that is in the world led in time to a highly developed dualism, in which Ahriman stands opposed to Ormuzd as a being possessed of almost equal power, but using it only for the worst purposes. Though we do not find this doctrine, as was said above, in the most ancient sections of the Zend- Avesta, yet even there the distinctions between good and evil, truth and falsehood, right and wrong, are described in strong colors; and the name Ahriman (in ancient Persian, Angro-Maingus, the dark spirit) occurs but in a highly poetical passage, not as a real personage, but as a figure of speech. But in course of time this “dark spirit” came to be regarded as a living power; and as men noticed how in the struggle of life evil seemed as mighty as good, he was invested with attributes as great as those of Ormuzd himself. As, too, it was inconceivable that the good deity would have allowed such a being to come into existence, it was concluded that evil must be co-eternal with good. But as man's heart dictates to him that good is better than evil, and must finally prevail, and as the thought was unendurable that the struggle could go on forever, and this world be eternally miserable, the conclusion was arrived at that at some distant period Ormuzd would gain the victory, and evil depart out of the world forever.

Meanwhile a fierce war is carried on, in which every act of Ormuzd is watched by his enemy, and immediately spoiled. The good deity spends his time in devising schemes of benevolence for the happiness of his people, and Ahriman is equally active, and even more successful in inventing pests and annoyances, which turn every creation of Ormuzd into a place of trial  and misery. The imagination, too, soon called into existence numerous personages to be the allies and ministers of these dread powers in the conflict, and each especially had his council of six, by whose instrumentality the conflict was maintained. On the side of Ormuzd the council is more completely defined than on that of Ahriman. It is composed of six Amshashpands, or immortal saints, of whom the first, Bahman, “the good mind,” originally a mere attribute of Ormuzd, has for his office the maintenance of life in animals and of goodness in man. Ardibesht, the second, means “the clearest truth.” He was regarded as the light of the universe, and his business was to maintain the splendor of the various luminaries, and enable them to dispense heat and light. The third, Shahravar, was the dispenser of riches. The fourth, Isfand-Armat, represented the earth. As the Iranians were a purely agricultural people, the earth always held a high place in their esteem, and Armaiti, the earth- goddess, was also goddess of piety. Under her charge was all growth and fertility, and she was the giver of abundant harvests. The last two were Khordad, “health,” and Amerdat, “immortality.” The vegetable world was especially intrusted to their charge. Besides these, the armies of Ormuzd are commanded by the angel Serosh, described as “the sincere, the beautiful, the victorious, the true, the master of truth.” Under his command they wage perpetual war with the Devas, whom sometimes he even stays, and guard the whole world, and especially the Iranian territory, from their attacks. Ahriman's council of six consists of Ako-mano, “the bad mind;” Indra, the Vedic god of storms and war, but simply a destructive being in the Zoroastrian mythology; Caurva, who may be Siva; Naonhaitya, Taric, and Zaric, the two latter being “darkness” and “poison;” but this council is not elaborated with so much care as that of Ormuzd, and several of its members are very shadowy persons.

In his general summary of Mazdeism, as the worship of Ormuzd is called, after Mazda, the second part of the deity's name, Mr. Rawlinson (p. 337) points out that, besides their belief in a spiritual world, composed partly of good, partly of evil intelligences, the Zoroastrians held very enlightened views with respect to human duties and hopes. In their system truth, purity, piety, and industry were the virtues chiefly valued and inculcated. Evil was traced up to its root in the heart of man; and it was distinctly taught that no virtue deserved the name but such as was co-extensive with the whole sphere of human activity, including the perfect triad of thought, word, and deed. Man's industry was to exert itself in reclaiming the soil from the  thorns and weeds and barrenness with which it had been cursed by Ahriman. Thus tillage became a religious duty, in which man was a fellow- worker with Ormuzd., Worship consisted in the recitation of prayers and hymns; the offering of soma-juice, which was not allowed to ferment and become intoxicating, as was the case in India, but was drunk fresh; and finally in sacrifices, that of the horse being looked upon as the most acceptable. The flesh was only shown to the sacred fire as an act of consecration, and was then eaten at a solemn banquet by the priest and his fellow-worshippers.

Finally, the Zoroastrians were devout believers in the immortality of the soul and a conscious future existence. They taught that immediately after death the souls of men, both good and bad, proceed together along an appointed path to “the bridge of the gatherer.” Over this, from its extreme narrowness, only the souls of the good can pass, while the wicked fall from it into the gulf of punishment below. Even the good have to be assisted in their passage by the angel Serosh, but when safely over the archangel Barman rises from his throne to greet them severally with the words, “How happy art thou who hast come hither to us from mortality to immortality.” After this the pious soul goes joyfully onward to the presence of Ormuzd, to the immortal saints, to the golden throne, and to Paradise. As for the wicked, when they fall into the gulf, they find themselves in outer darkness in Ahriman's kingdom, where they are forced to remain and feed on poisoned banquets. The one dark spot, therefore, in the Zoroastrian religion was this dualism, which placed opposite to the good god Ormuzd a being of nearly equal might and activity, Ahriman, who wages with him constant war. Yet even this appears to have been a corruption of the primitive creed. The earlier portions of the Zend-Avesta are strongly monotheistic, are averse to idolatry under every form, and mark in the strongest way the opposition between good and evil. But as time went on, and men mused upon this mysterious problem of the presence and power of evil in a world made by a good god, the figure of the bad intelligence, Ahriman, began to stand out in stronger colors, till he became a god too, endowed with attributes well-nigh as mighty as those of Ormuzd. Then round, the two there grew up a mythology of angelic beings, towards some of whom at last even a religious reverence was paid verging on idolatry; and so the spirituality of the original creed of the Iranians was lost.

The chief authorities are Spiegel's edition and translation of the Zend- Avesta; Haug, Essays on the Sacred Language, etc., of the Parsees;  Lenormant, Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de lOrient, 2:306-324; Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, 2:322-344. See also Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 2:383 sq.; Muller, Chips from a German Workshop, vol. i; Upham, Wise Men, p. 7274, 82-85; Hunt, Pantheism, p. 32 sq.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, 1:17 sq.; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrew Literature, p. 340 sq. (R. P. S.)

## Ornamatuas Tus[[@Headword:Ornamatuas Tus]]

             is the name of a spirit worshipped by the South Sea Islanders. There are supposed to be several such spirits, and they are thought to reside in the world of night, and are never invoked by wizards or sorcerers. They are a different order of beings from the gods; and are believed to be the spirits of departed relations. The natives were greatly afraid of them, and endeavored to propitiate them by presenting offerings. “They seem,” says Mr. Ellis, in his Polynesian Researches, “to have been regarded as a sort of daemons. In the Leeward Islands, the chief ornamatuas were spirits of departed warriors who had distinguished themselves by ferocity and murder, attributes of character usually supposed to belong to these evil genii. Each celebrated tu was honored with an image, through which it was supposed his influence was exerted.

The spirits of the reigning chiefs were united to this class, and the skulls of deceased rulers, kept with the images, were honored with the same worship. Some idea of what was regarded as their ruling passion may be inferred from the fearful apprehensions constantly entertained by all classes. They were supposed to be exceedingly irritable and cruel, avenging with death the slightest insult or neglect, and were kept within the precincts of the temple. In the marae of Tane, at Masva, the ruins of their abode were still standing when I last visited the place. It was a house built upon a number of large, strong poles, which raised the floor ten or twelve feet from the ground. They were thus elevated to keep them out of the way of men, as it was imagined they were constantly strangling or otherwise destroying the chiefs and people. To prevent this, they were also treated with great respect; men were appointed constantly to attend them, and to keep them wrapped in the choicest kinds of cloth; to take them out whenever there was a pae atua, or general exhibition of the gods; to anoint them frequently with fragrant oil; and to sleep in the house with them at night. All this was done to keep them pacified. And though the office of calming the angry spirits was honorable, it was regarded as dangerous; for if during the night, or at any other time, these keepers were guilty of the least impropriety, it was supposed the  spirits of the images or the skulls would hurl them headlong from their high abodes, and break their necks in the fall.” The names of the principle ornamatuas were Mauri, Bua-rai, Tea-fao. They were considered the most malignant of beings, exceedingly irritable and implacable. They were not confined to the skulls of departed warriors, or the images made for them, but were occasionally supposed to resort to the shells from the sea-shore, especially a beautiful kind of murex, called the murex ramoces. These shells were kept by the sorcerers, and the peculiar singing noise perceived on applying the valve to the ear was imagined to proceed from the daemon it contained.

## Ornament[[@Headword:Ornament]]

             is the usual and proper rendering in the O.T. of the Hebrew עֲדַי, adi (Sept. usually κόσμος). The Israelites, like other Oriental nations, have always been remarkable for their love of ornament (Gen 24:47; Exo 32:2; Exo 33:4, etc.), not only in costly garments and braiding the hair (1Pe 3:3 SEE HAIR ), but also in jewelry and gold (Eze 28:13 sq.). The men were usually content to wear simply seal-rings, SEE SEAL, and indulged in expensive attire only on solemn or public occasions; unless their position, as in the case of princes, required more display (Psa 45:5; 2Sa 12:30; 2Ma 4:38, etc.). But the women, especially young damsels and brides, wore many and very valuable ornaments (2Sa 1:24; Jer 2:32; Isa 3:17 sq.; Isa 61:10; Jdg 10:4; Judges 12:16; comp. Est 2:12), generally in the form of rings, chains, and bracelets. Sometimes the young women purposely made themselves publicly conspicuous by their adornments (Bar 6:8; i.e. Epist. Jeremiah 8). During times of mourning, in obedience to a natural impulse, all ornaments were laid aside (Exo 33:4 sq.; 2Sa 1:24; Eze 24:17; Eze 24:22). Ornaments are enumerated in various passages (see Isa 3:18 sq.; Hos 2:12; Eze 16:11). Among the ornaments peculiar to females was the golden head-dress in the form of the holy city (see Mishna, Edujoth, 2:7, עיר של זחב, so explained by the rabbins). Idols were also adorned with gold and jewels (Jer 10:4; Bar 6:10; Bar 6:23; 2Ma 2:2), as now the images of the Virgin in the Roman churches. SEE ATTIRE; SEE EPHOD.

The number, variety, and weight of the ornaments ordinarily worn upon the person form one of the characteristic features of Oriental costume, both in ancient and modern times (see Thomson, Land and Book, 1:184 sq.; Van  Lennep, Bible Lands, p. 531 sq.). The monuments of ancient Egypt exhibit the hands of ladies loaded with rings, earrings of very great size, anklets. armlets, bracelets of the most varied character and frequently inlaid with precious stones or enamel, handsome and richly ornamented necklaces, either of gold or of beads, and chains of various kinds (Wilkinson, 2:335- 341). The modern Egyptians retain to the full the same taste, and vie with their progenitors in the number and beauty of their ornaments (Lane, vol. iii, Appendix A). Nor is the display confined, as with us, to the upper classes; we are told that “even most of the women of the lower orders wear a variety of trumpery ornaments, such as ear-rings, necklaces, bracelets, etc., and sometimes a nose-ring” (Lane, 1:78). There is sufficient evidence in the Bible that the inhabitants of Palestine were equally devoted to finery. In the Old Testament, Isaiah (Isa 3:18-23) supplies us with a detailed description of the articles with which the luxurious women of his day were decorated, and the picture is filled up by incidental notices in other places; in the New Testament the apostles lead us to infer the prevalence of the same habit when they recommend the women to adorn themselves, “not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array, but with good works” (1Ti 2:9-10), — even with “the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price” (1Pe 3:4). Ornaments were most lavishly displayed at festivals, whether of a public (Hos 2:13) or a private character, particularly on the occasion of a wedding (Isa 61:10; Jer 2:32). In times of public mourning they were, on the other hand, laid aside (Exo 33:4-6).

With regard to the particular articles noticed in the Old Testament, it is sometimes difficult to explain their form or use, as the name is the only source of information open to us. Much illustration may, however, be gleaned both from the monuments of Egypt and Assyria and from the statements of modern travelers; and we are in all respects in a better position to explain the meaning of the Hebrew terms than were the learned men of the Reformation mera. We propose, therefore, to review the passages in which the personal ornaments are described, substituting, where necessary, for the readings of the A. V. the more correct sense in italics, and referring for more detailed descriptions of the articles to the various heads under which they may be found. The notices which occur in the early books of the Bible imply the weight and abundance of the ornaments worn at that period. Eliezer decorated Rebekah with “a golden  nose-ring ( נֶזֶם, nezem) of half a shekel weight, and two bracelets (צָמַיד, tsamid) for her hands of ten shekels weight of gold” (Gen 24:22); and he afterwards added “trinkets (כְּלַי., keli, articles in general) of silver and trinkets of gold” (Gen 24:53). Earrings ( נֶזֵם בְּאָזְנֵיהֶם“nezemn in their ears”) were worn by Jacob's wives, apparently as charms, for they are mentioned in connection with idols: “They gave unto Jacob all the strange gods which were in their hand, and their ear-rings which were in their ears” (Gen 35:4).

The ornaments worn by the patriarch Judah were a “signet” (חוֹתָם, chotham), which was suspended by a string (פָּתַיל,pathil) round the neck, and a “staff” (Gen 37:18): the staff itself was probably ornamented, and thus the practice of the Israelites would be exactly similar to that of the Babylonians, who, according to Herodotus (1:195), “each carried a seal, and a walking-stick, carved at the top into the form of an apple, a rose, an eagle, or something similar.” The first notice of the ring occurs in reference to Joseph: when he was made ruler of Egypt, Pharaoh “took off his signet-ring (טִבִּעִת, tabbdath; in this, as in other cases [Est 3:10; Est 8:2; 1Ma 6:15], not merely an ornament, but the symbol of authority) from his hand and put it upon Joseph's hand, and put a gold chain (רָבַיד, rabid; also a chain worn by a woman [Esther 16:11]) about his neck” (Gen 41:42), the latter being probably a “simple gold chain in imitation of string, to which a stone scarabseus, set in the same precious metal, was appended” (Wilkinson, 2:339). The number of personal ornaments worn by the Egyptians, particularly by the females, is incidentally noticed in Exo 3:22 : “Every woman shall ask (A. V. “borrow”) of her neighbor trinkets (כְּלַי, keli, as above) of silver and trinkets of gold. and ye shall spoil the Egyptians.” In Exo 11:2, the order is extended to the males, and from this time we may perhaps date the more frequent use of trinkets among men, for while it is said in the former passage, — “Ye shall put them nupon your sons and upon your daughters,” we find subsequent notices of ear-rings being worn at all events by young men (Exo 32:2), and again of offerings both from men and women of “nose-rings (חָח, chach, A. V, “bracelets;” some authorities prefer the sense “buckle;” in other passages the same word signifies the ring placed through the nose of an animal, such as a bull, to lead him by) and ear-rings, and rings, and riicklaes (כּוּמָז, kuuma, A.V. . “tablets;” a necklace formed of perforated gold drops strung together), all articles of gold” (Exo 35:22). The profusion of these ornaments was  such as to supply sufficient gold for making the sacred utensils for the tabernacle, while the laver of brass was constructed out of the brazen mirrors (מִרְאוֹת, maroth) which the women carried about with them (Exo 38:8).

The Midianites appear to have been as prodigal as the Egyptians in the use of ornaments; for the Israelites are described as having captured “trinkets of gold,” armlets ( אֶצְעָדָה, etsadah, A. V. “chains;” cognate term, used in Isa 3:20, means “stepchain;” but the word is used both here and in 2Sa 1:10 without reference to its etymological sense) and bracelets, rings, ear-rings (עָגַיל, agil, a circular ear-ring of a solid character), and necklaces” (כּוּמָז, kumaz, as above), the value of which amounted to 16,750 shekels (Num 31:50; Num 31:52). Equally valuable were the ornaments obtained from the same people after their defeat by Gideon: “The weight of the golden nose-rings (נֶזֶם, nezem, as above; the term is here undefined; but, as ear-rings are subsequently noticed in the verse, we think it probable that the nose-ring is intended) was a thousand and seven hundred shekels of gold; besides collars ( שִׂהֲרֹנַים, saharonim, A. V. “ornaments;” the word specifies moon- shaped disks of metal, strung on a cord, and placed around the necks either of men or of camels) and ear-pendants (נְטַיפוֹת, netiphoth, A. V. “collars” or “sweet-jewels;” the etymological sense of the word is pendants, which were no doubt attached to ear-rings) (Jdg 8:26).

The poetical portions of the O.T. contain numerous references to the ornaments worn by the Israelites in the time of their highest prosperity. The appearance of the bride is thus described in the book of the Canticles: “Thy cheeks are comely with beads (תּוֹרַים, torim, A. V. “rows;”' the term means, according to Gesenius [Thes. p. 1499], rows of pearls or beads; but as the etymological sense is connected with circle, it may rather mean the individual beads, which might be strung together, and so make a row, encircling the cheeks. In the next verse the same word is rendered in the A. V. “borders.” The sense must, however, be the same in both verses, and the point of contrast may perchance consist in the difference of the material, the beads in Jdg 8:10 being of some ordinary metal, while those in Jdg 8:11 were to be of gold), thy neck with perforated [pearls] (חֲרוּזַים, charuzim, A. V. “chains;” the word would apply to any perforated articles, such as beads, pearls, coral, etc.); we will make thee beads, of gold with studs of silver” (Jdg 1:10-11). Her neck, rising tall and stately “like the tower of David builded for an armory,” was decorated with various ornaments  hanging like the “thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men, on the walls of the armory” (4:4); her hair, falling gracefully over her neck, is described (4:9) figuratively as a “chain” (עֲנָק, anak), and “the roundings” (not as in the A. V. “the joints”) of her thighs are likened to the pendant (תְּלָאַים, “jewels;” rather this is the lace-work fringe of the drawers enveloping the lower limbs) of an ear-ring, which tapers gradually downwards (7:1). So again we read of the bridegroom: “his eyes are... fitly set,” as if they were gems filling the sockets of rings (v. 12): “his hands are as gold rings (גְּלַילַים, gelilim) set with the beryl,” i.e. (as explained by Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 287) the fingers when curved are like gold rings, and the nails dyed with henna resemble gems (rather the fingers had rings literally). Lastly, the yearning after close affection is expressed thus: “Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm,” whether that the seal itself was the most valuable personal ornament worn by a man, as in Jer 22:24; Hag 2:23, or whether perchance the close contiguity of the seal to the wax on which it is impressed may not rather be intended (Son 8:6). We may further notice the imagery employed in the Proverbs to describe the effects of wisdom in beautifying the character; in reference to the terms used we need only explain that the “ornament” of the A. V. in 1:9; 4:9, is more specifically a wreath (לַוְיָה, livyah), or garland; the “chains” of 1:9, the drops (עִנָק, anak, as above) of which the necklace was formed; the “jewel of gold in a swine's snout” of 11:22, a nose-ring (נֶזֶם, nezem, as above); the “jewel” of 20:15, a trinket, and the “ornament” of 25:12, an ear-pendant (חֲלַי, chali, as above).

The passage of Isaiah (Isa 3:18-23) to which we have already referred may be rendered as follows: (18) “In that day the Lord will take away the bravery of their anklets (עֲכָסַים, akasinu), and their lace caps (שֶׁבַיסַים, shebisim,; rather, perhaps, disks attached to the necklace), and their necklaces (lunettes); (19) the ear-pendants, and the bracelets, and the light veils; (20) the turbans, and the step-chains, and the girdles, and the scent-bottles, and the amulets; (21) the rings and noserings; (22) the state-dresses, and the cloaks, and the shawls, and the purses; (23) the mirrors, and the fine linen shirts, and the turbans, and the light dresses.”

The following extracts from the Mishna (Sabb. cap. vi) illustrate the subject of this article, it being premised that the object of the inquiry was to ascertain what constituted a proper article of dress. and what might be  regarded by rabbinical refinement as a burden “A woman must not go out (on the Sabbath) with linen or woolen laces, nor with the straps on her head; nor with a frontlet and pendants thereto, unless sewn to her cap; nor with a golden tower (i.e. an ornament in the shape of a tower); or with a tight gold chain; nor with nose-rings; nor with finger-rings on which there is no seal; nor with a needle without an eye (§ 1); nor with a needle that has an eye; nor with a finger-ring that has a seal on it; nor with a diadem; nor with a smelling-bottle or balm-flask (§ 3). A man is not to go out... with an amulet, unless it be by a distinguished sage (§ 2): knee-buckles are clean, and a man may go out with them; stepchains are liable to become unclean, and a man must not go out with them “(§ 4). See each article named in its place.

## Ornaments (Or Decorations), Architectural[[@Headword:Ornaments (Or Decorations), Architectural]]

             are additions made to simple constructive features, or to the form of these features, for the purpose of embellishment or elegance. Thus the Doric shaft, while answering the constructive purposes of a simple square or round pier, is ornamented with fluting; and its capital, with its beautifully proportioned echinus and abacus, supports as a plain slab would do the weight of the entablature. The other classic orders illustrate this in a richer manner. Thus the Corinthian column, with its fluted and elegant shaft, resting on an ornamented base, and crowned by an ornamented capital, takes the place of what might have been, had utility alone been consulted, a plain pier of rubble-work, with a rough stone to rest upon, and another on the top to receive the load.

In classic architecture, as in every good style, the same principle pervades all the ornamental features, viz. that they are constructive features ornamented in a manner suitable to their use; for instance, a column being a member for support, should be of such a form as to denote this; the constructive use of a cornice being to protect the top of the wall, and to shield the front of it from the rain and sun, it should be made of such a form as to do this, and also to look as if it did it to express its purpose. In classic architecture, the cornice consists of several members, in which the constructive decoration is well seen; the mutules and modillions beautifully indicating in an ornamental manner their original use, while the leaf enrichments of the small moldings give life and animation to the building. In mediaeval art the same principle prevails in a much greater degree, and over a more complex system of construction. The shafts, with their elegant  and purpose-like bases and caps, are arranged so that each supports a separate member of the vaulting. The arch moldings are divided so as to indicate the rings of their constructive formation. The buttresses, so elegant in outline, express the part they serve in supporting the vaulting; the pinnacles, with their ornamental finals, are the decorated dead-weights which steady the buttresses. The foliage and smaller ornaments are also beautifully and suitably applied, as the growth and vigor of the supporting capitals and corbels, and the running foliage of the string-courses, archmoldings, etc., fully illustrate.

There are, no doubt, many styles of art to which these remarks can hardly be said to apply; as, for example, the Assyrian, Egyptian, and Hindu styles, where we find many features applied in a manner meant to be ornamental, although actually contrary to their constructive use. In these styles (and also in Greek architecture), human figures, bulls, and other animals are placed as columns to carry the weight of a superincumbent mass. This is evidently wrong in principle, except when the figure is placed in an attitude to indicate that he is supporting a weight, as the Greek Atlantes do; but in the former cases religious notions seem to have overcome true artistic feeling. There are also many forms of ornament used in all styles the origin of which is obscure and their advantage doubtful; such are the zigzag, chevron, billet, etc., so common in early mediaeval art and the scrolls of Ionic and Indian art, and the complications of the interlacing work of the North in the Middle Ages. Such things may be admissible in colored decoration, such as the confused patterns of Saracenic art, and the shell- patterns of Indian art; but where ornamental form is wanted, unless the requirements of the construction are carefully followed as the guide to the decoration, all principle is lost, and the ornament runs wild. This has frequently occurred in the history of art, and in no case more markedly than in the art of the Renaissance.

The material in use must also have an influence on the form and style of the ornament. Thus stone-carving and metal-work must evidently require different treatment. Facsimile leaves might be formed in iron, but could not be so carved in stone. This constructive element should be carefully attended to in designing. All imitative art must be to some extent conventional. Natural objects, such as leaves, flowers, etc., cannot be copied absolutely literally; and in suiting the conventional treatment to the nature of the material used lies the great skill of the artist.

## Ornaments, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Ornaments, Ecclesiastical]]

             a designation of the various minor articles of furniture, utensils, pictures, etc., used in some churches.

Soon after the establishment of the Church as a state institution, i.e. in the time of Constantine, ornaments more or less costly began to be introduced. In addition to the observations on the sacred vessels and utensils of the church, and all gifts which were called Anathemata and Ε᾿κτηπώματα, and which were a sort of symbolical memorial or hieroglyphical representation of the kindness and favor that had been received, sentences of Holy Scripture and other inscriptions were frequently written on the walls. This was the most ancient of all decorations in churches. Gilding and mosaic- work were introduced at an early period. The practice of exhibiting pictures of saints, martyrs, etc., began in the 4th century; it was introduced by Paulinus, bishop of Nola, and his contemporaries, privately and by degrees. Statues and images were a later innovation. The pictures of kings and bishops were brought in about the same time; but no images of God or the Trinity were allowed in churches till after the second Nicene Council; nor, usually, statues or massy images, but only paintings and pictures, and those symbolical rather than any other. The practice of adorning churches with evergreens is mentioned by Augustine. and is probably of high antiquity.

The Roman Catholic Church has continued in a free use of all kinds of church ornamentation. Even in the Greek Church, where the Iconoclastic spirit has done away with much that is held essential to church decorations by Romanists, SEE ICONOCLASM, the number of ornaments used is still very great. Of course in the Protestant churches ornaments of a ritualistic character have been largely abandoned. In the Church of England, the Rubric before the Common Prayer directs that such ornaments of the church and the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as they were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of king Edward VI. SEE CONSTITUTIONS and SEE CANONS ECCLESIASTICAL; SEE RITUALISM.

The Lutheran Church of Germany has retained the use of pictures, tapers, and crucifix; while the Reformed Church and the dissenting bodies have carefully discarded every such ornament from the church.  We embody in this article a concise description of the chief articles used in the ritualistic churches of Christendom, and their supposed significance, taking it largely from a curious little book written in defense of extreme ritualism, and entitled The Ritual Reason Why. The altar-rail is a rail which separates the altar from the rest of the chancel, because it symbolizes the Holy of Holies in the Temple; the altar-cloth veils it as a token of respect, and to mark the different seasons of the Church by a change of colors, which are five in number; the lights are emblematic of Christ, the light of the world, and also signs of spiritual light and joy; flowers are used for the same purpose; the credence-table (q.v.) is used for the preparation of the elements for the communion before they are placed on the altar; the sedilia (q.v.) are the seats of the lesser clergy, arranged according to their rank; the paten (q.v.) is a thin dish of gold or silver gilt, on which the altar beads are placed for consecration and for communion; the ciborium is a kind of shallow cup used for the same purpose the chalice (qv.) is the cup for holding the consecrated wine; the chalice-veil is a square of embroidered silk for covering it when empty; the corporal is a napkin of fine linen spread on the altar at the time of the communion; the cruets are vessels of glass or metal for holding the sacred wine, and for water; the pyx (q.v.) is a metal canister lined with linen in which the bread is kept till required for use; the basin and napkin are used for washing the priests' hands; the piscina (q.v.) is a small stone basin set in the wall, and used for the same purpose; the lectern (q.v.) is the name given to the reading-desk; the censer (q.v.), or thurible, is a vessel of metal, usually in the shape of a cup, with a perforated cover, in which incense is offered; the sanctus bell is a small bell used to give notice of the elevation of the host, or eucharistic bread; the travelling-cloth is spread over the altar-rails, or before the communicants, to prevent any of the bread falling to the ground. There are other articles, especially different kinds of candles and candlesticks, used in and about the altar and in processions; but those above mentioned are the most important, except such as are worn upon the person, for which SEE VESTMENTS. (See illustrations on following page.)

See Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church, bk. viii; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 741 sq., 811 sq.; Coleman, Ancient Christianity exemplified, p. 260 sq.; and. for the Church of England especially, Hook, Church Dict. s.v.

## Ornan[[@Headword:Ornan]]

             (Heb. Ornan', אָרְנָן; Sept. Ο᾿ρνᾶ; Targum usually אַרוְוָן, but also אַרְנוֹן,

אַרְנָן, אָרוֹוָן, and niM; Vulg. Ornan), the form in which the name of the Jebusite king, who in the older record of the book of Samuel is called Araunah, Aranyah, Ha-avarnah, or Haornah, is given in Chronicles (1Ch 21:15; 1Ch 21:18; 1Ch 21:20-25; 1Ch 21:28; 2Ch 3:1). SEE ARAINAH. In some of the Greek versions of Origen's Hexapla collected by Bahrdt, the threshing-floor of Ornan (Ε᾿ρνὰ τοῦ Ι᾿εβουσαίου) is named for that of Nachon in 2Sa 6:6.

## Ornithomancy [[@Headword:Ornithomancy ]]

             (from ὄρνις, a bird, and μαντεία, divination), a species of divination practiced among the ancient Greeks by means of birds. SEE AUGURY.

## Oro[[@Headword:Oro]]

             is (1) the name given in the Yoruba country of West Africa to Mumbo Jumbo (q.v.). (2) The principal war-god of the pagan natives of Polynesia. Such was the delight which he was supposed to have in blood that his priest required every victim offered in sacrifice to be covered with its own blood in order to its acceptance. When war was in agitation a human sacrifice was offered to Oro, the ceremony connected with it being called fetching the god to preside over the army. The image of the god was brought out; when the victim was offered, a red feather was taken from his person and given to the party, who bore it to their companions, and considered it as a symbol of Oro's presence and sanction during their subsequent preparations. Oro was, in the Polynesian mythology, the first son of Tauroa, who was the founder and father of the gods; he was the first of the fourth class of beings worshipped in the Leeward Islands, and appears to have. been the medium of connection between celestial and. terrestrial beings. In Tahiti Oro was worshipped under the representation of a straight log of hard casuarina wood, six feet in length, uncarved. but decorated with feathers. This was the great national idol of the Polynesians. He was generally supposed to give the response to the priests who sought to know the will of the gods or the issue of events. At Opoa, which was considered the birthplace of the god, was the most celebrated oracle of the people.

## Orobio, Isaac De Castro[[@Headword:Orobio, Isaac De Castro]]

             a Spanish physician, noted as a philosopher and polemic against Christianity, was born at Braganza about the year 1620. His parents, who were Jews, though outwardly professing Romanism, educated him in  Judaism. Balthasar Orobio — this was his name while in the Church — studied

the scholastic philosophy at the University of Alcala de 'Honores, in which his acquisitions were so considerable that he was appointed lector in metaphysics in the University of Salamanca. He afterwards applied himself to the study of medicine, which he practiced at Seville. Upon suspicion of Judaism he was cast into the prisons of the Inquisition, where during three years he underwent torture worthy of the barbarity of that infamous. tribunal, and which often, according to his own declaration, so perplexed his understanding as to make him ask himself, “Am I really Don Balthasar Orobio, who walked about freely in Seville, who lived at ease, and had the blessing of a wife and children?” Sometimes he thought that his past life had been nothing but a dream, and that the frightful dungeon where he was had been his birthplace, as, according to all appearance, it was destined to see him die. At other times, as he had a very metaphysical mind, he formed arguments and then resolved them, thus performing the parts of opponent, respondent, and moderator at the same time. In this way he amused himself, and constantly denied that he was a Jew. After appearing twice or thrice before the inquisitors, he was treated as follows: At the bottom of a sub-terraneous vault, lighted by two or three small lamps, he appeared before two persons. One was the judge, and the other the secretary of the Inquisition, who asked him to confess the truth, declaring that, in case of a criminal's denial, the holy office would not be deemed the cause of his death if he should expire under the torture, but it must be attributed to his own obstinacy. Then the executioner stripped off his clothes, tied his hands and feet with a strong cord, and set him on a low stool, while he passed the cord through some iron rings fixed in the walls; then, drawing away the stool, he remained suspended by the cord, which the executioner drew tighter and tighter to make him confess, until a surgeon assured the court he could not bear more without expiring. These cords put him to exquisite torture by cutting into the flesh, and making the blood burst from under his nails. To prevent the cords tearing off the flesh, of which there was danger, bands were girded about the breast, which were drawn so tight that he would not have been able to breathe if he had not held his breath while the executioners put the bands around him.

By this device his lungs were enabled to perform their functions. During the severest, of his sufferings he was told that was but the beginning of his torments, and that he had better  confess before they proceeded to extremities. Orobio adds that the executioner, being on a small ladder, to frighten him, frequently let it fall against his shin-bones. The staves, being sharp, caused him dreadful pain. However, all the tortures of the holy office were insufficient to wrest from him the avowal of his true sentiments, which would have drawn down upon him the most cruel punishment. He was at length set at liberty, left Spain for France, and was appointed by Louis XIV as professor of medicine at Toulouse. But weary, at length, of the necessity under which he lay of concealing the religion which he believed to be the true one, and which, without doubt, the ill-treatment received from Christians had rendered more dear, he went to Amsterdam, where, after having received circumcision, he made an open profession of Judaism taking the name of Isaac. He died in the year 1687. It was in the city of Amsterdam that Orobio had his famous conferences with the theologian Philip de Limborch (q.v.), who, persuaded of the force of his own arguments in favor of the Christian religion, published them, together with the objections of Orobio: De veritate religionis Judicae cum confutatione religionis Christianae, in three treatises, under the title of Philippi a Limborch amica collatio cumr erudito Judaeo (Tergow, 1687; Basle, 1740). Orobio wrote, Certamen philosophicum propugnatae veritatis divince ac naturalis adversus Joh. Bredenburgii principia (Latin and Dutch, Amsterd. 1684, 1703, and 1731): — Respuesta a un Predicante sobre lt perpetua observancia de la divina Ley: — Explicacion del capitulo liii d' Ysaias: — Explicacion paraphrastica de has lxx Semanas de Daniel: — Una epistola invectiva contra un Judio philosopho medico, que aegava la ley de Mose y siendo Atheista alfectava la ley de Naturalezza: -Israel venge, ou exposition naturelle des propheties Hebraiquesu ls ues Chretiens appliquent a Jesus leur pretendu Messie (translated from the Spanish into French by Henriquez, Lond. 1770). With regard to the last work, it has been supposed by De Rossi that it was not written by Orobio himself, but only compiled from his works by Henriquez, who is mentioned as the translator; and it is remarkable that neither Basnage nor Wolf, who appear to have had his works as published in Spanish before them, enumerates any treatise with this title. The work Israel Venge has been translated into English by Miss Anna Maria Goldsmid (Lond. 1839), and also in the same year by the late Dr. A. M'Caul (q.v.), under the title Israel Avenged, to which edition is appended a reply from the pen of this able British apologist of Christianity. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:54 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:646 sq.; 3:551 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 253 sq. (Germ. transl. by  Hamburger); Bibliotheca Judaica antichiristiana, No. 122, etc. (Parma, 1800); Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, p. 743 sq. (Taylor's transl.); Schudt, Judische Denkwurdiqckeiten, 1:124, 159 sq.; Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche, p. 36; Limborch, Historia Inquisitionis, vol. ii, ch. 18; vol. iv, ch. 29; Joh. Clericus, Bibliotheca universalis, 7:289 sq.; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal. p. 370; Adams, History of the Jews (Bost. 1812), 2:91) Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 430 sq.; Finn, Sepharitidim' (Lond. 1841), p. 443 sq.; Frankel, Monatsschrift (1867), p. 321-330; Kayserling, Gesch. d. Juden in Portugal (Leips. 1867), p. 302 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 3:233; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:202 sq., note 1, p. x sq.; Rodriguez de Castro, Bibliotheca Espanola, 1:606; Fabricius, Delectus Argumentorum et Sytlabus Scriptorun, etc. (Hamb. 1725), p. 359, 614; Huie, History of the Jews (Edinb. 1841), p. 198 sq. (B. P.)

## Orosius, Paulus[[@Headword:Orosius, Paulus]]

             a noted writer of the early Christian Church in Spain, was born in the latter part of the 4th century at Tarragona, in Catalonia. He was educated in Spain, and, after entering the service of the Church, was made presbyter in his native place. About A.D. 414 he proceeded, by direction of the Spanish bishops Eutropius and Paul, to Africa, for the purpose, as it seems, of consulting St. Augustine (whom he appears; from the introduction to his History, to have been in communication with some years before) on several controverted points of belief, which were then discussed by the Priscillianists and the Origenists, especially concerning the doctrine of the nature and origin of the soul. (See Consultatio sive Commonitorium Orosii ad Augustinum de errore Priscillianistarums et Origeiistarum, together with Augustine's answer, Ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas, both in the collection of the works of St. Augustine.) By advice of Augustine, Orosius proceeded thence to Palestine with a recommendation from Augustine to Jerome, who was then living at Bethlehem to consult with this learned Church father too. While in Palestine, Orosius wrote a treatise against Pelagius, who was at that time spreading his opinions concerning original sin and grace — Liber apologeticus contra Pelagium de Arbitrii Libertate which is annexed to the History of Orosius. He was also called upon to oppose Pelagius and his disciple' Celestius in a synod held at Jerusalem July 30, 415. From Palestine Orosius returned to Hippo Regius, to his friend Augustine, and thence to Spain.

He now employed himself in writing, in accordance with Augustine's  advice, the historical work which gained him his reputation, viz. the Historiarum lib. vii, adv. paganos; also known under the different titles of De cladibus et miseriis munzdi, De totius mundi calamitatibus, Hormeta, and Ormsesta (the origin and signification of these latter appellations are uncertain). This work was commenced in 416, and completed in 417; its object is to refute the accusations of the heathen, who stated that the calamities which had befallen the Roman empire, and, above all, the capture and pillage of Rome by Alaric, A.D. 410, and the subsequent misfortunes of the people, arose from the neglect of the ancient gods and the introduction of Christianity. Augustine had already treated the same subject in his great apologetic work, De civitate Dei, in another manner. Orosins set himself to prove historically that this world had always been a place of suffering and sorrow, governed by errors and superstitions, but that it would be still worse were it not for Christianity. This historical work, which comes down to the year 417, consists of seven books, divided into chapters. It begins with a geographical description of the world, then treats of the origin of the human race according to the book of Genesis, and afterwards relates the various accounts of the mythologists and poets concerning the heroic ages. Then follows the history of the early monarchies, the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian; the conquests of Alexander, and the wars of his successors; as well as the early history of Rome, the contents being chiefly taken from Trogus Pompeius and Justinus. The fourth book contains the history of Rome from the wars of Pyrrhus to the fall of Carthage. The fifth book comprises the period from the taking of Corinth to the war of Spartacus. Orosius quotes his authorities, several of which are from works which are now lost. The narrative in the sixth book begins with the war of Sulla against Mithridates, and ends with the birth of our Savior.

The seventh book contains the history of the empire till A.D. 416, including a narrative of the taking and sacking of Rome by Alaric, which was the great event of the age. Orosius intermixes with his narrative moral reflections, and sometimes whole chapters of advice and consolation, addressed to his Christian brethren, and intended to confirm their faith amid the calamities of the times, which, however heavy, were not, as he asserts, unprecedented. The Romans, he says, in their conquests had inflicted equal if not greater wrongs on other countries. His tone is that of a Christian moralist impressed with the notions of justice, retribution, and humanity, in which most of the heathen historians show themselves deficient. He deprecates ambition, conquest, and glory gained at the expense of human blood and human happiness. As  a historian, Orosius shows considerable critical judgment in general, though in particular passages he appears too credulous, as in ch. 10 of the first book, where he relates from report that the marks of the chariot- wheels of Pharaoh's host are still visible at the bottom of the Red Sea. (As an instance of the incidental value of the passages taken by Orosius from older writers, see Savigny, Das Recht des Besitzes p. 176.) In the main, however, the work is not strictly original, but is largely taken from Justin and Eutropius. That it was highly prized in the Middle Ages is proved by the fact that there are a great many manuscript copies extant. The Historiae has often been published (Augsburg, 1471; Vicenza, 1475; Cologne, 1526, etc.; Leydel, by Haverkamp, 1738 and 1767). King Alfred made a free translation of it into the Anglo-Saxon language, which was published by Daines Barrington, with an English version of it (Lond. 1773, 8vo), but of which a much more accurate edition, with a literal translation into English, and valuable notes, was published by Dr. Bosworth in 1855. The very remarkable additions of Alfred are especially valuable, as containing “the only geography of Europe written by a contemporary, and giving the position and the political state of the Germanic nations so early as the 9th century.” A translation of Alfred's version forms a volume of “Bohn's Antiquarian Library” (1847). One of the best editions of Orosius is that with Haverkamp's notes, published at Leyden. Orosius died in Africa. Several other works, such as Quaestiones de Trinitate et aliis S.S. locis (Paris, 1533), have been erroneously attributed to him. See Mohler, De Orosii Vita ejusque Historiarum Libris Septem adversus Paganos (Bal. 1844); Gennadius, De Viris Illustribus, p. 39, 46; Schonenmann, Bibl. Patr. Lat. vol. ii, § 10; Moller, Dissertatio de Paulo Orosio (Altorf, 1689, 4to); Smith, Diet. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and iMythol. 3:58, 59; Alzog, Kirchengesch. vol. i; Moshelm, Eccles. Hist. vol. i; Lardner, Works (see Index); English Cyclop. s.v.

## Oroth[[@Headword:Oroth]]

             SEE HERB.

## Orpah[[@Headword:Orpah]]

             (Heb. Orpah', עָרְפָּה, supposed to be transposed for עָפְרָה, a gazelle; Sept. Ο᾿ρφά), a Moabitish woman, wife of Chilion, son of Naomi, and thereby sister-in-law to Ruth. B.C. cir. 1360. On the death of their husbands Orpah accompanied her sister-in-law and her mother-in-law on  the road to Bethlehem. But here her resolution failed her. The offer which Naomi made to the two younger women that they should return “each to her own mother's house,” after a slight hesitation, she embraced. “Orpah kissed her mother-in-law,” and went back “to her people and to her gods,” leaving to the unconscious Ruth the glory, which she might have rivalled, of being the mother of the most illustrious house of that or any nation (Rth 1:4; Rth 1:14). SEE RUTH.

## Orphan[[@Headword:Orphan]]

             The customary acceptation of the word orphans is well known to be that of “children deprived of their parents;” but the force of the Greek word ὀρφάνους (rendered comfortless in the king James version, Joh 14:18) implies the case of those who have lost some dear protecting friend; some patron, though not strictly a father: and in this sense it is used, 1Th 2:17 : “We also, brethren, being taken away from our care over you,” ἀπορφανισθεντες. Corresponding to this import of the word it may be used by Christ in the passage of John's Gospel.

## Orphanages Or Orphan Asylums[[@Headword:Orphanages Or Orphan Asylums]]

             a term applied to those philanthropic institutions which provide a home for orphaned children until their education or training has fitted them for safe contact with the world at large.

The history of the origin of orphan asylums is very uncertain. What the Romans understood bypueri (or puellce) alinentarii cannot properly be compared to our institutions called orphanages. Trajan, who did much to protect orphans, both the Antonines, and Alexander Severus, established foundations for them; but such institutions do not seem to have been frequent till the introduction of Christianity, which gave encouragement for the founding of so many institutions beneficial to mankind. SEE ASYLUMS; SEE HOSPITALS.

In the Middle Ages orphan asylums became quite frequent, especially in thriving and opulent cities of the Continent, and einactments were secured in the Church to take proper care of children bereft of their parents (comp. Lea, Studies in Church History, p. 74). In Germany and Italy many orphanages date from the 16th and 17th centuries, but by far the most famous of the institutions which originated in that period is the Orphan House at Halle founded by A. H. Francke (q.v.) in 1698. In many respects it is the most noted of all orphanages. The Orphan House founded at Ashley Down, near Bristol, England, by George Muller  (see his Life of Trust), stands perhaps second on the list. Both these institutions are noted not only for their extensive orphan labors, but also for their missionary enterprise at home and abroad. But while the former has largely devoted itself also to educational and business enterprises (see Hurst's Hagenbach, Church History of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:130, 140, 306), Muller's single and small Orphan House, founded in 1836, on his own premises, has grown to five orphanages, each one of extensive proportions, and each filled to its utmost capacity with indigent beneficiaries, and all these supported, not, as in the former, by endowment and traffic, but by unasked-for contributions to Muller; “all,” as he believes “in answer to prayer and faith.” The five orphanage buildings have cost over $500,000; the balance of the receipts has gone to meet the current expenses during the thirty-seven years of the history of the enterprise. Whatever has been received beyond what has been needed for present use has not been funded for possible future need for no future lack has been apprehended but has been immediately applied in missionary work in various parts of the country.

As many as 150 missionaries have been aided by the “surplus” funds. During the year ending May 26 1874, Muller received £37.855 15s. 6d., with which 189 missionaries and 122 schools were supported in whole or in part, 2261 orphans maintained, and 47,413 Bibles or parts of the Bible, and 3,775,971 tracts and books distributed. From the beginning up to May, 1874, he had instructed in all 38,800 children in the various schools entirely supported by the institution (as Mr. Muller is pleased to designate it), besides tens of thousands benefited in other schools assisted by its funds, not only in Great Britain, but in Spain, Italy, India, and British Guiana. Added to this, more than 467,000 Bibles and Testaments in various languages, and 50,000,000 religious tracts, have been issued and distributed through its agency, 190 missionaries supported year by year, and 4408 orphans brought up. In most of the institutions the care of the orphan is relinquished only to a competent person, usually one following a trade. The boy or girl, however, is more or less under the eye of the orphanage until the apprenticeship is satisfactorily completed. The Jews, noted for their philanthropic labors, have adopted this Christian institution, and have founded several large orphanages. One of their most noted is at Berlin, called the 'Auerbachsche Waisenanstalt.”

The question of most consequence in relation to the public support of orphans is, whether it is best, in a moral, physical, and economical point of view, to bring up large numbers of orphans in great establishments where  they live together, or to put them out singly in trustworthy families paid by the community (see Brit. Qu. Rev. Oct. 1875, art. v). In Germany this question was long and thoroughly discussed. and for a time the majority favored home-training; the asylum advocates have finally got the control, and orphanages are fast multiplying. Most of the governments of Europe now support orphanages. Institutions founded by private charity in many cases receive aid also from the government if they stand in need of it. In the United States orphans have received great consideration. We here distinguish three classes: (1) those supported by the national government; (2) those supported by single states; and (3) those supported by private (especially Church) charity. One of the most successful of the last named is the Howard Mission of New York City. A model orphanage on British soil is that at Erdington, founded by Josiah Mason at an expense of $1,500,000, and supporting over 300 orphans.

## Orphans[[@Headword:Orphans]]

             SEE HUSSITES.

## Orpheotelists[[@Headword:Orpheotelists]]

             a set of mystagogues in the early ages of ancient Greece, who were wont to appear at the doors of the wealthy, and promise to release them from their own sins and those of their fore-fathers by sacrifices and expiatory songs; and they produced on such occasions a collection of books of Orpheus and Musaeus, on which they formed their promises.

## Orpheus[[@Headword:Orpheus]]

             (supposed to be the Vedic Ribhu or Arbhu, an epithet both of Indra and the sun), a semi-mythic name of frequent occurrence in ancient Greek lore. The early legends call him a son of Apollo and the muse Calliope, or of Oleagrus and Clio, or Polymnia. His native country is Thrace, where many different localities were pointed out as his birthplace — such as the mounts of Olympus and Pangaeus, the river Enipeus, the promontory of Serrhium, and several cities. Apollo bestows upon him the lyre, which Hermes invented, and by its aid Orpheus moves men and beasts, the birds in the air, the fishes in the deep, the trees, and the rocks. He accompanies the Argonauts in their expedition, and the power of his music wards off all  mishaps and disasters, rocking monsters to sleep and stopping cliffs in their downward rush. His wife Eurydice (?- Sanscrit Uru, the Dawn) is bitten by a serpent (? =Night), and dies. Orpheus follows her into the infernal regions; and so powerful are his “golden tones” that even stern Pluto and Proserpina are moved to pity; while Tantalus forgets his thirst, Ixion's wheel ceases to revolve, and the Danaides stop in their wearisome task. He is allowed to take her back into the “light of heaven,” but he must not look around while they ascend. Love or doubt, however, draw his eyes towards her, and she is lost to him forever (? — first rays of the sun gleaming at the dawn make it disappear or melt into day). His death is sudden and violent. According to some accounts, it is the thunderbolt of Zeus that cuts him off, because he reveals the divine mysteries; according to others, it is Dionysus, who, angry at his refusing to worship him, causes the Menades to tear him to pieces, which pieces are collected and buried by the Muses in tearful piety at Leibethra, at the foot of Olympus, where a nightingale sings over his grave.

Others, again, make the Thracian women divide his limbs between them, either from excessive madness of unrequited love, or from anger at his drawing their husbands away from them. Thus far legend and art, in manifold hues and varieties and shapes, treat of Orpheus the fabulous. The faint glimmer of historical truth hidden beneath these myths becomes clearer in those records which speak of Orpheus as a divine bard or priest in the service of Zagreus. the Thracian Dionysus, and founder of the Mysteries (q.v.); as the first musician, the first inaugurator of the rites of expiation and of the mantic art, the inventor of letters and the heroic meter; of everything, in fact, that was supposed to have contributed to the civilization and initiation into a more humane worship of the deity among the primitive inhabitants of Thracia and all Greece. Orpheus was one of the Argonauts, of which celebrated expedition he wrote a poetical account still extant. This is doubted by Aristotle, who says, according to Cicero, that there never existed an Orpheus, but that the poems which pass under his name are the compositions of a Pythagorean philosopher named Cecrops. According to some of the moderns, the Argonautica, and the other poems attributed to Orpheus, are the production of the pen of Onomacritus, a poet who lived in the age of Pisistratus, tyrant of Athens. Pausanias, however, and Diodorus Siculus speak of Orpheus as a great poet and nmsician, who rendered himself equally celebrated by his knowledge of the art of war, by the extent of his understanding, and by the laws which he enacted. He was buried at Pieria in Macedonia, according to Apollodorus. The inhabitants of Dion boasted that his tomb was in their city. Orpheus, as  some report, after death received divine honors, the Muses gave an honorable burial to his remains, and his lyre became one of the constellations in the heavens (Diod. i, etc.; Pausan. i, etc.; Apollod. 1:9, etc.; Cicero, De Nat. Deo. 1:38; Apollon. i; Virgil, AEn. 6:645; Georg. 4:457, etc.; Hygin. Fab. xiv, etc.; Ovid, Mletam. 10:1, etc.; Plato, Polit. x; Horace, Odes, 1:13, 35). The best edition of the Orphic fragments is that of G. Herrmann (Leipsic, 1805). The hymns have repeatedly been translated into English by T. Taylor and others. The chief authority on the Orphic literature still remains Lobeck's Aglaophamus, p. 244. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. and Mythol. — s.v.; Menzel, Christliche Symbolik, 2:174-575; Westrop, Handbook of Archaeol. p. 199; Martigny, Dict. des Antiquits Chretiennes, s.v. Orphee.

## Orphic Mysteries[[@Headword:Orphic Mysteries]]

             a class of mystical ceremonies performed at a very early period in the history of Greece. The followers of Orpheus (q.v.) devoted themselves to the worship of Dionysus, not, however, by practicing the licentious rites which usually characterized the Dionysia or Bacchanalia, but by the maintenance of a pure and austere mode of life. These devotees were dressed in white linen garments, and partook of no animal food, except that which was taken from the ox offered in sacrifice to Dionysus.

## Orphrey[[@Headword:Orphrey]]

             (Aurum Phrygmatum, gold or Phrygia), the name of an ornamental border of a cope or alb, because it is an imitation of the famous Phrygian embroidery. England was famous for this work, and M. Paris relates that the pope, struck with its beauty, directed the Cistercian abbots to buy up all the specimens they could, saying, “England is our garden of pleasure and delight; its treasure is inexhaustible: where much is then, thence much maybe taken.” His order was obeyed, and his choir was vested in copes thus ornamented. In some English inventories the rich apparels (apparatus) of the alb for the neck and hands are called spatularia and manicularia.

## Orr, James M[[@Headword:Orr, James M]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Fairhaven, Preble County, Ohio, March 31, 1838. He was educated at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; studied theology in the Alleghany Seminary, Pa.; was licensed by the Ohio First Presbytery, April 1, 1862; and ordained by the Argyle Presbytery,  March 10, 1864. as the pastor of East Greenwich Church, N. Y. He died near Fairhaven, Ohio, April 18, 1865. Mr. Orr's ministry was short, but he gave evidence of being a most acceptable and useful minister. His style of writing and his delivery were exceedingly chaste. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 278.

## Orr, Robert[[@Headword:Orr, Robert]]

             a Presbyterian minister, who flourished in this country during the colonial period, was either a native of Scotland or Ireland, probably of the latter country. He came to America in 1715, and accepted in that year a call to Maidenhead and Hopewell, and thus became a member of the first American presbytery (organized in 1705 or 1706 at what is now supposed to be Freehold, N. J.). Orr died about the year 1725. See Gillett, Hist. of the Presb. Ch. 1:29, 34.

## Orrente, Pedro[[@Headword:Orrente, Pedro]]

             a Spanish painter, was born at Montealegre, in Murcia, in 1560. It is not known under whom he studied in his own country. Afterwards he went to Italy, and became the pupil of Giacomo da Ponte (Bassano), whose manner of coloring he adopted, though his own style of coloring and design was very different. Some authors say that he was not a pupil of Bassano, and that he never went to Italy, supposing that he was a pupil of El Greco, and afterwards imitated the manner of Bassano, from seeing his work in Spain; but Lanzi conclusively shows that he visited Italy, where he painted some works which Conca pronounced superior to those of Bassano. On his return to Spain he was favored with the protection of the duke of Olivarez, who employed him to paint several pictures for the palace Bueno Retiro. He painted many works for the churches and convents at Valencia, Cordova, and Toledo. His works are numerous, and are to be found in most of the principal cities of Spain, where they are held in high estimation. In the cathedral at Toledo is an admired picture by him representing Santa Leocadia coming out of the sepulcher, and in the chapel of Los Reyes Nuevos, in the same church, was a picture of the Nativity, since removed to the royal collection at Madrid; it is a grand composition, admirably executed. In the same church are some superb landscapes, and a picture of Orpheus charming the brute creation, one of his most celebrated works. He died at Toledo in 1644, and was interred in the same church as El Greco.

## Orsi, Benedetto[[@Headword:Orsi, Benedetto]]

             an Italian painter, was a native of Pescia, and flourished about 1660. Lanzi says he was an eminent pupil of Baldassare Franceschini, called Il Volterrano. There is a fine picture of St. John attributed to him in the church of St. Stefano, at Pescia. He also painted the Seven Works of Mercy for La Campagnia le Nobili. There still exists a large circular picture in the church of St. Maria del Letto, at Pistoia, which was enumerated by good  judges among the finest works of Volterrano, till an authentic document proved the real painter to be Benedetto Orsi.

## Orsi, Bernardino[[@Headword:Orsi, Bernardino]]

             an Italian painter, flourished at Reggio in the early part of the 15th century. According to Tiraboschi he was an eminent artist in his time. Most of his works have perished. Lanzi says Reggio still boasts a Madonna of Loretto painted by him in the cathedral in 1501.

## Orsi, Giuseppe Agostino[[@Headword:Orsi, Giuseppe Agostino]]

             an Italian Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Florence May 9, 1692. He received his education from the Jesuits, and in 1708 he entered the monastery of the Dominicans at Fiesole. Having been teacher of theology and philosophy in the monastery of St. Mark, at Florence, he was in 1732 called to Rome, and appointed secretary in the Congregation of the Index; in 1749 he became magister palatii; in 1759 cardinal, and died in 1761. Besides his work De irreformabili Roman. Pontific. in defin. idei controvers. judicio (Romoe, 1739), which was written for the purpose of defending papal infallibility, he also wrote a Church History (21 vols.), reaching as far down as the year 600 (Rome, 1747- sq., and 1754 sq.); a continuation of which, in 29 vols., reaching down to the Council of Trent, was written by the Dominican Becchetti (Rome, 1770 and 1788). See Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:885-886.

## Orsi, Lelio[[@Headword:Orsi, Lelio]]

             (called LELIO DA NOVELLARA), an Italian painter, was born at Reggio in 1511. Banished from his native city for some unknown reason, he established himself at Novellara, where he gained such great distinction as to acquire the surname. Notwithstanding he was one of the ablest artists of his time — and his works have been the admiration of succeeding times, — very little is known of his life with any certainty, and his history is mostly founded on supposition. The cardinal Tiraboschi wrote his life, compiled from a variety of sources. The Italian writers say that he was “in pittura grande, in architettura ottimo, e in disegno massimo” (in painting grand, in architecture excellent, and in design pre-eminent). Tiraboschi conjectures, on the authority of a MS., that he imbibed his taste of design at Rome; others suppose that he was a pupil of Michael Angelo, or that he studied  the designs and models of that master; and others, again, that he was a pupil of Giulio Romano. There is great similarity in his style to that of Correggio, though his are of a far more robust character; his works having the same grace in his chiaroscuro, in the spreading of his colors, and in the beauty and delicacy of his youthful heads; hence some suppose, with great probability, that he was a pupil of that master. At all events it is certain that he was on friendly terms with Correggio, that civilities passed between them, and that Orsi attentively studied his works, and copied some of them, as is evident from his fine copy of the celebrated Nolle, now in the possession of the noble house of Gazzolo at Verona. Tiraboschi says he painted several works for the churches at Rome. It would therefore seem probable, as Tiraboschi asserts, that he first studied at Rome, and afterwards improved his style by contemplating the works of Correggio; for Lanzi says “his design is evidently not of the Lombard school, and hence the difficulty of supposing him one of the scholars of Correggio, in which his earlier works, at least, would have partaken of a less robust character.” He painted many noble frescos in the churches at Reggio and Novellara, most of which have perished. Lanzi says, “for such of his works as are now to be seen at Modena we are indebted to Francesco III, of glorious memory, who had them transferred from the fortress of Novellara to the ducal palace for their preservation. Few of his altar-pieces now remain in public at either Novellara or Reggio, the most having perished or been removed, one of which last, representing Sts. Rocco and Sebastiano along with S. Giobbe, I happened to meet in the studio of Signor Armanno at Bologna.” There are a few others of doubtful authenticity, claimed to be genuine, by him at Parma, Ancona, and Mantua. Orsi died in 1587.

## Orsi, Prospero[[@Headword:Orsi, Prospero]]

             a Roman painter, was born in 1560. According to Baglioni, he was employed by pope Sixtus V in the palace of St. John of Lateran, where he painted two ceilings, one representing the Children of Israel passing through the Red Sea, and the other Isaac blessing Jacob. He was the particular friend of the Cav. Giuseppe Cesari d'Arpino, whose manner he imitated. He afterwards abandoned historical subjects for grotesques, for which he had extraordinary talents, and for this reason was called Prosperino dalle Grottesche. He died in 1635, in the pontificate of Urban VIII.

## Orsini[[@Headword:Orsini]]

             SEE BENEDICT XIII; SEE URSINUS.

## Ortega[[@Headword:Ortega]]

             (ST.), Juan de, a Spanish architect, flourished during the 11th century. According to Miliza, he was the son of Vela Velasquez, and a native of Fontana d'Ortunno, dear Burgos. He is said to have made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and to have erected at Montesdosa a church, a monastery, and a hospital, still existing.

## Ortega, Raymundo[[@Headword:Ortega, Raymundo]]

             a Spanish theologian noted for his antiquarian labors, was born at Beja in the 9th century. Nothing further is known of his personal history. His work, De Antiquitatibus Lusitaniae, which is reputed to have been written about 878, is a valuable treatise, and will perpetuate the memory of this scholar. He died towards the close of the 9th century.

## Orthodox[[@Headword:Orthodox]]

             (ὀρθόξος, from ὀρθός, right, and δόξα, an opinion) are those whose doctrine is right-whose religious opinion is in accordance with an assumed or generally prevalent standard. This last is with Roman Catholics the dogmas of their Church, with Protestants it is the Bible. The doctrines which are generally considered as orthodox among us are such as were generally professed at the time of the Reformation, viz. the fall of man, regeneration, atonement, repentance, justification by free grace, etc. The national standard of orthodoxy is not the same in all countries; for those opinions and observances which are received by the majority of any nation, or are patronized by the ruling power, are recognized as the standard faith; hence the Greek Church is orthodox in Russia; the Roman Catholic in Spain, Portugal, France, etc. the Anglican Church in England; the Presbyterian in Scotland; but in Ireland, while the religion of the majority is Roman Catholic, the state Church is on the Anglican model; so that it is a disputed point which set of religious opinions and customs should be acknowledged as orthodox. Again, in Upper Canada the orthodox faith is the Protestant Episcopal; while in Lower Canada the established religion, which is also the opinion of the majority is Roman Catholic. In New England the term is employed to distinguish those Congregational churches  which hold the evangelical creed from the Unitarian and Universalist churches. SEE ORTHODOXY.

Some have thought that, in order to keep error out of the Church, there should be some human form as a standard of orthodoxy, wherein certain disputed doctrines shall be expressed in determinate phrases directly leveled against such errors as shall prevail from time to time, requiring those especially who are to be public teachers in the Church to subscribe or virtually to declare their assent to such formularies. But, as Dr. Doddridge observes,

1. Had this been requisite, it is probable that the Scriptures would have given us some such formularies as these, or some directions as to the manner in which they should be drawn up, proposed, and received.

2. It is impossible that weak and passionate men, who have perhaps been heated in the very controversy thus decided, should express themselves with greater propriety than the apostles did.

3. It is plain, in fact, that this practice has been the cause of great contention in the Christian Church, and such formularies have been the grand engine of dividing it, in proportion to the degree in which they have been multiplied and urged.

4. This is laying a great temptation in the way of such as desire to undertake the office of teachers in the Church, and will be most likely to deter and afflict those who have the greatest tenderness of conscience, and therefore (being equal in other respects) best deserve encouragement.

5. It is not likely to answer the end proposed, viz. the preservation of uniformity of opinion; since persons of little integrity may satisfy their consciences in subscribing what they do not at all believe as articles of peace, or in putting the most unnatural sense on the words. And whereas, in answer to all these inconveniences, his pleaded that such forms are necessary to keep the Church from heresy, and it is better there should be some hypocrites under such forms of orthodoxy than that a freedom of debate and opinion should be allowed to all teachers; the answer is plain that when anyone begins to preach doctrines which appear to those who attend upon him dangerous and subversive of Christianity, it will be time enough to proceed to such animadversion as the nature of his error in their apprehension will require, and his relation to them will admit. These  remarks however are not applicable to the use of simple confessions or declarations of faith, the object of which is to ascertain and promote Christian fellowship. The design of these is of course only to state the sense in which we interpret and understand the Word of God. Thus, e.g., the Evangelical Alliance (q.v.) has adopted an orthodox standard for common confession of its members. See Doddridge, Lectures, lect. 174; Watts, Orthodoxy and Charity United; Fuller, Works; Robert Hall, Works; Duncan and Miller, On the Utility of Creeds; Donaldson, Christian Orthodoxy (Lond. 1857, 8vo), especially ch. v. SEE ESTABLISHMENT; SEE SUBSCRIPTION.

## Orthodoxy And Heterodoxy[[@Headword:Orthodoxy And Heterodoxy]]

             The use of these two words implies the possession of a standard of truth, so that what agrees with it is right, and what disagrees with it is wrong. In the general domain of truth, where there are no positive stipulations, and in philosophy, this distinction cannot be made. Yet as Christianity started with the consciousness of possessing the truth, it Was from the first led to establish principles — though less clearly defined than they were afterwards. Indeed we find heresy mentioned already in the N.T., as a departure from the absolute truth in religious doctrines and religious life. Christ came into the world to disclose the truth, as ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωῆ (Joh 14:6); every one who is of the truth hears his voice (Joh 18:37). Hence any one who follows his teachings is ὀρθοτομῶν τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθεαίς (2Ti 2:15), and the true doctrine is ἀποστολικὴ ὀρθοτομία (Euseb. Church History, 4:3), little different from what was later designated as ὀρθοδοξία (G. Major, De voc. ὀρθ. sign.if: Vit. 1545). Thus there arose in the apostolical times a κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, a regula veritatis; every departure from it was soon stamped as heresy, and afterwards more correctly called ἑτεροδοξία, by which we are to understand only οὐκ ὀρθοποδεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Gal 2:14; comp. 2Co 11:2 sq.), διδαχὴ ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε (Rom 16:17)? He who teaches differently, ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. ῏Ι Χρ. καὶ τῇ κατ᾿ ἐυσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾷ (1Ti 6:3). Plato considered heterodoxy as error, not as a simple departure from orthodoxy. Yet the ancient Church did not particularly attach itself to these denominations of orthodoxy and heterodoxy as designating the contrast between the Christian truth and its  opposite, for its doctrines were not yet firmly enough established. But as they gradually came to be more strictly defined, that which agreed with the decisions of the Church was called orthodox, and whatever differed from them heterodox. The notion of orthodoxy commenced only to acquire real power when the Church attained a secure footing in the state. We find the expression often used by Eusebius, Athanasius (whom Epiphanius: calls the father of orthodoxy, Haer. lxix, c. 2), etc., and also among the Latins, e.g. in the writings of Jerome. Isidore of Hispalis says in the Origines.(7:14). “Orthodoxus est recte credens et ut credit recte vivens.”

The Church as the embodiment of religion in the community needs a firmly established doctrine as its basis; it. no longer leaves the individual free to believe as he chooses. Unity of doctrine with the Church, or at least the acceptance of its fundamental principles, constitutes orthodoxys, departure from them is heterodoxy. A tendency to the use of these words was already apparent in the ancient Church, for we find Ignatius in the beginning of the 2d century designates. those who depart from the general faith, as taught and supported by the bishops, as ἑτεροδοξοῦτες (A d Smyrn. c. 6), and warns his readers against being led into error ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις (Ad Magn. c. 8). But he uses them more in the etymological than in the ecclesiastical sense. The ecclesiastical use of them did not become general before the 4th century, when the regula veritatis gradually acquired a more objective form in the canon of Scripture, in the confessions of the Church, the decrees of the synods, and the assertion of the Church possessing the standard of truth. In cases of uncertainty, the Church or the synods decided as to what was conformed to, the doctrine of the Church (orthodox), and what contrary to, it (heterodox). Thus it gradually proclaimed more and more loudly, especially in the East, that the doctrine it taught constituted orthodoxy, and that every doctrine differing from it was heterodoxy.

This question of orthodoxy twice attained paramount importance in the Church. First in the difficulties concerning the dogma and ecclesiastical usages which more from an outward impulse than from inner reasons led to a separation between the Eastern and the Western churches. In these discussions, and particularly on that concerning images, the Greek Church always based itself on its antiquity and its orthodoxy, till in the course of the dispute the ἑορτὴ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας was established in 842, which led to the Greek Church assuming specifically the name of orthodox, which it still maintains. The first formal exposition of its dogmas by Joiin of Damascus (732) had already borne the title of ἔκθεσις τῆς ὀρθοδξου  πίστεως, which was also the case with other distinguished dogmatic works afterwards, such as Euthymius Zigadenus's πανοπλία δογματικὴ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, and Nicetas Acominatus's θησαυρὸς ὀρθοδοξίας. The Greek Church consequently claims to possess the absolute truth, which she preserves without attempting to develop it, like a miser his treasure, while she considers all other Christian churches as heterodox, schismatic, and heretical. This is evinced in all official acts and documents of the Greek Church, as also from the generally received confession of the archbishop of Kief, Peter Mogilas, which bears the inscription Ο᾿ρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησαίς ἀνατολικῆς. See Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 17:466 sq.; Marheineke, Ueb. d. Ursprung u.d. Entwickelung d. Orthodoxie u. Heterodoxie, etc. in Daub u. Creutzer, Studienui. 1807.

The second occasion when the question of orthodoxy acquired such importance was at the time of Luther's Reformation. The whole body of doctrine was revised and determined down to the most minute dogmatic definitions. The adherents of the Reformation in the 16th century were from, the first obliged to defend themselves against the accusation of heresy and neologism. They were thus obliged to prove their conformity with the ancient Church, and therefore their orthodoxy. But as on this point there was no ecclesiastical authority to refer to, every member of the Protestant Church was obliged all the more diligently to prove his unity of doctrine with the true Church of Christ by the only valid standard, Scripture, and to reject from his association those who did not conform to that standard. The disputes which preceded the drawing up of the Formula of Concord greatly strengthened this feeling, and soon those alone were considered orthodox who accepted every article of that formula. The zeal of the contest magnified the importance of the mooted points until it led almost to a separation. The orthodox party considered that the possession of the absolute truth was sufficient, without absolute purity of life; it was a time of dead orthodoxy. There were certainly men of active and living piety in the party, but the paramount consideration was that of conformity to the doctrine of the Church, so that thoroughly worldly men who accepted fully every article of the formula were in high honor in the Church; while such men as John Arnd, Spener, Gottfried Arnold, could not atone by their piety for their want of conformity on some points, and were violently attacked by distinguished orthodox teachers. All heterodoxy was then considered as heresy, i.e. regarded as attacking the very foundation of  religious truth.

This tendency was strenuously opposed by the gentle and learned. G. Calixtus, and the pious and active Spener. Pietism, which arose about that time, aided in the work — although opposed also by the followers of Spener, and the orthodox party became but a shadow of its former self. Soon, however, under the influence of Kant, philosophy also entered into the strife. As it prevailed, orthodoxy became but a name to be mocked at (Nicolai Elias Hartknoch), and all the views which were formerly denounced as heterodox. nay even heretical, were now looked upon as orthodox. The Rationalists — when they retained Christ and the Bible — based their Christianity on reason; and every one was considered orthodox who still adhered to positive Christianity. As for definite Church doctrines, they seemed to be forever consigned to oblivion. The reaction, however, came from the same side from whence the attack had proceeded. In Kant himself there were already signs of this. Fichte, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Baader, Hegel, etc., threw discredit on the so-called revelations of the philosophic school, and led the way to a more thorough conception of the Biblical, and in consequence of the ecclesiastical doctrines. Theology now receiver a fresh impulse from such men as Schleiermacher, Neander, etc. The issue of the controversies thus raised will be found treated under SEE PROTESTANTISM; SEE RATIONALISM; SEE RITUALISM, and similar heads. SEE ORTHODOX.

## Orthodoxy, Feast of[[@Headword:Orthodoxy, Feast of]]

             The Council of Constantinople, held under Photius, in the year 879, and reckoned by the Greeks as the eighth general council, fortified image- worship by new and firm decisions, approving and renewing all the decrees of the Nicene Council. The Greeks, a superstitious people, and controlled by monks, regarded this as so great a blessing conferred on them by heaven that they resolved to consecrate an anniversary in remembrance of it, which they called the Feast of Orthodoxy.

## Orthosias[[@Headword:Orthosias]]

             (Ο᾿ρθωσιάς v. r. Ο᾿ρθωσία, Vulg. Orthosias), a place on the shore of Palestine, to which Tryphon, when besieged by Antiochus Sidetes in Dora, fled by ship (1Ma 15:37). Orthosia is described by Pliny (v. 17) as north of Tripolis, and south of the river Eleutherus, near which it was situated (Strabo, xvi, p. 753). It was the northern boundary of Phoenicia, and distant 1130 stadia from the Orontes (id. p. 760). Shaw (Trav. p. 270-  1, 2d ed.) identifies the Eleutherus with the modern Nahr el-Bridle, on the north bank of which, corresponding to the description of Strabo (p. 753), he found “ruins of a considerable city, whose adjacent district pays yearly to the bashaws of Tripoli a tax of fifty dollars by the name of Or-tosa. In the Peutinger Tables, also, Orthosia is placed thirty miles to the south of Antaradus, and twelve miles to the north of Tripoli.

The situation of it likewise is further illustrated by a medal of Antoninus Pius, struck at Orthosia; upon the reverse of which we have the goddess Astarte treading upon a river. For this city was built upon a rising ground on the northern banks of the river, within half a furlong of the sea, and, as the rugged eminences of Mount Libanus lie at a small distance in a parallel with the shore, Orthosia must have been a place of the greatest importance, as it would have hereby the entire command of the road (the only one there is) betwixt Phoenice and the maritime parts of Syria.” (See also Thomson, in the Biblioth. Sacra, 1848, p. 14.) On the other hand, Mr. Porter, who identifies the Eleutherus with the modern Nahr el-Kebtr, describes the ruins of Orthosia as on the south bank of the Nahr el-Barid, “the cold river” (Handb. p. 542, 553, ed. 1875), thus agreeing with the accounts of Ptolemy and Pliny. The statement of Strabo is not sufficiently precise to allow the inference that he considered Orthosia north of the Eleutherus. But if the ruins on the south bank of the Nahr el-Barid be really those of Orthosia, it seems an objection to the identification of the Eleutherus with the Nahr el-Kebir; for Strabo at one time makes Orthosia (xiv, p. 670), and at another the neighboring river Eleutherus (ὁ πλησίον ποταμός), the boundary of Phoenicia on the north. This could hardly have been the case if the Eleutherus were 38 hours, or nearly twelve miles, from Orthosia. Kiepert (Map) locates Orthosia at Nahr Arka, midway between these two points (Robinson, Later Bib. Res. p. 582).

According to Josephus (Anf. 10:7, 2), Tryphon fled to Apamea, while in a fragment of Charax, quoted by Grimm (Kurzgef. Handb.) from Muller's Frag. Graec. Hist. 3:644, fr. 14, he is said to have taken refuge at Ptolemais. Grimm reconciles these statements by supposing that Tryphon fled first to Orthosia, then to Ptolemais, and lastly to Apamea, where he was slain.

## Ortiz, Alonso[[@Headword:Ortiz, Alonso]]

             a noted Spanish theologian and historian, was a native of Toledo, and flourished in the early part of the 16th century. He held for some time the  canonry of Toledo, and while in this position he was employed by cardinal Ximenes to revise the Mozarabic Liturgy. At his death Ortiz bequeathed his library to the University of Salamanca. He left six:essays, which were collected and published in one volume under the title of De la herida del rey Don Fernando el Catdolco, consolatorio a la princesa de, Portugal; Una oracion a los reyes catolicos (in Spanish and Latin); Dos cartas mensageras a los reyes, una que escribio la ciudad, la otra el cabildo de la iglesia de Toledo; Contra la carta del protonotario' Loena (Seville, 1493, fol.). The most important among them are a treatise, in twenty-seven chapters, addressed to the princess of Portugal, daughter of Isabella, on the death of her husband, and a discourse addressed to Ferdinand and Isabella after the taking of Granada in 1492, in which he rejoices over the event, and expresses also his satisfaction at the cruel expulsion of the Jews and heretics. “These two discourses,” says Ticknor, “are written in a pompous style; vet they are not wanting in merit, and the second contains one or two really fine and even touching passages on the peace enjoyed by Spain since its hated enemy had been expelled, heartfelt expressions of the author which found an echo in all the Spaniards.” Besides these two treatises, this volume contains an account of an attempt at assassination committed against Ferdinand the Catholic at Barcelona Dec. 7, 1472; two letters from the city and cathedral of Toledo, asking that Granada may not take precedence before Toledo; and an attack against the prothonotary Juan de Lucena, who had ventured to blame the severity of the Inquisition. He wrote also Missale mixtum, secundum regulam beati Isidori, dictum Mozarabes (Toledo, 1500, fol., with a preface): — Breviariumn mixtum secundum regulam beati Isidori, dictum Mozarabes (Toledo, 1502, fol.); these two works are of great value on account of the learned preface and of their scarcity. See Nicolas Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispana nova; Ticknor, History of Spanish Literature, 1:383; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:891; Stud. u. Krit. 1868, 3:537; Meth. Qu. Rev. July, 1867, p. 437. (J. N. P.)

## Ortlibenses[[@Headword:Ortlibenses]]

             is the name of a Christian sect, sometimes spoken of as a branch of the ancient Vaudois, or Waldenses (q. y.). They were afterwards identified with the Brethren of the Free Spirit. The Ortlibenses are mentioned in the treatise of Reinerius against the Waldenses (Bibl. Max. 25:266), where also they are called, but apparently by a false reading, Ordibarii. The Ortlibenses appear to have been a party of the disciples of A malric of  Bena, who formed themselves into a sect under the influence of a leader named Ortlieb, at Strasburg, early in the 13th century (Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 3:467). Reiner describes them as repudiators of nearly all the articles of Christian faith. Thus they denied that there was a Trinity before the nativity of Jesus Christ, who, according to them. only then became the Son of God. To these two persons of the Godhead they added a third, during the preaching of Jesus Christ, namely, the apostle Peter, whom they acknowledged as being the Holy Ghost. They held the eternity of the world; but had no notion of the resurrection of the body or the immortality of the soul. Notwithstanding this they maintained (perhaps by way of irony) that there would be a final judgment, at which time the pope and the emperor would become proselytes to their sect. They denied the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. His cross, they pretended, was penance and their own abstemious way of life; this, they said, was the cross Jesus Christ bore. They ascribed all the virtue of baptism to the merit of him who administered it. They were of opinion that Jews might be saved without baptism, provided they joined their ranks. They boldly asserted that they themselves were the only true mystical body, that is to say; the Church of Christ. The Ortlibensian heresy seems to have been closely associated with the pantheism of Amalric, and with his theory as to the incarnation of the Holy Spirit. See, besides the works by Reiner and Gieseler above referred to, Neander, Ch. Hist. 4:570, 571.

## Orton, Azariah G. D.D[[@Headword:Orton, Azariah G. D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in Tyringham, Berkshire County, Mass., Aug. 6, 1789. He graduated at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., in 1813; studied theology in Princeton. Theological Seminary. Princeton, N.J.; was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, and ordained at Cranberry, N. J., in 1822. He labored successfully at Seneca Falls, N. Y., Lisle, Greene, and Lisle a second time. He died, at the latter place Dec. 28, 1864. Dr. Orton wrote largely for the press, especially on capital punishment, episcopacy, and slavery. He was a man of profound investigation; his powers of abstraction were seldom equaled. Infidelity in all its phases found in him an unbending opponent. Never for one moment did he seem to doubt the divinity of Christ, the inspiration of the Bible, or the sacredness of the ministry. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alm. 1866, p. 220. (J. L. S.)

## Orton, Job, S.T.P.[[@Headword:Orton, Job, S.T.P.]]

             an eminent English divine of the Independent body, noted as an expositor of sacred writ and as a pulpit laborer, was born at Shrewsbury Sept. 4, 1717. To his parents, who were the patrons of piety and good men, he was indebted for early instruction in the Christian faith, and he imbibed from them the principles of pure religion. In his native town he acquired a considerable portion of classical learning. In his sixteenth year he was put under the tuition of Dr. Charles Owen, of Warrington, who had usually with him a few young men designed for the work of the ministry. In 1734 he was sent to Dr. Doddridge's academy at Northampton; and, after going through the ordinary course of studies, he was in 1739 appointed assistant to the doctor in his academical labors. Young Orton discharged the duties of this office with singular ability, prudence, and success. In 1741 he was taken from this situation to his native town by the united voices of the Presbyterian and Independent congregations, which joined to receive him as their pastor. On Dr. Doddridge's decease, he was pressingly invited to succeed him in the academy and congregation; but this, as well as a call to succeed Dr. Hughes in London, he declined, and continued his labors at Shrewsbury till compelled by ill-health to resign the pastoral office. After this he devoted himself to literary pursuits, so far as his health would allow till his death, which occurred at Kidderminster July 19, 1783. “Few men were more diligent than Mr. Orton, or mnore conscientious in performing the various duties of his office. To the end of his life his heart was set on doing good; and when he had ceased to preach, conversation, letters, plans of sermons, were sent to his friends, and every private method in his power was resorted to. With the same view he published books: viz. Discourses on Eternity (1764, several editions), On Zeal (1774, 12mo), On Christian Worship (1775, 12mo): — Meditations for the Sacrament (1777, 12mo): — several volumes of Sermons, etc. His Life of Dr. Doddridge (Salop, 1766, 80o, and often) is one of the most useful books to a student and a minister.” But the principal work from the pen of Dr: Orton was published after his decease, and is entitled A Short and Plain Exposition of the Old Testament, with Devotional and Practical Reflections, for the Use of Families (edited by Robert Gentleman, from the author's MSS., 6 vols. 8vo, 1798; 2d ed. 6 vols. 1822). “It is composed on the plan of Doddridge's Expositor, with which it forms a complete commentary on the entire Bible. It is well adapted to the object for which it was intended, and exhibits good sense and much sound exposition. In its own department it  has not been superseded” (Kitto). See Jones, Christian Biog. s.v.; Kippis, Biog. Brit. v. 308; Alibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1462, 1463; Lowndes, Brit. Lib. p. 640, 821.

## Orus[[@Headword:Orus]]

             SEE HORUS.

## Orvis, Samuel[[@Headword:Orvis, Samuel]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Denmark, Lewis County, N. Y., Dec. 5, 1813; was converted in 1829; commenced preaching in 1839; joined the Black River Conference in 1842, and died at Carthage, N. Y., Sept. 14, 1850. Mr. Orvis was one of the brightest ornaments of his conference. His sermons were digested, symmetrical, and powerful, his scholarship respectable and sound, and his ardor for study intense. His pastoral labors were full of affection and success, and all his efforts were by his fervent piety made very acceptable and useful. See Minutes of Conferences, 4:616; Black River Conf: Memorial, p. 280. (G. L. T.)

## Oryx[[@Headword:Oryx]]

             a species of antelope held in high estimation among the ancient Egyptians. Sir John G. Wilkinson says: “Among the Egyptians the oryx was the only one of the antelope tribe chosen as an emblem, but it was not sacred; and the same city on whose monuments it was represented in sacred subjects was in the habit of killing it for the table. The head of this animal formed the prow of the mysterious boat of Pthah-Sokari-Osiris, who was worshipped with peculiar honors at Memphis, and who held a conspicuous place among contemporary gods of all the temples of Upper and Lower Egypt. This did not, however, prevent their sacrificing the oryx to the gods, or slaughtering it for their own use, large herds of them being kept by the wealthy Egyptians for this purpose, and the sculptures of Memphis and its vicinity abound, no less than those of the Thebaid, with proofs of this fact. But a particular one may have been set apart and consecrated to the deity, being distinguished by certain marks which the priests fancied they could discern, as in the case of oxen exempted from sacrifice. And if the laws permitted the oryx to be killed without the mark of the pontiffs seal (which was indispensable for oxen previous to their being taken to the altar), the privilege of exemption might be secured to a single animal when  kept apart within the inaccessible precincts of the temple. In the zodiacs the oryx was chosen to represent the sign Capricornus. M. Champollion considers it the representative of Seth, and Horapolla gives it an unenviable character as the emblem of impurity. It was even thought to foreknow the rising of the moon, and to be indignant at her presence. Pliny is disposed to give it credit for better behavior towards the dog-star, which, when rising, it looked upon with the appearance of adoration. But the naturalist was misinformed respecting the growth of its hair in imitation of the bull Basis. Such were the fables of old writers; and judging from the important post it held in the boat of Sokari, I am disposed to consider it the emblem of a good rather than of an evil deity, contrary to the opinion of the learned Champollion.” SEE ANTELOPE.

## Orzechowski, Stanislaus[[@Headword:Orzechowski, Stanislaus]]

             (better known to learned Europe under his Latinized name of Orzichorius), is one of the most noted of Polish theologians of the Reformation period. He was born in Galicia in 1513. pursued his elementary studies at Przemysl, and then went to the universities of Vienna and Wittenberg. At the latter place he became intimately acquainted with Luther and Melancthon, and adopted their opinions; not, however, from a sense of piety and love of truth, but because his reckless character craved novelty. “Having been sent to Germany,” he says himself, “I became enamoured of innovation. I considered that it would be very honorable to me if, by introducing some German doctrines, I should be distinguished from my equals in age, as, for instance, such principles as to disobey the pope; to have no respect for laws; to revel always, and never to fast; to seize the Church property; to know nothing about God; to exterminate the monks. After three years of study I arrived at the truth that all which is old, which is paternal, is not just. I wished to advance further, and I passed to Carlstadt, of whom it was said that all that he has taken from Luther he has made still worse. To the guidance of such leaders I intrusted myself, and whoever made more and bolder innovations, him I considered better and more learned.” This description of the particular tenets which he confessed, expressed in the most coarse and abusive language, was written at a time when he had joined the Romanists and attacked the Protestants; and although the account which he gives of his connection with the Reformers was written in order to throw odium on the Protestant doctrines, he gave at the same time a true picture of his passionate character, which rendered him through all his life equally dangerous as a friend or as an enemy.

After  having finished his studies at the German universities, Orzechowski visited Rome, and returned to his native land in 1543, thoroughly imbued with the opinions of the Reformers. He began openly to broach them in his country; but he soon perceived that they could not afford him any worldly advantages, while the Roman Catholic Church could dispose of wealth and honors in favor of its defenders. He therefore entered into orders, and was, after some time, promoted to the canonry of Przemysl. But, although a member of the Roman Catholic clergy, he could not entirely conceal his real opinions, being continually excited by his relative, Rey, of Naglowice, one of the first Protestant writers of his country. Afraid of losing, by an overt attack on the Roman Catholic Church, the advantages he derived as one of her dignitaries, he did it in an indirect manner. Thus he opened a' discussion in several writings on the councils of Ferrara and Florence, questioning the supremacy of the pope over the Eastern Church, although ostensibly professing a great respect for those councils, and thereby provoking an inquiry into the relation of the Polish Church, which was of Eastern origin, to the Church of Rome as its supreme (?) head. He also openly defended the matrimony of the priests. Having been cited before the ecclesiastical authorities for attempting innovations dangerous to the repose of the Church and the purity of its doctrines, Orzechowski made a recantation of his opinions, and the book which contained them was condemned to be burned. This submission of Orzechowski to the authority of his Church was not, however, of long duration; and when the rector of Kryczonow married a wife, Orzechowski took his part violently against the clergy. Soon afterwards he himself publicly married Magdaline Chelnicki; and when the bishop of Przemysl cited him on that account before the tribunal, he arrived in company with such numerous and powerful friends that the bishop dared not open the court, but, affecting to judge him by default, signed a decree of excommunication, inflicting upon him the penalty of infamy and confiscation of property.

Orzechowski, not in the least intimidated by these proceedings, gave a public justification of his conduct before his congregation. He complained at the same time before the tribunal of the province of the violent and cruel proceedings, and made an appeal from the episcopal sentence to the archbishop. Public sentiment favored Orzechowski, and, though the highest governmental authority had, approved the episcopal verdict, no officer dared to execute the Church decree. The delay only encouraged the opposition; and when in 1550 a diet was convened to further consider the case general opinion was so outspokenly arrayed against the Church that Orzechowski found it an easy  task to fan the popular indignation into a terrible flame, and thus unconsciously became a most valuable servant to the Reformation cause, though ha had himself turned the cold shoulder to it. His bitter attack of Romanism opened the eyes of the people, and soon the bishops who had been so eager to condemn Orzechowski sought for an opportunity to reconcile this able and violent antagonist. On Feb. 17, 1552, absolution was granted him, and he thereupon presented to a Roman Catholic synod a declaration of his entire adherence to its tenets, and at the same time resigned his ecclesiastical dignities. But as the pope of Rome refused to approve the action of the synod and bishops, Orzechowski broke out anew in invectives against Rome. This time, however, his opposition proved no longer as formidable as heretofore, the golden opportunity for leadership having been lost by him. Those who favored the Reformation cause lared not to trust him after his sudden desertion. The Romanists put his writings into the Index Expugatorius, and he was declared a servant of Satan. In 1557 he was excommunicated anew, but when, soon after, his wife died — the principal obstacle to reconciliation with Rome, as the pope refused to endorse the marriage contract — Orzechowski was approached kindly, and in 1559 was finally reconciled to the Church which he had so long and violently and ably attacked. He now directed his hostility to the Protestants, and for many years was Rome's ablest champion in Poland. His writings of this period abound in the same virulence and scurrility which characterize his works against Rome. He died in the second half of the 16th century. The life of this extraordinary individual is one of the most striking proofs that the highest talent, destitute of principle, is unable to produce anything that is really great or good. The principal cause of popular discontent with Rome in Poland, and the principal promoter of Protestant liberty, he betrayed by the fickleness of his character and the versatility of his opinions the high vocation to which his great talents and bold character seemed to entitle him. He might have been the founder of Protestantism in Poland. He died an abject slave to popish error and superstition, and left his country in darkness and slavery, instead of securing for it religious and civil freedom. See Krasinski, Hist. of the Ref. in Poland, 1:179-198.

## Osaias[[@Headword:Osaias]]

             (᾿Ωσαίας,Vulg. omits), a Graecized form (1Es 8:48) of the name JESHAIAH (Ezr 8:19).

## Osbaldistan, Richard[[@Headword:Osbaldistan, Richard]]

             an English prelate of note, was born near the opening of the 18th century. He was educated at Oxford, and, even after entering the Church, taught for a while. He was at one time master of Westminster School. While in this position he was found to entertain contempt for high ecclesiastical  authorities (see Perry, Ch. Hist. 1:536, 537), and he was obliged to flee from the country. Later we find Osbaldistan in the deanery of York, and in 1747 he was elevated to the bishopric of Carlisle, from which he was transferred to London in 1762. He died in 1764. He published several Sermons (Lond. 1723, 1748, 1752).

## Osband, Gideon[[@Headword:Osband, Gideon]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near the opening of this century. Of his early history we have but little at our command. He entered the Genesee Conference in 1842 or 1843, and for twelve years successfully labored for the Christian cause. “He accomplished,” says the record, “more for his sin-periled race and the glory of God than some men have in half a century.” He died at Macedon Centre, N. Y., June 7, 1855. See Conable, Hist. of the Genesee Conference (N.Y. 1876, 8vo), p. 550, 551.

## Osbern(e) Of Canterbury[[@Headword:Osbern(e) Of Canterbury]]

             an English divine of the-Anglo-Norman period, flourished near the close of the 11th century. He died in 1100. He is the author of a life of St. Dunstan, published in Wharton's Anglia Sacra (1691, fol.), and is supposed to have left other writings. See Wright, Biog. Brit. Literaria (Anglo-Norman period), p. 26 sq.

## Osbern(e) Of Gloucester[[@Headword:Osbern(e) Of Gloucester]]

             another English divine of the Anglo-Norman period, flourished near the middle of the 12th century. He was the author of a Commentary on the Pentateuch, in the form of dialogues; also a Commentary on the Book of Judges, and four treatises On the Incarnation, Nativity, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ, but none of these works have ever been printed. See Wright, Biog. Brit. Literaria (Anglo-Norman period), p. 158 sq.

## Osbernus, Claudianus[[@Headword:Osbernus, Claudianus]]

             SEE OSBERIN OF GLOUCESTER.

## Osbon, Abiathar Mann, D.D[[@Headword:Osbon, Abiathar Mann, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in 1808. He entered the New York Conference in 1829, with which he ever after remained connected, and in which he occupied many of the most important appointments, as pastor and presiding elder, and also as a member of the General Conference. He died August 6, 1882. He often wrote for the periodicals, and published a small volume on the prophecies of Daniel. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1883, page 89.

## Osborn, Chauncey[[@Headword:Osborn, Chauncey]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Berkshire, Tioga County, N. Y., Aug. 1, 1811. He was educated in Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio; studied divinity in the theological seminary of Hudson, Ohio; was licensed by Portage Presbytery, and ordained pastor of the Church in Farmington, Ohio, in 1842. He labored successively at Grand Blanc Brighton, Byron, Livonia, and Dearbornsville — all in the state of Michigan. He died Nov.  30, 1866. Mr. Osborn was a diligent and faithful home missionary, singularly punctual and systematic in his studies and habits, and never wearying in his labor of love. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 222. (J. L. S.)

## Osborn, Jeremiah[[@Headword:Osborn, Jeremiah]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lenox, Mass., in 1779. He studied theology under Dr. Perkins, and was one of the pioneer ministers of Tioga County, N. Y. He was ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Berkshire, N. Y., in 1806; preached in that place until 1820, when he removed to Candor, in the same county. Here his labors were indefatigable. Oftentimes he was known to start out on a pastoral visitation in the morning, visit from house to house through the day, conduct an evening meeting, and return to his home, not having taken any meal since he left in the morning. He became prematurely old, and was obliged to retire from the active ministry. In 1836 he removed to Ohio, and in 1839, while on a journey to Massachusetts to visit his mother, he died suddenly. Mr. Osborn was a man of grave and dignified deportment, his manner in the pulpit being of this type, and his sermons being always impressed with solemnity. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 222. (J. L. S.)

## Osborn, Samuel[[@Headword:Osborn, Samuel]]

             a Congregational minister, of Irish birth, came to this country near the opening of last century, and was minister at Eastham, Mass., from 1718 to 1736, when he was obliged to retire because of his leaning to Arminianism. He then taught school for some ten years in the city of Boston, and died about 1785, aged about ninety-five years. He published his case and complaint in 1743.

## Osborn, Theron[[@Headword:Osborn, Theron]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Amenia, N. Y.; in 1796; was converted about 1814, joined the New York Conference in 1826, and died at Marlborough, N. Y., Aug. 12, 1852. He was a faithful and useful minister, of deep piety, beautiful virtue, moderate gifts, and considerable usefulness. See Minutes of Conferences, v. 190; Smith, Sacred Memories, p. 46 sq.

## Osborne, Ethan[[@Headword:Osborne, Ethan]]

             an American Presbyterian minister, was born at Litchfield, Conn., Aug. 21, 1758. When just ready for school the Revolutionary War broke out, and he entered the army in defense of the American cause. After the war he studied for the ministry, and was licensed when twenty-seven years old; and from December, 1798, to 1844 was settled as pastor over the Old Sione Church at Fairfield, N. J. He died there May 1, 1858.

## Osborne, Lord Sydney Godolphin[[@Headword:Osborne, Lord Sydney Godolphin]]

             an English divine and philanthropist, was born Feb. 5, 1808, and graduated at Oxford in 1830. He became rector of Stoke Pogis, and in 1841 at Durweston, Dorsetshire. He died in 1873. Lord Osborne published Scutari and its Hospitals (1855), which he visited and aided in improving, and many brief essays for the promotion of various charities, as well as work of a strictly secular character.

## Osborne, Michael[[@Headword:Osborne, Michael]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Essex County, N.J., March 21, 1796. His early .educational advantages were limited; he studied theology in the Princeton Seminary, N.J.; was licensed to preach Oct. 10, 1822, and ordained in 1825. He labored successively in Savannah, Ga.; Woodbridge, N. J.; Charlotte C. H., Va.; Newbern and Raleigh, N. C.; Brierv and Cub Creek, Va., and Farmville, Va., at which latter place he died, July 3, 1863. Mr. Osborne was a man of excellent understanding, sound and logical judgment, quick and accurate perception. His preaching was of the highest order of excellence, being characterized by deep feeling and enthusiasm. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 361. (J. L. S.)

## Oscar I, King Of Sweden And Norway[[@Headword:Oscar I, King Of Sweden And Norway]]

             deserves a place here on account of his varied philanthropic labors. He was born at Paris. July 4,1799, and was the son of the French general Bernadotte. He came to the throne in 1844, and was then already noted as an author and a man of rare culture. He had renounced Romanism, and became an adherent to the Lutheran creed. As a monarch, he exerted himself in favor of religious and temperance reforms, and the improvement of the social condition of women. He resigned the royal authority in 1857,  and died in 1859. Among his publications is a work On Penal Laws and Establishments (1851).

## Oschophoria[[@Headword:Oschophoria]]

             (ὀσχοφόρια, branch-bearing), a festival among the ancient Greeks, celebrated, as some writers allege, in honor of Athene and Dionysus, while others maintain it to have been kept in honor of Dionysus and Ariadne. It was instituted by Theseus, or, according to some, by the Phoenicians. On the occasion of this festival, which was evidently connected with the vintage, two boys, carring vine branches in their hands, went in ranks, playing, from the temple of Dionysus to the sanctuary of Pallas. See Gardner. Faiths of the World, vol. ii, s.v.

## Osculatorium[[@Headword:Osculatorium]]

             (object to be kissed), viz. pacis ad Missam (of peace for the Mass); the “pax” for the holy kiss, as used in the ancient Church. It was a piece of wood or metal, with a picture of our Savior, the blessed Virgin, or the like, painted or embossed upon it. This was kissed by the priest during the celebration of mass, and afterwards handed to the people for the same purpose; a custom which probably originated in the ancient kiss of charity, which was practiced by the Christians at the service of the Eucharist. SEE PAX.

## Osea[[@Headword:Osea]]

             (Osee, 2Es 12:40), Ose'as (Osee, 2Es 1:39), Osee' (᾿Ωσηέ Rom 9:25), less correct modes of Anglicizing the name of the prophet HOSEA SEE HOSEA (q.v.).

## Osgood, David D.D.[[@Headword:Osgood, David D.D.]]

             a noted Congregational minister, was born at Andover, Mass., Oct. 14, 1747, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1771. He studied theology at Andover, of which one of his ancestors was a founder, and was ordained to the ministry Sept. 14, 1774. He settled as pastor of Medford, where he continued nearly fifty years, and became a distinguished preacher. He was a zealous Federalist, and one of his sermons in 1794, upon Genet's appeal to the people against the, government, attracted great attention, and rapidly passed through many editions. His election sermon in 1809 was the most celebrated of his discourses. He was a thorough Calvinist, “a truly  good and great man, and an earnest and fearless preacher.” A volume of his Sermons was published at Boston in 1824. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biogr. s.v.

## Osgood, S.M., D.D[[@Headword:Osgood, S.M., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Henderson, Jefferson County, N.Y., March 2, 1807. In his early manhood he resided in Cortland, N.Y., and: was one  of the publishers of the Cortland Chronicle. int 1831 he came back to Watertown, and in 1834 received an appointment as missionary printer at Maul'mainu. Burmah. He returned to the United States in 1846, and performed, for a period of about twenty-nine years, most valuable service as one of the financial agents of the Missionary Union. He received, in 1860, an appointment as district secretary of the Missionary Union for the West, which he held until his death, at his home in Chicago, July 9, 1875. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 876. (J.C.S.)

## Osgood, Samuel (1), D.D[[@Headword:Osgood, Samuel (1), D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Fryeburg, Maine, in February, 1774. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1805, and in 1809 settled as pastor of the First Congregational Church in Springfield, Maine, where he continued till his death, December 8, 1862. Dr. Osgood was an able preacher and an active reformer. He published a number of sermons and addresses. See Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1862, page 681.

## Osgood, Samuel (2), D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Osgood, Samuel (2), D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Charlestown, Mass., Aug. 30, 1812. He graduated from Harvard College in 1832, and entered the Unitarian ministry in 1835. In 4837 he was settled over a church in Nashua, N.H. Previous to this he had been the editor, with James Freeman Clarke, of The Western Messenger, at Louisville, Kentucky, a periodical which for  a time maintained a high literary rank. In 1841 he became pastor of the Westminster Church. From 1849 to 1869 he was pastor of the Church of the Messiah in New York city. From 1850 to 1854 he was one of the editors of The Christian Enquirer, a Unitarian journal published in that city. Having resigned his charge, he travelled abroad for seven months. Returning to New York, he entered the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1869. He died in New York city, April 14, 1880.

Dr. Osgood's contributions to different magazines, reviews, and newspapers were of a high order; the same is true of the occasional orations, lectures, and addresses which he delivered from time to time. He was a very versatile student, although perhaps his strong point was that of theology and Christian morals; an excellent German scholar, and familiar with all the great German theologians; also fond of historical researches, and a prominent member of the New York Historical Society, of which for a long time he was home corresponding secretary. But although of studious habits, he always took a warm interest in current public events, as a public- spirited citizen, ever ready to cooperate in the advancement of any scheme for promoting literature or art. His last public work was the reading of his paper before the Historical Society on Channing's Place in American History. Much of Dr. Osgood's literary work, scattered through periodicals or printed in a pamphlet form, it is impossible here to catalogue. He published, among other works of greater or less importance, translations from Olshausen and De Wette, The History of Passion (1839), and Human Life (1842). Among his original works are, Studies in Christian Biography (1851): — The Hearthstone (1854): — God with Men; or, Footprints of Providential Leaders (eod.):Milestones in our Life Journey (1855): — The Holy Gospels, illustrated by Overbeck (1856): — Student Life (1860): — American Leaves (1867). Among his principal addresses before the New York Historical Society was one upon Thomas Crawford and Art in America, in 1875. He also delivered a discourse before the society on its sixty-second anniversary, November 20, 1866. Many of his essays will be found in The International Review, The North American Review, The Bibliotheca Sacra, Harper's Monthly Magazine, and other periodicals. It is stated that he left unfinished a work entitled The Renaissance of Art in America, which was to include his papers upon Bryant and Channing.

## Osgood, Thaddeus[[@Headword:Osgood, Thaddeus]]

             an American minister, noted as a philanthropist, was born at Methuen, Mass., Oct. 24, 1775, and was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1803. He studied divinity with Drs. Lothrop and Emmons, and was ordained about 1806; was stated supply in Southbury, Conn.; and was a missionary in New York and Canada. He organized the first Church in Buffalo, N. Y., and many others; in 1812 he collected $9000 in England for a school in Quebec, and gathered there 200 boys in a Sabbath-school; went again to England in 1825, and collected $5000 for a society to promote education and industry in 1837 formed another society in Canada to supply Bibles for seamen and emigrants; was many years a distributer of tracts and founder of Sabbath-schools; went a third time to England for benevolent objects; and closed his useful life at Glasgow, in Scotland, Jan. 19, 1852. See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biogr. s.v.

## Oshea[[@Headword:Oshea]]

             (Heb. Hoshe'a, הוֹשֵׁעִ; Sept. Αὐσή; Vulg. Osee), another form (Num 13:8) of the name of JOSHUA SEE JOSHUA (q.v.), the son of Nun.

## Oshima[[@Headword:Oshima]]

             (i.e. big island) is a Japanese island, sometimes called Vries, or Barneveld's Island. It is about eight miles long and five wide, and there are many villages with considerable population on it. But as the inhabitants of Oshima are principally Japanese, we refer to the article JAPAN SEE JAPAN

## Osiander[[@Headword:Osiander]]

             By way of supplement we add the following:

1. GOTTLIEB, was born at Stuttgart, March 15, 1786, and died December 6, 1827, dean at Knittlingen. He is the author of different theological essays, for which see Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, 3:168; Ersch u. Gruber, Allgemeines Encyclop. page 261 sq.

2. JOHANN, a son of Johann Adam (1), was born, at Tilbingen, April 2, 1657. After completing his studies he travelled through France, and at Paris he made the acquaintance of La Chaise, who in vain endeavored to convert him to the Church of Rome. Having returned, Osiander was in 1686 professor of Hebrew at Tiibingen; a few years later professor of Greek and philosophy, and assistant preacher to his father. Osiander died October 18, 1724, having held the highest civic and ecclesiastical positions. See Schmidt, Leben Johana Osiander's (1843); Ersch u. Gruber, Allgemeine Encyclop. Theil 3, volume 6, page 263 sq.

3. JOHANN ERNST, a brother of Gottlieb, was borm June 23, 1792, at Stuttgart. In 1820 he was deacom at Metzingen, in 1824 professor at Maulbronn, in 1840 dean at Goppingen, in 1860 doctor of theology, and diedi April 3, 1870, senior of the Protestant clergy of Wurtemberg. He is the author of, Philipp Melanchthon,eine Rede (Stuttgart, 1830): — Zum Andenken Dr. Gottfried Menken's (Bremen, 1832): — Apologie des LebensJesu gegen Strauss (Stuttgart, 1837): — Lehrbuch zumchristlichen Religionsunterricht ( 1839 ): — Commentar uber die Briefe Pauli an die Korinthier (1849, 1858). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:552; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:963 sq.; Wiirtembergisches Kirchenblatt, 1870, page 195; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

4. JOHANN RUDOLF, son of Johann, was born May 21, 1689, at Tubingen, and died October 25, 1725, professorof theology. See Gass, Geschichte derprotest. Dogmatik, 3:126. (B.P.)

## Osiander, Andreas (1)[[@Headword:Osiander, Andreas (1)]]

             a distinguished German theologian of the Reformation period, and a disciple of Luther, was born at Gunzenhausen, in Bavaria, Dec. 19, 1498. His father was a blacksmith, called Hosemann, out of which name his son, after the fashion of his time, manufactured the classic-sounding name Osiander. Andreas studied successively at Leipsic, Altenburg, and Ingolstadt, and acquired great proficiency in the dead languages,  particularly in Hebrew, as also in theology, mathematics, and even in medicine. After completing his studies, he was made teacher of theology in an Augustinian convent at Nuremberg, but in 1522 accepted the principles of the Reformation, and became an evangelical preacher in one of the churches of that city. He labored with marked success for the Reformation, frequently defending it in public conferences against the Roman Catholic clergy. His eloquence gained him great reputation, and he was soon looked upon as one of the principal followers of Luther. Gieseler speaks of Osiander as at this time “the highly endowed Reformer of Nuremberg” (Eccles. Hist. 4:469 sq.). In 1529 he was sent to the Conference of Marburg, whose object was to reconcile the Lutheran and Swiss theologians, principally on the doctrine of the Eucharist. Osiander seems to have sided on that point most consistently with Luther against Zwingli, but on the doctrine of justification he held some peculiar views, yet they did not differ enough from those of the Lutherans to make him break from them. In 1539 he was one of the Protestant theologians who appeared before the Diet of Augsburg to advocate the cause of the Reformation. He took an active part in the proceedings which resulted in the drawing up of the Confession of Augsburg. In 1546 he attended at the conference in Smalcald (q.v.). But upon the publication of the Interim (May 15, 1548) Osiander felt that he could no longer stay at Nuremberg, and he retired, after twenty-seven years of successful Reformatory labors there, in 1549, to the court of duke Albert of Prussia, who had formerly been much pleased with his preaching. It is said that he expected to be called to England, but that Cranmer refrained from inviting him on account of his combative tendencies. Albert, however, offered him the professorship of theology in the newly organized University of Konigsberg. Osiander accepted this position, as it allowed him full scope for the spread of his doctrinal views. These were somewhat peculiar, and differed from those of the other Reformers, particularly on the question of justification. In opposition to the external view of justification by faith alone, as they taught it, Osiander insisted that “faith is the medium of the indwelling of Christ in the human soul.” This form of statement he proved from Luther's writings was authorized, but he used it, in distinction from Luther, to describe living faith as appropriating Christ, and thus developed the view in a mode akin to. that of the German mystics of the 14th century. The principal fault in Osiander's doctrine was, especially, the unwarrantable stress he laid upon his peculiar shape of the dogma, constituting justification and redemption  as only one act. His doctrine seems to have amounted to the following propositions:

1. That Christ, considered in his human nature only, could not by his obedience to the divine law obtain justification and pardon for sinners; neither can we be justified before God by embracing and applying to ourselves, through faith, the righteousness and obedience of the man Christ. It is only through that eternal and essential righteousness which dwells in Christ considered as God, and which resides in his divine nature united to the human, that mankind can obtain complete justification.

2. That a man becomes partaker of this divine righteousness by faith, since it is in consequence of this uniting principle that Christ dwells in the heart of man with his divine righteousness. Now, wherever this divine righteousness dwells, there God can behold no sin; therefore, when it is present with Christ in the hearts of the regenerate, they are, on its own account, considered by the Deity as righteous, although they be sinners. Moreover, this divine and justifying righteousness of Christ excites the faithful to the pursuit of holiness and to the practice of virtue. Osiander indeed maintained that what was called justification by orthodox theologians should be more properly designated redemption (illustrated by the case of a Moor ransomed from slavery). In his opinion the signification of δικαιοῦν is to “make just;” it is only by metonymy that it can mean “to pronounce a person just” (comp. Planck, 4:249 sq.; Tholuck's Anzeiger, 1833, No. 54, 55; Schenkel, 2:355). He was opposed by Francis Staphylus. Morlin, and others. (On Osiander's doctrine in its earliest form [after 1524], see Heberle in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1844; it is further developed in the two disputations which he held, A.D. 1549 and 1550, in his treatise De unico Mediatore, 1551, and in various sermons.) Says Baur, in his Dogmengesch. p. 332: “Justification, according to Osiander, is the mystical union of mall with Christ as the absolute principle of righteousness. The believer is so embodied in Christ that in this living concrete unity he is flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone.... The Formula Concordiae is incorrect in representing his doctrine as excluding the human nature of Christ from the work of redemption.” As Osiander considered justification, it is evidently not to be understood as a judicial act of God, as it was held by the Reformers, who all adopted on this point the theory of Anselm, but as something subjective, as a communication of an inner justice operating directly upon conscience. This doctrine was never violently attacked by the Lutherans, though they were opposed to it so long as Luther's  magnanimous spirit was able to restrain in the new Church all controversies which did not seem to him to be indispensable for preserving the purity of truths leading to salvation. While at Nuremberg Osiander therefore escaped violent opposition, but when established at Konigsberg, so much farther removed from the personal influence of his own devoted friends, and the great Reformer himself no longer on earth to stay the strife, the jealousy of competitors, the newness of Osiander's views, joined to a certain freedom — much removed, however, from immorality — of manners, created many enemies, and involved him in bitter controversies, which commenced with his first disputations, De lege et Evangelio (1549), De Justificatione (1550). The strife was for a while subdued by the authorities, who favored Osiander and exiled his opponents, but broke out with renewed violence when he published in Latin and in German his Confession, entitled in the former De unico mediatore Jes. Chr. etjustificationefidei Confessio n. Osiandri (Regiom. Oct. 1551, 4to), or in German Bekenntniss v. d. einigen Mittler Jes. Christ. u. v. d. Rechtfertigung (1551; 2d ed. 1552). Osiander by this publication simply inflamed the strife, because he here treated his opponents with arrogance and harshness. Morlin (q.v.), who had been made pastor at Konigsberg in September of this year, tried in vain to adjust the controversy; and when all seemed lost for Osiander, his devoted friend the duke called for a judgment from the theologians of all the German estates of the Augsburg Confession. The Wurtemberg judgment alone tried to vindicate the essential agreement of Osiander with Lutheranism, and this only the duke presented, but failed, nevertheless, to bring about a peaceful settlement. Osiander was finally, on account of his heretical views, called before the Synod of Wittenberg, but it declined to inderdict him; and before he could be the subject of further controversy he died, at Konigsberg, Oct. 17,1552. His faithful adherents, who continued the controversy after his death, are called Osiandrians (see below).

Osiander was well versed in mathematics, astronomy, and physics. He was very eloquent, but he had all the coarseness of his age; he overwhelmed his adversaries with insults, unbecoming jokes, and cynical jests. His works were numerous, but are now altogether forgotten; the most important are, Conjecture de ultimis temporibus ac de fine mundi (Nuremb. 1544, 4to): — Harmoniae evangelicae, libri iv, Greece et Latine (Basle. 1537, fol.; ibid. 1561, Greek and Latin; Paris. Robert Estienne, 1545, Latin only; translated into German by J. Schweinzer, Frankfort, 1540, 8vo). This is the first Protestant Harmony, but it is worthless because Osiander labored  under the new and erroneous opinion that the four Gospels, instead of being a narration of the same events, were an account of four different periods, chronologically following each other, and that the similitude of events was the result of a similarity of circumstances: — Biblia sacra, quce praeter antiquae Latince versionis necessariam emendationem, et diffciliorum locorum succinctam explicationem, multas insuper utilissimas observationes, continet (Tibing. 1600, fol.; four times reprinted). Osiander was the first to publish Copernicus's Astronomy, to which he wrote a preface (Nuremb. 1543. 4to). See, besides the works already referred to, Adam, Vitoe theologorum Germanorum; Teissier, Eloges des hommes savants, 1:110, 111; Jocher, Allg. Gelehrten-Lexikon; Musee des Protestants celebres; Moerlinos, Historia Osiandris; Wigandus, De Osiandrismo (1583, 4to); Wilken, And. Osiander's Leben, Lehre u. Schriften (Strasburg, 1844, 8vo); Lehnerdt, De Andr. Osiandro (Kinigsb. 1837, 8vo); Leben und ausgewahlte Schriften ‘der Voter und Begriinder der Lutherischen Kirche, by Hartmann, Moller, Schmidt, etc., vol. v; Moller, Andreas Osiander, Leben und ausgewihlte Schriften (Elberfeld, 1869, 8vo); Baur, Lehre v. d. Versohnung, p. 329; A cta Osiandristica (Regiom. 1553. 4to); Joach. Morlin, Historia (1554); Arnold, Unpart. Kirchenu. Ketzerhistorie, II, vol. xvi, c. 24; Walch, Religionsstreit. . . Evang. — Luth. Kirchen (1733, 1739); Schrockh, Kirchengesch. seit d. Reform. 4:572 sq.; Planck, Gesch. d. pmotestantischeni Lehmrbegrijfs, vol. iv, v, vi; Baur, Disquisitio in A. Osiandri de justificatione docti inam (Tubingen, 1831); Dorner, Entwickelunqsgesch. v. d. Person Christi (2d ed. 1854, p. 576-591); Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought; Buchanan, Doct. of Justification; Gass, Gesch. der protest. Dogmatik, 1:61 sq.; Held, De opere Jesu Christi salutari, quid M. Lutherus senserit demonstratur (Gott. 1860); Frank, Ad eccles. de satisf. Christi doctrinam, quid redimaverit ex lite Osiandrian. (Erl. 1858); Grau, De A ndr. Osiandri Doctrina Commentatio (1860); Neander, Hist. of Christian Dogmas; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 2:469-481; Hardwick, Hist. of Doctrines, 2:286 sq.; Bullet. Theol. Jan. 1867, p. 23; Jahrb. Deutscher Theol. 1857.

## Osiander, Andreas (2)[[@Headword:Osiander, Andreas (2)]]

             called THE YOUNGER, son of Lucas the Elder, was born at Blaubeuern, Wurtemberg, May 6, 1562. He became, in 1587, pastor at Guglingen; preacher to the duke of Wurtemberg in 1590; general superintendent in 1588; and, finally, chancellor of the University of Tubingen in 1605. Osiander died in 1617. He left sermons, essays, and theological treatises,  the best-known of which is Papa non papa, hoc est, papae et papicolarum de praecipuis Christiane fidei partibus Lutherana confessio (Tubing. 1599, 8vo; Frankf. 1610, 12mo).

## Osiander, Johann Adam (1)[[@Headword:Osiander, Johann Adam (1)]]

             a distinguished German Protestant writer, was born at Vaihingen, in Wurtemberg, Dec. 3, 1626. He became, in 1680, chancellor of the University of Tubingen, and died there Oct. 26, 1697. Among his theological works we note, Commentarius in Pentateuchurn (Tubing. 1676-78, 5 vols. fol.), which was until the close of the last century considered One of the best commentaries on the Pentateuch: -In Josuem (ibid. 1681, fol.): — In Judices (ibid. 1682, fol.): — In librum Ruth (ibid. 1682, fol.): — In primum et secundum librum Samuelis (Stuttg. 1687, fol.): — Tractatus theologicus de nmagia (Tiibing. 1687, 8vo): — Primitioe evangelicce, seu dispositiones in Evangelia dominicalia etfestivalia (ibid. 1665-1691, 14 pts. 4to): — De azylis Hebrceorum, Gentilium et Christianorum (ibid. 1673, 4to). Gronovius inserted in the fourth volume of his Thesaurus antiquitatum Graecarunz the part of this treatise which refers to the places of refuge among the Greeks and Romans. See Jocher, Allg. Gelehrten-Lex.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:905. (J. N. P.),

## Osiander, Johann Adam (2)[[@Headword:Osiander, Johann Adam (2)]]

             a German philologist and theologian, son of the preceding, was born at Tubingen in 1701. He became professor of Greek in the university of that city, and died there Nov. 20, 1756. He wrote a number of essays on questions of philology, literature, and philosophy. The best-known among them is entitled De imnmortalitate animne rationalis, ex lumine rationis probabili (Tubing. 1732, 4to). See J. G. Walchius, Bibl. theol. selecta; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:906. (J. N. P.)

## Osiander, Lucas (1)[[@Headword:Osiander, Lucas (1)]]

             called THE ELDER, son of Andreas Osiander (1), was born at Nuremburg Dec. 16 1534. He accompanied his father to Konigsberg, and was educated at that high school. Upon the completion of his studies he went to Suabia, and was made deacon at Goppingen in 1555, and two years later special superintendent at Blaubeuern; in 1560 he passed with the same title to Stuttgard, where he was appointed court preacher in 1567; and finally in  1593 he was appointed prelate of Adelberg. Here his violent denunciation of the Jews, who were protected by the duke from motives of policy, caused him to be ejected about 1596, and he withdrew to Esslingen; in this city he preached for about a year without any salary; but he finally returned to Stuttgard, and there was made general superintendent of the churches of Wurtemberg. He died Sept. 7,1604. His activity was as remarkable as his erudition. He had taken part in the conferences of Maulbronn in 1564, and also in 1576, when he assisted in framing the so-called Formula of Maulbronn; also in the conferences of Mompelgard in 1586, and of Regensburg in 1594. In 1584 he had taken an active part in opposing the persecutions directed against the Anabaptists. He wrote against Sturm in defense of the Formula of Concord; against Mentzer on the human nature of Christ; against Huber on the doctrine of election; against the Reformed theologians on the controverted points; against the Jesuits, etc. He even published a treatise against Mohammedanism. Osiander's principal works are, Epitomes historiae ecclesiasticae centuriae xv (ex Historia Magdeburgica) (Tilb. 1607, 3 Vols. 4to): — Enchiridion controversiarum, qpua Augustance Confessionis theologis cum Anabaptistis intercedunt (Witeb. 1614, sm. 8vo): — Enchiridion controversiarum, quas Augustance Confessionis theologi habent cume Calvinianis (ibid. 1614, sm. 8vo): — Enchiridion controversiarum religionis, puce hodie inter A ugustance Confessionis theologos et pontificios habentur (ibid. 1615, sm. 8vo): — Biblia Lat. ad fontes Hebraici textus eenedata, cum brevi et perspicua expositione Lucas Osiandri inversis locis theologicts (1574-1586, 7 vols. 4to; 13th ed. 1635; it was also translated into German by David Forster [Stuttg. 1609], and passed through many editions): — Institutiones Christiance Religionis; Postella Evangeliorum; De ratione concionandi (Tilb. 1582, 8vo; twice reprinted): — Adndonitio de studiis Verbi divini ministrorum privatis recte instituendis (ibid. 1691, 8vo). See Jocher, Allg. Gelehr. — Lexikon; J. G. Walch, Biblioth. theologica selecta; Neander, Hist. Christian Dogmas; Frischlinus, Memoria Theol. Wurtemb. 1:146 sq.; Schrockh. Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref. 4:428, 468, 671; Fuhrmann, Handworterb. der Kirchengesch. s.'v.

## Osiander, Lucas (2)[[@Headword:Osiander, Lucas (2)]]

             called THE YOUNGER, son of the preceding and brother of Andreas the Yoaunger, was born at Stuttgard, May 6, 1571. He became professor of theology at Tubingen in 1619, and died there Aug. 10, 1638. He was much given to controversy, and wrote against the Jesuits, the Reformed Church,  the Anabaptists, the Schwenckfeldians, etc., and was accused of having started the difficulties which divided the theologians of Tubingen and those of Giessen on the doctrine of the self-abasement of Christ. His immoderate attacks against J. Arnd's Wahre Christenthum, in 1623, led him into very disagreeable disputes. He wrote sermons and numerous theological works, mostly polemical. See Jocher, Allg. Gelehr. — Lexikon; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:905. (J. N. P.)

## Osiandrians[[@Headword:Osiandrians]]

             is the name of a body of Lutheran theologians who adhered to the doctrines of Andreas Osiander (q.v.) concerning the redemptive character of Christ by virtue of his divine nature alone. Osiander was opposed by Melancthon and others, but principally by Stancarus (q.v.), professor of Hebrew at Konigsberg, who adopted the opposite extreme, that Christ's divine nature had no concern in the satisfaction he made, and that the mediation between God and man belonged to Jesus, considered in his human nature only. After the death of Osiander the strife was continued by his disciples. They were at first upheld by Osiander's former protector, the duke; but in 1554 a council condemned their doctrines, and demanded that all Osiandrians should abjure their heresies. They protested, and were for the greater part obliged to leave the country. Osiander's son-in-law, the court preacher Johann Funck, was compelled to recant by the synod of 1556, but afterwards returned to his errors; he became also connected with political troubles, and paid the penalty of his heresy with his life. SEE FUNCK. After this the party soon lost all importance, and the troubles ended. Morlin, the leader of the orthodox party, who had been exiled from Konigsberg, was recalled and made bishop, and framed a new confession of faith denouncing the Osiandrian heresy. The confession, in order that it should not be considered a new formula, but only a reassertion of the old, was called Repetitio coaporis doctrines Christiance; this name was afterwards changed, however, to Corpus Doctrine Prutenicum (in 1567), and all the Osiandrians were banished from Prussia, after which they soon became extinct. See references in the article OSIANDER. In recent times the Osiandrian view of justification has been espoused by Dr. John Forbes in his Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Edinb. 1868, 8vo). See British and Foreign Evang. Rev. Oct. 1868, art. ii.

## Osiris[[@Headword:Osiris]]

             according to others, AIRIS or HYSIRIS (Many-eyed), a celebrated Egyptian deity, whose worship was universal throughout Egypt. This name appears in the hieroglyphic texts as early as the 4th dynasty, and is expressed by a throne and an eye; at a later period, that of the 19th, a palanquin is substituted for a throne; and under the Romans, the pupil of the eve for the eye itself. Osiris does not indeed appear to have been universally honored till the time of the 11th and 12th dynasties, or about 1800 B.C., when Abydos, which was reputed to be his burial-place, rose into importance. In the monuments of this age he is called “great god, eternal ruler, dwelling in the west, and lord of Abut” or Abydos. Even at the most remote period individuals after death were supposed to become an Osiris; and all the prayers and ceremonies performed or addressed to them were, in this character, referring to their future life and resurrection. At the time of the 18th dynasty this title of Osiris was prefixed to their names, and continued to be so till the time of the Romans and the fall of paganism.

The Greek and Roman writers greatly differ in their opinions concerning this celebrated god, but they all agree that, as king of Egypt, he took particular care to civilize his subjects, to polish their morals, to give them good and salutary laws, and to teach them agriculture. After he had accomplished a reform at home, Osiris resolved to go and spread cultivation in the other parts of the earth. He left his kingdom to the care of his wife His, and of her faithful minister Hermes or Mercury. The command of his troops at home was left to the trust of Hercules, a warlike officer. In this expedition Osiris was accompanied by his brother Apollo, and by Anubis, Macedo, and Pan. His march was through Ethiopia, where his army was increased by the addition of the Satyrs, a hairy race of monsters, who made dancing and playing on musical instruments their chief study. He afterwards passed through Arabia, and visited the greatest part of the kingdoms of Asia and Europe, where he enlightened the minds of men by introducing among them the worship of the gods, and a reverence for the wisdom of a supreme being. At his return home Osiris found the minds of his subjects roused and agitated. His brother Typhon had raised seditions, and endeavored to make himself popular. Osiris, whose sentiments were always of the most pacific nature, endeavored to convince his brother of his ill conduct, but he fell a sacrifice to the attempt.

Typhon murdered him in asecret apartment, and cut his body to pieces, which were divided among the associates of his guilt. This cruelty incensed His; she  revenged her husband's death, and, with her son Orus, she defeated Typhon and the partisans of his conspiracy. She recovered the mangled pieces of her husband's body, the genitals excepted, which the murderer had thrown into the sea; and to render him all the honor which his humanity deserved, she made as many statues of wax as there were mangled pieces of his body. Each statue contained a piece of the flesh of the dead monarch; and His, after she had summoned to her presence one by one the priests of all the different deities in her dominions, gave them each a statue, intimating that in doing so she had preferred them to all the other communities of Egypt, and she bound them by a solemn oath that they would keep secret that mark of her favor, and endeavor to show their sense of it by establishing a form of worship and paying divine homage to their prince. They were further directed to choose whatever animals they pleased to represent the person and the divinity of Osiris, and they were enjoined to pay the greatest reverence to that representative of divinity, and to bury it when dead with the greatest solemnity. To render their establishment more popular, each sacerdotal body had a certain portion of land allotted to them to maintain them, and to defray the expenses which necessarily attended their sacrifices and ceremonial rites. That part of the body of Osiris which had not been recovered was treated with more particular attention by His, and she ordered that it should receive honors more solemn, and at the same time more mysterious than the other members. As Osiris had particularly instructed his subjects in cultivating the ground, the priests chose the ox to represent him, and paid the most superstitious veneration to that animal. Osiris, according to the opinion of some mythologists, is the same as the sun, and the adoration which is paid by different nations to an Anubis, a Bacchus, a Dionysus, a Jupiter, a Pan, etc., is the same as that which Osiris received in the Egyptian temples. His also after death received divine honors as well as her husband; and as the ox was the symbol of the sun, or Osiris, so the cow was the emblem of the moon, or Isis. Nothing can give a clearer idea of the power and greatness of Osiris than this inscription, which has been found on some ancient monuments: “Saturn, the youngest of all the gods, was my father; I am Osiris, who conducted a large and numerous army as far as the deserts of India, and traveled over the greatest part of the world, and visited the streams of the Ister, and the remote shores of the ocean, diffusing benevolence to all the inhabitants of the earth.” Osiris was generally represented with a cap on his head like a mitre, with two horns; he held a stick in his left hand, and in his right a whip with three thongs. Sometimes he appears with the head of a hawk, as  that bird, by its quick and piercing eyes, is a proper emblem of the sun (Plutarch, In Isid. and Os.; Herodotus, 2:144; Diodorus, i; Homer, Od. 12:323; AElian, De Anim. iii; Lucian, De Dea. Syr.; Pliny, viii).

In the Egyptian Ritual, or “Book of the Dead,” and other inscriptions, Osiris is said to be the son of Seb or Saturn, and born of Nu or Rhea; to be the father of Horus by Isis, of Anubis, and of the four genii of the dead. Many mystic notions were connected with Osiris; he was sometimes thought to be the son of Ra, the Sun, or of Atum, the setting Sun, and the Bennu or Phoenix; also to be uncreate, or self-engendered, and he is identified in some instances with the Sun or the Creator, and the Pluto or Judge of Hades. Osiris was born on the first of the Epagomenae, or five additional days of the year. When born, Chroinos or Saturn is said to have given him in charge to Pamyles; having become king of Egypt, he is stated to have civilized the Egyptians, and especially to have taught them agriculture, the culture of the vine, and the art of making beer; he afterwards traveled over the earth, and conquered the people everywhere by his persuasion. During his absence, his kingdom was confided to His, who guarded it strictly, and Set or Typhon, the brother of Osiris (who was born in the third of the Epagomenae), was unable to revolt against him. Typhon had, however, persuaded seventy-two other persons, and Aso, the queen of Ethiopia, to join him in a conspiracy; and, having taken the measure of Osiris, he had a chest made of the same dimensions, richly ornamented and carved, and produced it at a banquet, where he promised to give it to whomsoever it should fit; and when all had lain down and tried it, and it suited none, Osiris at last laid himself down in it, and was immediately covered over by the conspirators, who placed the lid upon it, and fastened it with nails and molten lead. The chest was then hurled into the Nile, and floated down the Tanaitic mouth into the sea. This happened on the seventeenth of the month Athyr, in the twenty-eighth year of the reign or age of Osiris. Khem or Pan, and his attendant deities, discovered the loss of the god; His immediately cut off a lock of hair and went into mourning, and proceeded in search of Anubis, the child of her sister Nephthys by Osiris; and, having found him, brought him up. The chest meanwhile floated to Byblos, and, lodging in a tamarisk became enclosed in the tree, which was cut down by the king, and the trunk, containing the chest and the body of the god, was converted into a pillar to support the roof of the palace.

The goddess proceeded to Byblos, and ingratiated herself with the queen's women by plaiting their hair and imparting to it an  ambrosial smell, so that the monarch, whose name was Melcarthus, and his wife, Saosis or Nemanoun, invited her to court to take care of their own child. She endeavored to confer immortality upon him by placing him on a fire, and changing herself into a swallow, flew around the pillar and bemoaned her fate. The queen became alarmed at the danger of her child; His revealed herself, and asked for the pillar of tamarisk wood, which was given her. She then cut it open, and took out the chest, making great lamentations, and subsequently sailed for Egypt, with the eldest of the king's sons. The goddess, intending to visit Horns, her son, at Buto, deposited the chest in an unfrequented spot; but Typhon discovered it by the light of the moon, tore it into fourteen pieces, and distributed each to a home or district. His recovered all by passing the marshes in a boat of papyrus; all except the phallus, which had been eaten by the lepidotus, the phagrus, and oxyrhynchus fish. Subsequently a battle took place between Horus and Typhon or Set, which lasted three days, and ended by Typhon having fetters placed upon him. His, however, liberated Typhon, which so enraged Horus that he tore off her diadem, but Teti or Thoth placed on her the head of a cow instead. Typhon finally accused Horus of illegitimacy; but the question was decided between them by Teti or Thoth and the gods. From Osiris, after his death, and His sprung Harpocrates. Osiris seems to have been finally revived, and to have become the judge of the Karneter or Hades, presiding at the final judgment of souls in the hall of the two Truths, with the forty-two daemons who presided over the capital sins. and awarding to the soul its final destiny. Thoth or Hermes recorded the judgment, and justified the deceased against his accusers, as he had formerly done for Osiris.

Considerable diversity of opinion existed among the ancients themselves as to the meaning of the myth of Osiris. He represented, according to Plutarch, the inundation of the Nile; His, the irrigated land; Horus, the vapors; Buto, the marshes; Nephthys. the edge of the desert; Anubis, the barren soil; Typhon was the sea; the conspirators, the drought; the chest, the river's banks. The Tanaitic branch was the one which overflowed unprofitably; the twenty-eight years, the number of cubits which the Nile rose at Elephantine; Harpocrates, the first shootings of the corn. Such are the naturalistic interpretations of Plutarch; but there appears in the myth the dualistic principle of good and evil, represented by Osiris and Set or Typhon, or again paralleled by the contest of Ra or the Sun, and Apophis or Darkness. The difficulty of interpretation was increased from the form  of Osiris having become blended or identified with that of other deities, especially PtahSocharis, the pigmy of Memphis, and the bull Hapis or Apis, the avatar of Ptah. Osiris was the head of a tetrad of deities, whose local worship was at Abydos, but who were the last repetition of the gods of the other nomes of Egypt, and who had assumed a heroic or mortal type. In form, Osiris is always represented swathed or mummied, in allusion to his embalmment; a network, suggestive of the net by which his remains were fished out of the Nile, covers this dress; on his head he wears the cap atf; having at each side the feather of truth, of which he was the lord. This is placed on the horns of a goat. His hands hold the crook and whip, to indicate his governing and directing power; and his feet are based on the cubit of truth; a panther's skin on a pole is often placed before him, and festoons of grapes hang over his shrine, connecting him with Dionysus. As the “good being,” or Onnophris the meek-hearted, the celestial or king of heaven, he wears the white or upper crown. Another and rarer type of him represents him as the Tat, or emblem of stability, wearing the crown of. the two Truths upon his head. His worship, at a later time, was extended over Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome, and at an early age had penetrated into Phoenicia, traces of it being found on the coins of Malta and other places. He became introduced along with the Isiac worship into Rome, and had votaries under the Roman empire. But the attacks of the philosophers, and the rise of Christianity, overthrew these exotic deities, who were never popular with the more cultivated portion of the Roman world. See Prichard, Mythology, p. 208; Willinson, Man. and Cust. 4:314; Bunsen, Egypt's Place, 1:414.

## Oski, Reuben[[@Headword:Oski, Reuben]]

             (also called Hoschke), a rabbi at Prague, where he died in 1673, is the author of רְאוּבֵנַי יִלְקוּט, a manual for preachers, containing in alphabetical order certain loci communes, compiled from different authors, of which only the first part has been published (Prague, 1660; Hamburg, 1712), while the second part is yet in MS. in the Oppenheimeriana: יִלְקוּט רְאוּבֵנַי הִגָּדוֹל, a Cabalistic Midrash on the Pentateuch, with large extracts from the Mekiltha, Pesikta, Zohar, and other Cabalistic works (Wilmersdorf, 1681; Amsterd. 1700; Lemberg, 1860; Amsterd. 1870, fol.); which however must be distinguished from the יִלְקוּטofR. Simeon Cara (q.v.): — דָּבָר שֶׁבַקַדוּשָׁה, an introduction to the subject of asceticism (Sulzbach, 1684): — and עֹנֶג שִׁבָּת, Cabalistic observations on the ritual  for the Sabbath. — See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:412 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 254 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Etheridge, Introduction to Heb. Literatur e, p. 419; Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur, p. 402; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 223. (B. P.)

## Osmond Or Osmund St.[[@Headword:Osmond Or Osmund St.]]

             an English prelate of the 11th century, was son of the count of Seez, in Normandy. He succeeded his father, and gave most of his goods to the clergy. In 1066 he followed William the Conqueror to England, and received from him the county of Dorset and the charge of lord chancellor. The king, judging him better fitted for the Church than for the management of temporal affairs, made him bishop of Salisbury about 1078. He died Dec. 3, 1099, and was canonized by pope Calixtus III in 1458. In order to render the manner in which divine service was conducted more uniform, he wrote a treatise of ecclesiastical forms, named sometimes Liber ordinalis, sometimes Consuetudinariun ecclesice, or again Horariae preces. This work, with some slight alterations, remained in use until the time of Henry VIII; was one of the most popular manuals for public devotion with the English clergy, and has principally contributed to hand down Osmond's name to posterity. See Hist. litter. de la France; Butler, Lives of the Saints; Inett, Hist. Engl. Ch. I, 15:4, n. 4; Churton, Early Engl. Ch. p. 291; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:907; Hook, Eccles. Biogr. s.v.; Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. (AngloNorman period); Collier, Eccles. Hist. (see Index in vol. viii); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors.v.

## Osorio (Or Osorius), Geronimo (1)[[@Headword:Osorio (Or Osorius), Geronimo (1)]]

             a learned Roman Catholic Portuguese divine, aind an excellent writer, the descendant of an illustrious family, was born at Lisbon in 1506. Showing an extraordinary inclination for literature, he was sent, at thirteen, to the University of Salamanca, and there learned Greek and Latin, and studied the law. At nineteen he removed to Paris, to be instructed in Aristotle's philosophy. From Paris he went to Bologna, where he devoted himself to theology, learned Hebrew, and studied the Bible, in which he became so great a master that, on his return home, John III, king of Portugal, appointed him professor of divinity at Coimbra. Taking priest's orders, he was given the care of the church of Tayora by Dom Lewis, infante of Portugal, and soon after the archdeaconry of Evora by cardinal Henry, archbishop of that province, and brother to king John; and at last he was nominated to the bishopric of Sylves by Catharine of Austria, that king's widow, who was regent of the kingdom during the minority of her grandson Sebastian. When this prince became of the proper age for the personal administration of his kingdom, he resolved upon an expedition against the Moors in Africa, much against the persuasions of Osorio, who thereupon, to avoid being an eye-witness of the calamities he dreaded, made various pretenses to go to Rome. Here pope Gregory XIII gave Osorio many testimonies of his esteem; but he had not been absent above a twelvemonth when the king called him home. Not long after this Sebastian was slain in a battle against the Moors, Aug. 4, 1578.

During the tumults in Portugal which succeeded this fatal event Osorio labored incessantly to prevent the people of his diocese from joining in them; and failing in this effort, he laid it so deeply to heart that he died of grief, August, 1580. He is much commended for his piety and charity. He maintained several learned men in his palace, and at meals had some portion out of St. Bernard's works read, after which all present were at liberty to propose any difficulties that occurred upon it. As a writer, Du Pin observes that his diction is easy and elegant. for which reason he is called the Cicero of Portugal, as being a great imitator of Cicero, both in style, choice of subjects, and manner of treating them. His compositions are not intermixed with quotations, but consist of connected reasonings. He does not endeavor in his Commentaries and Paraphrases to explain the terms of the text, but to extend the sense of it, and show its order and series fully. These were collected and published at Rome (1592, in 4 vols. fol.) by Jerome Osorio, his nephew, who prefixed his uncle's life to the edition. The  titles of his works are: De nobilitate civili, et de nobilitate Christiana: — De gloria (printed with the foregoing; some have thought this last to have been written by Cicero, and that Osorio found it and published it as his own): — De regis institutione etdisciplina: — De rebus Emanuelis regis invictissimi virtute et auspicio gestis: — Item, cun prcefatione Joannis Metelli, de reperta India: — De justitia ccelesti, lib. x, ad Reginaldum Polum Cardinalen: — De vera sapientia, lib. v, ad Gregorium XII, P. M. — besides paraphrases and commentaries upon several parts of Scripture. He wrote to queen Elizabeth of England and exhorted her to turn papist. He was answered by Walter Haddon, master of the requests to that queen. See Genesis Biog. Diet. s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.; Hallam, Introd. to the Liter. of Europe, 1:258.

## Osorio, Francisco Meneses[[@Headword:Osorio, Francisco Meneses]]

             a Spanish painter, was born at Seville in the latter part of the 17th century. He studied under Murillo, and became one of the most successful imitators of that artist. In concert with Juan Garzon, one of his fellow-disciples, he painted several pictures in the churches and convents of Seville. In 1688 Osorio was chosen major-domo of the academy of that city, to which he presented his picture of the Conception, which was greatly admired. At the death of Murillo, in 1685, he was employed to finish the works at Cadiz left incomplete by that master. He copied the works of Murillo to perfection, particularly his pictures of children. Among his own works are, Elijah Fed in the Desert, in the church of San Martino at Madrid, and the picture of St. Catharine, in the Capuchin monastery at Cadiz his finest production. Osorio died at Seville about 1700.

## Osorio, Geronimo (2)[[@Headword:Osorio, Geronimo (2)]]

             nephew of the preceding, was canon of Evora, and, having been educated by his uncle, endeavored to imitate his style; but he was not so fine a writer, though he seems to have had more learning. He wrote, besides a life of his uncle, Notationes in Hieronymi Osorii Paraphrasin Psalmorum, subjoined to his uncle's Paraphrase in the third volume of his works. Du Pin says these “Remarks” are valuable, and filled with critical observations on the Hebrew language: — Paraphrasis et Commentaria ad Ecclesiasten nunc primunm edita:— Paraphrasis in Canticum Canticorum (Lugd. 1611, 4to).

## Ospray[[@Headword:Ospray]]

             (by ornithologists, Osprey) is the rendering in the A. V. of the Hebrew עָזְנַיָּה, ozniyah' (Sept. ἁλιαίετος, or sea-eagle; which Jerome follows, halyetus and halecetus, some copies translating it aquila marina; but the Veneto-Greek MS. has γύψ, the vulture, from mere conjecture); the name of some unclean bird which the law of Moses disallowed as food to the Israelites (Lev 11:13; Deu 14:12). The Hebrew etymology, from the root עָזִז, to strengthen, would seem to point to some bird remarkably powerful, fierce, or impudent. Bochart supposes the black eagle to be meant, but reasons upon the mere conjecture that by the word ἁλιαίετος is intended μελαναίετος (Hieroz. 3:188, etc.). The traditional  interpretation favors the English rendering, the name and description of this bird having been copied and preserved from hand to hand, at least from Aristotle's time to our own. Thus, Gesner and Aldrovandus copied from Aristotle (Ray, Preface to Willoughby's Ornithology); from them Willoughby took the names of his birds; and on this system Linnaeus based his classification (Neville Wood, Ornithologists' Text-book, p. 3). Aristotle, about B.C. 300 (probably contemporary with the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek; see above), describes the ἁλιαίετος as “a species of eagle dwelling near seas and lakes; and remarks it sometimes happens to it that, having seized its prey, and not being able to carry it, it is drowned in the deep” (Hist. Animal. 9, c. 32). — The same word is found in the writings of Pliny (A.D. 70) with the following description: “There remains (to be mentioned) the halicetos, having the most penetrating vision of all (eagles); soaring (or balancing itself) on high, and upon perceiving a fish in the sea, rushing down headlong, and with its breast dashing aside the waters, seizing its prey” (Hist. Nat. 10:3). The halicetus is described in the very words of Aristotle and Pliny by Aldrovandus (lib. 12, Bonon. 1594, p. 194). For the transference of names into the Linnaean system, see Systema Naturae, 1:129 (Holmiae, 1767). The word, according to its etymology, signifies sea-eagle, and the traditional English word is osprey.

The following accounts. from modern naturalists are strikingly in accordance with the ancient descriptions: Species of the halietus, or sea-eagle, occur in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia (Selby's British Ornithology). Mr. Macgillivray describes “its savage scream of anger when any one approaches the neighborhood of its nest, its intimidating gestures. and even its attempts to molest individuals who have ventured among its native crags.” Mr. Selby (Illustrations of British Ornithology, 1825), respecting the osprey, observes, “It is strictly piscivorous, and is found only in the vicinity of lakes, rivers, or such pools as abound with fish. It is a powerful bird, often weighing five pounds; the limbs are very muscular in proportion to its general dimensions; its feet are admirably adapted for retaining firm hold of its slippery prey.” Mr. Montagu (Ornithological Dictionary, 1802, s.v. Ospray) remarks, “Its principal food is fish, which it often catches with great dexterity, by pouncing upon them with vast rapidity. and carrying them off in its talons.” See also Grandsagne's edition of Pliny, with Notes and Excursus by Cuvier (Parisiis, 1828), p. 215. This fine and powerful bird of prey has a wide geographical distribution. It is spread over the whole of Europe and Asia from Norway to Kamtchatka, from Ireland and Portugal to India and Japan. On all the coasts of the Mediterranean it is  common, and in Africa it reaches from Egypt to the Cape. In America Dr. Richardson found it in the arctic regions; Wilson and Audubon describe it as abundant throughout the United States; and it is seen fishing in the West Indies. Its prey is fish, and to obtain this it selects its eyryon some bold headland jutting out into the sea, or a tall cliff overlooking the broad reach of a river, or a blasted pine that springs out of the rifted rock where a cataract plunges down the steep. The manners of this bold seaking have been eloquently described by Wilson:

“In leaving the nest, he usually flies direct till he comes to the sea, then sails around in easy curving lines, turning sometimes in the air as on a pivot, apparently without the least exertion, rarely moving the wings, his legs extended in a straight line behind, and his remarkable length and curvature of wing distinguishing him from all other hawks. The height at which he thus elegantly glides is various, from one hundred to one hundred and fifty and two hundred feet, sometimes much higher, all the while calmly reconnoitring the face of the deep below. Suddenly he is seen to check his course, as if struck by a particular object, which he seems to survey for a few moments with such steadiness that he appears fixed in the air, flapping his wings. This object, however, he abandons, or rather the fish he had in his eye has disappeared, and he is again seen sailing around as before. Now his attention is again arrested, and he descends with great rapidity; but ere he reaches the surface shoots off on another course, as if ashamed that a second victim had escaped him. He now sails at a short height above the surface, and by a zigzag descent, and without seeming to dip his feet in the water, seizes a fish, which, after carrying a short distance, he probably drops, or yields up to the bald-eagle, and again ascends by easy spiral circles to the higher regions of the air, where he glides about in all the ease and majesty of his species. At once, from this sublime aerial height, he descends like a perpendicular torrent, plunging into the sea with a loud rushing sound, and with the certainty of a rifle. In a few moments he emerges, bearing in his claws his struggling prey, which he always carries head foremost, and having risen a few feet above the surface, shakes himself as a water spaniel would do, and directs his heavy and laborious course directly for the land. The hawk, however, in his fishing pursuits, sometimes mistakes his mark, or  overrates his strength by striking fish too large and powerful for him to manage, by whom he is suddenly dragged under; and though he sometimes succeeds in extricating himself, after being taken down three or four times, yet oftener both parties perish. The bodies of sturgeon, and of several other large fish, with a fish-hawk fast grappled in them, have at different sites been found dead on the shore, cast up by the waves” (Amer. Ornith. s.v. Fishhawk).

With this may be compared the description of another modern naturalist, Dr. Richardson: “When looking out for its prey it sails with great ease and elegance, in undulating lines at a considerable altitude above the water, from whence it precipitates itself upon its quarry, and bears it off in its claws.” The osprey belongs to the family Falconide, order Raptores. It has a wide geographical range, and is occasionally seen in Egypt; but as it is rather a northern bird, the Hebrew word may refer, as Mr. Tristram suggests to us, either to the Aquila noevia or Aquila noevioides, or more probably still to the very abundant Circaetus gallicus which feeds upon reptilia (Nat. Hist. of Bible, p. 185).

## Ossa[[@Headword:Ossa]]

             a Homeric female deity, the messenger of Zeus. She was worshipped at Athens, and seems to have corresponded to the Latin goddess Fama.

## Ossat Arnaud D[[@Headword:Ossat Arnaud D]]

             a French cardinal and diplomatist, was born of very humble origin Aug. 23, 1536, at Larroque. He lost both his parents when but nine years of age, and entered the service of Thomas de Marca, who gave him as a servant to his nephew and ward, John de Marca, lord of Castelnau-Magnoac. Being present while his master was taking his lessons, D'Ossat soon learned enough of Latin to teach it to the less capable nobleman. Receiving the tonsure Dec. 26, 1556, he entered the Church, and afterwards accompanied his former master and two other young gentlemen to Paris as their tutor. These returned to Gascony in 1562, and D'Ossat remained in Paris, where he continued his studies under Ramus, whose intimate friend he soon became. He was for a while professor of rhetoric and philosophy at the University of Paris, but soon after went to Bourges to study law under Cujas, and became counselor to the Parliament. In 1574 he went to  Rome as secretary to the French ambassador, Paul de Foix, and now remained most of the time in that city, first in a subordinate position, then as ambassador of Henry III and Henry IV. In that capacity he rendered his employers great service. It was D'Ossat who reconciled the Church of Rome and Henry IV. He was made cardinal in 1599, and died at Rome March 13, 1604. Cardinal D'Ossat is a remarkable instance of elevation to Church dignity by the force of personal merit. He wrote, Expositio Arnaldi Ossati in disputationem Jacobi Carpentarii de methodo (Paris, 1654, 8vo), in defense of Ramus; and a collection of Lettres addressed to the minister of state, Villeroi, which are models of diplomatic correspondence (1st ed. Paris, 1624, fol. best by A. de la Houssaye, Paris, 1697, 2 vols. 4to, with notes; reprinted, with more notes, Amst. 1707, 1714, 1732, 5 vols. 12mo). This work was translated into Italian by Jerome Canini (Venice, 1729, 4to). He is also considered the author of the Lettres published under the name of cardinal Joyeuse, and of a remarkable Memoir on the League, written in Italian in 1590, and published in the Vie du Cardinal D'Ossat, Anon. (by Madame d'Arconville). See Gallia Christiana, vol. xi, xiv; Frizon, Gallia purpurata; Alby, Hist. des Cardin. illustres; Moreri, Dict. hist.; France pontificale; Niceron, Memoires, 34:31-40; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 1:224 sq.

## Ossenians[[@Headword:Ossenians]]

             a name sometimes given to the followers of Elxai, in the 1st century, who taught that faith may and ought to be dissembled. — Buck, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.

## Ossifrage[[@Headword:Ossifrage]]

             occurs in the A. V. at Lev 11:13; Deu 14:12 (where it is classed among unclean birds), as the rendering of the פֶּרֶס(pe'res; Sept. γρύψ,Vuulg. gryps), which is supposed to be derived from the root pairas', פָּרִס, to break, from the power of its beak to crush the bones of its victims. Hence the Latin compound ossifrage, or bone-breaker, is simply a translation of the Hebrew name. There has been much difference of opinion as to the bird intended by this term, but it is evidently a large bird of the eagle kind, and is very possibly called in these passages by a general name, bestowed indefinitely by the Jews. with no accurate  discrimination of species. The Targum of Onkelos, and the Sept. and Vulg., understand the “vulture,” and many modern versions concur in this reading. Others think the word denotes the black eagle, and some the falcon. It is perhaps the great sea-eagle, which, as it differs in its colors during the several stages of its growth, has obtained three distinct systematic names: Falco ossifragus, Falco albicilla, Falco albicandus. When it has attained its fifth year, it puts on its last suit, which is a dusky brown, intermixed with gray, with a white tail. It is about the size of the golden eagle, and inhabits the cliffs along the sea-shore. It is found in the northern parts of Europe and in Asia. But most prefer to identify the Hebrew bird in question with the species commonly known as the Vulture of the Alps, which was the ossifrage of the Romans. It was called by the Hellenic nations phene (φήνη), and is known as the Lammergeyer in Switzerland. This is the largest flying bird of the Old World, and inhabits the highest ranges of mountains in Europe, Western Asia, and Africa. Not only does he push kids and lambs, and even men, off the rocks, but he takes the bones of animals that other birds of prey have denuded of the flesh high up into the air, and lets them fall upon a stone in order to crack them and render them more digestible even for his enormous powers of deglutition. (See. Mr. Simpson's very interesting account of the Lammergeyer in Ibis, 2:282.) The Lammergeyer, or bearded vulture, as it is sometimes called, is one of the largest of the birds of prey. It is not uncommon in the East; and Mr. Tristram several times observed this bird “sailing over the high mountain-passes west of the Jordan” (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 171).

The species in Europe is. little if at all inferior in size to the Condor of South America, measuring from the point of the bill to the end of the tail four feet two or three inches, and sometimes ten feet in the expanse of wing; the head and neck are not, like those of vultures, naked, but covered .with whitish narrow feathers; and there is a beard of bristly hair under the lower mandible; the rest of the plumage is nearly black and brown, with some whitish streaks on the shoulders, and an abundance of pale rust color on the back of the neck, the thighs, vent, and legs; the toes are short and bluish, and the claws strong. In the young the head and neck are black, and the species or variety of Abyssinia appears to be rusty and yellowish on the neck and stomach. It is the griffon of Cuvier, Gypaetos barbatus of nomenclators, and γρύψ, of the Sept. The Arabs, according to Bruce, use the names Abu-Duch'n and Nisser-Werk, which is a proof that they consider it a kind of eagle, and perhaps confound this species with the great sea-eagle, which has likewise a few bristles under the throat; and  commentators who have often represented Peres to be the black vulture, or a great vulture, were only viewing the Gypaetos as forming one of the order Accipitres, according to the Linnoean arrangement, where Vultur barbatus (Syst. Nat.) is the last of that genus, although in the thirteenth edition (by Gmelin) we find the name changed to Falco barbatus, and located immediately before F. albicilla, or the sea-eagle, showing that until a still more accurate classification placed the species in a separate genus, ornithologists had no determined idea of the true place it should occupy, and consequently by what generical appellation it was to be distinguished.

## Ossilago[[@Headword:Ossilago]]

             (bone-hardening). SEE OSSIPAGA.

## Ossilegium[[@Headword:Ossilegium]]

             (os, “a bone,” and legere, “to gather”), the act of collecting the bones of the dead. It was customary among the ancient Greeks, when the funeral pyre was burned down, to quench the dying embers with wine, after which the relatives and friends collected the bones of the deceased. This last practice received the name of the Ossilegium. The bones, when collected, were washed with wine and oil, and deposited in urns, which were made of different materials, sometimes even of gold.

## Ossipaga[[@Headword:Ossipaga]]

             (bone-fastener), an ancient Roman deity, whose office it was to harden and consolidate the bones of infants. — Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Ossitinian Version[[@Headword:Ossitinian Version]]

             SEE RUSSIA, VERSIONS OF.

## Ossuarium[[@Headword:Ossuarium]]

             the vase or urn in which the ashes of the departed are deposited. SEE TURNS.

## Oster, P. J[[@Headword:Oster, P. J]]

             a missionary among the Jews in France, was born h at Strasburg March 5, 1804, where he also studied for the ministry. In November, 1828, he was engaged as a missionary by the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews, and was stationed at Marseilles, visiting and also preaching to the Jews in Paris, Metz, Colmar, Montbeliard, Besan-on- Lyons, Avignon, etc. In 1835 he was stationed at Metz, whence he  undertook extensive journeys through the south of France. After fourteen years' labor in the missionary cause, Mr. Oster resigned his office in 1843, and was during the last four years the minister of the Lutheran congregation in Posen. Too great exertion in the duties of his office had, however, an injurious effect on his health, for the restoration of which he was advised to undertake a voyage to South Australia. He died, however, Oct. 24, 1847, having been eight weeks on the sea. Besides his French translation of Dr. A. M'Caul's נתיבות עולם (the Old Path), under the title Les Sentiers d'Israel, he published also a brochure, Les Conjectures d'un Israelite Frangais sur l'Origine du Culte Mosaique, examinees (Metz, 1840), against a certain Tsarphati, who denied the inspiration and divine authority of the laws of Moses., See the proceedings of the London Society in the Jewish Expositor (London, 1829-31); the Monthly Intelligencer (1830-34); Jewish Intelligencer (1835-43), where Mr. Oster's interesting missionary journals are found. (B. P.)

## Ostertag, Paul Albert, Dr[[@Headword:Ostertag, Paul Albert, Dr]]

             a noted German missionary worker, was born at Stuttgard April 18, 1810. Having received the necessary education, he entered the University of Tubingen for the study of theology. In 1837 he became tutor and leader of the missionary institution at Basle in which position he for a long time edited the Basler Missionsmagazin (the Missionary Magazine), which up to this day is very extensively circulated in Europe as well as in this country. Failing health obliged him to retire from active work, and after some years of retirement he finished his course at Basle, Feb. 17, 1871. He is the author of some hymns, which are found in Knapp's Evangelischer Liederschatz. See Knapp, Evangelischer Liederschatz, p. 1340; Schutze, Deutschland's Dichter u. Schriftsteller s.v. (B. P.)

## Osterwald, Jean Frederic[[@Headword:Osterwald, Jean Frederic]]

             an eminent FrenchSwiss Reformed theologian, was born at Neuchatel, where his father was pastor, in 1663. In 1676 he went to Zurich to study under Prof. Ott, and in 1678 went to the University of Saumur, where he graduated in 1679. He then completed his studies at Orleans under the renowned Claude Pajon; at Paris under Pierre Alli, Jean Claude, etc.; and at Geneva under Louis Tronchin. He was ordained at Neuchatel in 1683, appointed deacon in 1686, pastor in 1699, and was repeatedly chosen dean by the clergy. He died at Neuchatel April 14,1747. Osterwald wrote, Traite  des sources de la corruption, qui irgne aujourd'hui parmi les Chretiens (Neuch. and Amst. 1700, anon.; often reprinted, and translated into English under the title of A Treatise. concerning the Causes of the present Corruption of Christians, and the Remedies thereof, 3d ed. Lond. 1711, 8vo; and in Watson's Tracts, No. 6; it was also translated into Dutch in 1703, and twice into German in 1713 and 1716). By this work Osterwald, who during his long and active life had, with Winnfels (q.v.) and Turretin (q.v.) — together called the Swiss triumvirate — labored zealously for the promotion of practical piety, sought a departure from that phase of orthodoxy which, recognizing profession as a principal obligation, had dwelt upon it so prominently as to lose sight of the holy living required of the Christian professor.

Osterwald attributed the corruption of Christians to the tendency to dispute concerning certain dogmas, and considered the bad state of morals as arising from the people seeking to derive comfort, but not improvement, from Scripture. He accused them of attaching more importance to the knowledge of the word of Scripture than to a life of practical piety. To insist on morals as of paramount importance was considered a heresy. This corruption was further authorized by the doctrine that good works are unnecessary, and also that it is impossible to fulfill all the requirements of the law, as if the regenerate man remained as impotent as the natural man. Osterwald also asserted that the Reformation was not a complete work, and that the reformation of morals was yet to take place. There was also a want of unity, the Church being divided into numerous parties excommunicating each other. It was therefore necessary to lay aside all these vexatious minor points, and to adhere firmly to the essential doctrine, for fear lest religion should be still more dishonored. The teachings even of the catechisms were more doctrinal than practical. Pastoral care was deficient. This works exhibiting in bold relief the failings of the orthodox party, had great success, but awakened also considerable opposition. In 1702 Osterwald published a Catechism, which was translated into Dutch, German, and into English, under the title of The Grounds and Principles of the Christian Religion explained in a Catechetical Discourse for the Instruction of Young People, rendered into English, and revised by George Stanhope, D.D. (Lond. 1704, '8vo). Among his other works we notice Douze Sermons sur divers Textes de l'Ecriture Sainte (Geneva, 1722, 8vo): — The Arguments of the Books and Chapters of theO. and N.T., with Practical Observations, translated by John Chamberlayne, Esq. (5th ed. Lond. 1779); the arguments and reflections with which this was accompanied have been translated into  most of the European languages, and are much-esteemed: — The Preliminary Discourse to the Arguments on the Books, etc. (ibid. 1722, 8vo): — The Nature of Uncleanness Considered, etc.; to which is added a Discourse concerning the Nature of Chastity, and the Means of obtaining it (ibid. 1708, 8vo): — Lectures on the Exercise of the Sacred Ministry, translated and enlarged by Thomas Stevens, M.A. (ibid. 1781, 8vo): — The Necessity and Usefulness of Reading the Holy Scriptures, and the Disposition with which they ought to be Read; translated by John Moore, A.B. (ibid. 1750, 18mo): — An Abridgment of the History of the Bible (ibid. 1750, 18mo). See Schweizer, Gesch. der ref. Centraldogmen, 2:759; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index in vol. ii); Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:481 sq.; Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:113 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 10:730 sq.; Darling, Cycl. Bibliographica, 2:2256. (J. N. P.)

## Ostiarii[[@Headword:Ostiarii]]

             (door-keepeirs), the lowest of the minor orders in the Western Church. They are spoken of by Church writers of the 3d or 4th century. The fourth Council of Carthage prescribed as the form for their admission to office the delivery of the church-key to them by the bishop, with the words: “Behave thyself as one who must render account to God of the things locked under these keys.” They arranged catechumens in their places, announced the hours of service, and had charge of the church. From this word ostiarius are derived the words huissier and usher. The second master of Winchester is called hostiariuis. The Greek Church only partially adopted the institution of porters, and soon let it die out. In the West they always lived near the church. See Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 418; Riddle, Christian Antiquities (see Index); Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iii; Westrop, Handb. of Archaeology, p. 72; Coleman, Anc. Christianity, p. 127, 185. SEE DOOR-KEEPERS.

## Ostjakian Version[[@Headword:Ostjakian Version]]

             SEE RUSSIA, VERSIONS OF.

## Ostrander, Daniel[[@Headword:Ostrander, Daniel]]

             a veteran Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Plattekill, N.Y., August 9, 1772. He was converted at sixteen, entered the New York Conference in 1793, was for fourteen years on circuits, for eight on station (New York, Brooklyn, and Albany),. and for twenty-eight years was presiding elder. From 1808 to 1840 inclusive he was elected member of every General Conference. He retired in 1843, and died December 8 of that year. He was firm, faithful, wise in pursuing his course, ever at his post, and always ready to serve See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1843-44, page 472; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:221.

## Ostrander, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Ostrander, Henry, D.D]]

             a Reformed (Dutch ) minister, was born at Plattekill, N.Y., March 11, 1781. He graduated from Union College in 1799; studied under Dr. Froeligh; was licensed by the Classis of Paramus in 1800; became pastor at Coxsackie in 1801; at Catskill (or Leeds) in 1810; Caatsban in 1812; also at Saugerties village in 1839; and stated supply at Hurley in 1811. He was without a charge from 1862 until his death, November 22, 1872. Fifteen Sermons of his are published in Gordon's Memoir of him, with selections from his autobiography, and extracts from his letters. See Corwin, Manual of Ref. Church in America, 3d ed. page 396.

## Ostrich[[@Headword:Ostrich]]

             (יִעֲנָה, yaanah', always with בִּת, daughter of the ostrich, i.e. the female ostrich. See also the cognate יָעֵן, yaen, Lam 4:3. In Job 39:13, the word נוֹצָה, notsah, feathers, is wrongly rendered ostrich; while רְנָנַים, female ostriches, is translated peacocks, in the A.V.; Sept.  στρουθός, Deu 14:15, but in Isaiah and in Mic 1:8, Sept. σειρῆνες; see Schleusner, Lex . s.v.). In Arabic the bird is called nea-mah, also thareds jammel, i.e. camel-bird; like the Persian sutur morgh; comp. Greek στρουθοκάμηλος (Diod. Sic. 2:50), and Lat. Struthiocamelus, in Pliny.

1. Names. —

(1.) It is now generally admitted that the word yaansh should be rendered ostrich; as the passages in which it occurs require us to understand some inhabitant of the remote desert, and seem thus to exclude the owl, the usual rendering in the English Version (Job 30:29; Job 39:13; Isa 13:21; Isa 34:13). SEE OWL.

The etymology of the word also accords better with the former rendering. The wordn יִעֲנָה, yaanah', like רְנָנַים, renanim', appears to refer to the habit of uttering loud-sounding cries; and the third name, bath-hayaanah, “the daughter of vociferation,” or “loud moaning,” is in conformity with the others, and an Oriental figurative mode of expressing the same faculty (which exists not, we think, in the females alone, but in the whole species); for the ostrich has an awful voice, which, when heard on the desert, is sometimes mistaken in the night, even by natives, for the sound of a beast. This, too, is the almost unanimous rendering of the old translators (Gesen. Thes. 2:609), while the reference of the word to the owl, supported by Oedmann (Samml. 3:35 sq.), rests on no 'early testimony. Bochart (2:830 sq.) would understand the male ostrich by תִּחְמָס, in Lev 11:16; Deu 14:15; but no ancient version supports this rendering. SEE NIGHT-HAWK.

Gesenius (Thes. s.v. יִעֲנָה) refers the word to the root יָעִן, which signifies “to be greedy or voracious;” and demurs to the explanation given by Michaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. p. 1127) and by Rosenmüller (Not. ad Hieroz. 2:829, and Schol. ad Lev 11:16), who trace the Hebrew word yaanah to one which 'in Arabic denotes “hard and sterile land:” bath-hayaanah accordingly would mean “daughter of the desert.” Without entering into the merits of these various explanations, it will be enough to mention that any one of them is well suited to the habits of the ostrich. This bird, as is well known, will swallow almost any substance, pieces of iron, large stones, etc.; this it does probably in order to assist the triturating action of the gizzard: so that the Oriental expression of “daughter of voracity” is eminently characteristic of the ostrich. With regard to the two other derivations of the Hebrew word, we may add that the cry of the ostrich is said sometimes to resemble  that of the lion, so that the Hottentots of South Africa are deceived by it; and that its particular haunts are the parched and desolate tracts of sandy deserts.

(2.) Ya'en (יָעֵן) occurs only in the plural number יְעֵנַים, ye'enim (Sept. στρουθίον, Vulg. struthio), in Lam 4:3, where the context shows that the ostrich is intended: “The daughter of my people is become cruel like the ostriches in the wilderness.” This is important, as showing that theabove word, which is merely the feminine form of this one, with the addition of bath, “daughter,” clearly points to the ostrich as its correct translation, even if all the old versions were not agreed upon the matter.

(3.) Ranan, רָנָן, in the plural form רְנָנָים, renanim; Sept. τερπόμενοι; Vulg. struthio), alone occurs in Job 39:13; where, however. it is clear from the whole passage (13-18) that ostriches are intended by the word. The A. V. renders rehanim by “peacocks,” a translation which has not found favor with commentators; as “peacocks,” for which there is a different Hebrew name (תֻּכַּיַּים), were probably not known to the people of Arabia or Syria before the time of Solomon. SEE PEACOCK.

The Hebrew renanins appears to be derived from the root רָנִן, randan, “to wail,” or to “utter a stridulous sound,” in allusion to this bird's nocturnal cries. Gesenius compares the Arabic zimar, “a female ostrich,” from the root zamar, “to sing.”

2. Description. — The head of the ostrich is small, and not composed of strong bones; the bill, in form somewhat like that of a duck, is flat, with a nail at the apex, and broad at the gape; the eyes, hazel-colored, have a clear and distinct vision of objects to a great distance, although when seen obliquely they have an opalescent appearance; the auditory apparatus is large and open, notwithstanding that in the pairing season ostriches are said to be very deaf; the neck, long and slender, is, together with the head, but scantiy clothed with whitish shining hairs, and in the pairing season becomes for a time pink or rosy red; towards the base it assumes the general color of the plumage, which, with the quill and tail plumes, is entirely composed of loose downy-webbed feathers, only differing in size and color; the wings, each from three to four feet long, exclusive of feathers, are entirely naked on the inner side, and are supplied towards the end of the pinion bone on each side with two sharp-pointed quills resembling those of a porcupine, and no doubt serving for defense; the  thighs, nearly bare of plumage, and of a deep flesh-color, are as full and muscular as those of a strong man, and the tarsi or legs, of corresponding length with the proportions of the neck, are covered with broad horny scales, and terminate in two toes; the inner, being the longest, is armed with a broad, strong claw; and that on the outside, only half the length of the other, is without any. The great feathers, so much prized in commerce, are twenty in each wing, those of the tail being nearly always useless, broken, and worn. The cloven feet, long neck, and vaulted back of these birds are in themselves quite sufficient to suggest to the imagination an animal of the camel kind: but these external appearances are not the only points of resemblance; the stomach is so formed as to appear possessed of a third ventricle, and there are other structural particulars, such as a sternum not keel-shaped, as in birds, but in the form of a round buckler, to protect the chest, which, with the fact that they are without the muscular conformation to render them capable of flying, altogether approximate these birds to quadrupeds, and particularly to the order of Ruminantia.

3. Habits. — Ostriches are gregarious — from families consisting of a male with one or several female birds, and perhaps a brood or two of young, up to troops of near a hundred. They keep aloof from: the presence of water in the wild and desert, mixing without hesitation among herds of gnu, wild asses, quaggas, and other striped Equidae, and the larger species of Antilopidte. From. the nature of their food, which consists of seeds and vegetables, although seldom or never in want of drink, it is evident that they must often approach more productive regions, which, by means of the great rapidity of motion they possess, is easily accomplished; and they are consequently known to be very destructive to cultivated fields. As the organ of taste is very obtuse in these birds, they swallow with little or no discrimination all kinds of substances, and among these stones; it is also probable that, like poultry, they devour lizards, snakes, and the young of birds that fail in their way. One has even been known to snap a traveler's sketch-book from his hand, attracted to it by the sight of the white paper. It is not yet finally decided whether the two species are polygamous, though concurrent testimony seems to leave no doubt of the fact: there is, however, no uncertainty respecting the nest, which is merely a circular basin scraped out of the soil, with a slight elevation at the border, and sufficiently large to contain a great number of eggs; from twelve to about sixty have been found in them, exclusive of a certain number always observed to be outlying, or placed beyond the raised border of the nest,  and amounting apparently to nearly one third of the whole. These are supposed to feed the young brood when first hatched, either in their fresh state, or in a corrupted form, when the substance in them has produced worms. These eggs are of different periods of laying, like those within, and the birds hatched form only a part of the contents of a nest, until the breeding season closes. The eggs are of different sizes, some attaining to seven inches in their longer diameter, and others less, having a dirty white shell, finely speckled with rust color; their weight borders on three pounds. Within the tropics they are kept sufficiently warm in the day-time not to require incubation, but beyond one or more females sit constantly, and the male bird takes that duty himself after the sun has set. It is then that the short roar may be heard during darkness; and at other times different sounds are uttered, likened to the cooing of pigeons, the cry of a hoarse child, and the hissing of a goose — no doubt expressive of different emotions; but that the roar is expressive of the feeling of anger may be inferred from the assertion that jackals and foxes (Canis Megalotis Caama?) have been found close to the nests of these birds, kicked to death. This fact is the more credible, as the last-mentioned animal is a dexterous purloiner of their eggs; and it may be here added, in proof of the organ of smelling not being quite so obtuse in the ostrich as is asserted, that Caffres and Hottentots, when they daily rob a nest for their own convenience, always withdraw the eggs by means of a stick, in order to prevent the female finding out the larceny by means of the scent which human hands would leave behind; for then they will not continue to lay, but forsake the abode altogether. This circumstance may account for the small number of eggs often found in their nests. Tristram states (Ibis, 2:74): “Two Arabs began to dig with their hands, and presently brought up four fine fresh eggs from the depth of about a foot under the warm sand.”

4. Locality. — The ostrich roams over the whole of Africa from the Sahara to the Cape; but principally affects vast desert plains, over which its lofty stature gives it a great command of sight. It is still abundant in the Arabian peninsula, and extends into the waste and and regions that bound it on the north. It was predicted both by Isa 13:21 and by Jeremiah 1, 39 that ostriches should dwell at Babylon, than which there could scarcely have been devised a feature more strongly fitted to mark the silence and desolation, not merely of the city itself, but of the whole region in which it stood, and the utter contrast of this condition with that in which it sat the lady of kingdoms, and the center to which converged all the traffic of a  plain that swarmed with towns and cities. The bird of the desert still strides over the Euphratean plains. Herbert says he saw it between Lar and Shiraz. Mr. Ainsworth also implies that it still exists in the and wastes of Mesopotamia and Assyria, though it has become rare. Dr. Kitto informs us that it “inhabits the great Syrian desert, especially the plains extending from the Hauran towards Jebel Shammar and Nejed. Some are found in the Hauran, and a few are taken almost every year, even within two days' journey of Damascus” (Phys. Hist. of Palestine, p. 407). Prophecy assigns it to Idumaea (Isa 34:13). Ostriches exist, not only in Africa, but in the region of Arabia, east and south of Palestine beyond the Euphrates; but it may be a question whether they extend so far to the eastward as Goa, although that limit is assigned them by late French ornithologists.

The two species appear promiscuously in Asia and Africa, but the troops or coveys of each are always separate. The gray is more common in the south, while the black, which grows largest in Caffraria, predominates to the north of the equator. One of the last mentioned, taken on board a French prize, and wounded in the capture, was brought to London, where it was able to peck its food from a cross-beam eleven feet from the ground. The enormous bird afterwards shown in Bullock's museum was said to be the same. The common-sized ostrich weighs about eighty pounds; whence it may be judged that the individual here mentioned may have been at least forty pounds heavier.

5. Scripture Notices, etc. — The ostrich is mentioned in the Old Testament among unclean birds (Lev 11:16; Deu 14:15), less, perhaps, because of the voracity with which it swallows glass, metals, etc. (AElian, Anim. 14:7; Shaw, Trav. p. 389), than because it appeared to the Hebrews as a kind of hybrid, half bird and half beast (comp. Sommer, Bibl. Abhdl. 1:257), or because the ideas of desolation and terror were naturally associated with its home in the desert. Indeed, the Arabians and Ethiopians eat the flesh of the ostrich with delight (see Diod. Sic. 3:28; Strabo, 16:772), and in India, and even in Rome, it was considered a delicacy (AElian, Anim. 14:13; Lamprid. Vit. Heliogab. p. 27). But it is only when young that it could be palatable to a modern taste; and it is always dry and hard (see Aben-Ezra, on Exo 23:29; Galen, De Aliment. Facult. 3:20). African Arabs, says Mr. Tristram, eat its flesh, which is good and sweet. Ostrich's brains were among the dainties that were, placed on the supper-tables of the ancient Romans. The fat of the ostrich is sometimes used in medicine for the cure of palsy and rheumatism (Pococke, Trav.  1:209). It is mentioned as living in the desert in Isa 13:21; Isa 34:13; Isa 43:20; Jeremiah 1:39; Lam 4:3; comp. Theophrast. Plant. 4:4, p. 322; Jerome on Isaiah 14. This is so notorious of the ostrich that the Arabian zoologists suppose that it never drinks. It is said to be hardened against its young (Lam 4:3). This is confirmed of the ostrich by travelers (comp. Shaw, Trav. p. 388). Yet the common statement that the ostrich deposits and leaves its eggs in the nests of other birds cannot be supported. Elian even speaks of the ostrich as peculiarly fond of its young (Anima. 14:7). “As a further proof of the affection of the ostrich for its young” (we quote from Shaw's Zoology, 11:426), “it is related by Thunberg that he once rode past a place where a female was sitting on her nest, when the bird sprang up and pursued him, evidently with a view to prevent his noticing her eggs or young.” A mournful cry or scream is attributed to it (Mic 1:8; Job 30:29; comp. Bochart, Hieroz. 2:811 sq.). Shaw testifies to the lugubrious voice of this bird: “During the lonesome part of the night they often make a doleful and hideous noise, which would sometimes be like the roaring of a lion; at other times it would bear resemblance to the hoarser voices of other quadrupeds, particularly of the bull and the ox. I have often heard them groan, as if they were in the greatest agonies” (2:349). Dr. Livingstone refers to the loudness and lion-like character of the sound: “The silly ostrich makes a noise as loud [as the lion] . I have been careful to inquire the opinions of Europeans who have heard both, if they could detect any difference between the roar of a lion and that of an ostrich; the invariable answer was that they could not when the animal was at any distance. . . To this day I can distinguish between them with certainty only by knowing that the ostrich roars by day, and the lion by night” (South Africa, p. 141). The name רְנָנַים (Job 39:13) is given in allusion to this cry, as is sufficiently clear from the context. The following is a close translation of the poetical description of this bird in the passage just cited (Job 39:13-18), which aptly delineates its chief characteristics

“The wing of the ostrich [is] flaunted: [Is her] pinion perchance [like that of the] pious [stork, or [her] feather? [Nay], for she will leave to the earth her eggs, Even upon [the] dust will she warm them; While she has forgotten that a foot may crush it, Even the living [thing] of the field trample it. She has harshly taken her young for [those] not [be longing] to her. In vain her labor [of parturition, since as to hatching she is] without dread. For God has made her oblivious of wisdom  Nor apportioned to her [a share] in Understanding. [Yet] whenever aloft she may lash [herself for flight] She will laugh at the horse and at his rider.”

The waving of the wing is well illustrated by the description of Leo Africanus (Descr. Afr. 9:55) and of Elian (Anim. 2:27), while the fact that the plumage is dark (gray or black) on the back, shoulders, and wings, and elsewhere white, is a striking resemblance to the stork. The statement in the 14th verse, that the ostrich leaves her eggs in the sand carelessly, arises probably from the fact that a few eggs are often found at a short distance from the nest, supposed to be placed there as food for the young when hatched (comp. Leo Afric. ut sup.; Vaillant, Reis. nach. Africa, 2:210; Bochart, p. 863). As to the folly spoken of in Job 39:17, it is a general belief among the Arabs that the ostrich is a very stupid bird; indeed they have a proverb, “Stupid as an ostrich;” and Bochart (Hieroz. 2:865) has given us five points on which this bird is supposed to deserve its character. They may be briefly stated thus:

(1) Because it will swallow iron, stones, etc.;

(2) Because when it is hunted it thrusts its head into a bush, and imagines the hunter does not see it;

(3) Because it allows itself to be deceived and captured in the manner described by Strabo (16:772. ed. Kramer);

(4) Because it neglects its eggs;

(5) Because it has a small head and few brains. Such is the opinion the Arabs have expressed with regard to the ostrich; a bird, however, which by no means deserves such a character, as travelers have frequently testified.

“So wary is the bird,” says Mr. Tristram (Ibis, 2:73), “and so open are the vast plains over which it roams, that no ambuscades or artifices can be employed, and the vulgar resource of dogged perseverance is the only mode of pursuit.” Dr. Shaw (Travels, 2:345) relates as an .instance of want of sagacity in the ostrich, that he “saw one swallow several leaden bullets, scorching hot from the mould.” We may add that not unfrequently the stones and other substances which ostriches swallow prove fatal to them. In this one respect, perhaps, there is some foundation for the character of stupidity attributed to them (Pliny, 10:1; comp. Diod. Sic. 2:50). Mr. Tristram, however, remarks, “The necessity for swallowing stones, etc., may be understood from the favorite food of the tame ostriches I have seen being the date-stone, the hardest of vegetable substances” (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 239). The statement that when erect “she scorneth the horse and his rider,” may be referred both to the height and the swiftness of the bird. The ostrich is the largest of all known birds, and perhaps the swiftest of all cursorial animals. The capture of an ostrich is often made at the sacrifice of the lives of two horses (Ibis, 2:73). Its strength is enormous. The wings are useless for flight, but when the bird is pursued they are extended and act as sails before the wind. The ostrich's feathers so much prized are the long white plumes of the wings. The best come to us from Barbary and the west coast of Africa. The ostrich belongs to the family Struthionidae, order Cursorses.

## Oswald Of Worcester[[@Headword:Oswald Of Worcester]]

             an English prelate who flourished .in the second half of the 10th century, is noted as one of the principal advocates on English soil of the monastic associations. He was a nephew of Odo of Canterbury (q.v.), and was, like him, of Danish parentage, but of English birth. In his childhood he was placed under Fridegode (q.v.), and made great progress in profane as well as theological learning. His uncle then called him to Canterbury, and made him canon of the old minister. Oswald was, however, very restless in this position, having conceived a great preference for the monastic state, and finally passed over to France and joined the monks of Fleury. On the approach of Odo's death Oswald was sent for, but he reached England too late to see his uncle again. Oswald was, however, induced to remain in his native country, after he had returned to the Continent for a short stay with his kinsman Oskitel, and was honored by the English clergy with several rich benefices, and in 960 with the see of Worcester. In 972 he was still further recognized by being elevated to the archbishopric of York, retaining at the same time the bishopric of Worcester. Together with Dunstan and Ethelwald, Oswald now labored for the triumph of English monasticism. and at the different English councils advocated the abolition of a married clergy (see Lea, Hist. of Celibacy, p. 174; Hill, English  Monasticism, p. 162 sq.). Oswald died Feb. 28, 992. Four books have been attributed to Oswald, none of which are known to exist at present: a book of letters to his uncle Odo; a letter or treatise addressed to Abbo, beginning with the words “Praescientia Die monachus;” a book, Ad sanctos dum esset Floriaci, beginning with the words “Oswaldus supplex monachus;” and Stzatuta synodalia. The only ground for the first of these titles appears to be the statement of his biographers that, in answer to Odo's letter begging him to return to England, 'he wrote excuses for staying at Fleury. It is difficult to judge of the authenticity of the other three, since they rest on the simple statement of the old bibliographers. See Inett, Hist. of the English Church, vol. i; Wright, Biog. Brit. Literaria (Anglo-Saxon period), p. 462-467.

## Oswald, Heinrich Siegmund[[@Headword:Oswald, Heinrich Siegmund]]

             a German divine of note, was born at Nimmerseet, in Silesia, June 30, 1751. After receiving his education at the school at Schmiedeberg, in Silesia, he went, in 1765 or 1766, into the office of his elder brother, who at that time held a public appointment. Seven years afterwards Oswald engaged himself as secretary to the landgrave of Glatz, but failing health obliged him to resign this position. He established himself in business at Breslau, but not meeting with success, he became a merchant's clerk. In 1790 Oswald became personally acquainted with king Frederick William II, who appointed him a court counselor, and afterwards a lector, and in 1791 a privy counselor. After the death of the king he retired with his family to Hirschberg, and later to Breslau, receiving a pension until his death, which occurred Sept. 8, 1834. His latter years Oswald had devoted to the production of musical, poetical, and religious works, and published in 1793 Gedichte und Lieder fiu's Herz. One of his best-known hymns, which is to be found in the Schwanengesdnge (Swan's Songs), is the one commencing “Wem in Leidenstagen” (English transl. by E. Cox in Hymns from the German, “Oh! let him whose sorrow”). Others of his hymns may be found in some of the modern hymn-books. See Koch Gesch. d. Kirchenliedes, 6:395 sq.; Sack, in Niedner's Zeitschrift fur histor. Theologie (1863), pt. iii; Miller, Singers and Songs of the Church, p. 303; Cox, Hymns from the German, p. 248; Knapp, -Evangelischer Liederschatz, p. 1340; Sch tz, Deutschlands Dichter undSchhriftsteller, v. (B. P.)

## Oswald, St.[[@Headword:Oswald, St.]]

             an English saint, was king of Bernicia, in Northumbria, England, from 634 to 642. He was a son of Ethelfrith, who was born in 604, and who became one of the most powerful S. Rxon monarchs. Oswald was noted for his piety and charitable nature. As a youth, while living in banishment among the Scots in Ireland, he had been instructed in Christianity and baptized by pious monks, and through their influence he was filled with an ardent zeal for the Christian faith. He sought to re-establish in England the Christian religion, which had been well-nigh abolished by Penda, the warlike pagan monarch of Mercia, and his equally warlike ally Cadwallon. Oswald defeated and slew Cadwallon, and having restored to Northumbria its independence in 636, it was now his firm resolution to do his utmost to make the worship of his God universal among his people. In order to carry out this object, he applied to the monks of Iona to send him one of their number. They consecrated the excellent and amiable monk Aidan as bishop, and sent him to Northumbria. Until he had gained a complete knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, Oswald himself acted as his interpreter. By this joint activity of the zealous king and Aidan, a firm foundation was laid for the Church in that district, and the success of their labor was truly unparalleled. Oswald founded an episcopal see in the island of Lindisfarne; and, aided by other missionaries from Iona, bishop Aidan converted in a few years the whole north of England to Christianity. Oswald, after a reign of eight years, met his death in battle with the pagan tribe of the Mercians, Aug. 5, 642. He fell by the sword of Penda, “in who worshipped Odin, and never left the altars of his grim war-god dry for want  of a victim.” As an illustration of Oswald's piety, we read in Miller's History of the Anglo-Saxons that “previous to his battle with the Welsh king (Cadwallon), which occurred soon after he was seated upon the throne of Bernicia, he planted the image of the cross upon the field, holding it with his own hands while his soldiers filled up the hollow which they had made in the earth to receive it. When the cross was firmly secured he exclaimed, 'Let us all bend our knees, and with one heart and voice pray to the true and the living God that he in his mercy will defend us from a proud and cruel enemy; for to him it is known that we have commenced this war for the salvation and safety of our people.'

All knelt, as he had commanded, around the cross, and when the last murmur of the solemn prayer had died away, they marched onward with stouter hearts to meet the terrible enemy.” Of the battle we have no other record than that Cadwallon fell, and that his army was destroyed. The spot where the cross was planted was afterwards called Heaven-field, and was for ages held in great reverence by the people. “Penda hated not the Christians who adhered rigidly to the tenets of their new creed,” but if they halted between Christianity and Odinism he abhorred them. The reason why he attacked Oswald is not known. It may have been to revenge the fall and defeat of Cadwallon, or it may have been simply love of conquest. Nor has it ever been charged that he attacked the Bernician king because the latter was a zealous Christian. All that is known is that Penda attacked and slew him at Maserfelth on Aug. 5, 642. In the above-mentioned work by Miller we read that “while the barbed javelin which caused his death was still fixed in his breast, he never for a moment ceased to pray, and that for centuries after his death his name was ever linked with the following pious sentence: 'May the Lord have mercy on their souls! as Oswald said when he fell on the battle-field.'”

Of his charitable nature it is related that “one day, as he was about to partake of the refreshments which were placed before him in a silver dish, the almoner, whose office it was to relieve the poor, stepped in and informed him that a number of beggars were waiting without soliciting alms. When his eye alighted upon the rich vessel in which the dainties were piled, the thought of their wants and his own unnecessary luxuries rose before him with so striking a contrast that he ordered the untouched food to be distributed among the beggars, and the silver dish to be broken up and given to them.” But Penda, after the battle of Maserfelth, ordered the head and limbs of this pious and charitable king to be severed from the body, and, transfixed on stakes, to be exposed to public gaze. Oswald was canonized. The fifth of March became Oswald's day, and: the  legend of Oswald is the theme of many old German poems and of the Icelandic Osvaldo Saga. See Miller, History of the Anglo-Saxons; Osvaldo Saga (Edinb. 1854). His name was cherished in the affection and respect of his nation, and hence soon began to be honored as that of a saint. Miracles were said to be wrought at his tomb and by his relics; and indeed the faith in them prevailed through the whole of these islands. Oswald's remains were carried to Bardney, in Lincolnshire, by Osthrida, and afterwards to St. Oswald's, in Gloucestershire, by Elfieda, the daughter of king Alfred. But more yet than the English legend, German myth has embellished Oswald's name. See Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschich. 1:234 (Mitau, 1874; Engl. trans. Phila. 1875, 1:301); Clement, Handb. of Legendary and Mythological Art, p. 243 (New York, 1872); Neander, Ch. History (Torrey's transl.), 3:20 sq.; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Die beiden Oswaldgedichte, ed. in Haupt's Zeitschrift fur deutsches Alterthumn, vol. ii, and by Etmiller (Zurich, 1845); Zingerle, Die Oswaldlegende (Stuttg. 1856); Wright, Biog. of Brit. Lit. (see Index); Collier, Eccles. Hist. (see Index in vol. viii); Churton, Hist. of the Early Engl. Church, p. 238, 244. (R. B. A.)

## Otey, James Hervey, D.D[[@Headword:Otey, James Hervey, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Liberty, Bedford County, Virginia, January 27, 1800. He graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1820, was ordained deacon in 1825, and presbyter in 1827; afterwards became rector of St. Paul's, in Franklin, Tennessee, from  which parish he was elected bishop of the diocese, the consecration taking place in Christ Church, Philadelphia, Jan. 14, 1834. He died at Memphis, Tennessee, April 23, 1863. From his urbanity and piety he usually went by the name of "the good bishop." He was the author of numerous Sermons, etc., and a volume on The Unity of the Church (1852). See Amer. Quar. Church Review, July 1863, page 321.

## Otfried[[@Headword:Otfried]]

             (Lat. Otfridus) OF WEISSENBURG, one of the most noted of mediaeval characters is celebrated especially as the author of a popular version of the Gospels, and for his efforts to familiarize the German people with the sacred Scriptures. He was probably of Alemannic race, and was born some time in the 9th century. He was at first educated at Fulda. under Rabanus Maurus (q.v.), the pupil of Alcuin (q.v.); next he lived many years in St. Gall, and finally removed to Weissenburg, in Alsace, one of those numerous monasteries scattered along the borders of Switzerland where the mountains break down to the lakes. While at Weissenburg Otfried wrote his Liber evangeliorum, a poetical paraphrase of the Gospels, in four-lined verses, with rhyme. Otfried's aim was to make the people familiar with God's Word in the German tongue. It was his wish, he said, that the praise of Christ might be sung in German (“thaz wir Christus sungun in unsera zungun”); that the Franks might learn to sing by heart what the Bible taught, and also be constantly reminded to reduce it to practice. He thought it “a shame that the Franks, a people not inferior in other respects to the Greeks and Romans, a people who had conquered so many nations, should not possess God's Word in their own language.” Otfried's work is the first rhymed poem we possess of the 9th century, and has always marked an important epoch in modern literature. True, there are very frequently introduced episodes, sometimes similes or allegories from ecclesiastical works, sometimes mystical and moral reflections of his own, which make Otfried's work less poetical; but, on the other hand, there are passages where the poet rises to warmth and true poetry, as where, in describing the journey of the Magi, he speaks of the longing of the soul for its heavenly fatherland. The poem, which was probably written before 868, was first published by M. Flacius (Basle, 1571); an edition with a Latin translation was published by Schilter, Thesaurus antiquitatum Teutonicarun' (Ulm, 1726); a critical edition was published by Graff, Krist, das lateste hochdeutsche Gedicht (Konigsb. 1831), and by Kelle (Regensb. 1856); a German translation was published by Rapp (Stuttg. 1856). See Grandidier, Sur la Vie et les Ouvrages d'Otffrid (Strasb. 1778); Lechler, in Stu(lien u. Kritiken (1849), 1:54-90; 2:303-332; Lachmann, in Ersch u. Gruber's Encyklop. iii, § 7:228-282; Neander, Hist. of the Christian Church, 3:425 (Torrey's transl.); Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 15 sq.; Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 1:171 sq. (Stuttg. 1866); Schutze, Deutschlands Dichter u. Schriftsteller,  s.v.; Vilmar, Gesch. d. deutschen Nationalliteratur, p. 36 sq.; Grimm, in the Introduction to his Deutsche Grammatik; -Gostwick and Harrison, Outlines of German Literature,p. 11; Miiller, Chips from a: German Workshop, 3:6; Hoffmann v. Flallersleben, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes bis auf Lutherszeif (Hanover, 1851), p. 23 sq.; id. Fundgruben fii deutsche Sprache und Literatur, i. 38-47; Wackernagel, Literaturgesch. § 31,32. (J. H.W.)

## Othlo[[@Headword:Othlo]]

             a Benedictine monk who flourished near the middle of the 11th century, is noted for his mystico-theological writings, and for several biographies of German saints. He was born at Freisingen of respectable parents; was educated at the convent in Tegernsee, and at Hersfeld. After a short stay at Wurzburg he entered the convent of Emmeram at Regensburg, and remained within its walls for over thirty years; then spent four years in hard literary labors at Fulda; and again went to Regensburg to die in the convent, some time near the close of the century. A list of all his works is given by Waitz in Pertz, Monum. German. Hist. 6:521. Among Othlo's theological writings are, Liber visionum spiritualis doctrince seientefie: — Dialogus de tribus aucestionibus: — De cursu spirituali. His opus De tentationibus (ipsius) variafortuna et scriptis, Mabillon published in his Analect. (Par. 1685), vol. 4. Among his biographies of German saints are lives of St. Boniface and St. Wolfgang. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 4:401; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 196.

## Othman I And III[[@Headword:Othman I And III]]

             sultans. SEE TURKEY.

## Othman, Ibn-Affan[[@Headword:Othman, Ibn-Affan]]

             the third caliph of the Moslems after the Prophet, is noted in Mohammedan history not only on account of the importance of his own reign, but also as the life-companion of the founder of Islam. He was a direct descendant from Abd el-menaf, one of the ancestors of, the Prophet. Having early adopted Islam by the persuasion of Mohammed, he became one of his most zealous ashab (companions), followed him in his flight from Mecca to Medina, and was made, on his return, one of his most confidential friends and secretaries. Upon the death of the caliph Omar, it was found that Othman was one of the six individuals whom he had by his will designated for his place. After mature deliberation, the majority chose Othman, on condition that he would govern the people according to the rules of the Koran, which Othman solemnly promised to do; and he was accordingly  invested with the supreme power towards the end of Dhi-l-hajjah A.H. 32 (Nov. or Dec., A.D. 644), three days after the death of Omar. His first public act was to send a body of troops under El-mugheyrah Ibn-Shaabah to complete the reduction of the province of Hamadan (A.D. 645), while another army expelled Jezdegerd from Persia (A.D. 646). SEE OMAR.

Another body of Arabs (A.D. 647) reduced all that part of Khorassan which had escaped former invasions. In the mean while Abdullab Ibn-Said invaded Eastern Africa, and, after defeating and killing at Yakfbiyah the patrician Gregorius, who commanded in the Grecian emperor's name, subdued its principal cities. Four years afterwards (A.D. 651) the same commander made an incursion into Nubia, and obliged the Christian sovereign of that country to sue for peace and pay him tribute. The islands of Cyprus and Rhodes were at, tacked and plundered by Muawivah Ibn- Abi-SufyAn (A.D. 648): these two maritime expeditions being the first which the Arabs ever made. But while the temporal power of Islam was thus extending its hold on all sides, Othman himself was rapidly losing his influence over his subjects, alienating their affections by the weakness of his internal administration and his partiality towards the members of his family. Othman began his reign by removing the celebrated Amru Ibn-el- ass from the government of Egypt — a country which he had conquered — and appointing in his place his own foster-brother, Abdullah Ibn-Said. This measure was as disagreeable to the Arabs as to the Egyptians. The people of Alexandria, who bore impatiently the Mohammedan yoke, and were only kept in obedience by the mildness and the justice of their governor, seeing a favorable opportunity, entered into a correspondence with the Greek emperor, and surrendered to him the city; and although Othman immediately reinstated Amrui, who recovered Alexandria and demolished its fortifications, this was not accomplished without great difficulty and considerable bloodshed (A.D. 646). Saad Ibn-Abi Wakkas and Abu Musa el-ashaari, two of Mohammed's companions, were also deprived by him of their command. Othman rendered himself further obnoxious by occupying the “minbar” (pulpit), and while at prayers in the mosque the same place which the Prophet had used, instead of placing himself, as his predecessors Omar and Abu-Bekr had done, a few steps lower down. He had also lost from off his finger a silver signet-ring which had once belonged to the Prophet, and with which the caliphs his predecessors had sealed their dispatches an ominous circumstance, which was regarded by all zealous Moslems as the greatest blow that could be inflicted on their rising empire; and he had recalled from his exile Hakem  Ibn-Aass, whom the Prophet himself had banished from Mecca. Othman was further accused of excessive prodigality towards his favorites.

Finally public discontent ran so high that the elders of the Arabian tribes and the most illustrious of Mohammed's own companions met at Medina, and threatened Othman with deposition unless he could justify his public acts. Othman resented this daring action of his subjects as an outrage upon his authority, and he not only ignored the message, but even severely abused the messenger. The people continued their protestations, and loudly clamored for his abdication, and they would even have done violence to his person: had not Ali, who had considerable influence with the rebellious subjects, promised immediate remedy in the caliph's name. Quiet was only maintained for a short time, however; for Ayesha, the Prophet's widow, sorely hated Othman, and she fanned an insurrection which resulted in the murder of Othman in his own palace, his soldiers having previously deserted him. His mutilated body lay unnoticed for three days; but was finally buried in a hole, without any ceremony, according to Abulfeda and Atabari, on June 18, 656 (18th day of Dhi-l-hajjah, A.H. 35). Othman was a pious Mohammedan, and was not only well versed in the Koran, but was the first to make an authentic copy of this sacred book of Islam, thus furnishing the basis for all future copies of the Koran. The transcription was done under his own supervision by Zeyd Ibn-Thabit, Abdullah Ibn- Zobeyr, and other companions of the Prophet. Othman himself transcribed the Koran several times, and while in the palace awaiting his assassination he was found to enjoy the companionship of the Koran. See Abulfaraj, Hist. Dynast. (transl. by Pococke), p. 31 sq.; Ockley, Hist. of the Saracens, vol. i; Price, Mohammedan History, vol. i; Engl. Cyclop. s.v., and the authorities there quoted.

## Othmar, St[[@Headword:Othmar, St]]

             (AUDEMAR, AUTOMARUS), is the name of one of the most celebrated monastics of the Middle Ages. He was the first real abbot of the convent of St. Gall, one of the most noted of ascetic asylums in Europe. As has been seen in the article ST. GALL SEE ST. GALL , the disciples of Gallus remained together after his decease, and appointed one of their own number as custos, or pastor Galli. Our Othmar was one of those whom his  brethren delighted to honor, and he occasionally held that post. He was well fitted for places of distinction. He had been as thoroughly trained as was the custom of his times in Courland, and enjoyed the favors and protection of duke Waldram, whose family took great interest in the county of St. Gall. As this establishment was hindered in its progress by the Franks, duke Waldram concluded to make them take an interest in it by surrendering it to them in 720, and Othmar was appointed abbot. He now exerted himself greatly in establishing the convent on a permanent basis. By Pepin's orders the rule was changed from Columban's to Benedict's, in order to harmonize with the other Frankish convents. This change, however, did not prove quite successful, as the French wished to place the convent under the immediate dependence of the diocesan bishop, in order to have greater control over it — a step which the monks themselves strenuously resisted. The chronicles of St. Gall give very full accounts of these disputes. Othmar took a journey to the court of the Franks, and there obtained some advantage; but while on his way to it a second time he was arrested, accused of lewdness and, judged by enemies, was of course condemned. He was taken to the village of Bodman, on the lake of Constance, where he was subjected to severe fasting. He was afterwards transferred to the island of Stein, on the Rhine, where he died, Nov. 16, 759. He had filled his office during forty years, and his death proved a severe loss to the convent, as his successor was a willing instrument in the hands of its enemies. Othmar's remains were brought to St. Gall in 769, and are said to have worked miracles there. He was canonized in the 9th century by Salomo I, bishop of Constance (839-871), which canonization was afterwards confirmed by the Church of Rome. Othmar's biography was written almost a century after his death by Gozbertus Diaconus. It is exclusively based on tradition. It was afterwards revised by abbot Walafrid Strabo of Reichenau, and continued by Iso of St. Gall. We have the latter work complete, but that of Gozbert only with the interpolations of Walafrid. See Walafridi Strabi Liber de vita S. Otmari, in Pertz, Mon. Germ. SS. 2:41-47; Isonis Magistri De miraculis eiusdem libri ii, p. 47-54 (ibid.); Ekkehardi Rhythmi de S. Otmaro, p. 54-58 (ibid.); Ratperti Casus S. Galli, cap. ii, p. 62-63 (ibid.); A bbatum S. Galli catalogs, ed. D. Ildefons. ab Arx, p. 35 (ibid.); Gozberti Diaconi Continuatio libri ii de miraculis S. Galli-per Walafridum emendata, cap. 11-15, p. 23-24 (ibid.); Aunn. Sangall. maior. in Pertz, Mon. Germ. 1:73, note d, and p. 74; Trudp. Neugart, Cod. dipl. A lam. etc. (1791, 4to); Traditiones monast. S. Galli; Ildephons. von Arx, Gesch. d. Kantons St. Gallen (1810, 2 vols.);  Rettberg, Kirchengesch. Deutschlands, 2:107 sq.; Heber, Lebensbilder aus der altdeutschen Kirche vor Bonifacius, in Marriott, Wahrem Protestanten (1855, vol. iv, pt. 2-3); Nagel, Gesch. d.'KI. St. Gallen, etc., in the Programm des Pidagogiums zu Halle, 1852; Heber, Die vorkarolingischen christlichen Glaubenshelden am Rhein u. deren Zeit (Frankf. ad M. 1858, p. 248 sq.); Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 7:802, 803; Herzog, — Real-Encyklop. 10:736.

## Othni[[@Headword:Othni]]

             (Heb. Othni', עָתְנַי. my lion; Sept. ῾Οθνί v. r. Γοθνί), the first named of six sons of Shemaiah; a mighty man of valor, made a porter in the tabernacle service (1Ch 26:7). B.C. cir. 1013.

## Othniel[[@Headword:Othniel]]

             (Heb. Othniel', עָתְנַיאֵלlion of God; Sept. Γοθονιήλ), the first judge or regent of the Hebrews after the death of Joshua. He was the son of Kenaz, the brother of Caleb (but see Rosenmüller, Schol. in Jos. p. 295 sq.), of the tribe of Judah. SEE CALEB; SEE KENAZ. Othniel displayed extraordinary valor in seizing the city of Debir, or Kirjath-sepher, for which exploit he was rewarded by the gift of Achsah, the daughter of Caleb, in marriage. Afterwards he was made the instrument of delivering the Hebrews from- the severe bondage in which they had been held for eight years by the Mesopotamians. During the forty years of his administration (B.C. 1567- 1527) the Hebrews remained faithful to Jehovah their God and king, and consequently prospered (Jos 15:16-19; Jdg 1:11-15; Jdg 3:8-11; 1Ch 4:13; 1Ch 27:15). SEE JUDGES.

## Otho And Otto Of Freising(en)[[@Headword:Otho And Otto Of Freising(en)]]

             a noted German monastic who; attained to high ecclesiastical offices, and was one of the crusaders, was a nobleman by descent. The date of his birth is not exactly known; it is supposed to be Dec. 5, 1109; some, however, put it in 1108. He was the third son of duke Leopold of Austria, and of Agnes, daughter of emperor Henry IV. In 1130 (or 1126) he joined the Cistercians, studied in Paris under Abelard, and became an adherent of Gilbert. In 1131 he was made abbot of Morimund, in Champagne, and bishop of Freising(en) in 1136. He did much towards raising the bishopric, which was at the time in a very bad condition, and was looked upon as its second founder. He had also great influence in the general affairs of the country. In 1147 he took part in the crusade with his half-brother, emperor Conrad III; was afterwards chosen by his nephew, emperor Frederick I, to negotiate between him and Henry Jasomirgott, duke of Bavaria; went as far as the Alps with the emperor in his second journey to Rome in 1158, then finally settled at Morimund, where he died, Sept. 22, 1158. He was much esteemed for his knowledge and his piety. Otho wrote, De duabus civitatibus, or De mutatione rerum (a history extending from the creation down to his own times): De gestis Friderici imperatoris (dictated to his secretary, canon Radewick of Freising, who afterwards added two sections to it). Both works were first publisher by Cuspinian, under the title Ottonis Episcopi Freysingensis Rerum ab origine mundi ad ipsius usque tempora (Strasb. 1515), and afterwards in Urstisius, Germanice hist. illustr. (Frankf. 1585 and 1670, fol.); in Tissier, Bibl. patr. Cisterc. (Par. 1669), and Radewick's continuation in Muratori, Scriptores rerum Ital. The history of Frederick I is found in Schiller, Ahg. Samnmlunng-historischer Memoiren. The first four books of this Chronicle are a mere compilation from Orosius, Eusebius, Isidore of Seville, and other previous writers; but  the last three books contain much original information, especially concerning the affairs of Germany in the 10th, 11th, and l2th centuries. Otho is an impartial and trustworthy historian, and judicious for the times in which he lived. His Chronicle was continued down to the year 1210 by another Otho, Appendix Ottonis a S. Blazio a fine libri septimi Ottonis uisque ad anunum Salutis 1210. Another work of Otho of Freysingen is a treatise concerning the end of the world, according to the book of Revelations, which is generally appended to his Chronicle. See Huber, O. von Freisingen (Munich, 1847); Wiedemann, O. von Freising, sein Leben it. Wirken (Passau, 1849); Lang, Psychologischer Charakter' Otto's von Freising (Augsb. 1853); Zeitschr. f. Gesch. Wissenschaft, vol. ii (1844); Lit. Central Blatt (1856). — Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 12:521; Herzog, Real-Encyklop.'x. 738. (J. H.W.)

## Otho I[[@Headword:Otho I]]

             (or the Great) OF GERMANY, next to Charlemagne the greatest European prince of the Middle Ages, noted alike in secular and ecclesiastical history in the former for his valuable service to German unity and influence, and in the latter for the support he gave to the papacy, and for the independence which he maintained towards the popes— was the son of the emperor Henry I, and was born in 912. He was carefully trained for successorship to the throne, and enjoyed the esteem of his associates and of the people. On the death of his father in A.D. 936 he was crowned king of the Germans. He immediately engaged in a series of eventful and generally triumphant wars, in the course of which he reduced the power of the dukes, -and conquered and converted the heathen Danes, Weinds. Bohemians, and Hungarians. He also interfered in the French dissensions, and thus acquired influence among that people, while at home he strengthened his individual power by gathering around him the leaders of the nation, and especially the best of the clergy.

When his throne had been secured beyond venture, he turned his attention to Italy for the purpose of making his power felt over the entire domain of Charlemagne. Otho appeared first as the champion of Adelaide, the young widow of king Lothaire, who had been imprisoned and otherwise ill-used by Berenigar, the poisoner of Lothaire, and the usurper of the Italian crown. Otho liberated Adelaide, whom he married at Pavia in the year 951, and forgave Berengar. and allowed him to retain the sovereignty of Italy, but as his vassal. Otho then returned to Germany. After some years, fresh complaints from pope John XII (q.v.) of the tyranny of Berengar, who was then waging war against the papal throne,  induced Otho to recross the Alps, and to go to the rescue of the pope in his extreme hour of need. Otho defeated Berengar and his son and colleague Adalbert. He was thereupon himself acknowledged by a diet held at Milan as king of Italy, and crowned by the archbishop with the iron crown of the Longobards in the church of St. Ambrose at the close of 961. In the following year Otho repaired to Rome, where pope John XII crowned him emperor of the West. as being the successor of Charlemagne, Feb. 2, 962. “Never did a more important event in history take place, making less impression on those who witnessed it, and being less commemorated by subsequent historians, than the coronation of Otho I at Rome in the year 962. By the coronation of Charles 162 years earlier, the first foundations had been laid for the empire; by the coronation of Otho that empire itself was founded afresh, and from that time forward it had an uninterrupted existences (Reichel, The Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 124). For a short period the spiritual and temporal heads of Christendom seemed to be happily united, but the fickle pope, influenced either by mistrust or jealousy, soon again interrupted that happy concord by concocting anew intrigues with Alberia, the son of Berengar. Otho, who heard complaints from many quarters against the pope's licentiousness and tyranny, first remonstrated with him by means of an envoy. John pleaded his youth as an excuse, and promised amendment, which, however, never took place. Invited by the Romans themselves, the emperor now returned to Rome with an army, and the pope fled.

The Romans having sworn that they would never elect another pope without the concurrence of the emperor and his son, he held a synod, in the year 963, in the church of St. Peter, and here many grave charges were variously preferred against the absent pontiff, who was deposed Dec. 4, and Leo VIII (q.v.) declared his successor. Fresh wars were the result of this step. Popes and antipopes contested the possession of Rome. No sooner had Otho departed from Rome than John re-entered the city and drove away Leo, and as papal incumbent once more practiced many acts of cruelty, this time seeking revenge upon those who had favored the exaltation of his rival. The struggle for the possession of Rome lasted for three years, and was ended only by the death of John and Berengar. The election of John's successor was held without the emperor's consultation, though it had been especially stipulated that Otho's wishes should be heeded. This brought Otho again to Rome, which he besieged and took. He banished the pope elect, Benedict V (q.v.), and reinstated Leo VIII. The year after, when this pope died, Otho instituted John XIII (q.v.). The Romans revolted against this action  as soon as the emperor had turned his back on their city, and Otho was again obliged to return in 966 and put down this insurrection. He hanged thirteen leaders, and many others he condemned to severe punishment. His presence at Rome he turned into service to himself by causing his son Otho, then a child of six years, to be anointed and crowned as his colleague and emperor by the pope, in order-that the claims of his house. to the throne might have the sanction of the Church. He also in 972 married his son to the princess Theophania, under whose powerful influence Eastern manners and luxury were introduced at the German court. Otho died at Minsleben, in Thuringia, May 7, 973, and was buried at Miagdeburg. He left the character of a great and just ruler, who had extended the limits of the empire, and restored the prestige of the imperial power more nearly to the rank which it occupied under Charlemagne than any other emperor. He appointed counts-palatine, founded cities, bishoprics, and monasteries, and did good service to the empire in reorganizing the shaken foundations of its power in Europe. Otho's policy towards the see of Rome is worthy of notice, for while he showed himself zealous for the interests of the Church, endowed abbeys and convents, and honored deserving men among the clergy, yet he always asserted his sovereign right in temporal matters, and in the elections of the popes, a right of choice which his successors continued to exercise for a long time afterwards (until the pontificate of Gregory VII). See Vehse. Lebens Kaiser Otto's dero Grossen (Dresden, 1827); Luitprand, Historia Othonzis in Afonumz. Ger2mss. Script. voL iii; Ranke, in Jahrbiicher des deutschen Reichs, vol. i, pt. i; Luden, Gesch. d. deutsch. Volkes, vol. iii, vii; Baxmann, Gesch. der Politik der Pdpste (see Index in vol. ii); Ch. Histories by Neander, Gieseler, Kurtz. Niedner (Indices); Reichel, The See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 121 sq.; Milman, Latin Christianzity, 3:175 sq.; Piper, Evangelisches Jcahrbuch, 1852, p. 111 sq.; Gibbon, Declize and Fall (Milman's ed.), v. 55, 59, 419; Lewis, Hist. of Germany (N. Y. 1874), p. 126 sq.; Zeller, Hist. de Allgemaine (Paris, 1873). — SEE PAPACY.

## Otho II[[@Headword:Otho II]]

             OF GERMANY, son of the preceding, and ruler from 973 to 983, deserves no special notice at our hand. He was largely engaged in suppressing sedition at Rome, and in settling the interminable strife of the Italian princes. He was intent in the latter part of his reign in collecting a large army against the Saracens, whom he wished to expel from Sicily; but he  died before the plan had reached execution. See Giesebrecht, Jahrbucher des deutschen Reichs (Berlin, 1840).

## Otho III[[@Headword:Otho III]]

             OF GERMANY, son of the preceding, was emperor from 983 to 1002. He was born in 980, and was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle first and at Rome in 996, whither he had been called by pope John XV to quell the insurrection of Crescentius, a remarkable character of the Middle Ages, who aspired to re-establish the Roman republic under a nominal allegiance to the Eastern emperors. Pope John XV dying in the mean time, Gregory V assumed the pontificate, and it was this pope who crowned Otho III. After the restoration of peace the emperor returned to Germany; but the renewed rebellion of Crescentius, who drove Gregory from the papal throne, and instituted a Calabrian Greek as antipope under the title of John XVI, compelled Otho to return to Italy, where success, as usual, attended his measures. Crescentius, who had thrown himself into St. Angelo, was seized and beheaded, together with twelve of his chief adherents; the antipope imprisoned, Gregory restored; and on the speedy death of the latter, Otho's old tutor, Gherbert, archbishop of Ravenna, was raised to the papacy under the title of Sylvester II. Otho, elated with his success, took up his residence at Rome, where he organized the government, erected new buildings, and showed every disposition, notwithstanding the ill- concealed dissatisfaction of the Romans, to convert their city into the capital of the Western empire. The near approach of the year 1000, to which so many alarming prophecies were then believed to point as the end of the world, induced Otho to undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, where he founded an archbishopric. On his return, after visiting Charlemagne's grave at Aix-la-Chapelle, and removing the consecrated cross suspended from the emperor's neck, he again repaired to Rome to consolidate his schemes of establishing a Roman empire. The insurrection of the Romans frustrated his plans, and, escaping from Rome at the risk of his life, he withdrew to Ravenna to await the arrival of powerful re- enforcements from Germany; but before they had crossed the Alps he died, in 1002, apparently from poison, said to have been administered to him by the widow of Crescentius, who, it is believed, had deliberately set herself to win his affections that she might have an opportunity of avenging the death of her husband. With Otho III the male branch of the Saxon imperial house became extinct. See Wilman, Jahrbucher des deutschen Reichs unter  Kaiser Otto III (Berl. 1840). and the histories referred to in the article SEE OTHO I.

## Otho IV[[@Headword:Otho IV]]

             OF GERMANY ruled from 1198 to 1218. but he played no part worthy of special mention here. He was crowned by Innocent III in 1209, but on account of the occupation of the papal territory was visited with the ban by this same pope, and thus crippled in his power he found it impossible to contend with the rival ruler, Frederick II, and retired to Brunswick, where he died, Nov. 19, 1218.

## Otho Or Otto St., Of Bamberg[[@Headword:Otho Or Otto St., Of Bamberg]]

             a noted Pomeranian prelate, and the evangelist of that now Prussian province, was born about 1062, and was descended of a noble but not wealthy Suabian family. He received a learned education, according to the fashion of those times. Providence brought him to Poland, where he became private tutor of the sons of some of the noblest families. Thus he became known to the duke Wladislay Herman who invited him to his court, and made him his chaplain (1082-1103). Having the confidence of the duke, he was soon employed on political missions, and in this way became known to the emperor Henry IV. This monarch finally drew Otho to his own court, and made him one of his chaplains, and also employed him as  secretary. Otho got into great favor with the emperor. He was appointed imperial chancellor; and when the bishopric of Bamberg, in the year 1102, fell vacant, was placed over that diocese. In the year 1103, Feb. 2, Otho entered upon his duties. He did not receive the papal consecration until the year 1106, by Pascal II (q.v.). “As a bishop, Otho was distinguished for the zeal and interest which he took in promoting tie religious instruction of the people in their own spoken language, and for his gift of clear and intelligible preaching. He was accustomed to moderate, with the severity of a monk, his bodily wants, and by this course, as well as by his frugality generally, was able to save so much the more out of the ample revenues of the bishopric for carrying forward the great enterprises which he undertook in the service of the Church and of religion. He loved to take from himself to give to the poor; and all the presents he received from princes and noblemen, far and near, he devoted to the same object. He caused many churches and edifices to be constructed for the embellishment or the greater security of his diocese, and especially took pleasure in founding new monasteries, for, in common with many of the more seriously disposed in his times, he cherished a strong predilection for the monastic life” (Neander). In the contest about ecclesiastical investitures, SEE INVESTITURE, between Henry V and Gregory VII (q.v.), Otho was inclined to favor the principles of the Gregorian Church government, but finally got tired of the quarrel, and accepted an invitation from the duke Boleslay of Poland to go to Pomerania in order to carry on a Christian mission there. Having obtained the sanction and blessing of pope Honorius II on this work, Otho began his journey on April 24, 1124. “Fondly attached as he was to monkish ways, the experience of his predecessor in this missionary field taught him to avoid every appearance of that sort, and rather to present himself in the full splendor of his episcopal dignity.

He not only provided himself in the most ample manner with everything that was necessary for his own support and that of his attendants in Pomerania, but also took with him costly raiment and other articles to be used as presents to the chiefs of the people; likewise all the necessary church utensils, by which he could make it visibly manifest to the Pomeranians that he did not visit them from interested motives, but was ready to devote his own property to the object of imparting to them a blessing which he regarded as the very highest.” On his first missionary journey he baptized in Pyritz, near Stargard, 7000 pagans; was favorably received in Kammin; where the first Church for the Pomeranians was founded by him. After having remained there for forty days, during which time he instructed and. baptized the  people, he determined to push his missionary journey onwards, and directed his steps to Wollin, where he found the people strongly attached to their ancient customs, and where he had every reason to expect a more determined opposition. Otho came near suffering martyrdom at this place, and, without having effected his purpose, he had to repair to Stettin, the capital town. Here the reception he met with was at first unfavorable, but finally, after a patient waiting of some months. Christianity triumphed, and the downfall of paganism could be made known to the duke. Otho then returned to Wollin. The inhabitants of this town having agreed with the bishop that they would follow the example of the capital city, had already sent persons to Stettin for the purpose of obtaining exact information respecting the manner in which the Gospel was there received. The news they obtained could not fail to make the most favorable impression, and Otho was received in Julin, or Wollin, with demonstrations of joy and respect.

The activity of the clergy during the two months which they spent in this place scarcely sufficed to baptize all who offered themselves. After having laid the foundation of the Christian Church in many other places, Otho felt bound to make a visitation-tour to the communities already founded by him. and bestow confirmation on those who had before been baptized. Julin, or Wollin, was made the first bishopric of Pomeiania, to which post Boleslay nominated Adalbert, one of his chaplains, who by his direction had accompanied bishop Otho as an assistant. By way of Poland Otho returned to Bamberg, where he was received with great joy, March 28,1125. In the year 1128 he undertook a second missionary journey by way of Germany over Halle, Magdeburg, and Havelberg. The result of this second journey was that at the diet held at Usedom a decree was issued which permitted the free preaching of the Gospel in all places. The bishop now commenced sending his clergy two by two into all the towns and villages, intending to follow them. In Wolgast and Gutzkov the temples were destroyed, and Stettin, which had relapsed into paganism, was brought over again to Christianity. Otho then returned to his episcopal see at Bamberg, keeping however a lively correspondence with the mission in Pomerania. He died June 30, 11.319 Whether Otho introduced the seven sacraments among the Pomeranians whom he had converted to Christianity is a point which remains to be investigated. See Vitae Ottonis Bamb. ed. Koepke (Monum. Germ. vol. xiv); Sulzbeck, Leben des heiligen Otto von Bamberg (Regensburg, 1866); Kannegiesser, Bekehrungsgeschichte der Pommern (Greifswalde, 1824); Meiller, Otto, episcopatus Bambergensis Pomeraniae apostolus et exempti monasterii Ensdorsensis prcecipuus  dotator (Amb. 1730); Otto von- Bamberg.(Stettin, 1792); Buch, Memoria Ottonis Episcopi Basnberg (Jenae, 1828); Barthold, Geschichte von Rigen und Pomnern (Hamburg, 1839); Milman, Mitslav, or the Conversion of Pomerania (1854); Maclear, Hist. Christian Missions in the M. A. p. 303 sq.; Hardwick, Ch. Rist. M. A. p. 208, 209; Engelhardt, Dog mengeschichte, 2:196; Munscher, Dogmengeschichte (ed. by Von Coln), p. 189, 190; Piperj Evangelischer Kalender, 1852, p. 149 sq.; Neander, Church History (Torrey's transl.), 4:23-30, 130; Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 1:296; Gieseler, Text-book of Church History, 2:596 sq.; Niedner, Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchezngeschichte, p. 384. (B. P.)

## Otho, Georg[[@Headword:Otho, Georg]]

             a distinguished German Orientalist, was born at Sattenhausen, near Cassel, in 1634. He became professor and librarian at the University of Marburg, and died in that city May 28, 1713. Besides a large number of academical discourses, and Latin essays on various points of philosophy and of Biblical exegesis, he wrote, Oratio funebris inl obiturn Justi Jungmannii (Cassel, 1668,4to): — De accentuatione textus Hebraici (Marburg, 1698, 4to): — Synopsis institutionum SamaritanarUm, Rabbinicarum, Arabicarum, .Ethiopicarunz, et Persicarum, ex. optimis autoribus excerpta Francf. 1701, 8vo). Otho, in his grammars, adopted the plan and system of James Alting (q.v.); they were therefore looked upon as a continuation of Alting's works, and reprinted with the latter's grammars in 1717 and 1730: — Fundamenta punctuationis linguce sazncte, and Institutiones Chald. et Syr.; Palestra linguarum Orientalium (ibid. 1702, 4to), destined to facilitate the comparative study of Oriental languages. It contains the first four chapters of Genesis, in the Hebrew text, accompanied by the Latin version of Arius Montanus, in the Targums of Onkelos, of Jonathan, and of Jerusalem, and the Syriac, Samaritan, Arabic, Ethiopian, and Persian translations, each with a literal Latin translation. It gives also all that part of both the smaller and the larger Masorah which relates to these four chapters, and the notes of R. Solomon, Aben-Ezra, etc. The whole is preceded by a model of parsing in each of these languages, and followed by glossaries for all the words contained in the book: — Virga Aharonis polyglottos (Marb. 1692, 4to); a work of the same kind as the preceding, more elaborate, but less extensive; it embraces only the first eleven verses of Numbers 17. A letter of Otho is inserted in Lacroze, Thesaurus epistol,  1:311. See Jocher, Allg. Gel.-Lex., Supplement; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:929. (J. N. P.)

## Otho, Johannes Heinrich[[@Headword:Otho, Johannes Heinrich]]

             a noted Swiss Hebraist, was born April 15, 1651, at Berne, in Switzerland. He received his education in his native place, went in 1669 to Lausanne, thence to Saumur, Orleans, Paris, and Oxford. In 1673 he returned to his native country, was appointed public teacher of philosophy at Lausanne, where he died, July 16, 1719, after having occupied some pastorates in different places. Otho published several works on the Hebrew, which to this day are used with great advantage, viz. Lexicon Rabbini cophilologicum in quo ordine alphabetico notantur et referuntur principue quae circa patrum hebreorum dogmata, ritus et statuta in utroque Talmude, laimonidis et aliorum scriptis occurrunt (Basle, 1675); enlarged edition by Zacharias (Altona, 1757). In a later edition, which was published at Geneva in 1675, the Talmudical treatise Shekalim, with notes and a Latin translation by the same author, is also given: — הִמַּשְׁנָה שִׁלְשֶׁלֶת הִכְמֵיi.e. Historia doctorum Mischnicorum quo opere etiam Synedrii magni Hierosolymitani presides et viceprcesides recensentur (Oxf. 1672; later ed. by Reland, Amst. 1698). See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr.; Furst. Bibl. Jud. 3:59 sq.; Jocher, Allgenzeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, 3:1142; Supplement by Rotermund, v. 1273 sq.; Bibl. Brenensi Class. vol. vi, fasc. ii, p. 291 sq. (B. P.)

## Otho, Julius Conrad[[@Headword:Otho, Julius Conrad]]

             (originally Naphtali Margalita), a distinguished German Orientalist, belonged to a very ancient Jewish family, distinguished for its great learning and Talmudic lore, of which five members have united with the Christian Church. Naphtali Margalita was born at Vienna Sept. 12 1562, and joined the Church in 1603 at Altona, where he was appointed professor of Oriental languages, and died at the same place in 1607. He wrote, Usus linguae Hebraicae, h. e. expositio mystica document. Hlebr. Vet. Test. (Nurnberg, 1604): — Grammatica Ebraica (ibid. 1605): - רָזִיָּא גְּלֵא. ie. Occultorum detectio seu monstratio dogmatum, quae omnes Rabbini. recte sentientes ante et post Christi nativitatem de unitate essentiae divine Trinitate personarum, et de Messia posteritati reliquerunt, etc. (ibid. 1605; Stettin, 1613); a work consisting of extracts from the Talmud and the Sohar to prove the validity of the Christian  doctrine: — Lexicon radicale s. thesaurus coronamn Sacrae Scroipturae complectens, in quo juxta ordinenz alphabeticum -ponuntur nomina, verba, serviles et radicales litere et voces inde derivatce (Nurnberg, 16.). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:60; Wolf, Bibl. Itebr. 1:480; Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 105; Same, Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiuna, p. 2080; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrtfen-Lexikon, 3:1142; Supplement by Rotermund, v. 1300; Fabricius, Delectus Argumentorum et syllabus scriptorum, etc. (Hamburg, 1725), p. 583 sq.; Loscher, De causis linguae Hebr. (Leips. 1706), p. 169; Delitzsch, Saat auf Hoffnung (Erlangen, 1869), 7:146 sq. (B. P.)

## Othobon, Synod of[[@Headword:Othobon, Synod of]]

             was held in London, A.D. 1268, under cardinal Othobon, and claims attention, not only as representing the united churches of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, but as displaying a commendable zeal for discipline, and embodying its decrees in constitutions. many of which are still law. It directs that the laity be carefully instructed in the baptismal formula, in order that in cases of emergency they might be qualified to administer the rite; and it enjoins, for the first time, the indicative form of absolution after confession, still retained in the office for the visitation of the sick. Several of its canons are directed against simoniacal contracts for benefices, non- residence and pluralities, commutations of penance. appropriations of tithes to monastic houses, and commendams, which, originating in early times when inlterruptions were perpetually occurring to regular ministerial appointments, were afterwards grievously perverted.

## Othonias[[@Headword:Othonias]]

             (Ο᾿θονίας, Vulg. Zochias), a corrupt form (1Es 9:28) of the name MATTANIAH (Ezr 10:27).

## Otji (Tschi, or Twi) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Otji (Tschi, or Twi) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The language distinguished as "Ashantee Proper, or Otji," is spoken in the south of Asante (Ashantee), in Fantee, Akim, Akwapim, and in Akwam. There are trifling dialectic differences in the language spoken in n-these several districts, but it may be considered, nevertheless, one and the same with the Akwapim or Otji, the best cultivated of them all. In 1846 the missionaries of the Basle Missionary Society commenced the preparation of a version of the New Test. into Ashantee, and completed the gospels of Matthew and Luke. Since 1855 the Reverend J.G. Christaller, one of the missionaries stationed at Acropong, has prosecuted the task of Scripture translation into the Otji language, and the four gospels, after a careful revision, were printed in 1857 by the British and Foreign-Bible Society. In 1861 the book of Genesis, the epistle to the Romans, and the general epistles of John followed, and in 1865 the entire New Test. was in circulation. In 1870 the Old Test. was printed in Europe, under the superintendence of the translator, and since then the entire Bible has been in circulation. (B.P.)

## Otji-herero Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Otji-herero Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The OOtji-herero is the same as the Damara, and is spoken by a south- western African tribe. The committee of the South African Auxiliary Bible Society printed in 1875 the book of Psalms in that language, the translation having been prepared by the Reverend H. Brincker, of rthe Rhenish Missionary Society. In 1879 the British and Foreign Bible Society, at the request of Dr. Fabri, of the Rhenish Missionary Society, printed the New Test., which was also translated by Mr. Brincker, and revised by a committee. (B.P.)

## Otolengo, Samuel Ben-David Ben-Jechiel, Of Casale[[@Headword:Otolengo, Samuel Ben-David Ben-Jechiel, Of Casale]]

             a noted Italian rabbi, flourished for a while at Venice, and died at Padua Aug. 22,1718. He distinguished himself as a poet and grammarian, and published שמואל מעיל, “the Mantle of Samuel,” being extracts from the שני לוחות הברית of Isaiah Horwitz (q.v.), to which he also wrote an Index (Venice, 1705): — נאמנה קריה, extracts from the מעבר יבק of Aaron Berechja befi-Moses ben-Nechemia of Modena, important for  ascetic literature (ibid. 1701): —  תקוןשובביםCorrectio seu institutio ponitentium, a ritual containing precepts, prayers, hymns, etc. (2d ed. Venice, 1719). See First, Bibl. Jud. 3:58; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:1094; 3:1080; Jocher, Allgesmeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, 3:1134. (B. P.)

## Otshirbani[[@Headword:Otshirbani]]

             in Kalmuckian worship, was a god of third rank, represented under a singular form. He appears only clothed about the hips. The figure has large eyes, a monstrous open mouth, is contracted, withihead turned back, as if in convulsions. This deity was sent to heaven to combat the evil daemons. He was victorious, and decapitated the spirits, from which he made himself a crown, ear-rings, and a long necklace, which extended to the belly. From the mouth through the body there runs a straight channel, which physicians use to give medicine. The idol is placed on the mouth of the sick, a pill is put into the channel, and falls into the mouth of the patient.

## Ott, Johann Baptist[[@Headword:Ott, Johann Baptist]]

             SEE OTT, JOHANN HEINRICH. (below)

## Ott, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Ott, Johann Heinrich]]

             a noted Swiss Protestant divine and Orientalist, was born in the canton of Zurich in 1617. His father, also a minister in the country, placed him at Zurich under the care of the distinguished Breitinger. In 1636 he went to:study at Lausanne; sometime after at Geneva and Grossingen, in the company of Hottinger; after rapid advancement under professors Gomar and Alting, he went to Leyden and Amsterdam. Here for five years he applied himself to the study of rabbinical learning and the Oriental languages. He then returned to Switzerland, making the tour of England and France. After his arrival home he became minister of the Church of Dietlickon, where he remained twenty-five years. In 1651 he was appointed professor of eloquence at Zurich, of Hebrew in 1655, and of ecclesiastical history in 1668. He died in 1682. Ott maintained an extensive literary correspondence. He wrote principally on theology. The following is a complete list of his works: Franco Gallia: — Oratio de causa Jan senitica: — Queastio, an et quando Petrus fuit Ronzoe: The Grandeur of the Roman Church (in Latin, with Remarks): — Ovouca Trooyitu, seu nomiina hominmum pr pria: — A nnales Anabaptistici: — Exzaminis perpetui in annales Ccesaris Baronii, centurieu tres: — Vindicice hujus tractatus adversus Abbatem Reding: — Oratio in commendationem studii Hebraici: — De resurrectione: — aronii examinis continuatio ad xiii saculunz usque: — De magia licita et illicita: — De' alphabetis et ratione scribendi onnium nationunm: — Universa poesis philologice tractata, etc.

His son, JOHANN BAPTIST, an Orientalist and antiquarian, was born in 1661. He became professor of Hebrew at Zurich about 1702, and wrote several antiquarian treatises. He died shortly after his appointment to the professorship at Zurich.

## Ottaviani, Carlo[[@Headword:Ottaviani, Carlo]]

             an Italian engraver, was born about the 18th century. He engraved ten of the thirty-three plates published under the following title: Le pitture della capella pontijicia Quirinade, opera di Guido Reni, disegnate da Pietro Angelleti ed incise da Giove Carlo fratelli Ottaviani.

## Ottaviani, Giovanni[[@Headword:Ottaviani, Giovanni]]

             an Italian engraver, was born at Rome in 1735. He visited Venice, where he studied under Wagner, and engravedl several prints. On returning to Rome he soon gained reputation, and became highly esteemed. His principal work was his collection of engravings after the pictures by Raphael in the Loggio of the Vatican, of which, the first part appeared. in twelve numbers (Rome, 1769-1770, fol.); the second in thirteen numbers (1776). Among his other prints the following are most noted, St. Jerome with a Crucifix, after Guercino, St. Cecilia; and Angelica and Medora; and twenty-three plates from the paintings by Raphael in the Vatican.

## Ottensosser, David[[@Headword:Ottensosser, David]]

             of Firth, distinguished as a translator and interpreter of Biblical books as well as of other Hebrew works, died May 22, 1858, at an age of 74 years. Of his many publications we mention: the Book of Job, translated into German, with a Hebrew commentary איוב עַם תרגום אשכנזי ובאור(Offenbach, 1807): — Isaiah, with a German translation and a Hebrew commentary (Ftrth, 1807): — the Lamentations of Jeremiah, with a Hebrew commentary (ibid. 1811): — a German translation of the Chaldee paraphrase of the Book of ??????????????Esther , 8א(Sulzbach, 1820): — a Hebrew commentary to the Bechinat-Olam of Jedid Penini (q.v.) (Vienna, 1830): — a German translation of and a Hebrew commentary on Petachja's (q.v.) Travels (Fiurth, 1844): — a History of the Jews according to Josephus, in Hebrew letters (ibid. 1821, 3 vols.): מוֹרֶה דֶרֶךְ, a Commentary on the Pentateuch, excerpted from Maimonides's (q.v.) More Nebuchim (ibid. 1804): — תְּשׁוּעִת יַשְׂרָאֵל, i.e. a refutation of the charge that the Jews use the blood of Christians, and the groundlessness of this charge (ibid.): — סַפּוּרֵי מוּסִר, Moral Tales of the Past (ibid. 1846): - אַמְרְי דִעִתor הִמּוֹרֶה אַגְּרוֹת, letters on the More Nebuchim of Maimonides, translated into German, with notes and  annotations (ibid. 1846, 1848, and 1856). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:58 sq.; Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 1856, p. 357 473; Dessauer, Geschichte der Israeliten (Bresla., 1870) p. 545. (B. P.)

## Otter, William, D.D[[@Headword:Otter, William, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born at Cuckney, Nottinghamshire, October 23, 1768. He was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow and tutor; was presented to the rectory of Colneworth, Bedfordshire, in 1804, with which he held the vicarage of Sturmer, in Essex; appointed to Chetwynd, Shropshire, in 1810; to Kinlet, in 1816; St. Mark's, Kennington, in 1825; was principal of King's College, London, in 1831, and consecrated bishop of Chichester, October 2, 1836. He died Aug. 20, 1840. Bishop Otter was an accomplished scholar, an able preacher, blameless in life, and held in high esteem by all who knew him. He published three Tracts respecting the Bible Society against bishop Marsh (1812-13): — Life and Remains of E.D. Clarke (1824, 4to; 1825, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Life of T.R. Malthus (1836). After his death a volume was published of his Pastoral Addresses (1841, 8vo). See (Loud.) Gentlemen's Magazine, November 1840, page 539; London Athenceum, 1840, p. 364; The (Lond.) Christian Remembrancer. January 1841, page 1; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Otterbein, Philip William[[@Headword:Otterbein, Philip William]]

             a noted divine, was born June 4, 1726, at Dillenburg, Germany, and is commonly acknowledged as the founder of the United Brethren in Christ (q.v.). His father was rector of a classical school at Herborn, and gave his son a thorough classical and theological education. He early felt a .strong desire to labor in some foreign land. This wish was gratified in 1752, when, at the instance of Rev. Michael Schlatter (q.v.), he received a call as minister of the German Reformed Church in America. Having, with five other young ministers, been ordained at the Hague, he sailed with them to New York, where they arrived July 27 of the same. year. Otterbein was first settled at Lancaster, Pa., in August, 1752. At the urgent solicitation of the Church he remained until the close of 1758, although lie was much dissatisfied with the lack of discipline which prevailed: From 1758 to 1760 he labored at Tulpehocken, Pa.; from 1760 to 1765, at Frederick, Md.; from 1765 to 1770, at York, Pa. He visited Germany in 1770, and returning to York in 1771, remained there until 1774. In that year he accepted a call from the new congregation in Baltimore, which, in 1770, had separated from the old Church. There he remained for the rest of his days. He died Nov. 17, 1813. A man of ardent piety and apostolical spirit, endowed with extraordinary power as a preacher, he exerted a: great influence among his brethren, and extended his work beyond the limits of his own Church. He proclaimed the necessity of regeneration and of a holy life with great force and directness. He took part in. union meetings, held often in the woods and kept up for several days. He instituted prayer- meetings, and trained pious laymen to lead them; and he maintained' a close fellowship with men of like mind in other religious denominations, especially with Martin Bohm, a Mennonite, and with Asbury and Wright, whom Johns Wesley sent to labor in America. In 1784 he assisted Dr. Coke in ordaining Asbury as the first bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. On Sept. 25, 1800, in conjunction with Bohm, he convened a conference at Baltimore. It was attended by thirteen ministers, and resulted in the organization of the society of the United Brethren in Christ. Otterbein is said to have been elected their first bishop or superintendent. This, however, is denied by Dr. Harbaugh, in his Fathers of the German Reformed Church (2:53-76), who says that no bishop was elected until  1813, and proves by substantial evidence that Otterbein never left. the communion of the German Reformed Church. Otterbein. worked for a revival in the Church, and not for an organization out of it. When he saw that the movements was tending to this result, “he held on to it, not to organize it, but to prevent its organization; not to carry it forward, but to restrain and control it. Only when the case became hopeless did he withdraw. In the quietude of old age, he silently mourned over the evil”' (Fath. of the Ger. Ref. Church, 2:71). It would therefore appear that while Otterbein was practically the founder of the United Brethren in Christ, he did not intend to establish a new religious denomination; and, like John Wesley, never really severed his connection with his own Church. See, besides Harbaugh, Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in Amer. p. 173 sq.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v. (E. de S.)

## Otterson, James[[@Headword:Otterson, James]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New York City Oct. 11, 1791. He graduated at Columbia College, New York; studied theology with Dr. J. M. Mason; was ordained by the Associate Presbytery of New York, and installed as the successor to Dr. Proudfit, pastor of the Church of Broadalbin, Fultor County, N. Y., in 1821. About the year 1827 he was called to the united pastorate of the Reformed Dutch churches of Hempstead and Oyster Bay, on Long Island, N. Y.; in 1834 he succeeded Dr. Van Vranken as pastor of the Church in Freehold, N. J.; he next took charge of the Church at the White House, in Hunterdon County, N. J.; in 1845 he was called to the Church in Johnstown, N. J.; his last charge was in Wilmington, Del., which he relinquished in 1863, and retired to the house of his son, a prominent member of the bar at Philadelphia, Pa. He died Sept. 17, 1867. Mr. Otterson possessed a clear, analytical mind, which showed the effect of early culture. He was a good scholar, a sound and able theologian, and a very instructive and edifying preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 133. (J. L. S.)

## Otther, Jacob[[@Headword:Otther, Jacob]]

             the reformer of Esslingen, was born at Lautenburg, in Alsace. He studied at Freiburg, where Wimpheling was his teacher, and while a resident at Strasburg Otther published the sermont of Geiler, of Kaiserberg, in a Latin translation, in 1510. In 1520, while preacher at Wolfenweiler, near Freiburg, he openly declared himself an adherent of Luther. In 1522 he was preacher at Kenzingen, in the Breisgau, but he left that place in 1524 on  account of the opposition, which he met from the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. Otther went to Neckarsteinach, near Heidelberg, and abolished there the mass and other papistic usages. In 1527 he left that place, and, after a short stay at Strasburg and in Switzerland, finally settled in 1532 at Esslingen, where he brought about the work of reformation, which had been commenced by Ambrosius Blaser. Otther died in the early part of 1547. See Seckendorf, Ausfuhrliche Historie des Lutherthums (Leipsic, 1714); Keim, Reformationsblatter der Reichsstadt Esslingen (1860) and Schwdbische Reformationsgeschichte; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Ottilia, St.[[@Headword:Ottilia, St.]]

             SEE ODILIA, ST.

## Ottini, Felice[[@Headword:Ottini, Felice]]

             a Roman painter, who, according to Pascoli, was a pupil of Giacinto Brandi. He possessed excellent talents, a fine taste, and was employed  almost in his youth to decorate the chapel of P. P. di Gesu e Maria at Rome. He died young, in 1695.

## Ottini, Pasquale[[@Headword:Ottini, Pasquale]]

             (sometimes called Pasqualotte), an Italian painter of note, was born at Verona in 1570. He studied with Felice Riccio, called Brusasorci, whose manner he imitated so happily that he was employed to finish some works left incomplete by his master at his death. Lanzi says “he was a good artist in regard to forms, and of no common expression, particularly in the works he conducted after having seen Raphael's. Of this we have a striking example in his Murder of the Innocents, at S. Stefano, and his picture of St. Nicolo, with other saints, at S. Giorgio, in the best style of Venetian coloring. In other instances his coloring is somewhat languid-a defect most probably from time and unfavorable situation.” He was in high repute in his native city, and the learned Alessandro Carli, in his history of Verona, says that he approached nearer to Paul Veronese than any other artist of that city. He died of the great plague in 1630. He is said to have executed some beautiful etchings. Bartsch has given a description of only one known print by him, which he commends in the highest terms. It represents the burial of Christ, and is signed Pasq. Ottii, Vers. ino.

## Otto Of Bamberg[[@Headword:Otto Of Bamberg]]

             SEE OTHO OF BAMBERG.

## Otto Of Freising[[@Headword:Otto Of Freising]]

             SEE OTHO OF FREISING.

## Otto Of Passau[[@Headword:Otto Of Passau]]

             (some have it OF NASSAU), for a time teacher in the Franciscan convent of Basle, was there connected with the Pietistic sect of the Friends of God (q.v.). He is principally known as the author of a book of edification for the use of the laity, entitled Die Vierunzdzwanzig Alten u. der Goldene Thion (1386). It consists of directions for leading a Christian life, and insists particularly on its subjective aspects. It was first printed at Augsburg in 1480, and lately under the title of Die Krone der Aeltesten (Regensb. 1836). It was translated into Dutch (Utrecht, 1480, and often reprinted). See Pfeiffer, Deutsche Mystiker des 14ten Jahrh. (Stuttg. 1845);  Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 4:408,409; Herzog, Real-Encyklop 10:741. (J. N. P.)

## Otto, Leopold Martin Von[[@Headword:Otto, Leopold Martin Von]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Warsaw, in Poland, November 2, 1819. He studied at Dorpat and Berlin, and acted for some time as vicar at Kalish. In 1844 he was pastor at Petrikau, and in 1849 at Warsaw, where he developed a great activity in founding many Christian institutions. Having taken part in the Polish revolution, he was imprisoned and suspended from his office. From 1866 to 1875 he served as pastor at Teshen, in Austrian Silesia, and when permission was granted for his return to his native town, he resumed his pastorate there again, where he died, September 22, 1885. In acknowledgment of his great efforts for propagating theological literature in the Polish language, the Leipsic University conferred on him in 1864 the degree of doctor of divinity. He published, The Augsburg Confession in the Polish language, in 1852: — History of the Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession of Warsaw, from 1652 to 1781 (1882). He afterwards published an evangelical review, the Zwiastun Ewangeliczny. (B.P.)

## Ouch[[@Headword:Ouch]]

             (only in the plur. מַשְׁבְּצוֹת, mishbetsoth', textures, e.g. brocade, as Psa 45:14; hence settings), bezels, in which gems are set; hence the sockets for fastening the precious stones in the shoulder-pieces of the high- priest's ephod (Exo 28:11; Exo 28:14; Exo 28:25; Exo 39:13; Exo 39:16). SEE EPHOD.

## Oude Or Oudh[[@Headword:Oude Or Oudh]]

             (Sanscrit, Ayodha, i.e. “invincible”), a province of British India, separated on the north from Nepaul by the lower ranges of the Himalayas, whence it gradually slopes to the Ganges, which forms its boundary on the south and south-west, is situated in lat. 25° 34'-29° 6' N., long. 79° 45'-83° 11' E., and has an area of 27,890 square miles, or rather less than that of Scotland, with a population in 1872 of 11,220,747. It is one great plain, the slope of which from north-west to south-east indicates also the direction of the principal rivers. These are the Gumti, the Ghagra (Ghogra), and the Rapti, which swarm with alligators. The northern part, on the edge of the Himalayas, is not very well known. It forms a portion of the Terai, a vast unhealthy tract stretching along the borders of Nepaul, and covered with impassable forests. The climate is cool and pleasant from November to March; during the next four months it is hot and sultry, after, which follows the long rainy season, but in general it is considered the healthiest along the whole valley of the Ganges. The soil is light, and. except small nodules of chalk and oolite called kankars, there is hardly a loose stone to be seen. Formerly it was more copiously watered than it is now, the clearing of the jungles having greatly decreased the moisture of the land. The chief crops are wheat, barley, gram, masure, mustard, rice (of the finest quality), millet, maize, joar, bajra, various kinds of pulse and oil- seeds, sugar-cane, tobacco, indigo, hemp, and cotton. In 1872 there were 12,673 square miles of cultivated lands in Ouqe, and 5588 additional capable of cultivation. The manufacturing industry is not much developed; soda, saltpetre, and salt are the only articles of which more is produced than is requisite for home consumption. Gunpowder, and all kinds of military weapons, guns, swords, spears, shields, and bows of bamboo, or Lucknow steel, are, however. also made, besides some woolen goods,  paper, etc. The principal towns are Lucknow, Fyzabad, Oude, or Ayodha, Roy Bareily, and Shahabad.

The people are of a decidedly warlike disposition. The bulk of the inhabitants are Hindus, though the dominant race for centuries, until the British annexation, was Mohammedan. The Brahmans are now the most numerous class, but there are twenty-nine different Rajput tribes. It is these two classes that mainly supplied the famous (or infamous) sepoys of the Bengal army. In 1869 Oude contained 7767 Christians, 9,713,730 Hinduls, 1,011,110 Mohammedans, 56 Buddhists, and 487.884 persons of all other creeds. Hindostanee is the language most in use, with a greater admixture of Persianand Arabic and less of Hindu than in the more easterly provinces. The houses of the people are generally of mud or unburnt brick, and the walls are carried up six or seven feet above the roof, to form a sort of enclosed court for the women, which is covered during the rains by a light temporary roofing of bamboo and grass. The rooms have no ceilings, and the floors are of earth, well packed and smooth.

The most characteristic feature in the social economy of Oude is that of the village communities, each of which constitutes a little republic of itself. The payment of a land-tax is one of the oldest institutions of the country. At the time of the British annexation it was supposed that the chiefs known as talukdars, who received this tax from the immediate cultivators of the soil, and paid a fixed sum on account thereof to the native government, were merely middlemen, who exacted from the villagers as much as possible, but themselves possessed no proprietary rights whatever. Acting on the assumption that they were only collectors of revenue, the first land settlement made under British rule, in 1856-57, dispossessed the talukdars of nearly all their villages, and provided for the payment of the land-tax by the actual occupants of the soil directly to the government. The injustice of this settlement led to great dissatisfaction, and was ultimately admitted by the British authorities. The talukdars were in fact an ancient landed nobility, with well-established rights of property in the soil, which were entitled to recognition, notwithstanding the frequent extortion which had been practiced upon the subordinate proprietors. The present land settlement, completed in 1859, recognizes the rights of both classes, confirming to each their possessions as they existed at the time of the annexation in 1856. According to the parliamentary accounts for 1871-72, it is so framed as to secure village occupants from extortion, and to exact certain duties and responsibilities from the talukdars. Half the gross rental  is paid to the government. The net land revenue in 1871-72 amounted to £1,207,902. In the same year the licenses for the sale of spirits and drugs, and the excise on opium, yielded £78,106. The total revenue in 1872-73 amounted to £1,656,602; expenditures, £626,519. The total number of educational institutions in 1871-72 was 1548, with an average daily attendance of 37,720 pupils. They comprise the Canning College at Lucknow, with 720 students, of whom 56 were in the college department; 11 high schools and 747 village schools; 81 schools for girls, with 1908 pupils. The expenditure for the support of schools amounted to £47,420. In each school district a library is maintained for the use of the schoolmaster; and there is said to be a school within four antia half miles of every child in Oude. There is a museum at Lucknow. Seven newspapers, four English and three native, are published in the province.

Oude is believed by Saniscrit scholars to be the ancient Kosala, the oldest seat of civilization in India. The country was conquered by a Mohammedan army in 1195, and made a province of the Mogul empire. In 1753 the vizier of Oude, Saffdar-Jung, rebelled against his imperial master, Ahmed Shah, and forced the latter to make the governorship hereditary in his family. His son, Sujah-ud-Dowlah, became entirely independent, and founded a dynasty which ruled the country, generally in a most deplorable manner, until the East India Company found itself forced to adopt the extreme measure of annexation, Feb. 7, 1856. The necessity for this highhanded but most beneficent act is claimed by the British to be interpreted by the statistics of crime in Oude during the last years of its independence. One item will suffice: from 1848 to 1854, there were, on an average, no fewer than 78 villages burned and plundered every year, while murders. robberies, abductions, and extortions were every-day occurrences. A feeble king, a blackguard soldiery, and a lawless peasantry had brought about a most helpless and ruinous anarchy. Many British residents in India, however, disclaimed this state of affairs, and regretted the step as unjust towards the people of Oude, and as impolitic for Britain. When the mutiny of 1857 broke out, Oude became one of the great centers of rebellion. Upon this the confiscation of all the estates of the talukdars was proclaimed by lord Canning; but when the country was subdued by force of British arms the estates of all such as laid down their arms and swore fealty to the British government were restored. The forts of the petty chiefs, however, were dismantled and the inhabitants disarmed. The province is now administered by a chief commissioner. The principal feature of the  present condition of affairs in Oude is the preservation in their integrity of the estates of the talukdars.

Missionary labors have been extensively carried on in Oude, and have been crowned with great success. Thus the Methodist Episcopal Church, which has by far the most flourishing mission, has is headquarters at Lucknow, and supports an English and native church; a press, which sent out 3,000,000 pages in 1875; a religious newspaper called the Witness, with 656 subscribers; a boarding-school, and 1000 Sunday-school-scholars. We have not room here to “give further details, but refer the reader to the article INDIA SEE INDIA and the books mentioned below.

One of the principal towns of Oude, of like name, is noted on account of a temple erected there in honor of Hanumat, the fabled monkey-ally of Rama, an incarnation of the god Vishnu. The ancient city of that name was situated opposite the modern Oude, where its ruins may still be seen. Ayodhya was one of the oldest seats of civilization in India; it was the residence of the solar dynasty, or one of the two oldest dynasties of India, deriving its descent from the sun; but it obtained special renown through Rama, the son of Dasaratha, a king of that dynasty. Its great beauty and immense size are dwelt upon in several of the Puranas and modern poems; but more especially in the Ramayana, the first and last books of which contain a description of it. According to some Puranas, Ayodhya was one of the seven sacred cities, the living at which was supposed to free . man from all sin, and the dying at which to secure eternal bliss. It was also called Saketa, Kosala, and Uttara-kosala. See Goldstucker's Sanscrit Dictionary, s.v. Ayodhya; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; The American Cyclop. s.v.; Bishop Thomson, Our Oriental Missions, 1:104 sq.; Bohn's India, p. 236 sq., 360 sq.; Butler, Land of the Veda, s.v.

## Oudin, Casimir[[@Headword:Oudin, Casimir]]

             a distinguished French writer, was born at Mezieres-sur-Meuse, Feb. 14, 1638. He was the son of a weaver. After studying at Charleville, he joined the Premonstrants in 1655, chiefly with a view to devoting himself entirely to study. The history of ecclesiastical writers first attracted his attention. In 1669 he was appointed professor of theology in the abbey of Moreau, and the next year grand-prior. Finally, after taking charge for a while of the Church of Epinay-sous-Gamaches, in the diocese of Rouen, he retired into a convent in 1677 to resume his former scientific labors. After visiting the divers establishments of the order in Lorraine, Burgundy, and the  Netherlands, he obtained permission to settle at Paris in 1683, and soon became intimate with the learned Benedictines of St. Maur, who placed their rich historical materials at his disposal, in order that he might write for them a history of their order — a task which, however, he never attempted. He enjoyed great reputation for learning, and was even considered a model of piety and regularity. But his superiors, frightened at an intimacy which sprung up between him and the renowned Jurieu, confined him to the abbey of Ressons near Beauvais, in 1692. The severe penances to which he was subjected contributed also to disgust him with monastic life; and having finally succeeded in escaping to Holland in 1692; he made an open profession of Protestantism at Leyden. He was subsequently appointed under-librarian of the university of that place, and died there in Sept., 1717. Abbe Boulliot, in his Biogr. Ardennaise (vol. ii), says of Oudin: “Contrary to what usually happens to such deserters, he always preserved the general esteem of his co-religionists. This was owing mainly to the purity of his life. To those who advised him to marry, he answered that he had become a Calvinist for the sake of truth, and not to free himself from celibacy.” Oudin's principal works are: — Supplementunm de scriptoribus vel de scriptis ecclesiasticis a Bellarmino omissis ad ann. 1460 (Paris, 1686, 8vo). This work which is far from supplying all the authors omitted by Bellarmine, contains, according to. Cave, a large number of errors: — Le Premontre defroque (Leyden, 1692, 12mo): — Veterum aliquot Gallice et Belgii scriptorum opuscula sacra numquam edita (ibid. 1692, .8vo): — Historia abbatis Caivi-Montis, in Acta Sanctorum, vol. iii (1701): — De Collectanea, in Mason, Hist. de la republique des Lettres, vol. ii, viii: — Tias dissert. criticarum (Leyden, 1717, 8vo). In this work he claims that the Codex Alexandrinus dates only from the 10th century, and that the questions Ad Antiochum principem were attributed by mistake to St. Athanasius; — De scriptoribus Ecclesice antiguis (Leips. 1722, 3 vols. fol.). See Niceron, Memoires, vol. i, x; Moreri, Dict. hist.; Paquot, Melmoires; Hugo, Annales ord. Prcem. 1:55; Haag, La France Protestante.

## Ouen, St[[@Headword:Ouen, St]]

             (Lat. Audenus), a French prelate, noted for his civil ministrations to king Dagobert, and highly esteemed by that monarch, was born at Sancy, near Soissons, in 609. He was brought up at Ussy-sur-Marne, of which his parents were lords. After studying in the monastery of St. Medard, he received an office at the court of king Clothaire II. Under Dagobert. I, St.  Ouen and St. Eloi, afterwards bishop of Noyon, became the principal ministers of the nation, St. Ouen holding the position of chancellor. But notwithstanding the onerous civil duties thus imposed upon these excellent men, they labored zealously for the spiritual welfare of the people. St. Ouen in particular greatly profited by his intimate association with St. Eloi, and by his advice founded, in 634, the abbey of Rebais, in the diocese of Meaux. Some time after St. Ouen entered the Church himself, and was ordained priest by Dieudonnd, bishop of Macon. On his return from a mission to Spain he was made archbishop of Rouen. He is generally believed to have been installed May 21, 640, the same day on which St. Eloi was made bishop of Noyon and of Tournai. The diocese of Rouen, which yet contained many very uncivilized districts, gained greatly under the government of Ouen. He took part in the council of Chalons-sur- Saone, Oct. 25, 644. Pope Martin I having in 651 requested of king Clovis II some of his most learned bishops to be sent as legates to Constantinople to inquire into the question of monothelism, St. Ouen and St. Eloi were designated for that purpose, but, for reasons unknown at present, they did not go on that journey. After the death of Ebroin, king Thierri I, at the suggestion of the new mayor of the palace, Warato, sent St. Onen to Cologne to negotiate peace with Pepin, duke of Austrasia. The bishop proved successful in this undertaking, but died soon after his return at Clichy-la-Garenne, Aug. 24, 683. His body was transported to Rouen, and buried in the church which now bears his name. Ouen wrote a Vita Eligii, which may be considered as one of the most valuable documents we possess for the history of the 7th century. MS. copies of it were preserved in many churches and monasteries. It was first published by Surius, but with many omissions. D'Achery having found two MS. copies — one in the library of the abbey of Corbie, the other in that of Conches, in Normandy — carefully compared them, and published the complete work of Ouen in the fifth volume of his Spicileg in 1661. Ghesquiere also published the Vita Eliqii, revised by means of MSS. from the collections of the Bollandists at Antwerp, in the Acta Sanct. Belgii, 3:294-331. It was translated into French, from these various editions, by Louis de Montigny, archdeacon of Noyon (Paris, 1626, 8vo); also anonymously (by Levesque, a priest) — (ibid. 1693, 8vo); by Charles de Barthelemy (ibid. 1847, 8vo); and by abbot Parenty, canon of Arras (Arras, 1851, 12mo). These two latter translations are accompanied with very instructive and learned notes. A life of St. Remy, in MS., preserved in the abbey of St. Gall, is also attributed to Ouen. See Gallia Christiana, vol. xi; Hist. littr'. de la France, 3:623-628;  Pommeraye, Hist. de ‘abbaye de St. Ouen; Hist. des archives de Rouen; France pontificale; Le Cointe, Ann. eccl. de France; Student's History of France, p. 47; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:978.

## Oughtred, William[[@Headword:Oughtred, William]]

             an eminent English divine, noted especially as a mathematician, was born at Eton, Buckinghamshire, in 1573. Being educated at Eton as a foundation- scholar, or “colleger,” he was elected thence, in 1592, to King's College, Cambridge, of which in regular course he was admitted perpetual-fellow. He largely cultivated classical learning, as the elegant Latinity of some of his works indicates; but he applied himself chiefly to the study of mathematics. While yet an undergraduate he invented An Easy Method of Geometrical Dialling, which, though not given to the public until 1647, was then immediately translated from English into Latin by Christopher Wren, at that time a gentleman-commoner of Wadham College, Oxford.

Oughtred took his degree of B.A. in 1596, and that of M.A. in 1599. In 1600 he projected a horizontal instrument delineating dials upon any kind of plane, and for working most questions which could be performed by the globe. In 1603, or thereabout, Oughtred was ordained priest, and presented to the living of Aldbury, near Guildford, in Surrey, upon which appointment he left the university and resided upon his living. He continued his mathematical purstits, but at the same time distinguished himself by the faithful discharge of his pastoral duties. The mathematical sciences were to him “the more than Elysian fields,” and his house was continually filled with young gentlemen who came thither for instruction. He probably wrote his Treatise of Trigonometry about 1614; and in pursuing the same subject he invented, not many years afterwards, an instrument called The Circles of Proportion. 'All such problems in arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and navigation as depended upon simple and compound proportion might be solved by its aid; and it was the first sliding rule that was projected for those uses, as well as that of gauging. In 1628 he was engaged by the earl of Arundel as tutor to his son, lord William Howard whose patronage of science has much to do with the history of its progress during the 17th century. For the use of his pupil Oughtred published, in 1631, Arithmetices in numeris et speciebus inzstitutio, quae turn logisticae tum analytiae, atque totius mathematicae clavis est.

This manual contained so many new and excellent theorems, both in algebra and geometry, that it was universally esteemed; and the general plan of it has since been followed by the best authors on the subject. Oughtred was, in 1646, in danger of  sequestration by the committee for plundering ministers, and several articles sufficient to have sequestered him were sworn against him. But William Lilly, the celebrated astrologer, appealed to Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke and all his old friends, and they appeared in such numbers in his behalf on the day of hearing that he was cleared by the majority, though the chairman and many other Presbyterian ministers were active against him. He sometimes amused himself with physical sports, and was sprightly at the age of eighty. Fuller (Worthies, 1:145) says that “this aged Simeon had a strong persuasion that before his death he should behold Christ's anointed restored to the throne, which he did to his incredible joy, and then had his 'dimittis' out of this mortal life Jan. 30, 1660.” According to Collier (Dictionary), Oughtred died about the beginning of May, 1660, having expired in an ecstasy of joy upon hearing the news of the vote at Westminster which passed for the restoration of Charles II. David Lloyd says that “Oughtred was as facetious in Greek and Latin as solid in arithmetic, geometry, and the sphere of all measures, music, etc.; exact in his style as in his judgment, handling his tube and other instruments at eighty as steadily as others did at thirty — owing this, as he said, to temperance and archery; principling his people with plain and solid truths, as he did the world with great and useful arts; advancing new inventions in all things but religion, which, in its old order and decency, he maintained secure in his privacy, prudence, meekness, simplicity, resolution, patience, and contentment.” He had one son, whom he put an apprentice to a watchmaker, and for whose use he wrote a book of instructions in that art. He left besides a great number of papers upon mathematical subjects; and in most of his Greek and Latin mathematical books were found notes in his own handwriting, with an abridgment of almost all the propositions and demonstrations. These books came into the museum of William Jones, F.R.S., and with the manuscripts passed into the hands of Sir Charles Scarborough. Such of the latter as were found suitable for publication were printed at Oxford in 1676, under the title Opuscula Mathematica hactenus inedita. Many of Oughtred's MSS. are in the library of the earl of Macclesfield. See Biog. Dict.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors; Engl. Cyclop.

## Oulih, Gerson Ashkenazi[[@Headword:Oulih, Gerson Ashkenazi]]

             a rabbi of the 17th century, studied at Nikolsburg under Menachem Mendel Krochmal, or Krochman. In 1644 he was called to the rabbiship at Prossnitz, then to Hanau, Nikolsburg, and Vienna. When, however,in the  year 1670, the Jews were expelled from the last-named place, he went to Metz, where he died in 1694. He wrote: שו8ת עבודת הגרשני, One hundred and twenty-four legal decisions, which were afterwards published by his son (Frankfort-on-theMain, 1699): — תפארת הגישני, Homiletical discourses on the Pentateuch (ibid. 1699): — חדושי גרשני, Discussive novellas, published by his grandson (ibid. 1710). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:60; Jost, Annalen, 1840, p. 80. (B.P.)

## Our Lady of Mercy, Sisters of[[@Headword:Our Lady of Mercy, Sisters of]]

             is the name of a modern Roman Catholic religious order founded in Dublin by Miss Catharine McAuley in 1830. Miss McAuley was born in Gormanstown Castle, near Dublin, Sept. 29, 1787, and died Nov. 13, 1841. Her parents. who were Roman Catholics, died when she was a child, and she was brought up without any definite religious faith. But she became a Roman Catholic, and devoted herself and her large fortune to the service of the poor. She induced several ladies to join her, purchased a house in Dublin, and there, in 1827, opened an asylum for destitute young women and a free school for poor children. Soon afterwards she and her companions underwent a regular novitiate in a convent of Presentation nuns, and in 1831 assumed there the habit and took the vows of the new order. The rules received the sanction of the archbishop of Dublin Jan. 23, 1834; but subsequently in the rule of St. Augustine, modified to suit the active duties of the sisterhood, was adopted by them, approved by Gregory XVI in 1835, and formally confirmed by him in 1840. As thus organized the Sisters of Mercy have in view, besides other charities, the visitation of the sick and prisoners, the instruction of poor girls, and the protection of virtuous women in distress. Wherever their means permit, they founda “houses of mercy,” in which destitute girls of good character are cared for until employment can be found for them. The sisterhood is divided into two classes, choir sisters and lay sisters. The former are employed about the ordinary objects of the order, and the latter about the domestic avocations of the convent, and such other duties as may be assigned to them. Candidates for membership of either class undergo a preliminary “postulancy” for six months; at the end of that time they assume the white veil and become novices. The novitiate lasts two years. The vows, which are taken for life, bind the members to poverty, chastity, obedience, and the service of the poor, sick, and ignorant. The sisters are subject to the bishops, and have no general superior. In the United States the  communities of each diocese form one body, governed by a common superior, who is elected by the professed choir sisters and confirmed by the bishop. The habit of the order is a black robe with long loose sleeves, a white coif, and a white or black veil. In the streets a bonnet of black crape is worn instead of the coif and veil.

The Sisters of Mercy have spread considerably over Great Britain and her colonies. The first American house was established at St. John's, Newfoundland, in 1842, and the first in the United States at Pittsburgh in 1843, where they now have their mother-house and novitiate for that diocese, also a hospital, house of mercy, and orphan asylum. Their academies in Pennsylvania are at Latrobe. Loretto, Harrisburg, Lebanon (?), and Philadelphia; they number about 200 sisters, novices, and postulants in their thirteen or fourteen convents and houses in that state; and teach in the diocese of Pittsburgh alone 5000 children. In the diocese of Hartford, which embraces Connecticut and Rhode Island, they have 128 sisters, novices, postulants, and lay-sisters in nine convents and houses (Providence, two, South Providence, Newport, Pawtucket, and Woonsocket, R. I.; Hartford, New Haven, Conn., two), with seven academies under their charge, besides free and parochial schools, two orphan asylums at Hartford and one at South Providence, the whole containing apparently 6395 pupils. Since Feb. 17, 1868, the Hamilton School, one of the public schools in New Haven, has been conducted entirely by them, eleven now teaching nearly 500 children (probably included in the above number of pupils), at a cost to the city of $5600, according to the report for the year ending Sept. 1, 1870 (see chap. xxiv). The Sisters of Mercy now number probably over 900 in their eighty or more convents and houses in twenty-one different states (Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, California), with thirty-nine academies (some of them on a large scale, as at Manchester, N. H., Providence, R. I., Vicksburg, Miss., etc.), twelve orphan asylums, and over fifty other schools (free, parish, or industrial), under their charge, containing in all probably from 20,000 to 25,000 pupils. They have hospitals at Worcester, Albany, Pittsburgh (had 2680 patients in one year), Chicago (cost $75,000), Louisville, Omaha, and San Francisco; houses of mercy in New York, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco; a house of providence in Chicago; a Magdalen asylum  apparently near San Francisco. Those in Georgia are said in the Catholic “Directory” to be a branch of an order founded (in 1829) by the late bishop England of Charleston, “where the nuns renew the vows of religion every year, and live under a rule approved by the bishop.” There are five convents in the state, at Savannah, Augusta, Macon, Columbus, and Atlanta, containing somewhat over thirty sisters., Whether the thirty or forty sisters in North and South Carolina belong to the same branch or not is not stated. See Barnum, Hist. of Romanism, p. 304, 305.

## Ouseel, Philipp[[@Headword:Ouseel, Philipp]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Dantzic, October 7, 1671, and studied theology and medicine at different universities. In 1711 he was preacher at Leyden, in 1717 professor at Frankfort, and died April 12, 1724, doctor of theology and medicine. He wrote, De Lepra Cutis Hebraeorum: — Introductio in Accentuationem Hebraeorum Metricam: — De Accentuatione Hebraeorum Prosaica: — De Auctore Decalogi: — De Nominibus Decalogi: — De Decalogo soli Isrceli Data: — De Denario regni Calorum: — De Natura Decalogi. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:60; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ouseley, Gideon[[@Headword:Ouseley, Gideon]]

             a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in Ireland, noted as a missionary, was born at Dunmore, Galway, in 1762. He was the eldest son of his house, the brother of General Sir Ralph Ouseley, and cousin of Sir William and Sir Gore Ouseley, the Orientalists; and his family is distinguished in British military, diplomatic, and literary history. He was designed for the government service, and received a classical education. Married while not yet of age, his recklessness speedily brought him towards financial and moral ruin; but a peculiar episode in his history, closing with an almost fatal gunshot, led him to consider most seriously his spiritual condition. Thus solemnized in his thoughts, he was in 1789 converted by some Methodist soldiers quartered at Dunmore, where Ouseley then resided. He at once began to preach with the same vigor and zeal which he had before displayed in his career of vice and folly, and soon became a most ardent Gospel evangelist. The people heard him with wonder. Attacking at the same time Romish superstition and Protestant indifference, he preached in season and out of season, exhorted in the streets and churchyards, fairs and markets, and was accustomed to attend the wake-houses, or places where the dead lay, there to mingle with the crowds that were collected for the purpose of “hearing mass;” and while the priest read the prayers in Latin, he would translate every part that was good into Irish, and then address the whole assembly, in the presence of the priest, on their eternal interests. He rode on horseback from town to town, generally addressed the crowd without dismounting, and preached from three to five times a day.

For seven years he traveled in this manner throughout the province of Connaught, and as far as Leinster, before his name appeared in the minutes. He was then received into the Wesleyan Conference, and in 1799 was appointed missionary to Ireland. It was just at the close of the rebellion, and the Catholic Irish often treated him rudely; but being a master of the Irish language, and thoroughly acquainted with  the Irish character, he succeeded in converting thousands. Charles Graham traveled with him. Together they went into the worst fields of the country, to the darkest and strongest holds of popery and of Satan. On entering a town, the Bible in hand and their hats off, processions of the people followed them to some convenient place, where they worshipped in the following manner: First they sang a translation of one of Charles Wesley's hymns.

Next a brief but fervent prayer was so uttered that all heard it, some standing and crossing themselves, some on their knees smiting their breasts. Then one of the missionaries proclaimed a text in both English and Irish, and preached a short but powerful sermon, the other following with an exhortation. Their discourses were mostly in Irish, but were often interspersed with English passages. These brave itinerants thus boldly grappling with the monster evil of the land, Protestants generally, who comprehended that there was no alternative if popery was ever to be conquered, as well as many of the clergy of the Establishment, took sides with them, and welcomed them to their homes and their parishes; and in the occasional mobs, Protestants of all denominations stood faithfully around them. Moreover, Ouseley was an Irish gentleman, his family was influential, and his father, having been converted, sided with him. The wonderful missionary had thus a prestige which commanded respect among his countrymen. His sincere reverence for '“the blessed Virgin” procured him, it is said, many a respectful hearing. Allusions in his sermons to her and the Scripture saints often secured reverent attention, without compromising his Protestantism. His popish hearers were seldom scandalized at anything in his services except the omission of the “Hail Mary” after the final prayer. Without provoking the prejudices of his hearers, he treated them with a courage and frankness which challenged their admiration and secured their good-humor. Thus in a town filled with Romanists he hired the bellman, as was his custom, to announce through the streets preaching for the evening. The man, afraid of opposition, uttered the announcement timidly and indistinctly. Ouseley, passing in the street, heard him, and, taking the bell, rang it himself, proclaiming aloud: “This is to give you notice that Gideon Ouseley, the Irish missionary, is to preach this evening in such a place and at such an hour; and I am the man myself!”

When Coke applied to the Irish Conference for the first official approval of his Asiatic project, and that body, looking upon him with almost idolatrous affection as its own chief apostle, not only sanctioned his plan, but voted him several of its ministers as missionaries, Ouseley stood forth on the Conference floor and begged, with tears, to be permitted to  accompany them. His services, however, could not be dispensed with at home, and he was thus continued in his warfare to the last. When seventy- four years old, and after nearly half a century of devoted labor, he was still abroad on the highways and in the market-places as actively as ever, preaching fourteen. sixteen, and sometimes twenty sermons a week. In the last year of his life he was several times prostrated by sickness, but rallying his remaining energies, he went forth again and again to his missionary labors.On April 8,1839, he finished his ministry at Mountmellick, where he that day preached three times, once in the street. He returned to Dublin to lie down on his death-bed. “I have no fear of death; the Spirit of God sustains me; God's Spirit is my support,” was his dying exclamation. He died May 14, 1839, in the hundredth year of Methodism. “Gideon Ouseley,” says Stevens, will be forever recognized as the Protestant apostle of Ireland; it is hardly too much to affirm that no one man has, directly and indirectly, done so much for her deliverance from the stupendous burden of superstition under which popery has crushed her.” Besides his incessant missionary labors, Ouseley was the author of several polemical publications, the most important of which was Old Christianity and Papal Novelties. The priests could not refute the conclusive arguments of this work; for its educated author was an adept in the controversy. Many popish laymen, popish schoolmasters, and even candidates for the priesthood, were converted by it, and not a few of these converts became: preachers of the Wesleyan body or of the Established Church. See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, vol. iii (see Index); Riley, Life of Ouseley (Lond. and New York, 1848); Arthur, Life of the Rev. Gideon Ouseley (Lond. 1876).

## Outram (Or Owtram), William, D.D.[[@Headword:Outram (Or Owtram), William, D.D.]]

             an English divine, was born in Derbyshire in 1625. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1641, and upon the completion of his university course became rector of St Mary Woolnoth, London, which position he resigned in 1666; was appointed archdeacon of Leicester in 1669; became prebendary of Westminster in 1670, and was also. for some time rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster. He was much esteemed by his contemporaries. Both the Churchmen and the Dissenters had great confidence in his piety and his judgment (see Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. [Church of the Restoration], 1:439). He was well versed in rabbinical learning, and in the writings of the fathers. He died in 1679. His works are: De Sacrisfciis Libri duo, quorum altero explicantur omnia Judceorum nonnulla Gentium Profanorum Sacrificia; altero Sacrificiumn Christi  contra F. Socinum (Lond. 1677, 4to; Amster. 1688, 12mo); this was translated into English, with additional notes and indexes, by John Allen, under the title of Two Dissertations on Sacrifices; the first on all the Sacrifices of the Jews, with Remarks on some of those of the Heathens; the second on the Sacrifice of Christ; in both which the General Doctrine of the Christian Church on these Subjects is defended against the Socinians (1817, 8vo; 1828, 8vo; 1833, 8vo). “Some of the best discussions on the subject of sacrifice,” says Orme, “are to be found in this work; and in no work is the typical relation of the ancient sacrifices to the nature and design of the death of Christ more satisfactorily explained. The English translation is respectably executed, and has made the work accessible to all.” “This work,” says Horne, “is of singular use to the divinity student, as affording, in a comparatively small compass — one of the most masterly vindications of the vicarious atonement of Christ: — Twenty Sermons preached on several Occasions (1652, 8vo, posth.; 2d ed. 1679, 8vo). These were edited by Dr. J. Gardiner, bishop of Lincoln, who commends them highly in his preface. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.; Orme, Bibl. Bibl. s.v.; Home, Introd. vol. ii.

## Outrein, Johann D[[@Headword:Outrein, Johann D]]

             a Reformed theologian, was born at Middleburg, October 17, 1663. . He studied at Franeker, and was preacher there in. 1687. In 1688 he was appointed librarian of the academy, in 1691 preacher at Arnheim, in 1703 at Dort, in 1708 at Amsterdam, and died February 20, 1722. He was a voluminous writer. A complete list of his many writings is given in Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Outremont, Hector Albert Chaulet D[[@Headword:Outremont, Hector Albert Chaulet D]]

             a French prelate, was born at Tours, February 27, 1825 .He became titular of St. Gatien of Tours in 1862, bishop of Agen in 1871, archbishop of Mans in 1874, and died September 16, 1884.

## Ouvrard, Rene[[@Headword:Ouvrard, Rene]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born at Chinon about 1620. He was intimate with Arnauld and other writers of Port-Royal. He died in 1694. He published treatises on music, theology, and mathematics.

## Ouvrier, Ludwig Benjamin[[@Headword:Ouvrier, Ludwig Benjamin]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Prenzlov, Prussia, May 7, 1735. He studied at Halle, and was for some time private tutor. In 1763 he was made court-preacher at Darmstadt, in 1770 member of consistory, and in 1772 professor of theology at Giessen. Ouvrier died October 1, 1792. He published, Untersuchung uber die Lehrsdtze des Christenthums (Berlin, 1773): — De Theologia. Populari (Giessen, 1775): — Annotationes Qucedam ad 2Pe 2:2; Judae 6 (1776): — De Necessitate Satisfactionis a Paulo Rom 8:3 Asserta (1777): — De Theologia Morali (1779): — An Actor. 4:24 Spiritus Sanctus Dicatur Universi Creator (1780): — De Iisden in Resurrectione Restituendis Corporibus (1781): — Geschichte der Religionen nebst ihren Griinden und Gegengriinden (1781-83, 2 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ovalle[[@Headword:Ovalle]]

             (sometimes written Ovaglie), ALFONSO DE, a Jesuit of Spanish extraction, was born in Chili in 1601. He died in 1651. He published in 1646 a Historical Account of the Kingdom of Chili and the Jesuit Missions in that country. See Backer, Biblioth. des ecrivains de la Compagniede Jesus (1854), 2d series, p. 451.

## Ovampoland[[@Headword:Ovampoland]]

             SEE OVAMPOS. (below)

## Ovampos[[@Headword:Ovampos]]

             or, as they are sometimes called, Otjiherero, are Africans, seemingly the connecting link between the Kaffre (q.v.) and Negro (q.v.). The country they live in is called Ovampoland, and is situated in the region north of the  great Namaqualand (q.v.), in South Africa, extending north to the Cuanene River, and south to the parallel of 23° S. lat. The land of the Ovampos is a much more fertile region than Namaqualand, from which it is separated by a wide belt of densely bushed country. It has but few rivers, and these not of a perennial nature. About fifty miles from the coast the country rises to a table-land about 6000 feet above the sea-level, and then declines to the south and east into the deserts of the Kalihari and the region of Lake Ngami. Many strong indications of copper-ore are found in various places. The principal rivers, or, rather, water-courses, are the Swakop, Kusip, and their branches, which enter the Atlantic a few miles north of Walfish Bay. The other rivers in the interior seem to lose themselves in the sands. The climate is healthy, except near the coast, where fever in some seasons prevails. It seldom rains in the coast region, which is a very desolate one, and almost devoid of water.

Thunderstorms are very violent in the summer season. All the large mammalia are more or less plentiful, according as water may be found at the different drinking-places. Elephants. rhinoceroses, elands, and other large animals driven from the south by the march of civilization, take refuge in the desert lying east of Ovampoland, where sportsmen like Green and Andersson have been known to kill as many as twelve elephants in a day. The country was first described by Sir J. Alexander, who visited its south border. Mr. Galton afterwards penetrated much farther north; and Mr. C.J. Andersson has since fully explored it nearly as far north as Cuanene. Large numbers of horned cattle are annually collected by traders from the Cape in these regions, and whales abound on the coast. The trade in ostrich-feathers and ivory is of increasing importance, and several trading-stations are established for the collection of native products. The Ovampos are described by Andersson as of a very dark complexion, tall and robust, but remarkably ugly. He found them, however, honest, industrious, and hospitable. They are not entirely pastoral, but cultivate much corn. Living in the same country are the Cattle Damaras, with still more of the Negro type, a stout, athletic people, very dirty in their habits, and generally armed with the bow and arrow. They live in a state of constant warfare with the Ghondannup, or Hill Damaras, a nearly pure Negro race, on the one hand, and the Namaqua Hottentbts, who live south of them, on the other.

“Little or nothing,” says the Missionary World (N. Y. 1874), “has as yet been done for the benefit of the wandering tribes which inhabit the dreary regions of Ovampoland.” German missionaries, employed by the Rhenish  Society, have labored here as well as in Namaqualand, but thus far no marked results have crowned their efforts for the Christianizing of the Ovampos. The missionaries have, however, succeeded in systematizing the Ovampo dialects, and they have even printed some elementary works in the Otjihehero dialect. Two of these appear in Sir G. Grey's catalogue.

## Ovation[[@Headword:Ovation]]

             a lesser triumph among the ancient Romans. The name seems to have been derived from the animal sacrificed on the occasion, which was not a bull, but a sheep (ovis). In an ovation the general entered the city on foot, clothed not in gorgeous robes, but simply in the toga praetexta of a magistrate. The wreath with which his brow was girt was composed not of laurel, but of myrtle. He carried no scepter in his hand. The procession by which he was attended consisted not of senators. and a victorious army, but of knights and plebeians. No trumpets heralded the general's entry into the city in the case of an ovation, but simply a band of flute-players.

## Oven[[@Headword:Oven]]

             (Heb. תִּנּוּר, tannur', from the same root with the Chaldee תְּנִןto smoke, Gr. κλίβανος), originally any receptacle for fire, as a furnace or kiln (comp. Gen 15:17; Isa 31:9); but usually an oven for baking bread and cakes (see Exo 7:23; Lev 2:4), not only that used by the baker (Hos 7:4; Hos 7:6-7), but also that in which the mistress of a house baked her bread (Lev 26:26; and see Jahn. Bibl. Archaeol. 1:213; 2,182). This oven was built of brick, and was smeared within and without with clay. A fire. was kindled within it, and the dough was placed upon the side, where it baked, and was called מִאֲפֵה תִּנּוּר, maapheh tannur (Lev 2:4). The κλίβανος of the Greeks appears to have been of a similar construction. Each household possessed such an article (Exo 8:3), and it was only in times of extreme dearth that the same oven sufficed for several families (Lev 26:26). It was heated with dry twigs and grass (Mat 6:30), and the loaves were placed both inside and outside of it. It was also used for roasting meat (Mishna, Taan. 3:8). The heat of the oven furnished Hebrew writers with an image of rapid and violent destruction (Psa 21:9; Hos 7:7; Mal 4:1). But the Hebrews did not always possess such an oven, and often seem to  have baked their bread on the ground, which was first heated by a fire, or on thin plates of metal, and sometimes to have made an excavation in the earth, which answered the purpose (see Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v. תִּנּוּר). SEE BAKE.

Among the modern Orientals the dough, when prepared, is not always baked at home. In towns there are public ovens and bakers by trade; and although the general rule in large and respectable families is to bake the bread at home, much bread is bought of the bakers by unsettled individuals and poor persons; and many small households send their dough to be baked at the public oven, the baker receiving for his trouble a portion of the baked bread, which he adds to his day's stock of bread for sale. Such public ovens and bakers by trade must have existed anciently in Palestine, and in the East generally, as is evident from Hos 7:4 and Jer 37:21. The latter text mentions the bakers' street (or, rather, bakers' place or market), and this would suggest that, as is the case at present, the bakers, as well as other trades, had a particular part of the bazaar or market entirely appropriated to their business, instead of being dispersed in different parts of the towns where they lived. SEE CRACKNEL.

For their larger operations the bakers have ovens of brick, not altogether unlike our own; and in large houses there are similar ovens. The ovens used in domestic baking are, however, usually of a portable description, and are large vessels of stone, earthenware, or copper, inside of which, when properly heated, small loaves and cakes are baked, and on the outer surface of which thin flaps of bread, or else a large wafer-like biscuit, may be prepared. This is adapted to the nomad state, and is the article generally intended by the Hebrew term tannur. It usually consists of a large jar made, of clay, about three feet high, and widening towards the bottom, with a hole for the extraction of the ashes (Niebuhr, Desc. de l'Arab. p. 46). Occasionally, however, it is not an actual jar, but an erection of clay in the form of a jar, built on the floor of the house (Wellsted, Travels, 1:350). The oven is frequently covered with a chimney made of mud, to create a draught.

Another mode of making bread is much used, especially in the villages. A pit is sunk in the middle of the floor of the principal room, about four or five feet deep by three in diameter, well lined with compost or cement.  When sufficiently heated by a fire kindled at the bottom, the bread is made by the thin pancake-like flaps of dough being, by a peculiar knack of hand in the women, stuck against the oven, to which they adhere for a few moments, till they are sufficiently dressed. As this oven requires considerable fuel, it is seldom used except in those parts where that article is somewhat abundant, and where the winter cold is severe enough to render the warmth of the oven desirable, not only for baking bread, but for warming the apartment. SEE FURNACE.

Another sort of oven, or rather mode of baking, is much in use among the pastoral tribes. A shallow hole, about six inches deep by three or four feet in diameter, is made in the ground; this is filled up with dry brushwood, upon which, when kindled, pebbles are thrown to concentrate and retain the heat. Meanwhile the dough is prepared, and when the oven is sufficiently heated the ashes and pebbles are removed, and the spot well cleaned out. The dough is then deposited in the hollow, and is left there over night. The cakes thus baked are about two fingers thick, and are very palatable. There can be little doubt that this kind of oven and mode of baking bread were common among the Jews. Hence Hezel very ingeniously, if not truly, conjectures (Real-Lexikon, s. Vo Brod) comes the סִלֵּי חוֹרַי(salley choriy, Sept. κανᾶ χονδριτῶν, Vulg. canistra Jarin(e), hole-bread baskets, of Gen 40:16, which he renders, or rather paraphrases, “baskets full of bread baked in holes,” not “white baskets”, SEE BASKET, as in the A.V., nor baskets full of holes,” as in our margin; nor “white bread,” as in most of the Continental versions, seeing that all bread is white in the East. As the process is slower and the bread more savory than any other, this kind of bread might certainly be entitled to the distinction implied in its being prepared for the table of the Egyptian king.

There is a baking utensil called in Arabic tajen, which is the same word (τηγάνον) by which the Sept. renders the Heb. מִחֲבִת(miachabhadth), “pan” in Lev 2:5, etc. This leaves little doubt that the ancient Hebrews had this tajen. It is a sort of pan of earthenware or iron (usually the latter), flat, or slightly convex, which is put over a slow fire, and on which the thin flaps of dough are laid and baked with considerable expedition, although only one cake can be baked in this way at a time. This is not a household mode of preparing bread, but is one of the simple and primitive processes employed by the wandering and semi-wandering tribes,  shepherds, husbandmen, and others, who have occasion to prepare a small quantity of daily bread in an easy, off-hand manner. Bread is also baked in a manner which, although apparently very different, is but a modification of the principle of the tajen, and is used chiefly in the. houses of the peasantry. There is a cavity in the fire-hearth, in which, when required for baking, a fire is kindled and burned down to hot embers. A plate of iron, or sometimes copper, is placed over the hole, and on this the bread is baked. SEE BREAD.

Another mode of baking is in use chiefly among the pastoral tribes, and by travelers in the open country, but is not unknown in the villages. A smooth, clear spot is chosen in the loose ground, a sandy soil — so common in the Eastern deserts and harder lands — being preferred. On this a fire is kindled, and when the ground is sufficiently heated the embers and ashes are raked aside, and the dough is laid on the heated spot, and then covered over with the glowing embers and ashes which had just been removed. The bread is several times turned, and in less than half an hour is sufficiently baked. Bread thus baked is called in Scripture עֻגָּה(uggah), “cake” (Gen 18:6; 1Ki 17:13; Eze 4:12, etc.), and the indication 1Ki 19:6 is very clear, “cake baken on the coals” (coal- cakes), i.e. cakes baked under the coals. The Sept. expresses this word very fairly by ἐγκρυφίαι, panis subcinericius (Gen 18:6; Exo 12:39). According to Busbequius (Itin. p. 36), the name of Ilugath, which he interprets ash-cakes, or ash-bread, was in his time still applied in Bulgaria to cakes prepared in this fashion; and as soon as a stranger arrived in the village the women baked such bread in all haste, in order to sell it to him. This conveys an interesting illustration of Gen 16:6, where Sarah, on the arrival of three strangers, was required to bake “quickly” such ash-bread though not for sale, but for the hospitable entertainment of the unknown travelers. The bread thus prepared is good and palatable, although the outer rind, or crust, is apt to smell and taste of the smoke and ashes. The necessity of turning these cakes gives a satisfactory explanation of Hos 7:8, where Ephraim is compared to a cake not turned, i.e. only baked on one side, while the other is raw and adhesive. SEE ASH-CAKE.

## Overall, John[[@Headword:Overall, John]]

             an English prelate, was born in 1559, and, after a proper preliminary training, was educated successively at St. John's College, Cambridge and at  Trinity College, of which he was chosen fellow. In 1596 he was appointed regius professor of divinity, when he took the degree of D.D., and about the same time was elected master of Catherine Hall in the same university. In 1601 he was preferred to the deanery of St. Paul's, London, by the. recommendation of his patron, Sir Fulk Greville, and queen Elizabeth; and in the beginning of James's reign was chosen prolocutor of the lower house of convocation. In 1612 he was appointed one of the first governors of the Charterhouse Hospital, then just founded by Thomas Sutton. In April, 1614, he was made bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; and in 1618 was transferred to Norwich. where he died in May, 1619. He was buried in that cathedral, where he lay unnoticed till some time after the restoration of Charles II, when Cosin, bishop of Durham, who had been his secretary, erected a monument in 1669 to his memory. Overall is characterized by Wood as being the best scholastic divine in the English nation; and Cosin, who perhaps may be thought to rival him in that learning, calls himself his scholar, and expressly declares that he derived all his knowledge from him. Bishop Overall is also extolled by Smith for his .distinguished wisdom, erudition, and piety. In the controversy which in his time divided the Reformed churches about predestination and grace, he held ground inclining rather to Arminianism; and seems to have paved the way for the reception of that doctrine in England, where it was generally embraced a few years afterwards, chiefly by the authority and influence of archbishop Laud. Overall had a particular friendship for Gerard Vossius and Grotius; and was much grieved to see the love of peace, and the projects of this last great man to obtain it, so ill requited. He labored heartily himself to accord the differences in Holland, upon what is known by the name of the Quin- quarticular controversy. Overall's chief work was the Convocation Book concerning the Government of God's Catholick Church and the Kingdoms of the Whole World (London, 1690). This treatise was adopted by the convocations of Canterbury and York, but was left unpublished by request of king James I. Overall's object in its compilation was to advocate the superior claims of the throne, and to dispute the claim of those who would place the episcopal office, as by divine right, superior to the throne.

He also denies the Presbyterian claim of the superiority of the πρεσβύτερος over the king by divine right. He also teaches that “there is no more necessity of one visible head over the Catholic Church than of one visible monarch over all the world,” and that “a government, which had originated in rebellion, ought, when thoroughly settled, to be considered as ordained by God, and as such to be obeyed by clergy and laity.” Not having received  the royal confirmation, the book is held as possessing no legal authority, yet there is no room to doubt that it was designed to be received as an authentic exposition of the mind of the Anglican Church on the subjects of which it treats. This work, preserved in manuscript for eighty-four years, was first given to the world by archbishop Sancroft in 1690, with the design of injuring the new government; but an important passage in it which had been overlooked reconciled William Sherlock to the oaths, and he no longer refused to take them. Anew edition of the work was published in the “Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology” (1844). — Bishop Overall also wrote Sententia de Predestinatione (London, 1651). He is besides named among the translators of the Bible, and as a writer of that portion of the Catechism of the Church of England which concerns the sacraments. For Overall's Notes on the Common Prayer, see Nichols, Commentary; for his remarks on The Necessity of One Visible Head, see Wordsworth, Christian Institutes, 4:135 and for his remarks On a Middle State, see Campbell, Doctrines of a Middle State. See also Biographical Dictionary, s.v.; Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors, s.v.; Adolphus, Manual four Students in Theology (see Index); M'Elhinney, The Doctrine of the Church, p. 260; Hallam, Literature, 2:358; Stoughton, Ecclesiastical History of England (Church of the Restoration), 1:219; Wordsworth, Ecclesiastical Biography, 1:128 sq.; 4:297 sq.

## Overbagh, Peter A[[@Headword:Overbagh, Peter A]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in 1779. He studied theology under Livingston, and was licensed to preach in 1803. From 1805 to 1806 he was stationed at Bethlehem and Corymans, N. Y.; from 1806 to 1809, at Woodstock; from 1809 to 1817, at Woodstock and Flatbush (Ulster Co.). After 1834 he also preached at Plattekill station. He died in 1843. Through his influence the character of the community in which he spent his ministry was greatly changed. He organized a Church in Flatbush with a dozen members, and left it with three hundred, besides having formed a new organization near by. Overbagh's labors, though mostly obscure, resulted in many conversions, and he was regarded as an eminently useful and faithful man. See Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church in America, p. 174, 175.

## Overbeck, Friedrich[[@Headword:Overbeck, Friedrich]]

             a distinguished German painter, to whom is justly awarded a large share of the merit for the movement in the early part of this century from which arose the modern German school of art, was born at Lubeck July 3, 1789. He began his studies as an artist at Vienna in 1806 but having adopted and continued to persist in carrying out certain notions of art, and the mode of studying it, essentially different from those inculcated in the academy, he was expelled along with certain other students who entertained the same views, and in 1809 set out for Rome. There he was soon afterwards joined by the now world-wide renowned painters Cornelius and Schadow; and these three, animated with similar ideas, and mutually encouraging one another, laid the foundation of a school that in no small degree influences the taste for art in Europe at the present time. The old German school of painting, partly under the influence of the dominant French taste, and partly guided by the maxims and practice of Mengs (q.v.), had been seeking inspiration almost exclusively from classic sources, and drawing its technical principles from the study of the later painters of Italy. But coincident with the casting off of the trammels of modern French criticism and ancient forms in literature, there had been growing up a desire for a return to a less academic or eclectic system in art; and Friedrich Schlegel, a leading critical advocate of the Romantic school in literature, was the herald and prophet of the new school of national German art. Overbeck was well prepared to become one of the advocates and propagators of these new ideas and, together with his two celebrated friends and a host of followers, the new school rapidly developed. He paid entire devotion to the style of the Italian artists prior to the period of the Renaissance, particularly Fra Angelico (b. 1387; d. 1455), and manifested a strong aversion to a dependence on the form of drawing in the style of Greek or classic art in works embodying religious subjects; although many of his compatriots — Cornelius, for instance — modified or perhaps enlarged these ideas, and studied the works of Michael Angelo and those of Raphael's later style executed under the influence of classic art. Overbeck first became noted by a picture of the Madonna, which he painted at Rome in 1811. He was next employed, along with Cornelius and others, by the Prussian consul, general Bartholdi. to execute certain frescos illustrating the history of Joseph; the Selling of Joseph; and the Seven lean Years being the subjects assigned to him.

After completing these, he painted in fresco, in the villa of the marchese Massimi, five large compositions from  Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered. In 1814 he and several of his artistic brethren abjured Lutheranism, and embraced the Roman Catholic religion. In 1815 he completed Christ at the house of Martha and Mary, which went far to secure his great reputation; but his grand picture, Christ entering Jerusalem — (about eight feet by five and a half), finished in the' following year for the Marienkirche at Lubeck, was that which may be said to have established his fame: there can be little hesitation in saying that, despite its crudenesses, it was in many respects one of the grandest scriptural pictures which had been painted since the decay of art initaly. Though a slow worker — his design being first elaborately thought out, and then laboriously corrected — the productions of a man who had been for nearly half a century constantly working are far too numerous to be mentioned here, even if we had the materials for completing the list. Overbeck's chief work is a fresco at Assisi, The Miracle of Roses of St. Francis. His oil-pictures are inferior to his frescos, being dry and weak in color. His great picture, The Influence of Religion on Art, preserved in the Stadel Institute at Frankfort, and well known from the engraving, is an admirable composition, and is indeed the most favorable specimen of his powers as a painter in oil-colors. In this vast production he has sought to symbolize in a single design the development of art — including music, architecture, sculpture, and painting — under the influence of Christianity. Christ in the act of blessing, and the Virgin recording the Magnificat, occupy the middle of the upper compartment of the picture, while the saints and prophets of the Old and the apostles of the New Testament are assembled around, and the representatives of the several arts fill the different stages or compartments into which the picture is divided. It is a work full of learning, thought, and fine feeling, but one which to understand, much less to do full justice to, it is necessary to study from the artist's own point of view, and with a clear conception of his central idea-to an ordinary spectator by no means an easy matter; He executed a great many drawings remarkable for high feeling, most of which have been engraved. One of his last undertakings, a series of designs from the Evangelists, delicately engraved in the line manner, is a work of high excellence. He died at Rome Nov. 12, 1869, and was buried in one of the churches of the Eternal City in tribute to his eminent services to sacred art. “The works of Overbeck are marked by unflagging invention, great refinement and delicacy of expression, considerable power of drawing, and a style of composition which presents his design with the greatest conceivable perspicuity. Where there is obscurity, as there sometimes is, it  rests in the idea and not in the manner of its presentation.

But his treatment of his themes is essentially subjective: in other words, he seems to have always sought to carry out Schlegel's principle that in all Christian themes the treatment must be spiritual and symbolic rather than human and dramatic. Hence his works display a calm devotional beauty and simplicity rather than energy or brilliancy of style. This spirituality and symbolism of style and thought rise in the works of Overbeck not infrequently into grandeur, and are always impressive; but often, even in his hands, they run into coldness, obscurity, and mannerism. But the nobleness and purity of aim, the great artistic knowledge and power, the fine poetic genius which pervades almost every production of his pencil, and his singleness of purpose, must always secure for the name of Friedrich Overbeck a high place in the history of art, and one of the very highest among the painters of the 19th century” (Enyl. Cyclop.). See Nagler, Kinstler-Lexikon, s.v.; Raczynski, Histoire de l'Art Allemand modern, Brockhaus, Conversations- Lexikon, s.v.

## Overberg, Bernhard[[@Headword:Overberg, Bernhard]]

             a distinguished German theologian and writer, was born at Hoeckel, near Osnabruck, about 1757. In 1774 he went to study theology at Munster, was ordained priest in 1780, and appointed professor in the normal school of Munster in 1783. In 1789 he became intimate with princess Amelie Gallitzine (q.v.), and this friendship lasted until death. In 1809 he was appointed regent of the episcopal seminary, and counselor of the Consistory in 1816. He died Nov. 9, 1826. He was very active in promoting the cause of education in the diocese of Munster. His principal works are, Anweisung zum Schulunterrichte (1795): — Biblische Geschichte (1796): — Religionshandbuch nebst den beiden Katechismen (1804, several eds.). His biography was written by J. Neinermann (Munster, 1829) and by Krabbe (ibid. 1832; 2d ed. 1846). See Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 12:529; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 10:743 sq. (J. N.P.)

## Overbury Sir Thomas[[@Headword:Overbury Sir Thomas]]

             an English author who flourished in the second half of the 17th century, but of whose personal history we know scarcely anything, is noted as the author of A true and perfect Account of the Examination, Trial, Condemnation, and Execution of Joan Perry and her two Sons for the supposed Murder of William Harrison, written by way of Letter to Thomas  Shirley, M.D., in London (1676): — Queries proposed to the serious Consideration of those who impose upon others in things of divine and supernatural Revelation, and prosecute any upon the Account of Religion; with a Desire of their candid and Christian Resolution thereof (1677): — in answer to criticisms on the above, Ratiocinium Vernaculum, or a Reply to Ataxice Obstaculum, etc.

## Overkamp, Georg Wilhelm[[@Headword:Overkamp, Georg Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 9, 1707, at Greifswalde, and died at his birthplace, July 27, 1790, professor and senior of the university. He wrote, De Significatione Verborum Quibus Induratio Pharaonis in HIistoria Mosaica Exprimitur (Jena, 1736): — De Judaeis Primariis Christiani Nominis Hostibus (eod.): — De Judaeis Frustra a Guilielmo Whistono aliisque Corruptionis Hebraei Codicis Insimulatis (Greifswalde, 1739): — De Hebraeorum סגןPontificis Maximi in Summo Expiationis de Vicario (eod.): — De Peccato ac Pcena Israelis Typicis  (1743): — De Divinitus Prcedicto ac Definito Tempore Nativitatis Messice (eod.): — De Philosophia Orientali (1744):De Magis ex Orienfe ut Vere Sapientibus (1749): — De Salomone, Verce Sapientice Magistro, ex Libro Coheleth Ostenso (1754): — Meletema Quadragesimale in les. 53:7, 8, 9 (1760): — Commentatio in Psalms 32 (1770): — De Distinctione in Judaeos et Grcecos, in Grcecos et Barbaros (1782). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:60 sq.; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Overseer[[@Headword:Overseer]]

             (usually פָּקַיד, pakid', visitor, Gen 39:4; Gen 41:34; but Piel of נָצִח, to preside, in 2Ch 2:2; 2Ch 2:18; 2Ch 34:13; שׁוֹטֵר, in Pro 6:7; ἐπίσκοπος, a bishop, in Act 20:28), not only an officer who had the superintendence of the household, as Joseph had in that of Pontiphar, but also an overlooker of work-men, as those appointed by Solomon (2Ch 2:18) SEE OFFICER. We read that Pharaoh set taskmasters or overseers, over the children of Israel, who “made their lives bitter with hard bondage” (Exo 1:14), a statement fully confirmed by the monuments, where the taskmasters are uniformly represented armed with cudgels. SEE BASTINADO. In the margins of many of the Psalms, the Hebrew word מְנָצֵּחis properly rendered overseer, meaning probably the chief musician, as the text has it. (See Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v.) SEE CHIEF MUSICIAN.

## Overseer (2)[[@Headword:Overseer (2)]]

             SEE BISHOP; SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE PRELACY.

## Overton, Samuel[[@Headword:Overton, Samuel]]

             an English minister of the Society of Friends, was born in the county of Warwick in 1668. He entered the ministry in 1694, and labored therein forty-three years. He is noted as one of the first of those concerned in establishing meetings for Church discipline in Warwickshire. He died July 23, 1737. See Janney, Hist. of the Friends, 3:225.

## Oviedo, Council Of[[@Headword:Oviedo, Council Of]]

             (Conciliumn Ovetense), was held about 877, according to Pagi (Mansi says the date is altogether uncertain). King Alphonso, his queen, and sons were present, and eighteen bishops. Several useful regulations were drawn up. The Church of Oviedo was erected into a metropolitan see, and  Hermenegilde, who presided over it, was recognized as head over the other bishops, to labor with them for the re-establishment of discipline in the Church, which had been impaired by the rule of the infidels. See Labbe, Conc. 9:501.

## Ovington, John[[@Headword:Ovington, John]]

             an English ecclesiastical writer and traveler, was born in the 17th century. He was chaplain to king James II. In 1689 he sailed to the East Indies, and spent several years in Surat. He published in 1698 his Voyage to Surat in the years 16891693, etc., which was translated into French. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Thomas, Dictionary of Biography and Mythology, s.v.

## Owen (Or Owings)[[@Headword:Owen (Or Owings)]]

             Richard, was the first native American Methodist preacher, though for many years he acted only as a local preacher. He was converted under the preaching of Robert Strawbridge, in Baltimore Co., Md., and is described as “a man of a respectable family, of good natural parts, and of considerable utterance, plain in his dress, plain in his manners, industrious and frugal.” He was long the most effective co-laborer of Strawbridge, traveling the country in all directions, founding societies in Maryland and Virginia, and opening the way for the coming itinerants. He thus secured the pre-eminence of being the first native standard-bearer of the Methodistic movement in the Western hemisphere. Owen's temperament was congenial with that of Strawbridge, whose missionary activity he  emulated, and whose funeral sermon he preached. Though burdened with the cares of a large family, he often left wife and children and a comfortable living, and went without recompense into distant parts to publish the Gospel. In 1772 he was with Strawbridge stationed in Frederick Co. His name was printed in the Minutes, but it is not said that he was received into the traveling connection until 1785. At the time of his death he had been preaching fifteen or sixteen years, and was stationed in Fairfax Co. He died at Leesburg in 1787. See Bennett, Memorials of Methodism in Virginia, p. 240; Stevens, Hist. of the M. E. Church, vol. i (see Index in vol. iv).

## Owen, Anning[[@Headword:Owen, Anning]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the State of New York in 1751. He is said to have been a member of the Congregational Church in early life; but he dated his conversion from the Indian battle in Wyoming in 1778. His account of this event was as follows: When the retreat commenced on the battle-field he expected to be killed, and determined that, should he be shot, his last breath should be spent in calling upon God for mercy. Having secreted himself under a grape-vine on the margin of the river, he there gave his heart to God, and found peace to his soul. He united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was soon licensed to preach; was ordained deacon in 1791; joined the traveling connection in 1795; and in 1797 received elder's orders. He was three years presiding elder on the Susquehanna District; continued in the itinerancy nineteen or twenty years; traveled extensively in the north-western part of New York, and was one of the first Methodist laborers in many parts: of the old Genesee Conference. In 1813, in consequence of bodily infirmities. he received a superannuated relation. He died at Ulysses, Cayuga County, N. Y., in April, 1814. He is described as a zealous, good man, very eccentric, and at times quite eloquent. Possessed of little learning, he nevertheless was ready in thought, shrewd and witty, and never at a loss for adequate means of communication with the people. He labored with all his might, and when he was convinced that he was right nothing could turn him aside. Of great religious sympathy, of mighty faith, and tremendous power, the labors of Anning Owen were eminently successful. See Connable, Hist. of the Genesee Conference (N. Y. 1876), chap. i.

## Owen, Francis A., D.D[[@Headword:Owen, Francis A., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Brunswick County, Virginia, February 8, 1804. In 1822 he entered the Tennessee Conference, in which and in the St. Louis Conference (after 1874) he served efficiently as preacher, missionary to the Indians, and editor of the Memphis Christian Advocate (1854), until compelled to take a supernumerary and finally a superannuate relation. He died March 16, 1883. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1883, page 75.

## Owen, Griffith[[@Headword:Owen, Griffith]]

             a minister of the Society of Friends, flourished towards the close of the 17th century. He died in 1717. As a minister of the Gospele was lively and pathetic; as a member of religious society, he was active and exemplary. William Penn, in one of his letters, mentions him as “tender Griffith Owen, who sees and feels.” For some years he was an active member of the governor's council. He was not only a minister, but practiced medicine, and was eminently useful in the newly settled province. He was universally beloved through life, and lamented at death. See Janney, Hist. of the Friends, 3:67, 187.

## Owen, Henry M.D.[[@Headword:Owen, Henry M.D.]]

             a learned divine of the Church of England, was born in 1716, near Dolgelly, in Merionethshire. He was educated at the grammar school of Ruthin, in Wales, whence he was removed to Jesus College, Oxford. His attention was primarily directed towards the medical profession; but, changing his purpose, he took orders, and, after various preferments, became in 1760 rector of St. Olave, Hart Street, and vicar of Edmonton, in Middlesex. In 1775 he also obtained the living of Edmonton. He died in 1795. He published, The Intent and Propriety of the Scripture Miracles, a most valuable work: — Observations on the Four Gospels: — Directions to Students in Divinity:— Inquiry into the State of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: — Critica Sacra, or a Short Introduction to Hebrew Criticism:— Collatio Codicis Cottoniani Geneseos, cum editione Romana a viro clarissimo. Johanne Ernesto Grabe, deemed the most ancient manuscript in Europe: — Critical Disquisitions: — The Modes of Quotation used by. the Evangelical Writers. “All of Dr. Henry Owen's works,” says Orme, are characterized by sound criticism and laborious research. Bishop Marsh, who says that he is an excellent critic, observes that his Historical and Critical Account of the Septuagint Version should be read by every man who wishes to be acquainted with the history of that version” (Bibl. Bibl. [1839] p. 187). See Nichols; Lit. Anecdotes; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Jones, Christian Biog. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Owen, Isaac, D.D[[@Headword:Owen, Isaac, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Milton, Vermont, March 8, 1809. Two years later he removed with his parents to Indiana. He was converted in his sixteenth year, in his twenty-third was licensed to preach, and in 1834 entered the Indiana Conference. For fourteen years he filled without interruption the regular appointments given him by that Conference, and during the last four years of the time served with great efficiency as agent of the Indiana Asbury University. In 1848 he received a transfer to California as a missionary. Upon his arrival in California the interests of the work were mainly placed in his hands. For many years he filled the office of presiding elder; twice he was elected to the General Conference; once, upon the non-arrival of the bishop, he was chosen to fill his place and preside; and he was always among the foremost in Church and literary enterprises. To no one man was California more indebted for her progress in morals and social reform than to Dr. Owen. He died Feb. 9, 1866. Industry, zeal, and faithfulness marked his life. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1867, page 233; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Owen, James[[@Headword:Owen, James]]

             a minister of the Society of Friends, was born Feb. 18, 1822, near Caesar's Creek. Ohio, and was religiously trained. In 1826 his family removed to  Hendricks County, Indiana, where he learned something of the difficulties and privations incident to frontier life. He was recorded as a minister Sept. 8, 1849. He labored in Iowa in 1849, visited the yearly meetings of Philadelphia, New York, and New England in 1850. and soon after went again to Indiana and Ohio. In 1854 he again visited Iowa, and, in view of the rapid emigration of Friends to that state, left his home, then in Howard County, Indiana, and settled at Bangor, Iowa, in 1855. Here he was subjected again to many .privations. Afterwards he visited the Friends of Indiana, Ohio, Maryland, and North Carolina, and labored among the freedmen in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Arkansas. March 16, 1369, he went on a visit to the Society of Friends and others in England, Ireland, and some parts of the Continent. He returned to America, and visited in course Baltimore and North Carolina yearly meetings, and appointed meetings within the limits of Randolph and other counties, as many as seventeen per week. The climate of this latitude proved detrimental to his health, and an attack of typhoid pneumonia obliged him to seek a northern climate. He died Jan. 2, 1871, and was interred in the Friends' cemetery at New Providence, Iowa. James Owen was eminently successful in his unusually abundant ministerial labors. The weightiness of his spirit, the edifying manner in which he preached, and the solemnity of his appeals, together with his sincere kindness and genial ways, gave him a place in the hearts of all, both old and young, within the scope of his acquaintance. See Friends' Review (Philadelphia), Nov. 2, 1872.

## Owen, John (1)[[@Headword:Owen, John (1)]]

             an English divine of the Puritan age, and most conspicuous among the English Congregationalists of his day. Descended from an ancient and honored family in Wales, he was born (1616) at Stadham, near Oxford. His father, Henry Owen, was an earnest and laborious minister in the Church of England, but a Noncomformist. At the age of twelve he was entered a student at Queen's College, Oxford, where, while he was still a boy, his diligence in study and his progress in all the departments of learning were such as are not often equaled by maturer minds. From the first he seems to have had in view the clerical profession; but in the early years of his university life he was impelled (as he afterwards believed and confessed) by no better motive than ambition for eminence and power in the Church of England. In the progress of his studies he was wakened by the Spirit of God to higher thoughts and aspirations; and he began to work with religious conscientiousness, seeking to do God's will, though he had not  yet attained the full freedom of the sons of God. The Puritan habit of thinking and the Puritan spirit, which Owen had inherited from his father, brought him into collision with certain ritualisms which Laud, then chancellor of the university, was forcing upon Oxford, and which to the evangelical party of those days seemed to be “popish superstitions.”

Compelled to choose between a compliance with the new regulations and a relinquishment of his place and hopes in the university, he chose the latter. He was then twenty-one years of age, having commenced master of arts two years before, and having been more recently ordained to the ministry of the Church of England. That confession of Puritanism cost him (as he knew it must) the favor of an uncle in Wales who had chiefly supported him, and whose estate he was expected to inherit. At that time the conflict between king Charles I and the English people as represented in Parliament was impending, and men everywhere, young and old, were taking sides. Owen had taken the side of reformation in the Church and of chartered liberty in the state; and all who knew him knew where he would be found. To such a man, so long as Laud might remain at the helm of the ecclesiastical establishment, there was no prospect of preferment. Many a Puritan clergyman in those days found refuge and employment as chaplain or tutor, or both, in the family of some nobleman or gentleman favorable to that party. Such was the beginning of Owen's ministry. But at the outbreak of the civil war the nobleman in whose. family he was then employed took arms for the king, while he himself declared for the Parliament, and notonly lost his place, but was disinherited by his Welsh uncle. Being thus thrown upon the world, he removed to London, which had become the metropolis of Puritanism. His religious life at the university and in the: country had been earnest and resolute, but had not been. enriched with the joy of salvation. He had not. found in his own experience an assured peace with God through Christ. But it happened to him, not long after his removal to London, that having gone on a. Sabbath morning to hear a celebrated preacher, he was disappointed by seeing a stranger in the pulpit. The. unknown preacher's text. “Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?” was so appropriate to Owen's habit of mind that it commanded his most earnest attention, and the sermon that followed led him into the light.

Thenceforward he knew how to rest upon the Gospel with a cheerful and sustaining confidence. His removal to London seems to have been with a view to the publication of a work on the chief theological controversy of that age. His Display of Arminianism, published in 1642, was an elaborate confutation of the doctrines which Laud and his abettors were introducing  into the originally Calvinistic Church of England, and which were regarded on all sides as having more than an accidental connection with the party of absolutism in the state, as well as with tendencies Rome-ward in the Church. The learning and ability of that book, written by a young man of twenty-six years, commended its author to the Parliamentary committee for purging the Church of scandalous ministers, and thus it was the occasion of his being introduced to a pastoral charge. The incumbent of the parish church at Fordham, in Essex, having been found scandalous, the living was “sequestered,” and Owen was commissioned to supply the vacancy. In that retired parish his ability as a preacher, and his diligence in visiting the families and catechizing the children of his flock, gave character and success to his ministry, so that in 1646 (when he was thirty years of age) he was called to preach before the House of Commons at one of their monthly fasts. Not far from that time the incumbent of Fordham, whose place he was occupying, having died, the right of presentation to the living was exercised by the patron, and Owen was displaced. Immediately the people of Coggeshall, in the same county, invited him to become their minister; and by the Puritan earl of Warwick, patron of that parish, he was presented to the living. The invitation came from a people who had been trained in Christian knowledge and duty by faithful ministers, and who called him because they knew him. It was by the patron's judicious use of his right of presentation that the parish had become so competent to choose; and. his confirmation of the people's choice, when they chose so wisely, was a matter of course. Till this time Owen had accepted, in a general way, the Presbyterian theory of a National Church, governed by classical and synodical courts; but in connection with his removal to Coggeshall he began to act more definitely upon those principles of ecclesiastical polity which, in that age and country, more than now and here, distinguished the Independents or Congregationalists from the Puritans of the Presbyterian party. Long afterwards, reviewing what he had asserted and practiced in the administration of his parish at Fordham, and describing the change in his position, he said, “I found that my principles were far more suited to what is the judgment and practice of the Congregational men than to those of the Presbyterian.”

Yet he had considered himself a Presbyterian, for he had not consciously advanced beyond the position of his Puritan friends. His acquaintance was not with any of the ministers or of the people who held “the Congregational way,” but wholly with those of “the Presbyterian way.” When the question between those two parties was becoming the great question in England, he set himself “seriously to inquire into the  controversy.” After reading much of what had been written on both sides, he proceeded in his study of the question as his manner had been in. other controversies. He “took under peculiar consideration and examination” the work — “which seemed most methodically and strongly to maintain that which was contrary,” as he thought, to what was then his own persuasion. The book thus selected was from New England — John Cotton's book of The Keys; and to “the examination and confutation” of that book he addressed himself “for his own particular satisfaction.” His own account of the result is, “Quite beside and contrary to my expectation, at a time and season when I could expect nothing on that account but ruin in this world, without the knowledge or advice of or conference with any one person of that judgment, I was prevailed upon to receive those principles which I had thought to have set myself in opposition unto.” He had published, while at Fordham, a tract entitled The Duty of Pastor and People Distinguished. His first publication after coming to his new charge was Eshcol, or Rules of Church Fellowship; and thenceforward he found himself among the champions of Congregationalism, or Church independency against the theory of a National Church under a National Church government. Yet his mind and heart were always set much more upon great questions in theology, and upon the theines of Christian experience and Christian living, than upon questions of Church polity. His Eshcol was a simple tract for use in his own parish; but the more arduous labor of his mind and of his pen, while he ministered to that congregation of two thousand souls, appears in another publication. Saclus Electorum, Sanguis Jesu, or the Death of Death in the Death of Christ, a volume of more than 300 pages, quarto. was another of his battles against Arminianism. About that time, Essex having become a principal seat of the war, Fairfax, the chief commander of the Parliamentary forces, had his headquarters for a while at Coggeshall during the siege of Colchester, and Owen, who seems to have served temporarily as his chaplain, became one of his friends.

After the fall of Colchester and the deliverance of the Parliament committee who had been held captive there (which virtually ended the war in England), he preached a Thanksgiving sermon to the victorious army, and another, at another place, to the committee in celebration of their deliverance — the two sermons from the same text, and so connected that they were published as one discourse. At the age of thirty-two years he had attained the highest rank among the preachers as well as among the controversial theologians of his generation. A few months later he was required, at very short notice, to preach before Parliament on an occasion unique in history. It was the  day after that 30th of January, 1649, which saw the king beheaded in the name of justice for crimes against the people. The sermon on that occasion is remarkable for its abstinence from any explicit reference to the great event of the preceding day; but a careful reading of it will show that while the preacher did not find himself called to sit in judgment on the High Court of Justice, or to pronounce a sentence of approval or disapproval on what that court had done, he did not fear to teach that inasmuch as kings have their power from the formal or informal consent of the people, and inasmuch as the people are therefore held responsible in God's providence for the crimes of those whom they permit to rule them, kings are of right responsible to the people whom they rule. To the sermon, as published by request of Parliament, he appended a most timely Discourse on Toleration, maintaining that religion, as such, does not come within the province of the magistrate, and that, therefore; the state ought not to concern itself with the suppression of any religious error which does not directly assail the foundations of society or the public peace. At the moment when the party with which his interests were identified, and of which as a religious party he had become a leader, was wielding the supreme power, he demanded of Parliament liberty for all to worship God according to their own convictions.

Less than three months elapsed before he was again called to preach before Parliament, the principal officers of the army being also present, among whom was Cromwell, then lately appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland. That was his sermon on the shaking of heaven and earth, from Heb 12:27. The next day Cromwell met Owen for the first time, and, immediately taking him aside, announced his intention with regard to Ireland, and invited him to go as chaplain, and to aid in reforming and restoring the University of Dublin. Yielding to the advice of brethren in the ministry, and to the urgency of the great chief, whose earnest invitation was equivalent to a command, he left his parish for the time. While preparations for the expected campaigns were in progress he had the opportunity of preaching or another memorable occasion before Parliament, the council of state, and the council of the army, the occasion being a national thanksgiving when the attempt at military revolution by the Levellers had been suppressed. Going to Ireland, he remained in Dublin preaching to attentive multitudes, investigating the affairs of the university, and devising measures for its benefit. Returning with Cromwell to England, he was again summoned to preach before Parliament on a day of national fasting. In consequence of his representations and appeals on that occasion, seconded as they were by Cromwell, the Parliament passed an ordinance  for the encouragement of religion and learning in Ireland. Certain lands were appropriated to the support of Trinity College, to the founding of another college in that university with maintenance for teachers, and to the establishment of a free school with support for masters and scholars. At the same time six of the most acceptable preachers in England were sent over to give reputation to the restored university, and they. till the provided endowments should become productive, were to be supported from the public revenue. So conspicuous had Owen become in connection with public affairs that he was soon required to leave his flock again, and to go with the lord-general into Scotland, where Presbyterianism had anointed the second Charles for king, and was in arms against the commonwealth of England. Accordingly he was with Cromwell through that strange campaign in which sermons and theological disputations alternated with sieges and cannonadings.

Returning once more to his home and his parochial work, he was soon appointed dean of Christ Church College at Oxford, his great friend Cromwell having been already made chancellor of the university. The next year he became by Cromwell's appointment vicechancellor, and the chief responsibility for the welfare of the university came upon him. Owen's administration at Oxford was perhaps the most active — certainly not the least useful period of his life. The university had been brought almost to ruin by the long war, Oxford having been for a time the royal residence, and its colleges having exhausted their resources in the vain attempt to sustain the divine right of Charles Stuart to govern England according to his absolute will. When the victories achieved for Parliament had ended the conflict, some of the colleges had been closed, others had been converted into barracks and military storehouses; the university was overwhelmed with debt; and the students, diminished in number, were characterized more by insubordination and licentious behavior than by diligence in study or by generous aspirations. To Owen was committed the public work of raising the university from its low estate, and of making it, more than it had ever been before, the seat of learning and of religion. He restored order and salutary discipline. He gathered around him men conspicuous by their ability, such as John Howe, Charnock, Thomas Goodwin, Theophilus Gale. Pocock the Orientalist, and Ward the astronomer — men not of the Independent party only, but of various party connections or of none. His government, severe towards licentious practices, was tolerant of honest differences; he conciliated the Presbyterians by bestowing upon eminent preachers of that party some of the livings of which he was officially the patron; and, at a time when the  use of the old Book of Common Prayer was regarded by law as proof of hostility to the existing government, he silently permitted a meeting of Episcopalians every Lord's day hard by his own lodgings. So manifest was the revival and prosperity of learning there that, after the restoration of Charles II, even the enemies of Puritanism were compelled to acknowledge the fact. Clarendon's reluctant testimony for the university as governed by Owen is, “It yielded a harvest of extraordinary good and sound knowledge in all parts of learning; and many who were wickedly introduced applied themselves to the study of learning and the practice of virtue; so that when it pleased God to bring king Charles II back to his throne, he found the university abounding in excellent learning, and little inferior to what it was before its desolation.” While thus presiding over the university, Owen never intermitted his work as a preacher, nor was he relieved from the responsibility of often advising those in whose hands were the interests of the commonwealth. It is difficult to see how even he, under such burdens, could find time for the labors of authorship. But during that period many of his most elaborate and learned treatises were published — some in Latin, others in English. Owen's retirement from the vice-chancellorship followed soon after the crisis at which Cromwell found himself constrained to decline the title of king, offered to him by the Parliament as a means of restoring the ancient forms of government under a new dynasty.

Owen opposed that movement, and was the aluthor of the petition which was presented to the protector in the name of his early and best friends, and which overruled in his mind his own judgment, convincing him that, though governing with more than kingly power, he could not assume the kingly name without the ruin of “the good old cause.” Cromwell, invested with new dignity in the state, transferred the chancellorship of Oxford to his son Richard, who appointed a new vice-chancellor. Owen remained in the deanery of Christ Church College till a few months before the restoration of the Stuart monarchy. From Oxford he retired to his native place, where a Congregational Church, previously gathered by his ministry, received him as its pastor. But the suppression of such congregations, by an Act of Parliament forbidding more than five persons to meet for worship in any unauthorized place, was an early consequence of the restoration; and thenceforward his preaching to little secret assemblies, or sometimes more publicly, when persecution grew less violent, was always in violation of law. In 1663 he received, but for some unrecorded reason did not accept, an invitation to New England. The First Church in Boston called him to become the successor of John Cotton and John Norton, and the colleague  of John Wilson; and for several years his coming was confidently expected. When Charles II, in 1671, proclaimed his “declaration of indulgence,” virtually abrogating those acts of Parliament which' inflicted penalties on Roman Catholic recusants and Protestant dissenters, there was a measure of liberty which Owen did not hesitate to use. He began to preach openly in London. Under his ministry a Church was constituted-the same which, in another generation, enjoyed the pastoral ministrations of Isaac Watts. He was still recognized as the leading man of the Independents; and, though under the ban of the law for his nonconformity, he was widely honored, and had powerful friends even in the House of Lords. On one occasion, being at Tunbridge Wells, when the king and the duke of York (afterwards James II) were there, he was invited to the royal tent; and Charles talked freely with him about the laws against dissenters. Afterwards, at London, the king invited him to repeated interviews on the same subject, and even entrusted him with a thousand guineas for the relief of suffering Nonconformists. Of course it was well understood, all the while, that the king's sympathy was not with nonconforming Protestants, but with recusant Romanists. Those latest years of Owen's life were in one respect the most productive. Persecuted or tolerated, worshipping in secret conventicles or openly preaching the Word, he seems to have been always writing, and the demand for his books seems to have been constant. His greatest and best-remembered works (of which the most voluminous is his Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews) are the product of those years. His last work (destined to be posthumous) was Meditations on the Glory of Christ, and the first sheet of it only had been printed when he departed, rejoicing that he was to see that “Glory” face to face. His death took place at Ealing, near London, Aug. 24, 1683. Eleven days afterwards a procession of more than sixty noblemen in carriages drawn by six horses each, and of many others in mourning coaches and on horseback,” followed his remains along the streets of London to their burial in Bunhill- fields.

Many of Owen's works have been often reprinted, and are among the classics of English religious literature. A collected edition of all his works in twenty-three volumes, the first being Memoirs of his Life, by the Rev. William Orme, was published at London in 1820. Another edition, in twenty-four volumes, carefully edited by the Rev. William H. Goold, and including a Memoir by the Rev. Andrew Thomson, was published at Edinburgh in 1850, and republished at Philadelphia in 1860. The last-  named memoir has been used (but not exclusively) in the preparation of this article. See also Bogue and Bennett, Hist. of the Dissenters, 1:444; Nea., Hist. of the Puritans; Princeton Rev. 1852, p. 165 sq.; Presbyt. Rev. Oct. 1862; North Brit. Rev. Nov. 1851; Kitto's Jour. Sac. Lit. July, 1854, p. 466. (L. B.)

## Owen, John (2)[[@Headword:Owen, John (2)]]

             a divine of the Church of England, was born in London in 1765, and received his education at St. Paul's School and at Cambridge. Having taken orders, he became a popular preacher at Fulham, and obtained from bishop Porteus the living of Paglesham, in Essex. Dr. Randolph, the successor of the bishop in the see of London, insisting upon Mr. Owen's residence at his rectory, he was obliged to relinquish the curacy of Fulham. whereupon the inhabitants of the parish presented him with a purse of near £700. On the institution of the British and Foreign Bible Society he became one of the secretaries, and for eighteen years was the most active of its members. He died Sept. 26, 1822. Besides various tracts and sermons, he was the author of The Retrospect, or Reflections on the State of Religion and Politics in France and Great Britain: — The Christian Monitor for the Last Days: The Fashionable World Displayed: — Vindication of the Bible Society, its History, etc.; and works of travel in different parts of Europe. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Owen, John Jason D.D., LL.D.[[@Headword:Owen, John Jason D.D., LL.D.]]

             a noted American Biblical scholar and educator, was born at Colbrook, Conn., August, 1803. While very young, although surrounded by unfavorable circumstances he devoted himself earnestly to study, more particularly with a view to the mastery of the ancient languages. His early life, especially, was characterized by remarkable perseverance. Without aid, except that furnished by his own mind, he undertook the study of Greek, and it is noteworthy that difficulties which seem as if they could not be successfully encountered even with the aid of an instructor he met and conquered solely by the power of his will. His preparations for the academical course he began under the tutorship of the Rev. Dr. Elisha Yale, of Kingsborough, N. Y., to which place his parents removed about that time. Shortly afterwards he went to Middlebury College, and graduated in 1831. He then entered the theological seminary at Andover, Mass. After spending the requisite time in the last-named institution, he  became a minister of the Presbyterian Church, to which body he rendered very efficient and valuable services. Though he never accepted the pastorate of any congregation, he was accustomed to preach from time to time in the different churches throughout New York, in which city he had taken up his residence after graduation, or wherever else he might be spending his time. He was a very prominent member of the New York Educational Society, and also of the Young Men's Educational Society, and under his private and more public instruction many young men have become qualified for the ministry of different religious denominations. At the opening of the Cornelius Institute he became its principal. While there he edited his Xenophon's Anabasis, which was the first Greek text-book with English notes that was published in the United States. Under his direction also were published a Greek Reader. Xenophon's Cyropoedia, the Odyssey and Iliad of Homer, and Thucydides.

These books attracted considerable attention and scrutiny, and were warmly welcomed by all scholars. Prof. L. Schmitz himself a celebrated Greek scholar, wrote to Owen from Edinburgh, in 1850, congratulating him on his success as a translator. It was a frequent regret of Prof. Owen's that the Greek language is too exclusively studied in schools from classical sources; and to remedy this defect he edited the Acts of the Apostles in the original for students, appending a lexicon for the same purpose (N. Y. 1850, 12mo). His most extensive literary undertaking was his Commentaries on the Gospels, the first volume of which appeared in 1857. Two volumes have since been printed, and manuscript for a third was in readiness for the printer at the time of his death, and-was afterwards published. The three volumes are entitled A Commentary, Critical, Expository, and Practical, on the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and the Acts (N.Y. 1869, and often, 12mo). This work deservedly ranks among the very best for popular use which the scholarship of our country has produced. It is lucid, thorough, and evangelical. It meets fairly and fully every difficulty which arises. There is no parade of learning in it, but the results of extended reading and a careful and thorough independent investigation are given. The critical part of the work is beyond all doubt as ably and satisfactorily performed as in any similar American or English work. In the year 1848 Dr. Owen resigned his position in the Institute in order to take the chair of professor of ancient languages in the New York Free Academy, of which he became vice- principal. In the year 1866, the name of the institution being changed to that of College of the City of New York, he became vicepresident of the faculty; and in this sphere he worked faithfully until about two weeks  before his death, which occurred on Sunday, April 18,1869. Dr. Adams conducted the funeral services. The presence of a large number of eminent clergymen, the most learned men and prominent citizens of the United States, indicated the position obtained by the deceased. As a scholar he was well known and highly esteemed by the learned men of England, Scotland, and America. He ranked as one of our best Greek scholars and most industrious of commentators. As a Christian, all who came in contact with him felt the influence of his holy life, and could not but recognize in him the love of that Savior he endeavored to persuade others to follow. As an instructor, he was faithful, sympathizing, and kind almost to a fault. As a man, he was genial in his temper, earnest in his endeavors, and won the love. of a large circle of New York's most distinguished residents.

## Owen, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Owen, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bedford, N.Y., June 14, 1814. He graduated from Princeton College in 1835, and from the Theological Seminary there in 1838; was ordained in 1839 for the mission-field, in which he did his life-work. Landing in India in 1840, and assigned to the station of Allahabad, he continued to labor there without release or relaxation for four-and-twenty years. After the death of his first wife, in 1864, he obtained a short release, and crossed the Himalaya mountains into Thibet. Five years later he undertook a visit to his native land. In acknowledgment of the value of his translation of the Bible into Hindu, the  North India Bible Society presented him money to visit Palestine. He visited Egypt, Jerusalem, Constantinople, Germany, and Scotland on this tour, and was intending to visit America. He died at Edinburgh, Scotland, December 4, 1870.

## Owen, Lewis[[@Headword:Owen, Lewis]]

             an English theologian and writer, was born in Merioneth County in 1572. After passing some time with the Jesuits in Spain, he left them to reenter the world, and was ever after a bitter opponent of the society. He wrote The Running Register, recording a true Relation of the State of the English Colleges, Seminaries, and Cloysters of all foreign Parts (Lond. 1626); the most curious parts of it are to be found in Restituta, 1:141: — The Unmasking of all Popish Monks, Friars, and Jesuits (ibid. 1628, 4to): — Speculum Jesuiticum, or the Jesuit's Looking-glass (ibid. 1629, 4to); reprinted in Edward Sandys's Europe Speculum. See Chalmers, General Biog. Dict.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38:1005; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v. (J. N. P.)

## Owen, Robert[[@Headword:Owen, Robert]]

             a noted socialist and philanthropist, was born at Newton, Montgomeryshire, North Wales, in 1771. His parents were poor, but they gave him a good elementary education. Until he was fourteen he was employed in drapers' shops in his native town and at Stamford. He then procured a situation in London, where he showed such talents for business that at eighteen he became a partner in a small cotton mill. He was successful in this enterprise, and then removed to the Chorlton Mills, near Manchester, where he was equally prosperous. In 1801 he married the daughter of David Dale, a manufacturer of Glasgow, who had established in 1784 a cotton-factory near Lanark, now New Lanark, on the banks of the Clyde. In this factory not only cotton-spinning, but other connected branches of the manufacture were carried on, and at one time as many as 4000 persons were settled there in connection with it. Shortly after his marriage, Owen sold the Chorlton Mills and undertook the management of New Lanark. The latter establishment had been a center of disorder and immorality; but the incessant labors and the paternal administration of the new proprietor made a rapid change in affairs. The little colony established at Lanark prospered both materially and morally. As a commercial speculation it was in a high degree successful: but the most remarkable feature was the benevolent care with which Mr. Owen attended to the welfare of the persons employed and to the education of their children. He here introduced many improvements, since adopted in other schools, so as to make instruction at once attractive and useful, and founded, if not the first, one of the earliest of the infant schools. Besides the ordinary routine of education, the children of whom there were at one time 600 — were taught various practical arts, and were instructed in singing and dancing, care being also taken of their health by building well ventilated school- rooms and providing for active exercise. The reputation of the  establishment spread rapidly; it was visited by persons of rank and influence, giving to Lanark a European celebrity. In 1812 he published his New View of Society, or Essays on the Formation of Human Character, and afterwards a Book of the New Moral World, in which he developed a theory of modified communism. SEE SOCIALISM.

The unfavorable reception which his system received among the English clergy induced him in 1823 to relinquish his connection with New Lanark and to betake himself to the United States. About 1824 he purchased from a Pennsylvania German colony, under Frederick Rapp, a tract of land on the Wabash, in Posey Co., Indiana, and founded the settlement of New Harmony, where he endeavored to carry his theory of the co-operative system into effect. Largely composed of vagabonds and adventurers from all nations, this colony proved an utter failure, and Owen returned to England in 1827. In this year an attempt was also made to effect an establishment in consonance with his new view of society at Orbiston, in the parish of Bothwell, Lanarkshire. It was intended to purchase 1200 acres of land, and to erect a parallelogram to accommodate 1200 persons. A large sum of money was raised, but the expenses so greatly exceeded the estimates that not more than a fourth of the purposed parallelogram was built; but it had a theater, lecture-room, and schoolrooms. Less than 200 persons were collected; the laborers were to work on the co-operative system, but were not all paid alike, nor did all fare alike. They took their meals in a common hall, but at four different tables, the charge for the total weekly board varying from 14s. to 10s., 7s., and 5s., 6d. Including English and Irish families, as well as Scotch, it is not strange that their manners and customs gave great offense to their Presbyterian neighbors, and indeed there was much that was objectionable. It terminated in a short time; the society was dissolved; the property was sold at an enormous loss; the buildings were pulled down, and the materials sold; and nothing now remains of New Orbiston. A similar experiment was also made at Tytherley, in Hampshire, and was equally unsuccessful. Mr. Owen's attempts to establish a “Labor Exchange” in London, in connection with a bazaar and a bank, were likewise fruitless; after a short existence the concern became bankrupt. In 1828 he visited Mexico on an invitation from the Mexican government to carry out his scheme there. but nothing was done.

In 1829 he held a public debate at Cincinnati, with the Rev. Alexander Campbell, D.D., of Bethanyv Va., on the “Evidences of Christianity;” of which discussion a newspaper of the day says: “With an acute, vigorous mind, quick perceptions, and rapid powers of combination,  Mr. Campbell sorely. puzzled his antagonist by his masterly defense of the truth, divine origin, and inestimable importance of Christianity.” In spite of his failures, Owen lost nothing of his wonderful activity. For a long time he resided at London, where he held weekly reunions and a great number of meetings. In these gatherings he delivered more than a thousand discourses. For years he edited the Millennial Gazette, a publication designed to show that men might be happier by uniting their interests than by carrying out the present competition system. He wrote more than two thousand articles for the journals. He also undertook numerous journeys, some of which were to France, where his “rational system” did not even succeed in exciting curiosity. An audience which he obtained in 1840 from queen Victoria, by the mediation of lord Melbourne, provoked against him in the House of Lords some most severe remarks. After having failed in 1847 in the parliamentary elections of London, he thought to take advantage of the Revolution of February, 1848, - 60 passing into France and rallying to the support of his system the provisional government, or one of the socialistic parties; but he could not make his voice heard there. He, however, continued for the rest of his life to advocate his views both as a writer and public speaker, and revisited America several times, attempting to found a system of religion and society according to reason alone. During his last years he was a believer in spiritualism, through which he became convinced of the immortality of the soul; and he devoted much effort to the vindication of his claim to hold conversations with the spirits of the dead. He died at Newton, Nov. 19, 1858.

Owen insisted on an absolute equality in all rights and duties, and the abolition of all superiority, including alike that of capital and that of birth. Being desirous of improving the condition of the industrial classes, he speculated on the causes of evil, and approached the subject from the extreme sensational point of view. He regarded the power of circumstances as controlling, and he was led to consider action as simply obedience to the stronger motive. He thus introduced the idea of physical causation into the human will, and made the rule of right to be each one's own pleasures and pains. He believed that man is born a passive creature with certain susceptibilities, and that external circumstances acting on these susceptibilities of necessity give rise to our dispositions, and through them form our whole character; in other words, that the character of an individual is formed for him, and not by him. This doctrine, which is the most extreme development of philosophical necessity that the present age  has known, was doubtless in great part the result of a too exclusive experience with that class of mankind which exists chiefly as the appendages and machinery of commercial life, and which is made up of those whose poverty and ignorance unite to render them to an unusual degree passive instruments. As a philosopher Owen must be condemned; but, whatever may be thought of the opinions he held, there can be little doubt of his extreme benevolence, his moral integrity, and his executive ability, more especially as, displayed in his early life. His publications are, A New View of Society (Lond. 1813): — Observations on the Effects of the Manufacturing System (1815): — Address to the Inhabitants of New Lanark (Lond. 1816): — Tracts Relative to the New Society (1817): — Two Memorials in Behalf of the Working Classes: — Discourses on a New System of Society, with an Account of the Society of New Lanark (Pittsburgh, 1825): — Robert Owen's Opening Speech, and his Reply to the Rev. Alexander Campbell; the Debate on the Evidences of Christianity, the Social System, and Scepticism, between Mr. Owen and Mr. Campbell (Bethany, 1829): — Mr. Owen's Memorial to the Republic of Mexico (Cincinnati. 1829): — Book of the New Moral World (Lond. and N. Y.): — The Revolution in the Mind and Practice of the Human Race (Lond. 1849). See Packard, Life of Robert Owen (Phila. 1866) Martineau, Biographical Sketches; A. J. Booth, Robert Owen, the Founder of Socialism in England (1869); Noyes, Hist. of Socialism; English Cyclop. s.v.; American Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought, p. 201 sq.; Morell, Hist. of Modern Philosophy, p. 293 sq.; New-Englander, 1866, p. 399 Amer. Presbyt. Rev. April, 1866, p. 344.

## Owen, William[[@Headword:Owen, William]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Pembrokeshire, Wales, Oct. 23, 1844, and was educated at the Congregational Memorial College, Brecon, from 1868 to 1870. He was ordained for the ministry at Coalburgh, Ohio, in September, 1870, and became pastor of the Congregational society in that place. Too severe application to his studies in college and overwork in the pastorate broke his constitution, and he died of consumption Jan. 14, 1875, on his first charge.

## Owens, Thomas[[@Headword:Owens, Thomas]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in South Carolina Jan. 8 1787, and was the son of Thomas and Frances Owens. His parents took him to the Natchez country when young, and settled in what is now Jefferson County. Thomas was in early manhood perverted to vicious purposes. In his twenty-fourth year he became an earnest seeker of salvation from sin. As a preliminary step, he united with the Church in 1810, and was soon after converted while kneeling to receive the holy communion. He was soon encouraged by his brethren to take an active part in the social meetings of the Church. where he successfully commenced those extraordinary labors which made him so conspicuous in afterlife. He was admitted into the traveling connection Nov. 1, 1813, as a member of the Tennessee Conference, and was effective seventeen years, during which time he traveled four years in Alabama, four years in Louisiana, west of the Mississippi, and nine years in various parts of Mississippi. He was on the superannuated list thirty-eight years, but most of that time he rendered efficient service as a self-supporting minister. All who have succeeded him in his different fields of ministerial labor know what a deep and lasting impression his preaching and other kindred exercises made on the minds of all classes. He had learned by experience and practical observation all the avenues leading to the human heart, and he knew how to touch every chord of human sympathy. His native wit and genius cropped out everywhere. He said what other men said, and preached the same doctrines his brethren preached, but it was all said and preached in his own peculiar and attractive style. His genial face, the indescribable intonations of his voice, his apt illustrations and gestures, all combined to keep up an interest in his hearers. He died July 1, 1868. But few men of his talents ever accomplished a similar amount of good. See Minutes of the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1868.

## Owings, Richard[[@Headword:Owings, Richard]]

             SEE OWEN, RICHARD.

## Owl[[@Headword:Owl]]

             is the rendering in the English Version of several Hebrew words. In our identifications of them we follow the ancient intimations compared with modern authorities.

1. Yanshuph (יִנְשׁוּ), which is mentioned in Lev 11:17; Deu 14:16, among unclean water-fowl; and in Isa 34:11 (here written yanshoph, יִנְשׁוֹ), in the description of desolate Edom. The Sept. and Jerome translate it ibis, i.e. the Egyptian heron, according to the older commentators; and Oedmann (Sammlung, 6:27; comp. Oken, Lehrb. d. Naturg. III, 2:583) and others favor this rendering; but it has been shown that the real ibis is a smaller bird, not of the heron species, the Ibis religiosa of Cuvier; a rare bird even about Memphis, and unknown in Palestine. This, then, could not be the yanshuph of the Pentateuch, nor could the black ibis which appears about Damietta, nor any species strictly tenants of hot and watery regions, be well taken for it. See IBIS. Bochart and others, who refer the name to a species of owl, appear to disregard two other names ascribed to owls in the 16th verse of the same chapter of Leviticus. If, therefore, an owl was here again intended, it would have been placed in the former verse, or near to it. On the whole, as the Sept. refers the word to a wader, and the older commentators to a species of ardea, we accept the view already indicated by Gesenius (Thesaurus, p. 922), on etymological grounds, that a heron is intended; and the night-heron is the only one, perhaps, in all respects suited to the passages. It is a bird smaller than the common heron; distinguished by two or three white plumes hanging out of the black-capped nape of the male. In habit it is partially nocturnal. The Arabian Abu-onk (?), if not identical, is a close congener of the species, being found in every portion of the temperate and warmer climates of the earth: it is an inhabitant of Syria, and altogether is free from the principal objections made to the ibis and the owl. The Linnaean single Ardea nycticorax is now typical of a genus of that name, and includes several species of night-herons. They fly abroad at dusk, frequent the sea- shore, marshes, and rivers, feeding on mollusca, crustacea, and worms, and have a cry of a most disagreeable nature. This bird has been confounded with the night-hawk, which is a goat-sucker (caprimulgus), not a hawk.

2. Kos (כּוֹס, Lev 11:17; Deu 14:16; Psa 102:6), rendered “little owl” and “owl of the desert,” is perhaps most applicable to the white or barn owl, Strix flammea. Bochart (Hieroz. 2:267) referred this name to the pelican, on account of the assumed signification of kos, “cup,” by him fancied to point out the pouch beneath the bill (so Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 695); whereas it is more probably an  indication of the disproportionate bulk and flatness of the head compared with the body, of which it measures to the eve full half of the whole bird, when the feathers are raised in their usual appearance. Kos is only a variation of cup and cap, which, with some inflexions, additional or terminal particles, is common to all the great languages of the old continent. The barn-owl-is still sacred in Northern Asia.

3. Kippoz (קַפּוֹז, “great owl,” Isa 34:15) has been variously supposed to designate the hedge-hog, otter, osprey, bittern, and owl. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1226), with Bochart, deriving the word from the root קָפִז, kaphaz, to draw together, to contract, thinks it to be a species of serpent, Serpensjaculus, i.e. the arrowsnake, so called from its darting, springing, in the mainer of the rattlesnake. But as the text evidently speaks of the habits of a bird, we may perhaps acquiesce in the translation owl. There are noticed in Egypt and Syria three well-known species of the genus Strix, or owl: Strix bubo, “the great-eared owl;” Strix flammea, the common barn-owl; and Strix passerina, the little owl. In this list Strix otus, the long-eared owl, Strix brachyotus or ulula, the short-eared owl, known nearly over the whole earth, and Strix orientaulis of Hasselquist, are not included, and several other species of these wandering birds, both of African and Asiatic regions, occur in Palestine. The eagle-owl, or great- eared owl, Strix bubo, we do not find in ornithological works as an inhabitant of Syria, though no doubt it is an occasional winter visitant; and the smaller species, Bubo Atheniensis of Gmelin, which may be a rare but permanent resident, probably also visiting Egypt. It is not, however, we believe, that species, but the Otus ascalaphus of Cuvier, which is common in Egypt, and which in all probability is the type of the innumerable representations of an eared owl in hieroglyphical inscriptions. This may be the species noticed under the indefinite name of kippoz.

4. Yaanah' (יִעֲנָה, Lev 11:16; Deu 14:15; Job 30:29; Isa 13:21; Isa 34:13; Isa 43:20;  Mic 1:8), the OSTRICH SEE OSTRICH (q.v.).

5. Lilith (לַילַית, Isa 34:14), “screech-owl,” but better in the margin NIGHT-MONSTER SEE NIGHT-MONSTER (q.v.).

## Owl-headed Minerva[[@Headword:Owl-headed Minerva]]

             The idea of this goddess is due to the imaginative enthusiasm of Dr. Schliemann, who believed that he saw an owl-headed Athena in the rude attempts at the imitation of the human face on vases and other objects discovered by him at Hissarlik. The faces of certain images of Apollo, found on the coasts of Asia Minor, and now in the British Museum, are ruder than those of the Hissarlik antiquities. Similar faces are also found on the Etruscan blackware from Chinsi, where the spout of the vase serves as a nose, and it is probable that the ornamentation originated in two eyes being set on each side of a vessel's spout or mouth, to ward off the evil eye. Two large eyes are sometimes introduced on Greek vases in the midst of a group of figures. SEE MINERVA.

## Ox[[@Headword:Ox]]

             (῎Ωξ, Vulg. Idox), given (Jdt 8:1) as the son of Joseph, and father of Mereri, among the ancestors of Judith (q.v.).

## Ox (2)[[@Headword:Ox (2)]]

             the different terms denoting this family, or part of it, in the A.V. are the renderings of the following Hebrew words:

1. Abbir', אִבַּיר, is translated “bulls” in Psa 22:12; Psalms 1, 13; Psa 68:30; Isa 34:7; Jer 1:11. This word is properly an adjective, derived from אָבִר, to be strong, and means mighty; hence transferred to the bull in allusion to his strength. But in Psa 68:30 it should probably be rendered princes (see Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v. אָבִר).

2. E'leph, אֶלֶ, which occurs only in the plural, alaphim', אֲלָפַים, derived from אָלִ, to learn, in allusion to the domestic and docile disposition of the animal, and used in the common gender, including the whole family, like the English beeve — an ox or cow. In Deu 7:13; Deu 28:4; Deu 28:18; Deu 28:51, it is translated kinze; in Psa 8:7; Pro 14:4; Isa 30:24, oxen.

3. Alluph', אִלּוּ. also written, defectively, אִלֻּ, is from the same root, in the same signification, but is used in the mascllline gender only, grammatically, while including animals of both genders. It is found in this sense in Jer 11:19, rendered “ox,” and in Psa 144:14, in the plural, “oxen;” — but in Jer 11:19 the word is properly an adjective, tame, gentle, and the rendering should be, “I was like a tamed lamb,” not, as in the English Version, “I was like a lamb or an ox.” See Gesenius. Thesaur. s.v. אָלִ.

4. Bakar', בָּקָר, in the common gender, a word for all oxen or neat cattle; generically a herd. The word is derived from בָּקִר, to cleave, to lay open, in allusion to the use of the blast for plowing (comp. Latin armentun, from arare). This very general and very common word is usually rendered head, herds, as Gen 13:5; Deu 16:2; Hab 3:17; or oxen, as Gen 12:16; 1Sa 11:7; Amo 6:12. But two  phrases deserve especial notice, the ben-bakar, בֶּןאּבָּקָר, son of the herd, or of a bull, which is translated calf; calves, in Gen 18:7-8; 1Sa 14:32; but bullock in Lev 1:5; Num 15:8-9; and again, par ben-bakal, פִּר בֶּןאּבָקָר, literally, an ox, son of the herd, which is rendered bullock, or young bullock, as Lev 4:3; Lev 16:3; Eze 43:19; Eze 43:23; Eze 43:25, and often. SEE CATTLE.

5. E'gel, עֵגֶל, from an obsolete root, said to signify to roll (see Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v. עָגִל), a calf possibly from the idea of the embryo as rolled or wrapped together; and so always translated, as Exo 32:4; Isa 11:6; Mal 4:2; except in Jer 31:18; Jer 46:21, where our English Version wrongly has bullock, bullocks. The feminine form, eglah, עֶגְלָה is also frequent, and is rightly rendered: heifer, as Gen 15:9; Isa 15:5; but in Hos 10:5 the English Version represents the plural by the word calves. SEE CALF; SEE HEIFER.

6. Par, פָּר or פִּר, probably from the root פָּרִר, to be borne, referring to the bearing of the yoke; but the word usually means a bull, young bullock, and is hence often referred to the root פָּרִר, in its more usual sense, to break, in allusion to the fierceness and violence of his anger. It is usually spoken of bullocks for sacrifice only, as Exo 24:5; Lev 4:3-5; Lev 4:7; Num 28:11; Num 28:19, and often; so Hos 14:2, where the meaning is, “So will we offer our praise as victims,” or sacrificial bullocks. But in Psa 22:13 it means bulls, without reference to sacrifice. (See also No. 4 above.) SEE BULLOCK.

7. Tse'med, צֶמֶד from the root צָמִד, to subject to the yoke; hence a pair or yoke, as of asses, Jdg 19:10; 2Sa 16:1; even of horsemen, as Isa 21:7; Isa 21:9; and also of oxen, as 1Sa 11:7; Job 1:3; Job 42:12. SEE YOKE.

8. Shor, שׁוֹר, from a root denoting to be strong or bold. It is a general term for animals of the beeve kind, without distinction of age or sex, and hence is variously rendered, according to the context: ox, oxen, as Gen 32:5; Exo 20:17; Exo 22:1; Exo 22:4; Deu 5:14; Eze 1:10; bullock, Lev 4:10; Lev 9:4; Lev 22:23; Hos 12:11; cow, Num 18:17. In Lev 22:27, where the English Version has bullock, the context requires calf; and in Job 21:10, where it renders bull, the cow is meant. SEE BULL.

9. Teo', תְּאוֹ, only in Deu 14:5, where our version has wild ox, and with transposition of the last letters, t6, תּוֹא, only in Isa 51:20 — rendered “wild bull;” probably means a species of antelope or mountain-goat; so called from its swiftness, from the root תָּאָה, to outrun. Yet the ancient interpreters generally render wild ox, and the exact meaning is uncertain (comp. Bochart, Hieroz. 1:973; Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v. תָּאָה). SEE ANTELOPE.

10. Tor, תּוֹר, the Chaldee term for ox, corresponding to the Hebrew שׁוֹר, No. 8, above. It is found only in the plural, in Ezr 6:9; Ezr 6:17; Ezr 7:17, where it is translated “bullocks,” and in Dan 4:25; Dan 4:32-33; Dan 5:21, where our version has “oxen.”

Natural History of the Bovidoe (scientifically considered). — The earliest pastoral tribes appear to have had domesticated cattle in the herd; and judging from the manners of South Africa, where we find nations still retaining in many respects primeval usages, it is likely that the patriarchal families, or at least their movables, were transported on the backs of oxen in the manner which the Kaffres still practice, as also the Gwallahs and grain-merchants in India, who come down from the interior with whole droves bearing burdens. But, as the Hebrews did not castrate their bulls, it is plain some other method of enervation (bistournure?) was necessary in order to render their violent and brutal indocility sufficiently tractable to permit the use of a, metal ring or twisted rope passed, through the nostrils, and to insure something like safety and command to their owners. In Egypt, emasculation, no doubt, was resorted to, for no ring is observable in the numerous representations of cattle, while many of these indicate even more entire docility in these animals than is now attained.

The breeds of Egypt were various, differing in the length and flexure of the horns. There were some with long horns, others with short, and even none, while a hunched race of Nubia reveals an Indian origin, and indicates that at least one of the nations on the Upper Nile had come from the valleys of the Ganges; for it is to the east of the Indus alone that that species is to be found whose original stock appears to be the mountain yak (Bos grunniens). It is born with two teeth ill the mouth, has a groaning voice, and is possessed of other distinctive characteristics. Figures of this species or variety bear the significant lotus flower suspended from the neck, and, as is still practiced in India, they are harnessed to the cars of princesses of  Nubia. These, as well as the straight-backed cattle of Egypt, are all figured with evident indications of beauty in their form, and they are in general painted white, with black or rufous clouds, or entirely red, speckled, or grandinated, that is, black, with numerous small white specks; and there are also beeves with white and black occasionally marked in a peculiar manner, seemingly the kind of tokens by which the priesthood pretended to recognize their sacred individuals. The cattle of Egypt continued to be remarkable for beauty for some ages after the Moslem conquest.

The domestic buffalo was unknown to Western Asia and Egypt till after the Arabian conquest: it is now common in the last-mentioned region and far to the south, but not beyond the equator; and from structural differences it may be surmised that there was in early ages a domesticated distinct species of this animal in Africa. The buffalo (Bos bubalis) is not uncommon in Palestine; the Arabs call it jamus. Robinson (Bib. Res. 3:306) notices buffaloes around the lake el-Huleh as being mingled with the neat cattle, and applied in general to the same uses. They are a shy, ill- looking, ill-tempered animal.” These animals love to wallow and lie for hours in water or mud, with barely the nostrils above the surface. In Syria and Egypt the present races of domestic cattle are somewhat less than thee large breeds of Europe, and those of Palestine appear to be of at least two forms, both with short horns and both used to the plow, one being tall and lank, the other more compact; and we possess figures of the present Egyptian cattle with long horns bent down and forwards. From Egyptian pictures it is to be inferred that large droves of fine cattle were imported from Abyssinia, and that in the valley of the Nile they were in general stall- fed, used exclusively for the plow, and treated with humanity. There are now fine cattle in Egypt; but the Palestine cattle appear to have deteriorated, in size at least, since Biblical times. “Herds of cattle,” says Schubert (Oriental Christian Spectator, April, 1853), “are seldom to be seen; the bullock of the neighborhood of Jerusalem is small and insignificant; beef and veal are but rare dainties. Yet the bullock thrives better, and is more frequently seen, in the upper valley of the Jordan, also on Mount Tabor and near Nazareth but particularly east of the Jordan on the road from Jacob's-bridge to Damascus.” See also Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 518), who observes that danger from being gored has not ceased “among the half-wild droves that range over the luxuriant pastures in certain parts of the country.” In Palestine the Mosaic law provided with care for the kind treatment of cattle; for in treading out corn — the  Oriental mode of separating the grain from the straw — it was enjoined that the ox should not be muzzled (Deu 25:4), and old cattle that had long served in tillage were often suffered to wander at large till their death — a practice still in vogue, though from a different motive, in India. But the Hebrews and other nations of Syria grazed their domestic stock, particularly those tribes which, residing to the east of the Jordan, had fertile districts for that purpose. Here, of course, the droves became shy and wild; and though we are inclined to apply the passage in Psa 22:12 to wild species, yet old bulls, roaming at large in a land where the lion still abounded, no doubt became fierce and as they would obtain cows from the pastures, there must have been wild breeds in the woods, as fierce and resolute as real wild Uri which ancient name may be a mere modification of Reem. SEE UNICORN.

There was no animal in the rural economy of the Israelites, or indeed in that of the ancient Orientals generally, that was held in higher esteem than the ox; and deservedly so, for the ox was the animal upon whose patient labors depended all the ordinary operations of farming. Ploughing with horses was a thing never thought of in those days. Asses, indeed, were used for this purpose, SEE ASS; but it was the ox upon whom devolved for the most part this important service. The pre-eminent value of the ox to “a nation of husbandmen like the Israelites,” to use an expression of Michaelis in his article on this subject, will be at once evident from the scriptural account of the various uses to which it is applied. Animals of the ox family were used for ploughing (Deu 22:10; 1Sa 14:14; 1Ki 19:19; Job 1:14; Amo 6:12, etc.); for treading out corn (Deu 25:4; Hos 10:11; Mic 4:13; 1Co 9:9; 1Ti 5:18), SEE AGRICULTURE; for draught purposes, when they were generally yoked in pairs (Num 7:3; 1Sa 6:7; 2Sa 6:6); as beasts of burden (1Ch 12:40); their flesh was eaten (Deu 14:4; 1Ki 1:9; 1Ki 4:23; 1Ki 19:21; Isa 22:13; Pro 15:17; Neh 5:18); they were used in the sacrifices, SEE SACRIFICE; they supplied milk, butter, etc. (Deu 32:14; Isa 7:22; 2Sa 17:29). SEE BUTTER; SEE MILK.

The law which prohibited the slaughter of any clean animal, excepting as “an offering unto the Lord before the tabernacle,” during the time that the Israelites abode in the wilderness (Lev 17:1-6), although expressly designed to keep the people from idolatry, no doubt contributed to the  preservation of their oxen and sheep, which they were not allowed to kill excepting in public. There can be little doubt that during the forty years' wanderings oxen and sheep were rarely used as food, whence it was flesh that they so often lusted after. (See Michaelis, Laws of Moses, art. 169.) SEE FLESH.

## Ox (3)[[@Headword:Ox (3)]]

             The ox and the ass are often represented round the cradle of the Nativity, in allusion to Isa 1:3. Beleth says that the lion and ox in front of doors, and a cock or eagle upon the church, were common representations.

## Ox, Wild[[@Headword:Ox, Wild]]

             (תּוֹא תְּאוֹ, teo or te; Sept. ὄρυξ, σευτλίον; Aq., Symm., and Theod., ὄρυξ; Vulg. oryx), is mentioned among the beasts that were to be eaten (Deu 14:5); again, in Isaiah,” they lie at the head of all the streets like a wild bull in the nets.” The most important ancient versions point to the oryx (Oryx leucoryx) as the animal denoted by the Hebrew words. Were it not for the fact that another Hebrew name (yachmur) seems to stand for this animal, we should have no hesitation in referring the teo to the antelope above named. Col. H. Smith suggests that the antelope he calls the Nubian Oryx (Oryx Tao) may be the animal intended; this, however, is probably only a variety of the other. Oedmann (Verm. Samml. p. 4:23) thinks the Bubule (Alcephalus bubalis) may be the tô; this is the Bekker-el-wash of North Africa mentioned by Shaw (Trav. 1, 310, 8vo ed.). SEE ANTELOPE; SEE FALLOW DEER.

## Ox-Goad[[@Headword:Ox-Goad]]

             (מִלְמִד הִבָּקָר; Sept. ἀροτρόπος τῶν βοῶν; Vulg. vomer, Jdg 3:31). SEE GOAD.

## Oxenbridge, John[[@Headword:Oxenbridge, John]]

             a celebrated English Nonconformist, for some time minister in this country, was born at Daventry, England, Jan. 30, 1609. He was educated at Oxford, and also at Cambridge, and at: the last university, he took his degree in 1631. He was tutor of Magdalen Hall, Oxford; but was deprived of this position in 1634, because he refused to give up the, practice of persuading his pupils to subscribe to certain religious articles of his own framing. He  spent the next few years as a missionary in the Bermuda Islands. Through the intervention, of the Long Parliament, he was ape pointed fellow of Eton College in 1642; and was ordained pastor of a church in Beverly in 1644. He afterwards settled at Berwick-on-Tweed, where he was silenced by the Bartholomew act in 1662. Having for some time urged the importance of the new settlements in Dutch Guiana, then under lord Willoughby, as a field of missionary labor, he now himself led the way to Surinam, where he labored for some time diligently and with success. In 1667 he visited Barbadoes, whence in 1669 he proceeded to Boston. He was ordained pastor of the First Church, Boston, in conjunction with the Rev. James Allen, April 10, 1670; and remained there until his death, Dec. 28, 1674. Though Oxenbridge was a very popular preacher, his whole life seems to have been passed in religious controversy. His publications are, A Double Watchword (1661): — A Seasonable Proposition for Propagating the Gospel by Christian Colonies in the Continent of New Guiana (London). The arguments employed by Oxenbridge in this pamphlet are well chosen and ably pursued; but their influence was much weakened by a spirit of intolerant strife: — Election Sermon (1671): — A Sermon on Seasonable Seeking of God. See Anderson, History of the Colonial Church, 2, 245-249; Brown, History of the Propagation of Christianity among the Heathen, 3, 490; Drake, Dictionary of American Biography, s.v.; Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors, s.v.

## Oxendine, Alexander W.[[@Headword:Oxendine, Alexander W.]]

             an American Baptist minister, of Revolutionary fame, was born in South Carolina Aug. 26, 1759. At the outbreak of the colonial struggle he enlisted, and was one of the famous Marion men. After the war he preached for many years, and died at a very advanced age, with sight, hearing, and intellect unimpaired, at Benton's Creek, Phelps County, Mo., Sept. 3, 1869.

## Oxenstiern[[@Headword:Oxenstiern]]

             (a), AXEL GUSTAVSSON, one of the most illustrious statesmen of the 17th century, especially prominent in upholding the cause of the Reformation at a most critical period, was born June 16, 1583, at Fanoe, in the province of Upland, Sweden. He was descended from an ancient highly aristocratic family, distinguished in Swedish history. Early deprived of his father, he received under the direction of his mother an educational training  becoming his rank. As if in preparation for the ministry in the Lutheran Church, which bad already been introduced and established as the state religion by Gustavus Vasa (1523-60), he attended the German universities of Rostock, Wittenberg, and Jena, studying at the same time jurisprudence; but it does not appear that he ever held an ecclesiastical office; yet even in his subsequent career of diplomacy, he always preserved a fondness for theological subjects, and a zealous enthusiasm for the maintenance and propagation of the evangelical doctrines. After having finished his academical course by graduating at Wittenberg, he visited most of the German courts. In 1603 he returned home, and was called into state service by Charles IX (1604-1611). He was sent on several diplomatic missions, in which he showed such tact and skill that the king, verging on the grave, appointed him guardian of the royal family, and placed him with six others at the head of the regency.

It was at Oxenstiern's urgent suggestion, after the death of the king, that the crown prince, though only seventeen years old, was declared of age at Nykoeping (1611), and succeeded to the throne as Gustavus Adolphus. Oxenstiern was selected to act as chancellor of the kingdom, and:in this high office he enjoyed and justified the full confidence and friendship of his sovereign, who leaned on him, as did Henry IV of France on Sully, in all the political conflicts and complications in which his reign from beginning to end was involved, his cool insight and prudence tempering the ardent impulses of the king, and contributing thereby not a little to his glory. It was also by Oxenstiern's influence, assisted by the queen-mother, that Gustavus Adolphus gave up contracting what in those days would have been considered a mesalliance with Ebba Brahe, and married the gentle and beautiful Mary Eleonore, a princess of the house of Brandenburg, which proved a mutually happy- union. In 1613 (Jan. 16), as Swedish plenipotentiary, Oxenstiern signed a treaty of peace with Denmark, to give the country an opportunity, in a measure, to recover from internal and external commotions. In 1614 he accompanied the king to Livonia, and soon had the satisfaction (1617) of terminating hostilities between Russia and Sweden by an honorable treaty at Stobowa. In 1621, after the king had departed for a campaign in Poland, he was despatched with several regiments to occupy and govern certain districts of Prussia, then under the suzerainty of Poland, which the Swedish arms had gained, and he filled this post four years to the advantage of the country. When, in 1628, Austria and the Catholic league attempted to secure the Baltic coast, he negotiated with the duke of Pomerania and the king of Denmark to replace or re-enforce the Danish garrison of Stralsund  by Swedish troops, and thus frustrated all efforts to capture that stronghold, so that Wallenstein, the imperial general, who had boasted that he would take that city even if it were bound by chains to the sky, had to beat an inglorious retreat. He succeeded also, supported by the mediation of England and France, in effecting an armistice for six years with Poland. All these proceedings appear as arrangements preparatory to that grander undertaking of his administration-an expedition into Germany.

The pious and chivalrous king had long meditated, it, and was prevented only by the cautious remonstrance of his minister; but now the measure was determined on, alike from the policy of self-preservation and the moral motive of succoring the sorely oppressed co-religionists who, since 1618, were waging an unequal struggle against the combined forces of Romanism. It is beyond our design here to delineate the origin and progress of the. Thirty-years War (q.v.); we have only to sketch the course pursued by the great chancellor of Sweden. We will state briefly: Gustavus Adolphus landed in July, 1630, on the German coast with 15,000 choice troops, accompanied by his minister. Oxenstiern had put all his energy into the execution of the plan, procuring men, money, and material; and his diplomatic talent had ample scope to overcome the lukewarmness and jealousy of the German Protestant princes. Their united activity restored again the fortunes of Protestantism. Gustavus Adolphus advanced into the heart of Germany as in triumph, defeated Tilly near Leipsic, and fell, Nov. 16, 1632, on the bloody field of Liitzen, Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar finishing the battle victoriously against Wallenstein. The death of the king, well calculated greatly to encourage one and to dismay the other of the contending parties, did not move Oxenstiern to give up the cause as lost, though it added much to his embarrassments and responsibilities.

Here may also be remarked, as a proof of the authority and confidence he enjoyed at home, that when he sent what purported to be the testament of the late king, and drawn up by him, but not signed by the royal hand, it was accepted as binding; and its tenor observed by the Swedish Dict. Oxenstiern was appointed a delegate to Germany with full powers to make any arrangement which he might deem best for the welfare of his country. He immediately exerted himself to increase the number and strength of the armies in-the field, and went to Dresden and Berlin to concert measures for the effectual continuation of the war. In March, 1633, he convened a congress of the German princes at Heilbronn, and by that assembly was declared director of the evangelical alliance. Also Holland and France, from which latter Sweden had been subsidized. with money since Jan. 1, 1631,  he tried to interest and stir up to more energetic assistance. At his re turn to Saxony (1634), finding affairs in the saddest disorder-the confederates vacillating, the soldiers dissatisfied and lost to all discipline, and after the disaster of Noirdlingen almost all despairing, even the elector of Saxony openly gone over to the enemy — his mind, rich in resources even in these perplexing circumstances, discovered ways and means to rescue his party from imminent ruin. This accomplished (1636), he returned to Sweden, whence he had been absent for ten years. Longing for a more quiet sphere of action, he resigned in the first session of the senate he attended his plenipotentiary powers, with the advice never to confide so much power as he had been intrusted with to any one person, lest it might be abused; he retained only his seat as chancellor of the kingdom, and as one of the five guardians of the only child and daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, who was but seven years old at the time of his death. Concerning the latter he proved a faithful Mentor, taking particular pains to give her daily lessons in the science of government and international law, and found in Christina an apt and quickwitted pupil. In this connection may be mentioned the proposal of Richelieu — who wished to render him more pliable for his own ends, and promised him all the French influence — to transfer the crown of Sweden by a marriage of one of Oxenstiern's sons with the royal heiress into his own family.

The Swedish chancellor resisted the alluring temptation and declined the offer. Meanwhile the politico-religious contest in Germany was maintained on the part of Sweden by the generals Horn, Baner, and Torstenson with varying success. In 1645 he sent his son John there to watch more closely the interests of Sweden, and assist in bringing about a satisfactory settlement. Neither party gave up until both were nearly exhausted. After protracted negotiations at Munster and Osnsabriick, they agreed to what is styled the Peace of Westphalia (q.v.), which, besides other political changes, established the principle of at least partial tolerance in religious matters (signed Oct. 24, 1648). Sweden, universally and uniformly Lutheran, received as indemnity five millions of thalers, a part of Pomerania, Bremen, Verden, and Wismar. In 1643 Oxenstiern secretly organized a war with Denmark, which had subjected Sweden to long-standing humiliations, and by skilful management obtained the advantage of his adversary, In the negotiations necessitated in consequence, Oxepstiern, who attended them personally, extorted in the peace of Bromsebro the most favorable terms, ending with an increase of territory. Christina, who since December, 1644, had become queen of Sweden, acknowledged his services by raising him to the rank of a count  (of Sodermark), and the University of Upsala elected him its chancellor. Engrossed as he was with the business of foreign relations, he was by no means unmindful of domestic affairs and home rule. In 1634 be submitted to the Swedish Dict a constitution, which was considered a masterpiece of statesmanship, and was gladly accepted. He abolished many oppressive taxes, urged economy in administration, favored and fostered all kinds of industry, and caused canals to be constructed, in order to facilitate intercourse in the interior and commerce with other nations. Nor was he backward in providing for the moral and intellectual advancement of the people; he was instrumental in founding the universities of Abo and Dorpat, and many new schools and academies, five of which he established out of his own purse. The last years of his life were much embittered by the conduct of the young queen, who, endowed with high intelligence and knowledge, might have shone a star of the first magnitude in the north of Europe; but, disregarding older and wiser counsels, under the influence of unworthy favorites she indulged sin passions and caprices that created general discontent. Yet when made aware of the public sentiment she decided to resign, and nominated her cousin her successor (1649).

Oxenstiern, averse to a foreigner as sovereign, remonstrated most strenuously against such a step as unworthy of her talents, and fraught with evils for the country. She for the time desisted, underwent in 1650 coronation, and for a while manifested more proper attention to governmental affairs, but soon relapsed into her former ways, and, impatient of the restraint imposed upon her as the head of a moral and sensitive, nation, carried out her resolution, and in 1654, in a diet purposely convoked, laid down the royal insignia to confer them on her cousin, Charles Gustavus, prince palatine. Oxenstiern, under the pretext of sickness, kept away from the deliberations necessary for the execution of this measure. He died in the same year (Aug. 28, 1654). Christina, not altogether too well affected towards him, bears this testimony to his character: He had great capacity and knowledge of secular affairs and interests; he knew the strong and weak points of all the European states. He was possessed of consummate wisdom and prudence, had a vast capacity and a great heart. State affairs were for him amusement. He was ambitious, but loyal and incorruptible.” He was certainly the greatest politician and statesman which Sweden has produced. An extraordinary sagacity and immovable calmness characterized all his decisions, and energy and perseverance their execution. Nothing was deferred to the following day, and still less forgotten, and his activity never tired. His  faculties in this respect border on the marvellous. On all important affairs his activity, his will, his loyalty is impressed.

There is not a single branch of the Swedish government which does not owe to him improvements. His vast activity would have been impossible without strict gravity and order; which he exacted of others as well as of himself. His good health and equanimity served to lighten the burden of work and care. He was unusually unselfish and disinterested; he never used his influence, extensive as it was, to amass property by perverse means; on the contrary, he repeatedly advanced considerable sums for public .purposes without interest. Frugal in his household, he was for display and luxury where he acted as representative of the state. As a negotiator he ranked with the highest diplomats of the period, even Richelieu not excepted. Cool, reserved, fully acquainted with human character, penetrating to the smallest details of the situation, he conducted affairs with a sure glance; only his haughtiness, which was sometimes excessive, damaged him now and then. His bearing was imposing, though his stature was only a little above middle height. As a diversion and refreshment from his serious practical occupation, he read Greek and Latin classics, in which latter tongue he- could fluently converse; and perused the Bible and the fathers of the Church. His letters to Grotius allow us to form an opinion of his vast erudition; often in his despatches to the king he would attach long treatises on the subjects under consideration. There are, however, few of his writings published. He is known as the author of the second volume of Chemnitz's Historia belli Sueco Germanici; and his correspondence with his son John (1642-1649) has been edited by Gjorwell; but there remain in the royal archives of Stockholm six vols. fol. of letters written by him from 1626 to 1632; and in Ridderstolpe and Falkenberg a still larger number of documents of his hand are preserved. See Geier, Svenska Folket's Historia; Schiller, Geschichte des dreissigjahrigen Kriegses; Lundblad, Svensk Plutarch (Stockholm,. 1824, 2 vols.); Coxe, House of Austria; Gardner, Thirty-years War (N. Y. 1874, 12mo), p. 145-148, 166, 172, 174, 192.

## Oxford Tracts[[@Headword:Oxford Tracts]]

             a term applied to certain writings of a clerical party in the Church of England which began to form itself at the University of Oxford in 1833, and which has grown into what is now known as Anglo Catholicism, Sacramentarianism, or. Ritualism.

History. — A conference of certain Anglican theologians, held in July, 1833, laid the foundation of this movement. But this conference was occasioned by preceding events. The state of the English Church in the 18th century was deplorable — a proud, lifeless skeleton. The Wesleyan revival, meeting little sympathy within, had to grow up outside of the Church. Only towards the close of that century did the evangelical spirit find place, and form to itself a party, inside of the Church. This party was intent on practical Christian life rather than on guarding the strict formulae of orthodoxy. Hence it tended to liberalism, both in Church and in state. The political liberalism culminated in reform, particularly in the abolition of the Test Act, in 1828. Parliament was thus opened both to Dissenters and to Catholics. Church reform was now undertaken. The popular voice called for an “adaptation” of the Church to the spirit of the age. Violence occurred at some points. At Bristol the populace burned down the episcopal palace. In 1833 one half of the bishoprics of Ireland were abolished. The very existence of the Church of England seemed to be in danger. It was at this point that the Tractarian party organized itself in order to oppose both the assaults of politics and the inroads of evangelicalism. It was members of the University of Oxford who inaugurated this movement. Oxford, as opposed to Cambridge, the seat of the evangelical party, had remained, to some extent, true to its High- Church reactionary traditions. It was here that the clerical spirit of the past had had its intensest seat. Here the Romanizing tendency of Laud had never entirely died out. Oriel College became the nursery of the new  tendency, notwithstanding that a few years previously it had been the seat of a very liberal scientific spirit.

To this college now belonged several very gifted young men; among them, John Keble, after 1831 professor of poetry, and author of the much-admired Christian Year; Edward Bouverie Pusey, since 1828 canon of Christ Church and professor of Hebrew; John Henry Newman, fellow and tutor in Oriel; and R. H. Froude. With these co-operated A. P. Perceval, rector at East Horsley. Froude and Perceval first gave form to the movement. Perceval appeared in 1828 in a book — A Christian Peace Offering — aiming to allay the prejudices of the Anglicans against the Romanists. He argues that the differences between Anglicans and Romanists are not essential, and that the Roman is a true branch of the one Catholic Church. The debate as to the sacrament is mostly a battle of words. The two churches hold equally to the real presence; but the Roman errs in undertaking to explain the mode of this presence. The mode should be left to private .judgment; but the laity should have the communion in both kinds. As to the mass, the English articles only deny that at each celebration of the Eucharist Christ suffers afresh the tortures of the cross; but that is not the real sense of the Romish doctrine. It speaks only of an unbloody offering, and holds that, in some sense, the Eucharist is a sacrifice. Petitions to angels and to saints, and prayer for the dead, as also the veneration of relics, are per se harmless, but easily lead to misuse; hence their restriction or prohibition is justifiable. Purgatory, though not based on Scripture nor taught by the early fathers, is not to be condemned. Auriicular confession and indulgences are ancient customs, whose loss the Anglican Church regrets. Though not a complete substitute for the strict discipline of the primitive Church, they are much preferable to the lack of discipline which disgraces the English Church. As to justification, the Romish Church teaches not that man is justified by works alone, but only that none is justified by works that are done without grace through Christ.

Both the Romish and the Protestant churches teach that the sins of him who repents are forgiven through Christ; hence on this point they do not essentially differ. But works of supererogation (they are not mentioned by the Council of Trent) are to be rejected. The Church is infallible thus far, that whatever objective error she may temporarily formulate, yet the people who faithfully follow her decisions infallibly attain to salvation. The significance of this doctrine is as a safeguard against promiscuous rationalism. A limitation of private judgment is to be preferred to such danger. Every branch of the true Church is superior to rulers in spiritual things; but the temporal claims of the pope are illegitimate. As thus viewed  by Perceval, the Romish errors are mere excrescences which can readily be thrown off without seriously affecting the Church. The English Church is simply a branch of this Church in temporary schism. He looks for a reunion. But he is all the more severe against Dissenters. What error of Romanism is half so serious as the breaking up of the unity of the Church by the Independents, the rejection of infant baptism by Baptists? And what are all possible papal errors in comparison with the horrible, godless doctrine of a Decretum absolutum! But Froude, an earnest, logical, ascetically pious and very gifted young man, went even farther than Perceval. At first inclined to rationalism, he came finally to the view that while reason is able to judge and compare given ideas, it is dependent on the Church for the ideas themselves. But where is the Church? An examination of the formation of the English Church convinced him that it was far from being the sole true Church. Its founders had been governed too much by arbitrary caprice in their so-called reform of the old Church. The true criterion of the Church is the ancient rule: “Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.” The Church of the first centuries alone is true to this rule. From it there is no dissent.

To it must all modern churches go back, for doctrine, for rites, and for constitution. At first Froude hoped for reconciliation with the Romish Church; but a visit to Rome convinced him that it had fallen far from the primitive pattern. So was it largely also with the actual Anglican Church. The reformers of this Church had given up the divine right of the Church, had substituted preaching in the place of the sacraments as a means of grace, had eliminated the essential sacrificial element from the Eucharist; in a word, had retained only the merest crumbs of the apostolic preaching. But he found comfort in the assumption that the formulae of the Anglican Church are capable of being construed into the sense of the true primitive Church. Accordingly he insisted on celibacy, fasting, retirement from the world, and veneration for sacred things and places. He also looked on the revival of monkish orders as the best means of Christianizing the masses. In one respect he differed from most Ritualists. He insisted on the entire separation of the Church from state control. The friends of Froude at first went not so far as he in their disavowal of the Reformation. The Anglican Church had indeed been badly maimed by the Reformers; but, after all, it was the truest of all the severed branches, and, by proper culture, might yet be made to bear the good fruit of the original stock. But they saw in Froude's ideal primitive Church the sole goal of all their efforts, and in submission to Church discipline the sole remedy for rationalism.  While this little circle of devout ascetics was forming itself and shaping its ideal, the spirit of reform in the political world was moving in the opposite direction. The inherent rights of the bishops were in danger of being undermined. The Tractarians determined to stand in the breach. Their first endeavor was to indoctrinate the laity as to the inalienable rights of the Church as such. Three points were made prominent: The idea of the Church; the importance of the sacraments; the significance of the priestly office.

These points were developed in popular catechetical form, and published under the title The Churchman's Manual in 1833. While this was in preparation Parliament abolished ten of the Irish bishoprics. This gave impulse to a conference at Hadleigh, July 25-29, of Hugh Rose, Froude, Keble, Newman, and Perceval, in view of a revision of the Manual. and of concerted action in defence of the Church. The action agreed upon was directed to two points — to develop the significance of apostolical succession, which had been ruthlessly ignored in the abolition of the Irish bishoprics, and to defend the orthodox interpretation of the Prayer-book against the Socinian views which the action of Parliament implied. In September Keble prepared a programme of action for the party, stating the doctrinal reforms they aimed at, and the means agreed upon to effect the end. The Churchman's Manual may be regarded as a sort of confession of faith of the party. It was sent to all the Scottish bishops, and was warmly welcomed by them and others. The archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley) refused it his official sanction, but did not object to its publication. This Manual is “the first tract put forth to meet the exigencies of the times.” Upon it followed ninety other small treatises, under the general title “Tracts for the Times.” Hence the name of the party — Tractarians.

The Tracts (1833-1841). — Though the tracts were the chief missionary agency of the party, their views found also expression in poetry, tales, review articles, and sermons. Keble and Newman wrote the most of the tracts. Pusey wrote several of the most important. The first tract proper appeared Sept. 9 1833; by November, 1835, seventy had appeared, making two volumes. Most of them were original essays, though some were extracts from earlier writers. The later tracts were more lengthy and thorough, the last twenty making four volumes. At first these tracts were almost universally welcomed. They carefully respected the Prayer-book, and defended the rights of the clergy. They were an opportune ally of the establishment in a time of danger. They raised to fresh life the old High Church party, and vigorously assailed evangelicals and dissenters. But the  evangelical Church party soon became alarmed. The Christian Observer, in March, 1834, charged the Tractarians with being Romanists. Newman resented the charge in his Via media (tracts 38, 41), arguing that not his party, but the opposers had fallen away from the idea of the primitive Church, and declaring that the Thirty-nine Articles needed to be supplemented by a protest against Erasmianism and latitudinarianism, and by an additional article on the sacrediless of the priesthood. In 1836 the Tractarians involved themselves in a violent personal strife. Dr. Hampden, a Broad Churchman, was nominated by the crown to a professorship of moral philosophy at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. The Tractarians used petitions and all other practicable means to prevent the confirmation. Dr. Thomas Arnold sprang to the help of Hampden in the Edinburgh Review (April, 1836). It was the signal to a general attack. The Tractarian movement became the order of the day.

Though defeated in the Hampden matter, they lost none of their courage nor zeal. In 1838 they began a series of translations from the fathers, entitled “A Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the Division of the East and West.” The Bible is the foundation of the apostolical doctrine, but the fathers are the channel through which it has come down to us — so says the Preface. In 1837, and later, some of the tracts showed a marked advance towards Rome. Rev. Isaac Williams, in tract 80, enjoined “reserve” in the communication of religious truths. It was an effort to revive the Romish Disciplina arcani; it discountenanced the preaching of all doctrines to the general public, as also the promiscuous distribution of the Bible. This and similar tracts excited general dismay. It was in vain that Pusey, in a letter to the bishop of Oxford, attempted to deny the Romanizing tendency. Keble wrote tracts in the same vein as Williams. The Tractarians in general had taught their followers to look indulgently on the errors of Rome, and to bewail the Reformation as a blunder. What wonder, then, that certain young enthusiasts were on the point of actually going over to Rome? To prevent this consummation Newman wrote the 90th tract. It was a most ingenious piece of sophistry, the point of which was to make it easy for the conscience to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and yet hold firmly all the essentials of Romanism. No other essay from the whole school made such a sensation as this. The Thirty-nine Articles had always been looked upon as a breastwork against all the errors of popery. This breastwork was now riddled through and through, and a free way opened for the influx of the whole host of papal errors. Shortly after the appearance of tract 90 Oxford became alarmed. A session of the university authorities declared  that the tracts were in no wise officially sanctioned by the university, and that a subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles in the sense taught in tract 90 was utterly contrary to the' spirit of subscription. Also the bishop of Oxford (hitherto friendly to the party) sent a message to Newman, censuring the tract in question, and forbidding their further publication. Other prelates joined in the condemnation. Newman yielded; and the tracts ceased to appear. A host of hostile writings was now set afloat. The evangelical party saw all its fears realized: the Tractarians were at the threshold of Rome.

The Perverts. — It seemed a heavy stroke for the Tractarians that their tracts were now prohibited, and that most of the prelates had turned against them. But this very crisis was a help to their cause; it occasioned a sifting of the party, throwing out the half-hearted elements, and drawing the genuine Anglo-Catholics into closer ranks. The general drift of the school disapproved of Newman's crypto-Romanism. Perceval, in 1842, in a book, A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement, etc., divided the Tractarian doctrines into two classes: the common teaching, and the private views of certain individuals. The first class embraced four points: apostolic succession, baptismal regeneration, the eucharistic sacrifice, and the infallibility of councils called according to the canons of 1571. To the second class belonged five opinions: turning towards the east in prayer, the purification of souls in the middle state, Pusey's view of sin after baptism, Williams's reservatio, and Keble's notion of mystical interpretation of Scripture. The first four points constituted the golden centre of the Tractarian school. Pusey and Keble diverged slightly towards Rome; and farther still stood Newman, W. G. Ward, and many younger disciples. When, now, the official condemnation of Newman's tract 90 tended to drive the extremists back towards the centre, some had already gone too far to regain their equilibrium. In a sermon in May, 1843, Pusey taught transubstantiation so clearly that the authorities suspended his preaching for two years. Soon thereafter his assistant teacher in Hebrew, Seager, went over to Rome. The next important case was Ward. He had taught in the British Critic, a quarterly that went down in 1843, and in the Ideal of a Christian Church, 1844, the most offensive Romish views — Mariolatry and mental reservation in subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles. A ‘“convocation” at Oxford degraded him from his university rights, and expelled him. In September, 1845, he went over to Rome. Newman thereupon clearly saw that a mid-position  between Anglicanism and Rome was no longer practicable. lie resigned his position, and followed Ward. Newman's act was the signal for a host. Oakley, fellow of Baliol, and priest of St. Margaret's, London, followed. Other perverts were: Collyns, chief pastor at St. Mary's, Oxford; the poet F. W. Faber, rector of Elton;. Thompson, pastor of St. Marylebone; Gordon, priest of Christ Church, Regent's Park. By December, 1846, not less than 150 clergymen and eminent laymen had become Romanists.

It was not merely doctrines, however, but rites also that caused trouble. Several Romish usages were silently and gradually introduced into many churches. These things alarmed the public. The press resounded the cry, “No Popery!” Counteractive societies were formed. An incident gave impulse to a general attack. One Gorham was nominated to a parish in the diocese of Exeter. The High-Church bishop, Dr. Philpotts, opposed his appointment on the ground that he denied baptismal regeneration. After manifold protests and appeals, Gorham's views were justified by the highest tribunal. This spread consternation among the AngloCatholics. The Church, said they, is surrendered to heresy, and that too by a court of laymen. How can she longer be a guardian of orthodoxy! It was now feared that the Sacramentarians would in a body go over to Rome. But the bishops of Exeter and Oxford exhorted to patience and hope. This, however, came too late for some: Palmer, a chief Tractarian, had sought. communion with the Greek Church; Maskell, priest in Exeter, had come to the conviction that, with the exception of the Trinity, the English Church had not a single settled doctrine; Dr. Townsend, of Durham, had sought audience with the pope, and prayed for the call of a council. Others, in deeper despair. had set out to colonize New Zealand, in hope of there realizing their Church ideal. While this agitation was in progress, England was awakened and astonished by the news, in October, 1850, that the pope had raised Dr. Wiseman to the dignity of cardinal and archbishop of Westminster, and distributed England into twelve bishoprics. Nothing, however, but regrets and disapproval were possible. The pope had acted uncanonically, said the Tractarians, since England possesses already a sufficiency of Catholic bishops. But this papal action was severely felt by the Tractarian party: it rendered the Romish Church more inviting and aristocratic, and attracted many of their members into its bosom, especially from the higher classes. By Christmas, 1852, no less than 200 clergymen and more than as many laymen had gone over to the Romish communion. The assumptions of Romanism and the political agitation combined to  check the extreme High-Church bishops in their patronage of innovations. The bishops of Exeter, of Oxford, of Bath-Wells, and the archbishop of Canterbury, assumed a more conservative position, protested against the arrogance of Rome, and counselled their clergy to beware of giving deeper offence. But these counsels were poorly heeded. The leaven of sacramentarianism had been too widely sown. It continued to work, and silently to gain ground. Romanizing ritualism more or less pronounced spread far and wide. Auricular confession was introduced in some parishes. In a few cases priests were silenced for indulging in it. This feature is very distasteful to the English sense of personal honor, and has contributed largely to moderate the Tractarian advance. By the end of the year 1862 the whole number of clergymen who had gone over to Rome amounted to about 300.

Tractarian Doctrine. — The basal principle of the system is salvation through the sacraments. The formal principle is the exclusive authority of the visible Church. But what of the Protestant principle of justification by faith? Faith, so teaches Pusey, does not justify, but simply brings us to God, who freely justifies us by grace. In this faith lie- other elements, as repentance, hatred of sin, hope of forgiveness. It is the repentant, humble, earnest faith that justifies; and this. faith is wrought in us by God. Justification implies two acts on the part of God: the declaring of the soul just, and the making of it what it is declared to be; The first is an actus Dei forensis, the second a justitia infesa. This double act is essentially but one. God imputes not to us righteousness, but imparts it. In baptism, righteousness is given in germ. It grows by the use of the means of grace. We are justified before works; but works are germinally involved in faith. God rewards each according to his works; hence works stand in relation to the reward of grace. According to this view justification is essentially a habitus infusus, and faith is the grace-life produced by the justitia infusa. This is essentially the Romish view, save that works are not regarded as meritorious, but only as a manifestation of the inner faith. Faith, as appropriating God's grace, has no place in this view; all depends upon a mystical infusion of the divine life. Baptism regenerates, that is, the regularly administered rite is the means through which God works regeneration. In the Eucharist the bread and wine become really, but Iwr a spiritual manner, the body and blood of Christ; and Christ, as so present, imparts himself to the believer as spiritual food, unto salvation. The consecrated elements are not Christ, but Christ is present in them. The  Tractarians adore not the consecrated bread and wine, but Christ as specially present in them. The Church, as the organic body founded by Christ, and perpetuated by apostolic succession, is the sole mediator of grace, inasmuch as she alone can validly administer the sacraments. The Church is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. But the attributes of unity and sanctity may suffer eclipse in times of schism and misfortune. The Church, as an organism derived by direct succession from Christ, is supreme authority in spiritual matters. Her helps are the Scriptures as interpreted by patristic tradition. But as both Bible and tradition admit of different interpretations, hence it is ultimately to the autonomy of the Church that the believer must look for infallible guidance. The grace and truth that were in Christ passed over to the apostles, and thence to the bishops. The unity of the bishops finds expression in general councils; and the embodiment of the councils lies in the recognised primacy of the successor of Peter. Thus tractarianism, when followed out, leads to Rome. As a school of, theology, tractarianism is a revived scholasticism. It is purely realistic and unspeculative. Truth is to be sought for not by processes of thought, but by consulting authorities. It is objectively existent, and needs only to be looked for. As a form of Church life, tractarianism is esthetic, earnest, active, contemplative, constructive. Regarding itself as the visible manifestation of a divine institution, it lays great stress on the outward form of the Church life upon architecture, ceremonies, manners, and daily conduct. With all its narrowness and errors, it has infused an entirely new spiritual life into what was once the very staid, cold life of the High-Church party in the Church of England. It has also in the same way affected the Protestant Episcopal Church in America.

Quite recently the ritual innovations of the Tractarians have been repeatedly opposed by legal prosecution. The points involved are the eastward posture of the celebrant of the Eucharist, lights on the altar, incense, the mixed chalice, and unleavened bread (wafer). A case in 1867 against Westerton failed. Cases in 1868 and 1869 against Mackonochie and Purchas led to little result. The case against Bennett for the most extreme ritualistic practices resulted in Bennett's favor. This decision of the Court of Arches was appealed by the judicial committee to the Privy Council; but in 1872 the Privy Council dismissed the appeal. Other later attempts of the same nature have also failed of result. So at present the ritualists have pretty nearly' all the liberty of action they could desire.  See Tracts of the Times (1834); Froude, Remains (1838); Perceval, Christian Peace Offering (1828), and his Collection of Papers (1842); Wiseman, High-Church Claims (i841); Weaver, View of Puseyismn (1843); Dublin Review, Sept. 1843; Quart. Review, May, 1843; Palmer, Narrative (1843); Newman. Essay on Miracles (1843); Ward, Ideal (1844); Bishop M'Ilvaine, Oxford Divinity (1841); Gladstone, Church Principles (1840); Alexander, Anglo-Catholicism (1843); Taylor, Ancient Christianity (1844); Goode, Rule of Faith; many articles in the Edinburgh Review after 1843; Herzog, Real Encyklop. art. Tractarianismus; Lond. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1874, art. 8; Pye-Smith, Introd. to Theol. (see Index), Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Brit. and For. Rev. (1844), p. 528 sq. Buchanan, Justf; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 424.

## Oxford, Councils of[[@Headword:Oxford, Councils of]]

             (CONCILIA OXONIENSIA), were frequently held in the Middle Ages. Of these the most important are:

(1) Convened in 1160, in which more than thirty Vaudois or Publicani, who had lately come over into England, headed by one Gerard, and who  denied baptism, the Eucharist, and marriage, and who set at naught the authority of the Church, were condemned, and given over to the secular arm, upon which they were sentenced to be branded in the forehead, and publicly flogged out of the city, and were forbidden to remain in that neighborhood. They appear to have made but one convert, a woman, who soon returned into the Church. See Labbe, Comm. 10:1404; Wilkins, Conc. i, 438.

(2) King John, on his return from abroad, assembled a large number of his clergy and barons. first at London, and subsequently at Oxford, demanding a certain portion of the ecclesiastical revenues, but this was unanimously. refused (Wilkins, Conc. i, 515).

(3) Was held at the monastery of Osney, near Oxford, on the 11th of June, by Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury and cardinal legate, who presided. This was a council of all England, and fifty canons were published in conformity with those of the Council of Lateran of 1215:

1. Excommunicates generally all who encroach upon the rights of the Church, disturb the public peace, etc.

2. Directs that bishops shall retain about them wise and charitable almoners, and attend to the petitions of the poor; that they shall also at times themselves hear and make confessions; that they shall reside at their cathedrals, etc.

3. Forbids bishops, archdeacons, and deans to take anything for collations or institutions to benefices.

6. Orders the celebration of the nocturnal and diurnal office, and of all the sacraments, especially those of baptism and of the altar.

7. Forbids priests to say mass more than once in the same day, except at Christmas and Easter, and when there was a corpse to be buried.

10. Orders curates to preach often, and to attend to the sick.

11. Directs that the ornaments and vessels of the church be properly kept, and that in every church there shall be a silver chalice and a clean white linen cloth for, the altar; also that old corporals be burned, etc.

12. Forbids any one to resign his benefice, retaining the vicarage, to prevent suspicion of unlawful bargain.

13. Forbids to divide benefices in order to provide for several persons.

15. Orders churches not worth more than five marks a year to be given to none but such as will reside and minister in them.

16. Assigns to the perpetual vicar a stipend not less than five marks, except in Wales, “where vicars are content with less by reason of the poverty of the churches.” Orders that the diocesan shall decide whether the parson or vicar shall bear the charges of the church.

17. Orders that in large parishes there shall be two or three priests.

18. Directs that the bishop shall make the person presented to a living take an oath that he has neither given nor promised anything to the patron.

19. Provides that in each archdeaconry confessors shall be appointed for the rural deans and others of the clergy who may be unwilling to confess to the bishop.

20. Takes from the rural. deans the cognizance of matrimonial causes.

21. Forbids, under anathema, to harbor thieves, etc.

22 and 23. Relate to archidiaconal visitations. Forbid those dignitaries to burden the clergy whom they visit with many horses, to invite strangers to the procurations provided for them, or to, extort procurations without reasonable cause.

24. Forbids to let out to farm archdeaconries, deaneries, etc.

25. Orders the archdeacons to take care in their visitations that .the canon of the mass be correct; that the priest can rightly pronounce the words of the canon and of baptism; that laymen be taught how to baptize rightly in case of necessity; and that the host, chrism, and holy oil be kept under lock and key, etc.

26. Forbids bishops, archdeacons, and their officers to pass sentence without first giving the canonical monitions.

27. Forbids to exact any fee for burials and the administration of the holy sacraments.

30. Orders ecclesiastics to wear decent habits with close copes, to observe the tonsure, to keep their hair cut short, and to abstain from immoderate eating and drinking.

31. Forbids clergymen in holy orders publicly to keep concubines.

34. Forbids the clergy to spend their ecclesiastical revenues in building houses on lay fees for their sons, nephews, or concubines.

36. Forbids the nuns to wear veils of silk, to use pins of silver and gold, and to wear girdles worked and embroidered, and long trains.

41. Forbids to give to a person already provided with a benefice, having cure of souls, any revenue out of another church.

42 and 43. Order monks to live in common, and forbid them to receive any one into their community under eighteen years of age.

44. Orders monks to give away to the poor what remains of their repasts.

45. Forbids monks to make. wills.

47. Forbids monks and canons regular to eat and drink save at the: appointed hours; permits them to quench their thirst in the refectory, but not to indulge.

In the Oxford copy of these constitutions two others are added relating to the Jews. See Johnson, Eccl. Canons; Conc. 11:270; Wilkins, Conc. i, 585.

(4) Convened in 1322, by Walter Reynolds, archbishop of Canterbury, in which ten constitutions were published:

1. Relates to the conferring of holy orders. Directs that all- candidates shall be examined previously; enumerates those cases in which holy orders shall be refused. Also forbids to admit clerks ordained in Ireland, Wales, and Scotland to officiate without letters dismissory or commendatory from their ordinaries. Orders that monks shall be ordained by their own diocesan.

2. Directs priests to exhort their people to be confirmed, and adults to confess before confirmation. Orders that children on the third day after confirmation be carried to church, that their foreheads may be washed in the baptistery by the priest's hand, in honor of the chrism. Prescribes caution against children receiving confirmation twice.

3. Relates to extreme unction, and appeals to St. James (Jam 5:14-15) in proof of its necessity.

4. Orders rectors and priests to be careful of their altars, to keep the holy Eucharist in a clean pyx of silver or ivory, or other befitting material, to renew the consecrated host weekly, to carry it to the sick with reverence, a light going before, etc.

5. Orders that the linen furniture of the altar be kept whole and clean, that the words of the canon be fully and exactly pronounced, and with the greatest devotion. Forbids a priest to celebrate mass till he has finished 7matins, prime, and undern. Directs that two candles, or one at least, be lighted at high mass.

6. Relates to the duty of archdeacons in visitation.

7. Relates to marriage.

8. Relates to penance. Orders the priest to consider carefully the particular circumstances of each sin, to receive confessions, especially those of women, in some open place; to consult the bishop, or some discreet men, in doubtful cases, and to be careful not to make the penitents implicate other persons by name in their confessions.

9. Forbids a priest in a state of mortal sin to celebrate before confession. Forbids to reveal confession in any way, directly or indirectly; orders that a priest convicted of doing so shall be degraded without hope of reconciliation.

10. Orders the appointment of a fit priest in every deanery to receive the confession of the clergy.

See Johnson, Eccl. Canons; Wilkids, Conc. i, 512.

(5) Held in 1408, by Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, against the Lollards. Ten constitutions Were published at this council, and sanctioned in one held afterwards in London:

1. Forbids any one to preach without being first examined and allowed by the diocesan. Also forbids men suspended for preaching erroneous doctrine to preach within the province until they be restored by the ordinary who suspended them. Sentences all violators of this statute to excommunication. Declares that any preacher who shall a second time, in  any way, intimate that the Church has not power to make such ordinances by her prelates shall be sentenced to excommunication; and all Christian people forbidden to hold any communication with him under pain of excommunication. Further declares that when lawfully convicted of so doing, such offenders shall be declared heretics by the ordinary, and incur all the penalties of heresy, and their aiders and abettors also, unless they desist within a month from the date of their admonition.

2. Forbids the clergy aid people of any parish to allow any one to preach unless full assurance be first given of his being authorized, privileged, or sent according to the form specified in Constitution I. Orders that the church, churchyard, or other place where unauthorized preachers hive been pernitted to hold forth, shall be put under an interdict. Orders, further, that authorized preachers shall suit their discourses to the circumstances-of their hearers.

3. Excommunicates, ipso facto, all who preach or say anything contrary to the teaching of the Church concerning the sacraments, or any point of faith; declares that such offenders shall not be absolved (except at the point of death), unless they abjure their errors and do penance. Orders that persons who do so a second time shall be formally denounced as heretics, and subject to confiscation of their goods. With regard to the penance to be performed, it is declared that the offender shall expressly recant the things he has preached, taught, or affirmed in the parish church in which he did so, upon some one or more Lord's-days or holy days at high mass.

4. Forbids, schoolmasters and other teachers to instruct their pupils in the sacraments and other theological points contrary to the determination of the Church, and enjoins them not to permit their scholars to dispute publicly or privately upon such subjects.

5. Forbids to read any book composed by John Wickliffe, or any other in his time or since, in any schools, halls, inns, or other places whatsoever within the province, unless it have been first examined and unanimously approved by the universities of Oxford or Cambridge.

6. Declares, upon the authority of St. Jerome, that the translation of the text of holy Scripture is a dangerous thing, because it is not easy to make the sense in all respects the same; enacts that no one shall henceforth, by his own authority, translate any text of Scripture into English; and that no  part of any such book or treatise lately composed in the time of John Wickliffe shall be read in public or private, under pain of excommunication.

7. Forbids any one, under pain of being publicly denounced excommunicate, to propose or assert any propositions which carry a sound contrary to the Catholic faith or good morals.

8. Forbids all disputing, either in public or private, concerning things determined by the Church, unless it be in order to get at the true meaning. Forbids, also, to call in question the authority of Church decisions, or to preach anything contrary to them, especially concerning the adoration of the cross, the veneration of the images of the saints, and pilgrimages to holy places and relics, or against taking oaths in judicial matters. Orders all preachers to encourage these things, as fell as processions, genuflections, bowinegs, incensings, kissings, olhations, pilgrimages, illuminations, and the making of oaths in a lawful manner by touching God's holy Gospels. Offenders to incur the penalty of heresy.

9. Orders that none be admitted to serve as chaplain in any diocese within the province who was not born or ordained there, unless he bring with him letters from his diocesan.

10. Declares the University of Oxford to be infected with new unprofitable doctrines, and blemished with the new damnable brand of Lollardy, to the great scandal of the university at home and abroad, and to the seemingly irreparable injury of the Church of England, which used to be defended by her virtue and learning; that therefore, upon the petition of the proctors of the whole clergy of the province, and with the consent of all the prelates present in the convocation, it is enacted that every head of a college or hall in the university shall, at least once a month, make diligent inquiry whether any scholar or inhabitant hath asserted or held any position carrying a sound contrary to the Catholic faith and sound morals; and if he find any such, that he shall effectually admonish him; and that any such person so admonished advancing the same proposition shall be ipso facto excommunicated and otherwise punished. Orders that if the offender be a scholar, he shall be disqualified for his degree; if a doctor, M.A., or B.A., he shall be suspended from all scholastic acts, lose all his rights in his college, and be actually expelled, and a Catholic put into his place. Declares that if any head of a house shall neglect, within ten days after the publication of these constitutions, to execute the above regulations against any offender in their college, he shall himself be ipso facto  excommunicated and deprived of his office, and the college considered to be void, and a new head appointed. Enacts the same penalties against a head of a college suspected of heresy, who, after admonition from the ordinary, does not reform; and, further, declares him to be for three years incapable of holding any benefice within the province. Lastly, it treats of the manner of proceeding against suspected persons.

See Johnson, Eccles. Canons; Labbe, Conc. 11, 2089; Wilkins, Conc. iii, 314.

## Oxlee, John[[@Headword:Oxlee, John]]

             a distinguished English divine, was born at Gisborough, in Cleveland, Sept. 25, 1779. In 1802, owing to his knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages, he was selected as second master of Tunbridge Grammar School by the eminent Dr. Vicesimus Knox, its first master. There Oxlee's Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac studies were begun. From 1816 to 1826 he held the rectory of Scawton, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, for the Rev. Thomas Worsley, afterwards master of Downing. In 1836 the archbishop of York presented him to the rectory of Molesworth, Hunts. He died Jan. 30,1854. Mr. Oxlee, though self-taught, became master of more than 120 languages or dialects, the last being the Yuroba. He wrote The Christian Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation (Lond. 1850, 3 vols. 8vo): — Three Sermons on the Christian Hierarchy, deducing an uninterrupted Triple List of Bishops, etc.: — Three Letters to the Archbishop of Cashel on the Apocryphal Books of Enoch, etc.: — Three Letters to Mr. C. Wellbeloved: on Unitarian Error: — Three Letters to the Rev. F. Nolan, and Two Letters to the Bishop of Salisbury, on the Spurious Text of the Heavenly Witnesses: A Reply to the Rev. R. Towers, the Roman Catholic Head of Ampleforth College, near York: — Three Letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the Impropriety of requiring Jews to forsake the Law of Moses. etc.: — Three more Letters on the Inutility of any Attempt to Convert the Jews to the Christi in Faith in the Manner hitherto practiced, with a Confutation of the Diabolarchy. He was also a contributor to Valpy's Classical Journal; the Christian Remembrancer for 1822; the Voice of Israel; the Voice of Jacob; Jewish Chronicle; but more particularly of seven letters addressed to S. M., the Jew, occupying 110  pages in The Jewish Repository. In his work on The Christian Doctrines, etc., the mass of learning is astonishing; through more than 1000 pages we are presented with correct extracts from early and late Jewish writers, accompanied with an exact English translation. The Letters to archbishop Lawrence are filled with exceedingly rare extracts, and Dr. Nicholls, the late regius professor of Oxford, is said to have expressed his wonder how the works quoted bad been obtained, considering that the author's benefice was worth but £228 a year. Nearly up to the day of his death Mr. Oxlee was engaged in literary pursuits. He left behind him many works yet unpublished. — See Gent. Mag. Feb. 1855, p. 203 sq.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2, 2268; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Kitto, Journal of Sac. Lit. April, 1854; Coleridge, Works, p. 457. (J. H.W.)

## Oxygraphus[[@Headword:Oxygraphus]]

             (from ὄξυς, swift, and γπάφω, to write), a name sometimes given by the Greek fathers to the Notary (q.v.) of the ancient Christian Church.

## Ozanam, Antoine Frederic[[@Headword:Ozanam, Antoine Frederic]]

             a distinguished French philosopher and polemic, was born at Milan April 23, 1813. He studied at the college in Lyons, and in 1832 went to Paris to study law. He took the degrees of M.A. and LL.D., and in 1840 was called to the professorship of foreign literature by the Academy of Sciences of Paris,. a position which his thorough knowledge of English, German, Italian, and Spanish, besides Hebrew and Sanscrit, enabled him to fill with great success. He died at Marseilles Sept. 8, 1853. Ozanam was a zealous opponent of Protestantism. Among his works, the most important is Dante et la philosophic Catholique au treizieme siecle (Paris, 1839 8vo; 2d ed. 1845). Four Italian and one German translation appeared between the first and second editions. It has been very variously judged, according to the standpoint taken by the critics. Ozanam, following the example of Artaud de Montor, attempted to prove the Roman Catholic orthodoxy of Dante against the assertions of Rosetti and Ugo Foscolo. In this Lamennais agreed with him; only the latter maintained that Dante's orthodoxy was but a concession made by him to the prevailing views of his age. Valuable as is Ozanam's work as a sort of commentary or key to Dante's Divina Commedia, it might have been much more so had he not entertained such ultramontane views. A more impartial appreciation of his author would have brought him nearer to the evangelical Church, which he condemned without knowing anything of its doctrines. Among his other remarkable works are Deux chanceliers d'AngleterreBacon de Verulam et St. Thomas de Canterbury (Paris, 1836, 8vo and 12mo): — Les Poetes Franciscains en Italie au treizieme siecle (ibid. 1852, 8vo), valuable to the theological student who desires an acquaintance with the period of which it treats, for  it gives full portraits of St. Francis, Fra Pacifico, St. Bonaventura, Giacomino di Verona, Thomas de Celano, the author of Dies Ire (q.v.), Giacopone da Todi, the author of the famous hymn, Cur Mundus Militat, and the famous Stabat Mater Dolorosa. There is also a History of Civilization in the Fifth Century, which was translated into English by Glynn, and was published at London in 1859, in 2 vols. post 8vo. Besides, Ozanam contributed largely to the Correspondant, L' Universite Catholique, and L' Ere Nouvelle. His complete works were published after his death, under the title Ouvres completes de A. F. Ozanam (Paris, 1855, 8 vols. 8vo). Ozanam was one of the eight students who, in 1833, founded the Societe de St. Vincent de Paul, which has since become so powerful in France. See Ampere, Notice, in the Journal des Debats, Oct. 9 and 12, 1858; Legeay, Etude Biogr. sur Ozanam (Paris, 1854, 8vo); Le Correspondant, Sept. 26, 1853; Collombet; Biographie de F. Ozanam (1853); Lacordaire, Conferences, 5, 267; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 38, 1018; Revue Chretienne, Oct. 1869, p. 579.

## Ozem[[@Headword:Ozem]]

             (Heb. O'tsem, אֹצֶם, strength; Selt. Α᾿σόμ v.r. Α᾿σάμ, and Α᾿σάν; Vulg. Assom and Asom), the name of two men of the tribe of Judah.

1. The fourth of the sons of Jerahmeel by his first wife (1Ch 2:25). B.C. cir. 1656.

2. The sixth son of Jesse, and brother of David (1Ch 2:15). B.C. cir. 1100.

## Ozias[[@Headword:Ozias]]

             (Ο᾿ζίας), the Greecized form of the name of three Hebrews.

1. UZZIAH (q.v.), king of Judah (Mat 1:8-9).

2. UZZI (Ezr 6:4), one of the ancestors of Ezra (2Es 1:2).

3. The son of Micha of the tribe of Simeon, one of the “governors” of Bethulia, in the history of Judith (Jdt 6:15-16; Jdt 6:21; Jdt 7:23; Jdt 7:30; Jdt 8:10; Jdt 8:28; Jdt 8:35; Jdt 15:4). SEE JUDITH.

## Oziel[[@Headword:Oziel]]

             (Ο᾿ζιήλ, i.e. Uzziel), given (Jdt 8:1) as the son of Joseph, and father of Elria, in the ancestry of Judith (q.v.).

## Ozni[[@Headword:Ozni]]

             (Heb. Ozni', אָזְנַי, my ear, or eared, i.e. having long ears, or attentive; Sept. Α᾿ζενί v.r. Α᾿ζανί), the fourth named of the seven sons of Gad (Num 26:16); called EZBON SEE EZBON (q.v.) in Gen 46:16.

## Oznite[[@Headword:Oznite]]

             (Heb. same as Ozni [q.v.]), a patronic title of one of the families in the tribe of Gad (Num 26:16).

## Ozniyah[[@Headword:Ozniyah]]

             SEE OSPREY.

## Ozora[[@Headword:Ozora]]

             (Ο᾿ζωρά v.r. Ε᾿ζωρά), a corrupt form (1Es 9:34) for MACHNADEBAI (q.v.), one of the heads of returned exiles (Ezr 10:40).