

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**O - Orator**

*by James Strong & John McClintock*

*To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:*

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE  
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

**AGES Software Rio, WI USA**  
**Version 1.0 © 2000**

# O

## 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

### Picture for Oak 1

### Picture for Oak 2

is the rendering in the A.V. of four Hebrew words (*l yaq* in the plural, however, only so rendered, *μῦλ γαῖ, ἡλ ἄηλ* and *ῶβα*), but is usually thought to be the meaning also of two others (*l yaam* and *ῶbya*), which are all from the same or cognate roots (*l wa, l ya* or *l l a*), 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* (*l ya* Sept. Vat. *τερέβινθος*; Alex. *τερέμινθος*; Aq., Sym., Theod., Apvg; Vulg. *campestris*) occurs only in the singular number in <sup>4146</sup>Genesis 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 Saadiah 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 <sup><212></sup>Isaiah 1:29, where probably “oaks” are intended; in <sup><216></sup>Isaiah 61:3, and Ezra 31:14, any strong, flourishing trees may be denoted. **SEE ELIM.**

**2. Elah** (חל אֶפֶס Sept. *τερέβινθος, δρυς Ἠλά, δένδρον δένδρον συσκίαζον*, Symm.); *πλάτανος* in Hosea iv. 13 [*δένδρον σύσκιον*]; Vulg. *terebinthus, quercus*; A. V. “oak,” “*elah*,” “teal-tree” in <sup><216></sup>Isaiah 6:13; “elms” in <sup><201></sup>Hosea 4:13). **SEE ELAH.**

**3. Eylon** (עבא Sept. *ἡ δρυς ἡ ὑψηλή, ἡ βάλανος Ἠλων*; 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** (חל יא 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** (חל א Sept. *ἡ τέρμινθος*, Aq. and Symm. *ἡ δρυς*; Vulg. *quercus*) occurs only in <sup><162></sup>Joshua 24:26, and is correctly rendered “oak” by the A. V.

**6. Allon** (חל א Sept. *ἡ βάλανος, δένδρον βαλάνου, δρυς*; Vulg. *quercus*) is uniformly rendered “oak” by the A. V., and has always been so understood by commentators. It occurs in <sup><138></sup>Genesis 35:8; <sup><162></sup>Joshua 19:32; <sup><213></sup>Isaiah 2:13; 6:13; 44:14; <sup><201></sup>Hosea 4:13; <sup><311></sup>Amos 2:9; <sup><312></sup>Zechariah 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* (חֵלְאֵ) with the terebinth, and the *allon* (אֵלֹן): 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* (אֵלֹן). It should be stated that *allon* occurs in <sup>אֵלֹן</sup>Hosea 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.**

### Picture for Oak 3

### Picture for Oak 4

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* ( [ I WΘ ] ), which denotes a worm, and particularly the kermes worm, denotes also the dye prepared from it

(~~2018~~ Isaiah 1:18; ~~2015~~ Lamentations 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 Linnæan 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 (~~2123~~ Isaiah 2:13; ~~3102~~ Zechariah 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 (~~3206~~ Ezekiel 27:6; comp. Theophr. *Plant.* v., 8; Val. Flac. 2:644; Strabo, 4:195), and idolaters their images (~~2444~~ Isaiah 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 some 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 Judæa 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 (<sup><0338></sup>Genesis 35:8; comp. <sup><0813></sup>1 Samuel 31:13; <sup><3112></sup>1 Chronicles 11:12), offerings were made to idols (<sup><2043></sup>Hosea 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 (<sup><0006></sup>Judges 9:6, 37). Single oaks of great height served also as landmarks (<sup><0903></sup>1 Samuel 10:3), and bore a distinguishing name (<sup><0006></sup>Judges 9:6, 37, where <sup>ˆ</sup>wbaeoak, is mistakenly rendered *plain* in the English version). *SEE MEONENIM; SEE OAK-WORSHIP.*

### 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-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 <sup><2163></sup>Ezekiel 6:13, they were likewise the scene of idolatrous practices. Altars were set up under them (<sup><0226></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><0061></sup>Judges 6:11; <sup><1134></sup>1 Kings 13:14). Jacob buried idolatrous images under an oak (<sup><0334></sup>Genesis 35:4); and Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, was buried under one of these trees (<sup><0338></sup>Genesis 35:8; see <sup><3102></sup>1 Chronicles 10:12). Abimelech was made king under an oak (<sup><0006></sup>Judges 9:6). Idolatry was practiced under oaks (<sup><2123></sup>Isaiah 1:29; 57:5;

<sup>23013</sup>Hosea 4:13). Idols were made of oaks (<sup>23414</sup>Isaiah 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 φαγειν, *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

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 Titchfield, 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

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 Erythraean 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

### Picture for Oates

(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 if .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 βασιλική*, 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 IHarcourt, pretended Rector of London; J)hn Fenwick,*

*Procurator faor 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 Committee upon the Complaint 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 Wr'itings 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. Hlist. of England*, 3:717 sq.; and especially the article in the *English Cyclopaedia* s.v.*

## 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'*, **hl a**; and *shebuah'* **h[wbv]** 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 (<sup><1608></sup>Nehemiah 10:30; <sup><1220></sup>Exodus 22:10); 2. *A sworn covenant* (<sup><1238></sup>Genesis 26:28; <sup><12107></sup>2 Samuel 21:7) 3. *A curse or imprecation* (<sup><1621></sup>Numbers 5:21; <sup><2191></sup>Daniel 9:11). In the first of these senses, which answers to our word “oath,” the Sept. renders both words by ὅρκος, and the Vulg. *byjurementum* or *jusjurandum*; while in the last sense we have the rendering ἀρά, *maledictio*. The two words **hl a** and **h[wbç]**, however, are by no means synonymous. They denote two different modes of swearing, or rather two classes of oaths. Thus **hl a** (from **ha**; *to lament; to wail, to express woe*; or, according to Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 44, 99, akin with **l aē**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 **h[wbç]** (from **[bç]**,

*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. **twj x**, 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 (<sup><0228></sup>Genesis 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 <sup><0421></sup>Numbers 5:21, where an oath with an imprecation is described, the phrase **hl ah t[wbç** is used, and the formula of imprecation is forthwith given.

**II.** *Nature and Sanction of Oaths.* — The term *jusjurandum* is defined by Cicero (*De Officiis*, 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 (*juramentum assertorium*) or to do (*juramentum promissorium*) 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 adjuvet 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 <sup><3016></sup>Hebrews 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 <sup><0226></sup>Genesis 22:16 and 12:7 compared with 24:7; <sup><0276></sup>Exodus 17:16 and <sup><0314></sup>Leviticus 26:14 with <sup><2791></sup>Daniel 9:11; <sup><0072></sup>2 Samuel 7:12, 13 with <sup><4423></sup>Acts 2:30; <sup><4904></sup>Psalms 110:4 with <sup><8072></sup>Hebrews 7:21, 28; <sup><2452></sup>Isaiah 45:23; <sup><2925></sup>Jeremiah 22:5; 32:22). With this divine asseveration we may compare the Stygian oath of Greek mythology (Homer, *Il.* 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 <sup><0213></sup>Genesis 21:23; 31:53; <sup><0442></sup>Numbers 14:2; 30:2; <sup><0449></sup>1 Samuel 14:39, 44; <sup><1022></sup>1 Kings 2:42; <sup><2481></sup>Isaiah 48:1; 65:16; <sup><2045></sup>Hosea 4:15). So also our Lord himself accepted the high-priest’s adjuration (<sup><4263></sup>Matthew 26:63), and Paul frequently appeals to God in confirmation of his statements (<sup><4252></sup>Acts 26:29; <sup><4909></sup>Romans 1:9; 9:1; <sup><4013></sup>2 Corinthians 1:23; 11:31; <sup><3008></sup>Philippians 1:8; see also <sup><6016></sup>Revelation 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 (<sup><4463></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><0230></sup>Exodus 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 (<sup><0233></sup>Exodus 23:13; 34:6; <sup><0292></sup>Deuteronomy 29:12; <sup><0270></sup>Joshua 23:7; 24:16; <sup><0452></sup>2 Chronicles 15:12, 14; <sup><2308></sup>Isaiah 19:18; 45:23; <sup><0426></sup>Jeremiah 12:16; <sup><0084></sup>Amos 8:14; <sup><0005></sup>Zephaniah 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 (<sup><0425></sup>Genesis 42:15; <sup><0111></sup>2 Samuel 11:11; 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 (<sup><0153></sup>Matthew 5:33; 23:16-22; and see <sup><0052></sup>James 5:12). Yet he did not refuse the solemn adjuration of the highpriest (<sup><0163></sup>Matthew 26:63, 64; see Juv. *Sat.* 6:16; Mart. 11:94; Mishna, *Sanh.* 3:2, compared with <sup><0087></sup>Amos 8:7; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* 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 (<sup><0152></sup>2 Samuel 15:21; 19:23) or exacted (<sup><0022></sup>Genesis 24:2-4; 1, 5, 25; <sup><0022></sup>Joshua 2:12-21; 6:26; 9:15; <sup><0505></sup>Ezra 10:5); when covenants were concluded (<sup><0353></sup>Genesis 31:53; <sup><0204></sup>2 Kings 11:4; 1 Maccabees 7:15; Joseph. *Ant.* 14:1, 2); when a solemn asseveration was made (<sup><0142></sup>Genesis 14:22; <sup><0201></sup>Judges 21:1-7; <sup><0149></sup>1 Samuel 14:39, 44; 19:6); and when allegiance to God, fealty to a sovereign, or obedience from an inferior to a superior was professed (<sup><0180></sup>1 Kings 18:10; <sup><0217></sup>2 Kings 11:17; <sup><0308></sup>1 Chronicles 11:3; 29:24; <sup><0454></sup>2 Chronicles 15:14, 15; 36:13; <sup><0102></sup>Ecclesiastes 8:2; Joseph. *Ant.* 12:1; 15:10, 4). A vow was in the nature of an oath (<sup><0004></sup>Leviticus 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 (<sup><0220></sup>Exodus 22:10, 11; <sup><1081></sup>1 Kings 8:31; <sup><1462></sup>2 Chronicles 6:22). A willful breaker of trust, especially if he added perjury to his fraud, was to be severely punished (<sup><0812></sup>Leviticus 6:2-5; <sup><0596></sup>Deuteronomy 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 (<sup><0812></sup>Leviticus 6:3).

(c) When a wife was suspected of incontinence, she was required to clear herself by an oath (<sup><0459></sup>Numbers 5:19-22).

(d) When a theft was committed or an injury sustained, and the offender remained undetected, a judicial oath was to be imposed 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 (<sup><0812></sup>Leviticus 5:1; <sup><0772></sup>Judges 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 (<sup><1024></sup>Proverbs 29:24; Michaelis, . c. art. 256, vol. iv, p. 109; <sup><0596></sup>Deuteronomy 19:16-19; Grotius, in *Crit. Sacr.* on <sup><1463></sup>Matthew 26:63; Knobel on <sup><0812></sup>Leviticus 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 (<sup><0221></sup>Exodus 22:11; <sup><0459></sup>Numbers 5:19-22; <sup><1081></sup>1 Kings 8:31; <sup><1462></sup>2 Chronicles 6:22; <sup><1463></sup>Matthew 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. (<sup><0444></sup>1 Samuel 14:44); “As the Lord liveth” (<sup><0443></sup>1 Samuel 14:39; 19:6; <sup><1052></sup>2 Samuel 15:21; <sup><1180></sup>1 Kings 18:10); “As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth” (<sup><0813></sup>1 Samuel 20:3); “The Lord be between thee and me forever” (<sup><0813></sup>1 Samuel 20:23); “The God of Abraham judge between us” (<sup><0353></sup>Genesis 31:53). The Jews also swore “by heaven,” “by the earth,” “by the sun,” “by Jerusalem,?” “by the Temple” (Mishna, *Shebuoth*, 4:2;

<sup><0134></sup>Matthew 5:34; 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 (<sup><0425></sup>Genesis 42:15; <sup><0026></sup>1 Samuel 1:26; 17:55; <sup><0111></sup>2 Samuel 11:11; 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 (**h[wbç]**), which properly denotes seven, and by the verb *to swear* (**[bçn]**), which means *to seven, to produce seven* (comp. <sup><0128></sup>Genesis 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 (<sup><0242></sup>Genesis 24:2; 47:29). This practice evidently arose from the fact that *the genital member*, which is meant by the euphemistic expression “*thigh*” (**ry**), 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 **ry yaxwy**, <sup><0426></sup>Genesis 46:26; <sup><0106></sup>Exodus 1:5; <sup><0780></sup>Judges 8:30). Hence this creative organ became the symbol of the Creator and the object of worship among all nations of antiquity (comp. <sup><2667></sup>Ezekiel 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* <sup><0124></sup>*Genesis* 24:2). More unnatural is the explanation of Grotius, that Eliezer put his hand on Abraham’s thigh, where the sword was hanging (<sup><0183></sup>*Psalm* 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 (<sup><0150></sup>*Genesis* 15:10, 17; <sup><0185></sup>*Jeremiah* 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 <sup><0192></sup>*Judges* 19:29; <sup><0117></sup>*1 Samuel* 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’ (<sup><0142></sup>*Genesis* 14:22; <sup><0130></sup>*Deuteronomy* 32:40; <sup><0117></sup>*Daniel* 12:7; *Rev.* x, ’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 (<sup><0168></sup>*Exodus* 6:8; <sup><0163></sup>*Psalm* 106:26; <sup><0115></sup>*Ezekiel* 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 (**h[w]bçb hl ab wa**), 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* (אָמֵן), or *Thou hast said it* (σὺ εἶπας), which was all that was required to constitute an oath in case any one was adjured (<sup><0459></sup>Numbers 5:19; Mishna, *Shebuoth*, 3:11; 4:3), explains the reply of our Savior (<sup><0166></sup>Matthew 26:63, 64).

On the same analogy witnesses laid their hands on the head of the accused (<sup><0142></sup>Genesis 14:22; <sup><0344></sup>Leviticus 24:14; <sup><0524></sup>Deuteronomy 32:40; <sup><0307></sup>Isaiah 3:7; <sup><0105></sup>Ezekiel 20:5, 6; Sus. 5:35; Rev. 10:5; see Homer, *Il.* 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 (<sup><1083></sup>1 Kings 8:31; <sup><0462></sup>2 Chronicles 6:22; Godwyn, *I. c.* 6:6; Carpzov, p. 654; see also Juvenal, *Sat.* 14:219; Homer, *Il.* 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 (<sup><0221></sup>Exodus 22:11; <sup><0301></sup>Leviticus 5:1; 6:3; <sup><0459></sup>Numbers 5:19-22). Hence the great care exercised in inculcating the sacredness of oaths, and the heavy punishment for perjury or frivolous swearing (<sup><0207></sup>Exodus 20:7; <sup><0392></sup>Leviticus 19:12; <sup><0596></sup>Deuteronomy 19:16-19; <sup><0154></sup>Psalms 15:4; <sup><0462></sup>Jeremiah 5:2; 7:9; <sup><0369></sup>Ezekiel 16:59; <sup><0304></sup>Hosea 10:4; <sup><0387></sup>Zechariah 8:17; Mishna, *Shebuoth*, 3:11; 4:3). Whether the “swearing” mentioned by Jeremiah (<sup><0230></sup>Jeremiah 23:10) and by Hosea (<sup><0392></sup>Hosea 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 (<sup><0341></sup>Leviticus 24:11, 16; <sup><0154></sup>Matthew 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 (<sup><0301></sup>Leviticus 5:4);

- 2, *Vanum*, an absurd self-contradictory assertion;
- 3, *Depositi*, breach of contract denied (<sup><RB1></sup>Leviticus 19:11);
- 4, *Testinonii*, judicial perjury (<sup><RB1></sup>Leviticus 5:1; see Nicolaus and Selden, *De Juramentis*, in Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, xxvi; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on <sup><RB3></sup>Matthew 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 (<sup><RB7></sup>Deuteronomy 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 (<sup><RB4></sup>Matthew 5:34-36; 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" (<sup><RB1></sup>Leviticus 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. *Ecclesiasticus* 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 (<sup>4183</sup>Matthew 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. <sup>4189</sup>Matthew 8:9; <sup>4129</sup>Acts 12:19; 16:27; 27:42; see also Dionys. Hal. 11:43, and Aul. <sup>4164</sup>Genesis 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* <sup>4231</sup>*Exodus* 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, not 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.; Lightfoot, *Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations on Matt.* 5:33; Frankel, *Die Eidesleistung der Juden in- theologischer und historischer Beziehung* (2d ed. Breslau, 1847); by the same author, *Der gerichtliche Beweis nach: losaisch-talmudischem Rechte* (Berlin, 1846), p. 304 sq.; Saalschiltz, *Das*

*Hiosaische Recht* (Berlin, 1853), p. 608 sq.; Ewald, *Die Alterthumer des Volkes Israel* (Göttingen, 1854), p. 15 sq. *SEE PERJURY*.

## Oath

(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 appropriate 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 Pontifex 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,  
Quidquid 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 us, 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 comprehended 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 unless 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 a judicial 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 natural 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 and 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, in consequence 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 itself must 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 an 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, he; 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 importance 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 cross-examination; 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 be 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 Omichund, 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 views with more complacency the worst forms of paganism than a question of the 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 transatlantic 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 (<sup>(-RHB)</sup>Deuteronomy 6:13; 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 (<sup><1054></sup>Matthew 5:34), regard all oaths as unlawful. But other, communions generally restrict this prohibition to ordinary and private discourse, and find in <sup><800></sup>Romans 1:9; <sup><4712></sup>2 Corinthians 11:21; <sup><8021></sup>Galatians 1:20; <sup><3008></sup>Philippians 1:8; and <sup><5015></sup>1 Thessalonians 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 Articles*, 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 ~~2012~~ Jeremiah 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. Prælect.* (ed. 1688). See also *Literature* in Malcom, *Theol. Index*, s.v., and *Notes and Queries*, Jan. to June, 1860, and Dec. 1859.

### 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

*SEE OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE AND SUPREMACY.*

### 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.”

### Oath of Canonical Obedience

*SEE INSTITUTION; SEE OBEDIENCE; SEE ROMANISM.*

### Oath of a Christian

See the last of the *SEE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.*

### Oath of Conformity and Obedience

#### Picture for 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 offered 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 cause 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

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 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 Supremacy

*SEE OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE AND SUPREMACY.*

### 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).

## Obadi’ah

(Heb. *Obadyah*’, **וַיְהִי** *servant of Jehovah* [<sup><1322></sup>1 Chronicles 3:21; 7:3; 8:38; 9:16, 44; <sup><1323></sup>Ezra 8:9; elsewhere the lengthened form, *Obadya’hu*, **וַיְהִי** **וְהָיָה** Sept. variously , **Ἀβδίας**, **Ἀβδιός**, **Ἀβδείας**, **Ἀβδία**, **Ἀβαδία**, **Ὀβδία**, **Ὀβδιός**; v. r. **Ἀβδείας**, **Ὀβδιός** ), 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 (<sup><131B></sup>1 Chronicles 12:9). B.C. 1054.
2. The father of Ishmaiah, which latter was chief of the tribe of Zebulun in David's reign. (<sup><137B></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><137B></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><147B></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><118B></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><118B></sup>1 Kings 18:4, 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 (<sup><1187></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><1113></sup>2 Kings 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 (<sup><1141></sup>2 Kings 4:1) was, according to the tradition in Rashi, his widow.

**6.** The fifth named of the six sons of Azel (<sup><1188></sup>1 Chronicles 8:38; 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 (<sup><1342></sup>2 Chronicles 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 **hydb** [ , 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, col. 4; see also Jarchi on ver. 1 of the Prophecy).

The: Targum on <sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 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 (<sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 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 ver. 11 refers to a capture of Jerusalem, but maintains that it may apply to its capture by Shishak in the reign of Rehoboam (<sup><1145></sup>1 Kings 14:25; <sup><1112></sup>2 Chronicles 12:2); by the Philistines and Arabians in the reign of Jehoram (<sup><1216></sup>2 Chronicles 21:16); by Joash in the reign of Amaziah (25:22): or by the Chaldaeans in the reigns of Jehoiakim and of Jehoiachin (<sup><1212></sup>2 Kings 24:2 and 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. <sup><2189></sup>Joel 3:19; <sup><3100></sup>Amos 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 (<sup><1452></sup>2 Chronicles 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 ver. 1-4 with ~~2414~~ Jeremiah 49:14-16; Obadiah ver. 6 with ~~2410~~ Jeremiah 49:9, 10; and Obadiah ver. 8 with ~~2417~~ Jeremiah 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 Obadiah 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 Obadiah 1-10 and ver. 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! (*Einkl.* 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 (*Einkl.* 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; <sup>3100</sup>Obadiah 1:10, comp. <sup>3100</sup>Amos 1:11); both complain of the carrying off a great spoil from Jerusalem (Joel 4:5; <sup>3101</sup>Obadiah 1:11); both say it was done by *strangers* (Joel 4:17; <sup>3101</sup>Obadiah 1:11); both use the formula, *cast lots on Jerusalem* (Joel 4:3; <sup>3100</sup>Obadiah 1:1; again in <sup>3100</sup>Nahum 1:10); both speak of the *day of the Lord* (Joel 4:14; 1:15; <sup>3105</sup>Obadiah 1:15); both make prominent the idea of *requital* in that day (Joel 4:4, 7; <sup>3105</sup>Obadiah 1:15); both speak of the *remnant* or *refuge* that shall be in that day (<sup>2985</sup>Joel 3:5; Obadiah 17), both saying it shall be on Mount Zion (<sup>2985</sup>Joel 3:5; <sup>3107</sup>Obadiah 1:17), and both that it shall be holy (Joel 4:17; <sup>3107</sup>Obadiah 1:17); both employ the simile of fire for a destroyer (<sup>2985</sup>Joel 2:3, 5; <sup>3108</sup>Obadiah 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; <sup>3108</sup>Obadiah 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 (<sup>3102</sup>Amos 9:12; <sup>3102</sup>Obadiah 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 (~~200~~Lamentations 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 (ver. 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 (ver. 20). Those who had dwelt in the southern tract are to overrun and settle in Idumaea (ver. 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 (ver. 20). What or where Sepharad is no one knows. The Sept., perhaps by an error of the copyist, reads **Ἐφραθά**. Jerome’s Hebrew tutor told him the Jews held it to be the Bosphorus. 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 διασπορᾷ** of ~~300~~James 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 right 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 quam ut ad Sorobabelica aut Macabaica tempora referri possit," says Rosenmüller on ver. 21; and "necessitas cogit ut omnia ad praedicationem evangelii referamus," says Luther. The full completion of the prophetic 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 (<sup>cf.</sup> Revelation 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 <sup>267</sup>Isaiah 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. **מַדְבָּא**, 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 <sup>269</sup>Joel 3:19) says that Julius Caesar was an Idumaeen. 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 Idumaeen. Jerome says that some of the Jews read **המור**, Rome, for **המורד**, Dumrah, in <sup>271</sup>Isaiah 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 ver. 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 ver. 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 ver. 8:

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

On ver. 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 ver. 20: “Sarepta” is “France;” “Sepharad” is “Spain.” The “Mount of Esau,” in ver. 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 ver. 8). His sentiments are noble, and his figures bold and striking (De Wette’s *Introd.* Engl. transl.). De Wette’s translator 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, *Erklärung* (Darmst. 1606, 4to); Reynolds, *Application* (Lond. 1613, 4to); Reuter, *Commentarius* (Fr. ad Od. 1617, 4to); Gesner, *Commentarius* (Hamb. 1618, 8vo); Zierlin, *Erklrdung* (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, *Commentarius* (Hafn. 1697, 4to); Heupel, *Annotationes* (Argent. 1699, 4to); Outhof, *Verklaaring* (Gron. 1700, 8vo; Dort, 1730; 4to); Zierold, *Erkl'druing* (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* [on 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 (<sup><1121></sup>1 Chronicles 3:21), probably the son of Arnan (as the Sept. and Vulg. have it, reading /nB] “his son,” instead of ynB] “sons of”); apparently the same with JUDA (<sup><1136></sup>Luke 3:26) and ABIUD (<sup><1113></sup>Matthew 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 (<sup><1389></sup>Ezra 8:9). B.C. 459.

**11.** A Levite, son of Shemaiah, and descended from Jeduthun (<sup><1396></sup>1 Chronicles 9:16). He appears to have been a principal musician in the Temple choir in the time of Nehemiah (<sup><1425></sup>Nehemiah 12:25). B.C. cir. 446. It is evident, from a comparison of the last-quoted passage with <sup><1395></sup>1 Chronicles 9:15-17 and <sup><1417></sup>Nehemiah 11:17-19, that the first three names, “Mattaniah, Bakbukiah, and Obadiah,” belong to ver. 24, and the last three, “Meshullam, Talmon, Akkub,” were the families of porters. The name is omitted in the Vat. MS. in <sup><1425></sup>Nehemiah 12:25, where the Codex Fred. Aug. has **Ὀβδίας** and the Vulg. *Obedia*. In <sup><1417></sup>Nehemiah 11:17 this Obadiah is called “ABDA, the son of Shammua.”

**12.** One of the priests who joined in the covenant with Nehemiah (Nehemiah 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 *muylja muæ raB]* cabalistic expositions and explanations of the Jewish ritual, consisting of four parts, of which the first part, entitled *muylja x[e* “the tree of life,” treats of meals; the second, *muylja r/qm]* “the fountain of life,” treats of what is to be done when going to bed; the third, *ËrD, muylja* “the way of life,” treats of the reading of the law in the original and in the Chaldee paraphrase; and the fourth part, entitled *muylja j r/a*, “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 *muB8m rhl jvdj bivWDqæhæp*, 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 First, *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 *hVvæ [ivWrpæhvjæ yredæ]* 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 *tWrl [i vWrpæ]* reprinted at Cracow under the title *tWrl vrdjæ* and reprinted in the collection *vdqærqjæ* (Venice, 1585). Besides, he wrote a super-commentary on Rashi’s commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled *aqæ]rm[ }*

(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 **y8y rwa**, *A Commentary on the Pentateuch* (Venice, 1567): — *A Commentary on the Song of Songs and Koheleth* (ibid. 1567): — *A Commentary on Job*, entitled **qdx, fPivna** (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 **hvm tLhæj** edited by Frankfurter (q.v.) (Amst. 1724-1727, 4 vols. fol.): — *A commentary on the treatise Aboth*, **t/ba;yqæPæ [ivlrPæ** reprinted in the Machasor of Bologna, 1541: — *A treatise on metaphysics*, entitled **µyMæi rwa 8se** (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 librorum Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 2075; Kitto, *Cyclop. s.v. Sforno*; *Jahrbuch der Gesch. d. Juden u. d. Judenthums*, 2:345. \ (B. P.)

## O'bal

(Heb. *Obal'*, **אבאל**, 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 <sup><1008></sup>Genesis 10:28, and of the region wherein it dwelt, <sup><1012></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (**Γοβολίτις**, *Ant.* 2:1, 2; 3:2, 1; see Schulthess, *Parad.* p. 84), but here there is not even a resemblance (**אבאל** and **אבאל** *SEE ARABIA*).

## Obdi'a

(**אבדיא** v. r. **אבביעא**; Vulg. *Obia*), a corrupt form (1 Esdras 5:38) of the Heb. name HABAIAH (<sup><1008></sup>Ezra 2:61).

## Obduracy

*SEE HARDNESS OF HEART; SEE SIN.*

## 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.*

## O'bed

(Heb. *Obed'*, **אבד**, *servant*, i.e. of Jehovah; Sept. **Ωβήδ** in Ruth, and so in the N.T.; **Αβήδ** in Chronicles; v. r. **Ωβήδ**, etc.), the name of several Hebrews. *SEE OBED-EDOÍ.*

**1.** The son of Boaz and Ruth, and father of Jesse the father of David, according to the apparently incomplete genealogical list (<sup><1007></sup>Ruth 4:17; <sup><1012></sup>1 Chronicles 2:12). B.C. cir. 1360. The name occurs in the genealogies of Christ given in <sup><1008></sup>Matthew 1:5 and <sup><1008></sup>Luke 3:33. *SEE DAVID; SEE GENEALOGY.*

2. One of David's mighty men (<sup><13147></sup>1 Chronicles 11:47). B.C. cir. 1046.
3. The third named of the sons of Shemaiah who were gate-keepers of the Temple (<sup><13317></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><13257></sup>1 Chronicles 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. (<sup><14231></sup>2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. ante 876.

### O'bed-e'dom

(Heb. *Obed'-edom*,  $\mu/d\bar{e} db[\rho]$  *servant of Edom*; Sept. in 2 Samuel  $\text{Ὀβῆθ Ἐδὼμ}$ , in Chronicles  $\text{Ἀβεδδαρά, Ἀβδεδὸμ, Ἀβδοδὸμ}$ , 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 (<sup><10160></sup>2 Samuel 6:10-12; <sup><13133></sup>1 Chronicles 13:13,14; 15:25). We learn from <sup><13168></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><13158></sup>1 Chronicles 15:18, 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 (<sup><10160></sup>2 Samuel 6:10,111), that is, probably, a native of the Levitical city of Gath-Rimmon in Dan, which was assigned to the Kohathites (<sup><10215></sup>Joshua 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 <sup><13301></sup>1 Chronicles 26:1, 8.

(b.) In one passage (<sup><13168></sup>1 Chronicles 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” (~~1352~~1 Chronicles 15:21; 16:5). That it was also he, with his family of eight sons and their children, “mighty men of valor” (~~1354~~1 Chronicles 26:4-8), who kept the south gate (ver. 15) and the house of Asuppim, is evident from the expression of the chronicler (ver. 5), adding, “for God blessed him,” referring apparently to ~~1061~~2 Samuel 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 (~~1368~~1 Chronicles 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 (~~1424~~2 Chronicles 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

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 (~~19816~~ Psalm 95:6);

(2) from the law which he has revealed to us in his Word (~~19816~~ Psalm 119:3; ~~6006~~ 2 Peter 1:5, 7);

(3) from the blessings of his providence which we are constantly receiving (~~4447~~ Acts 14:17; Psalm 145);

(4) from the love and goodness of God in the grand work of redemption (~~461~~ 1 Corinthians 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 (~~5188~~ Colossians 3:8, 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 (~~6172~~ Romans 7:22; 3:31);

(3) sincere (~~4506~~ Psalm 51:6; ~~5006~~ 1 Timothy 1:5);

(4) affectionate, springing from love and not from terror (~~6169~~ 1 John 5:19; 2:5; ~~4084~~ 2 Corinthians 5:14)

(5) diligent, not slothful (~~4016~~ Galatians 1:16; ~~4984~~ Psalm 18:44; ~~6121~~ Romans 12:11);

(6) conspicuous and open (~~5445~~ Philippians 2:15; ~~4056~~ Matthew 5:16);

(7) universal; not one duty, but all must be performed (~~6006~~ 2 Peter 1:5,10);

(8) perpetual, at all times, places, and occasions (~~4817~~ Romans 2:7; ~~4819~~ Galatians 6:9).

The advantages of obedience are these:

- (1) it adorns the Gospel (~~<4120>~~Titus 2:10);
- (2) it is evidential of grace (~~<4157>~~2 Corinthians 5:17);
- (3) it rejoices the hearts of the ministers and people of God (~~<6002>~~3 John 1:2; ~~<5000>~~2 Thessalonians 1:19, 20);
- (4) it silences gainsayers (~~<6011>~~2 Peter 1:11, 12);
- (5) encourages the saints, while it reproves the lukewarm (~~<41516>~~Matthew 5:16);
- (6) it affords peace to the subject of it (~~<49512>~~Psalm 25:12, 13; ~~<4246>~~Acts 24:16);
- (7) it powerfully recommends religion, as that which is both delightful and practicable (~~<5010>~~Colossians 1:10).
- (8) it is the forerunner and evidence of eternal glory (~~<4162>~~Romans 6:22; ~~<624>~~Revelation 22:14).

**2. Obedience to parents** is taught us in the N.T. Scriptures in Ephesians 6:1 (also in ~~<5031>~~Colossians 3:20): “Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.” Thus also servants are to obey their masters, as taught in ~~<4015>~~Ephesians 6:5 (also ~~<5032>~~Colossians 3:22; ~~<4128>~~1 Peter 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 (~~<4047>~~Acts 4:17; 5:29).

See Krehl, *New-Testament. Handwörterbuch*, 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 of Christ

(ὕπακοή) 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 (<sup><2303></sup>Isaiah 49:3; <sup><0145></sup>Philippians 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 (<sup><0174></sup>Matthew 17:24, 27; <sup><0122></sup>Luke 2:22; <sup><0107></sup>Psalms 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 (<sup><0106></sup>Psalms 40:6);
- (2) complete (<sup><0122></sup>1 Peter 2:22);
- (3) wrought out in the room and stead of his people (<sup><5104></sup>Romans 10:4; 5:19);
- (4) well pleasing and acceptable in the sight of God;
- (5) followed by a glorious reward (<sup><0209></sup>Philippians 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 remissione 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 culpae 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 Gehorsam 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 (◀46▶ John 6:51; 3:14-16; 12:24; ◀47▶ 1

John 4:9; ~~1~~1 Thessalonians 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.

### 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 incumbents 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, pitancier, 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.

### O'beirne, 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

(a frequent rendering of *h̄j ṽ*; *shachah*, in Hithpael, to *bow* one's self in reverence). In <sup><1016></sup>1 Kings 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

*SEE STOOLS.*

## 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

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

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 Decretalium ex monumentis, auctoribus et controversiis* (Antwerp, 1762, 1763, 3 vols. 4to): — *System historico-criticuma divisarumpotestatum in legibus matrimonialibus impedimentorum dirimentium* (Franf. 1771, 8vo): — *Apologia historico-critica* (ibid. 1771, and Vienna. 1776, 8vo): — *Compendium preelectionum canonicarum juxta libros V Decretalium* (Franf. 1773 and 1779, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Thomassinus abbreviatus, seu vetus et nova*

*Ecclesice disciplina de beneficiis 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

(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, Jean Frederic

### Picture for 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 unflinching 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 Benefactor* (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

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).

### Oberlin Theology

An impression 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 not 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 in 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 good respect 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 can 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.)

### 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, tum 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 theologicis* (Augsb. 1760, 5 pts. 4to): — *Theologia dogmatico — historico — scholastica* (Freiburg, 1762-1765, 5 vols. 8vo): — *Systemna theologicis 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

(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 Innsbruck, 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 Innsbruck, 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.

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 Sanctorum Patrum de veritate religionis Christianae contra Gentiles et Judaeos* (ibid. 1777-92, etc., 34 vols.). See Ruland, *Series et vita professorum S. S. Theolog., qui Wirceburgi a fund. Academia usque in ann. 1834 docuerunt* (ibid. 1835); Dix, in Wetzer und Welte's *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 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,

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."

## O 'beth

(Ὠβήθη), a Graecized form (1 Esdras 8:32) of the name of EBED *SEE EBED* (q.v.), son of Jonathan (<sup><15786></sup>Ezra 8:6).

## Obi

*SEE OBEAH.*

## O'bil

(Heb. *Obil'*, *lybza*, from the Arabic *abal*, an overseer of camels; Sept. *Ὠβίας* v. r. *Ἀβίας* and *Ὠβίλ*, Vulg. *Ubil*), an Ishmaelite, or Arab, doubtless of the nomadic tribes, who had charge of the royal camels in the time of David — an exceedingly fit employment for an Arab (<sup><15730></sup>1 Chronicles 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

(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

*SEE OBIT.*

## 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 sancte fidei* (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

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.

*SEE APOLOGETICS.*

## 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

(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

(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 Borromeo 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

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

SEE OBLATES.

## 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 (<sup>310</sup>Ezekiel 20:40) for **tæjñi**, *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 (<sup><08123></sup>Leviticus 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 (<sup><04812></sup>Numbers 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* (<sup><08230></sup>Leviticus 23:10).

(2.) *The first-fruits in the two waveloaves* (ver. 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 **t/pWnT]** *tenuphoth*’, offerings.

(3.) *The first of the dough*, being the twenty-fourth part thereof, which was given to the priests (<sup><04153></sup>Numbers 15:20); and this kind of offering was not neglected even after the return from Babylon (<sup><16057></sup>Nehemiah 10:37).

(4.) *The first-fruits of the threshing-floor.* These last two are called **t/mWrT]** *terumoth*’, ‘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)

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 libitum*; 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 *depositarietatis* 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

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 CREDESCENCE-TABLE*.

## 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

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 Juramenti 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

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

*SEE STOOLS.*

## O’both

(Heb. *Oboth*’, **tbap**water-skins, i.e., according to Furst, *hollow passes*; Sept. **Ωβώθ** v. r. **Υ Σωβώθ**), the forty-sixth station of the Israelites on their way to Canaan, near Moab (<sup>(-0210)</sup>Numbers 21:10, 11; 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.

*SEE SLAVES; SEE VICELINUS.*

## 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 Montbdiard 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 pacis*. In 1685 the king of France nominated him to preside, in 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 Premier, 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 Nicéron, *Memoires*, vol. 34; Haag, *La France Protestante*, s.v.

### Obregon, Bernard

the founder 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

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.

## O'brien, 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,

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

(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

JULIUS, an ancient sage who flourished some time in the early Christian period, is principally known as the author of a work entitled *De Prodigiiis*, 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 Woolfhard, 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

SEE *OBSEQUIUM*.

## 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

(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 *Stricteris 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

is the rendering in the A. V. of the Heb. *né[m] meonen'*, <sup><6180></sup>Deuteronomy 18:10, 14 [so also the verb, <sup><18926></sup>Leviticus 19:26; <sup><12216></sup>2 Kings 21:6; <sup><4316></sup>2 Chronicles 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'* (*μυναῖ* <sup><2116></sup>Isaiah 2:6; <sup><2470></sup>Jeremiah 27:9) and *osienah'* (*חנני* <sup><2573></sup>Isaiah 57:3), commonly rendered “soothsayers” or “sorcerers” (q.v.). Deyling (*Observat.* 3:128 sq.) finds it mentioned also in <sup><18185></sup>Job 3:5 (*γρηρακαπ/γ*; but see Gesen. *Thes.* 2:693). In <sup><8040></sup>Galatians 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. <sup><4996></sup>Psalm 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

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 <sup><4013></sup>Ephesians 1:13, et al. *SEE BAPTISM; SEE SPIRIT.*

## 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 Alcalá, 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 annals, 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 que han sido individuos de los seis colegios mayores*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:417; Ticknor, *Hist. of Spanish Literature*, 1:308.

### 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

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 diverse 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 repraesentive*, rather than as *voces essentialiter significativae*; 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 Naudeus 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 nvgani 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 atque 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 facturus 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 Annalium 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, *Entwicklungsgesch. 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

or the doctrine of *Occasional Causes*, is the name of a religious philosophical theory marking an era 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 ascendancy, 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 casualism, 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,

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 not 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

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

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, Ianira, Telestho, Europa, Menestho, Petrea, Eudora, Calypso, Tyche, Ocyroe, Crisia, Amphiro, with those mentioned by Apollodorus, except Amphitrite. Hyginus mentions 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

in ancient mythology, was the powerful divinity of the sea (hence the name *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

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 Chazim Vital. He was a *darshan* or preacher at Safed, in Upper Galilee, and wrote a very extensive commentary on the treatise *Aboth*, entitled **ל אבן** **עדה** with special reference to the commentaries of Gerundi, Abulafia, Maimonides, Abarbanel, Bertinore, Almosino, and others (Venice, 1519, and often): a commentary on Lamentations, entitled **ח [מ]דא** **י**, “the Bread of Sorrow,” the Hebrew text and Rashi’s commentary (Venice, 1600, and often): — a commentary on Ruth, entitled **ל אבן** **עדה** **ל** **ר** **ש** **ל** “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) ii, 15; Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 254. (B. P.)

### Ocellus, Lucanus

(Ὀκελλος [also Ὀκελος, Ὀκελλος, Οἴκελλος, Ουκελλος, Ἡκελος, Ἐκκελος, 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 ὀσιότητος**, **Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντός 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 νόμου*, 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 Byzantine 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, et physica*, 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 philosophorum fragmentis, et Ocelli Lucani, qui fertur, de universa natura libello* (Berlin, 1846). The second is included in the *Fragmenta*

*philosophorum Graecorum* (A. F. Didot's *Bibliothèque Grecque*, 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. vorzüglichsten philosoph. Begriffe*. (Halle, 1788); Filleborn, *Beitrag 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*. — Hoefler, *Nour. Biog. Gener.* 38 428; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth.* rol. 3.

## O'chiel

(Ὀχιήλος v. r. Ὀξιήλος, Vulg. *Oziel*), a corrupt form (1 Esdras 1:9) of the Heb. name JEIEL (<sup><4230></sup>2 Chronicles 25:9).

## Ochim

(μυj æ plural of j a) a species of animal classed with wild beasts of the desert, and described as haunting ruins (<sup><2132></sup>Isaiah 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: j a, 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,

one of the most noted of Italian reformers, who, in his generation, was revered 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 while 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 1547, 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 causae 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 be 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. Antitritin.* 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 Pescara, 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 innamorarsi 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 pcesentia 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 pccenotione, destinatione et libertate disputatio*, Basel, probably printed in 1562): — *Il catechismo, o*

*vero institutione Christiana, in forma di dialogo* (Basle, 1561): — 30 *Dialogi in duos libros divisi, quorum primus 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, *Beitrag 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. Ochini* (1851); Hook, *Eccles. Biogr.* 7:448-450; Benrath, *Bern. Ochino* (Leips. 1875).

## Ochlah

SEE OCLAH.

## Ocide’lus

(Ὠκεΐδηλος v. r. Ὠκόδηλος; Vulg. *Jussio, Reddus*), a corrupt form (1 Esdr. 9:22) of the Heb. name JOZABAD (<sup><5102></sup>Ezra 10:22).

## Oci’na

[most *Oc’inza*] (Ὠκεινά v. r. Ὠκινά), 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 Ἀκωνά (᾿κϜ᾿). On an unfortunate conjecture in Gesenius, see Movers, in the *Zeitschr. Philosophie u. Kath. Theologie*, 13:38.



## 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 orientales 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 of 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

SEE UCKWALLISTS.

## Oclah ve-Oclah

(**hl kaw hl ka**) 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, **hl kḥ;** (<sup>(0000)</sup>1 Samuel 1:9), **hl kḥw]** (<sup>(0079)</sup>Genesis 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 **hl kaw hl ka** is 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 Zeitschrift*, 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* (**l wl km**), 35 b, col. 2; 51 a, col 2 (ed. Levita, Bomberg, 1545, fol.), or 116,163 a (ed. Hechin, Ffirth, 1793), and in his Lexicon, **ḥyḥrḥ rps** (i.e. the Book of Roots), s.v. **brq**, p. 334 a (ed. Biesenthal and Lebrecht, Berlin, 1847), and Ibsi-Aknin (q.v.), in his ethical work, **ḥwpnl a bwf** and in his Methodology (comp. Steinschneider, in Geiger’s *Zeitschrift*, 1862, p. 316, note 31); in the middle of the 13th century it: was quoted again by Isaac ben-Jehudah in his **l ḥah 8s** (comp. — Steinschneider’. *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodlej. coj.* 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 ~~BOOK~~ 1 Samuel 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 *hta*, 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 mnorgenlndischen 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.)

### O'connor, 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.

### Oc'ran

(Heb. אֲרָכָי; *afflicted*; Sept. Ἐρχάων), the father of Pagiel, which latter was the chief man of the tribe of Asher about the time of the exode (<sup>0113</sup>Numbers 1:13, 2:27; 7:72; 10:26). B.C. ante 1658.

### 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

(*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

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

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

Roman emperor. *SEE AUGUSTUS.*

### 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

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

(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

(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 witnesses before an inquest.

### O'Daly, 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.

### 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.

### 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,

## Ode

(ὕδῃ, *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.**

## O'ded

(Heb. *Oded'*, **דדנף**, *erecting*; Sept. **Ὠδῆδ** v.r. **Ἀδάδ**), 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 (<sup><4430></sup>2 Chronicles 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* (**Ὠβηδάς**). 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 (<sup><4430></sup>2 Chronicles 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

*SEE SARDIUS.*

## 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 Italiana*; 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 Minorum*, 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,

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

*SEE INNOCENT XI.*

### Odescalchi, Marc Antollio

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

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

*SEE AUDIANS.*

## 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 (*Beaunne 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, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, 2:76 sq. (B. P.)

### 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 Clugny, 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 Antiquae*, 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. Cluniacensis*, 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

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 Sanct. 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

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 in 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 their descent 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.

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,

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 treatises. *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 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; Trithem, *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 Cantianus.

*SEE ODO OF KENT.*

### Odo Of Chiteauroux,

a French prelate of distinction, 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 Psalterium*, in MS. No. 1327, 1328, Sorbonne Collection, 857, *St. Victor's*: — *Sermones*, 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, 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 177, ann. 1247*; *Gallia Christ.* vol. vii, col. 887; vol. xi, col. 61 *Hist. litter. de la France.* 18:527.

## 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 cilia 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 musica*, 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, cum 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 dicitur apostolis*, attributed to Odo by Marrier, and to Adam of Persigne 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 virtutibus vitiisque animae, De perversitate pravorum, De hujus vitae qualitate. De institutione divina, De contenpla. mundi, Liber ad cedificationem sancte 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; *Veterum 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. *Singularites hist. et litter.* p. 129-179; *Vies des SS. de la Franche-Comte*; Hoefler, *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. Hymnez n u. Gesdng*e, i, 39:98 sq.; 2:146.; Simnrock, *Lauda Sion* (Stuttg. 1868), p. 232 sq.; *Edinb, Rev.* 30:348; 42:14.

### 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 ascendancy 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 Anjou, 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 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 Compiègne. 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 conformity with, the

spirit of the age, when the principal occupation of an abbe was 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 of 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 assertum*. See *Gallia Christiana*, t. vii, .col. 337; *Histoire litt. de la France*, 7:493.

### 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 *Bibliothèque 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 (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 Monasticism*, 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 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 numerorum 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 tractatus -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,

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.

### 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 be 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 Epiphani*; 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

(Ὀδαλλάμ, 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 <sup><021></sup>1 Samuel 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 Khureitun at the time of the Crusades (Will. of Tyre, 15:6)., Dr. Bonar suggests that the name Khureitun represents 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. Galneau 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 <sup><021></sup>1 Samuel 22:3; <sup><023></sup>2 Samuel 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 (<sup><0275></sup>1 Samuel 22:5; 23:3). It was apparently located between Engedi and Jerusalem (if we may so interpret “up” from the former, <sup><0272></sup>1 Samuel 24:22, and “down” from the latter, <sup><0187></sup>2 Samuel 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,

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.

### Odonar'kes

(Ὀδομηρά v. r. Ὀδοναῖρῆς; *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 (1 Maccabees 9:66).

### 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 commission went 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 dismissal. 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

(j ʃj ynæ) *anicho'ach*, <sup><1276></sup>Leviticus 26:31; <sup><2146></sup>Daniel 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 (<sup><2847></sup>Hosea 14:7; <sup><2141></sup>Song of Solomon 4:11); flowers, even exotics, were cultivated in pleasure-gardens for this purpose (<sup><2112></sup>Song of Solomon 1:12; 4:6,14). Odorous extracts were used sometimes in the form of incense, sometimes as ointments (<sup><2108></sup>Song of Solomon 1:3; 4:10); sometimes in water, with which clothing, bed-furniture, etc., was sprinkled (<sup><2177></sup>Proverbs 7:17). *SEE INCENSE; SEE PERFUME; SEE SPICES*.

## 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. Obligated 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

(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

(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 Tübingen and Stuttgart, 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 getting 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 Adelmansfelden, 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 imprisonment. 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 meum* — 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 *Antisyngamma*. Fryth, one of 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 Zwingli'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 at 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 he 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 (Psalm 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 for 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 Genesim; in librum Job exegetata; in Daniele prophetam libri duo* (1553, fol.): — *Commentarii omnes in libros prophetarum* (1558, 2 vols. foL): — *Joasznis Oecolampadii et Huldrici Zuinglii epistolarum libri iv, prcecipua cum religionis a Christo nobis traditce papita, tunc 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. ausgewiihlte 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'Istria, *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

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

(*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 *æconomi* were always chosen from among the clergy. **SEE OICONOMISTS.**

## 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* οἰκνóμος 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” (~~4004~~ 2 Corinthians 4:4, 5). *SEE RESERVE.*

### 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 ~~41230~~ Matthew 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 unfounded, antichristian, and blasphemous.

## 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 Church 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 NICAËAN 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 eyes 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

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

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 II, 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 reproofing 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

(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, *Commentaria in sacrosancta quatuor Christi Evangelia, . . . auctore quidem (ut pluarimi sentiunt) œcumenio, interprete vero Joanne Hentenio* (Louvain, 1543, fol.). The Greek text was published by O. F. Matthaei (Leips. 1792, 3 vols. 8vo): — Ἐξηγήσεις εἰς τὰς πράξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων (compiled from the ancient Greek fathers, and especially from St. Chrysostom): Ἐξηγήσεις εἰς τὰς Παύλου ἐπιστολάς πάσας; Ἐξηγήσεις εἰς τὰς ἑπτὰ καθολικὰς λεγομένας ἐπιστολάς; Εἰς τὴν Ἰωάννου Ἀποκάλυψιν. 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, *Hermeneutics*, p. 169). It is noticeable that he does not read 1 John v. 7; and that he reads SdEg and not Og (<sup>54B6</sup>1 Timothy 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

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,

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

(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 too small, so that Thor had to go to the giant Hymmer, 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 nannies 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,

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 Stuttgart, 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* (Stuttgart, 1845): — *Commentationum ad theologiam pertinentium*, pars I (ibid. 1846): — *Die Grundziige der Alttestamentlichen 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 Kirchengeschichte* (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.

### Oehlmüller, 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.

### 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

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

## Oenomancy

(Gr. *οἶνος*, *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

(*οἶνος*, *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 well-established 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

(*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:* — *Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ὁμηρον Φιλοσοφίας; Περὶ Κράτῆτος 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 stigatorum.* 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; Theodoret. *Therap.* 6:36; 10:141 a). Julian also speaks of tragedies by (Enomaus (*Orat.* 7:210).

### 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

(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 Erzählungen* (Wiesbaden, 1850-1809, 13 vols.) has passed through numerous editions.

### 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 Wuirtemberg, 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): — *Erklärung d. Psalmen nach*

*dem historischen Wortverstande* (Esslingen, 1748, and Heilbronn, 1756, 8vo): — *Inquisitio in sensum communem et rationern pro judicandis philosophorum theoris ad normam Scripturce Sacrce* (Tiibingen, 1753, 8vo): — *Dreyfache Sittenlehre nach der Natur, nach der heiligen Schlrft, nach Jesu Christo* (Heilbronn, 1753, 8vo): — *Die Eulerische u. Frickische Philosophie uber die Musik-*:(Neuwied, 1761): — *Die Philosophie der Alten wiederkommend in der g.üidenen 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 erkennen* (ibid. 1775, 8vo): — *Biblisches u. emblematisches 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). Oettinger's complete works were published at Reutlingen in 1852 sq., and his theosophical writings have been brought out at Stuttgart as follows: *Simmntl. theosophische Schrifte-u, Theologie a. d. Idee des Lebens* (1865).

See *Neues Gelehrtes Europa*, vol. xv; Moser, *Wüirtembergisches Gelehrten-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. Oettinger's nach ihren Grundzugen* (Tubing. 1848).

## Oetosynus

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

## 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 Quellen zum 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

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

### 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.

## 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 Anglicanae* (see Index in pt. ii of vol. ii).

## 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 a fall into sin* (<sup><4162></sup>Matthew 5:29). It may, therefore, apply to ourselves as well as to others (<sup><41816></sup>Matthew 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 (<sup><41817></sup>Matthew 18:17; <sup><5413></sup>Romans 14:13; <sup><4102></sup>1 Corinthians 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" (<sup><4511></sup>Galatians 5:11; 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 (<sup><6143></sup>Romans 14:13-21; <sup><6189></sup>1 Corinthians 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 (<sup><6192></sup>1 Corinthians 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" (<sup><2384></sup>Isaiah 8:14; <sup><6192></sup>Romans 9:32, 33; <sup><6198></sup>1 Peter 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

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

### 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. פּוּדֶוּבֵיִרְאֶה (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

(the general name for which in Hebrew is  $\text{קָרְבָּן}$ ; *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 (*Abstinencia*, 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* ( $\text{חִנְּחָל}$  *minchah*,  $\text{προσφορά, δῶρον}$ ) and *bloody* ( $\text{זֶבַח}$ , *zebach*,  $\text{θυσία}$ ). 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 ( $\text{Nehemiah 10:34}$ ). 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 ( $\text{Leviticus 22:20}$ ;  $\text{Malachi 1:8}$ ), and, with the exception of the doves, not under eight days old ( $\text{Leviticus 22:27}$ ), younger animals being tasteless and innutritious. The smaller beasts, such as sheep, goats, and calves, were commonly one year old ( $\text{Exodus 29:38}$ ;  $\text{Leviticus 9:3; 12:6; 14:10}$ ;  $\text{Numbers 15:27; 28:9 sq.}$ ). Oxen were offered at three years of age; in Judges ( $\text{Judges 6:25}$ ) 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 ( $\text{Leviticus 3:1, 6; 12:5, 6}$ ); 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 (<sup><B00B></sup>Leviticus 1:3), but in trespass and sin offerings it was regulated by law (<sup><B00B></sup>Leviticus 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 (<sup><B15B></sup>Numbers 15:3; <sup><B12B></sup>Deuteronomy 12:6; <sup><B17B></sup>Jeremiah 17:26). Hecatombs or large numbers of cattle were sacrificed on special occasions. In <sup><B08B></sup>1 Kings 8:5,63, 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 <sup><B02B></sup>2 Chronicles 29:32 sq.; 30:24; 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 (<sup><B02B></sup>1 Samuel 1:24; <sup><B00B></sup>Job 1:5 2 Maccabees 3:32). Foreigners were permitted to make offerings on the national altar (<sup><B14B></sup>Numbers 15:14; 2 Maccabees 3:35; 13:23; Philo, *Legat.* p. 1014; Joseph. *Apion*, 2:5). Offerings were made by Jews fir heathen princes (1 Maccabees 7:33; Joseph. *Ant.* 12:2, 5). In the case of bloody-offerings, the possessor, after he had sanctified himself (<sup><B06B></sup>1 Samuel 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 (<sup><B01B></sup>Leviticus 3:1; 12:4; 14:17), where, laying his hand on the head of the animal (<sup><B00B></sup>Leviticus 1:4; 3:2; 4:4), he thus, in a clear and pointed way, devoted it to God. Having so done, he proceeded to slay the victim himself (<sup><B01B></sup>Leviticus 3:2; 4:4); which act might be, and in later times was done by the priests (<sup><B02B></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><B00B></sup>Leviticus 1:6), which, when not burned (<sup><B00B></sup>Leviticus 4:11), belonged either to the priest (<sup><B00B></sup>Leviticus 7:8) or to the offerer (comp. Mishna, *Zebach*, 12:2). The victim was then cut into pieces (<sup><B00B></sup>Leviticus 1:6; 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 <sup><RB14></sup>Leviticus 1:14 sq.; v. 8 (see Hottinger, *De Sacrificiis Avium*, Marb. 1706). In some sacrifices heaving (**hmwr t**) and waving (**hkwb t**) 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 (<sup><RB9></sup>Ezra 6:9; 1 Maccabees 10:39, 2 Maccabees 3:3; 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 (<sup><RB74></sup>Leviticus 17:4 sq.; <sup><RB25></sup>Deuteronomy 12:5 sq.; comp. <sup><RB27></sup>1 Kings 12:27). The precise spot is laid down in <sup><RB3></sup>Leviticus 1:3; 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 (<sup><RB27></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><RB2></sup>1 Kings 3:2, 3). Offerings were made in other places besides the door of the Tabernacle (<sup><RB77></sup>1 Samuel 7:17; <sup><RB6></sup>Judges 2:5). High places, which had long been used by the Canaanites, retained a certain sanctity, and were honored with offerings (<sup><RB6></sup>Judges 6:26; 13:19). Even the loyal Samuel followed this practice (1 Samuel), and David tolerated it (<sup><RB2></sup>1 Kings 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

(<sup><1965></sup>Psalm 66:15; 110:3; <sup><2881></sup>Jeremiah 38:11; <sup><4184></sup>Matthew 8:4; <sup><4226></sup>Acts 21:26; <sup><2423></sup>Isaiah 43:23). Offerings were sworn by, as being something in themselves holy, from the purpose to which they were consecrated (<sup><4238></sup>Matthew 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 (<sup><2321></sup>Isaiah 19:21; 56:7; 60:7; <sup><3421></sup>Zechariah 14:21; <sup><2473></sup>Jeremiah 17:26; 33:18); and deprivation of this privilege was among the calamities of the period of exile (<sup><2104></sup>Hosea 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 (<sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 1:11; <sup><2451></sup>Jeremiah 6:20; 7:21 sq.; <sup><2366></sup>Hosea 6:6; <sup><3122></sup>Amos 5:22; <sup><3366></sup>Micah 6:6 sq.; comp. <sup><1916></sup>Psalm 40:6; 51:17 sq.; <sup><1208></sup>Proverbs 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 (<sup><1023></sup>Matthew 5:23; <sup><4134></sup>Galatians 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” (Hebrews 13:15, 16; Matthew 9:13; 12:7; Romans 15:16; Philippians 2:17; 2 Timothy 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

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.

## Offertorium

*SEE OFFERTORY.*

## Offertory

### Picture for 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 censuring 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 Ecclesiasticus 1:12-18. Pope Gregory caused oblations to be made as God had directed by Moses (<sup>12315</sup>Exodus 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 re-adoption 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 ~~1~~1 Corinthians 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

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

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

(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 Officiis* (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.

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

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

### Picture for 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. **σῦρξ** *saris* (<sup><0376></sup>Genesis 37:36; 39:1; 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 (Ecclesiasticus 20:4; Mishna, *Jebamoth*, 8:4; Juvenal, *Sat.* 1:22; Terence, *Eun.* 4:3, 23; Chardin, *Voyages*, 3:397). *SEE EUNUCH.*

2. **ῥῥοσῥοτῥ** *roshoter*, part. of **ῥῥῥῥ**; *to cut, to grave*, properly a *writer* (Sept. **γραμματεῦς**), and, from the use of writing in judicial administration, a *magistrate* or *praetor*. 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 (<sup><0116></sup>Numbers 11:16; <sup><0315></sup>Deuteronomy 20:5, 8, 9; 29:10; 31:28; <sup><0610></sup>Joshua 1:10; 3:2; 8:33, etc.); of magistrates in the cities and towns of Palestine (<sup><0368></sup>Deuteronomy 16:18; Sept. **γραμματοεισαγωγεῖς**; <sup><1320></sup>1 Chronicles 23:4; 26:29; <sup><4911></sup>2 Chronicles 19:11; <sup><1067></sup>Proverbs 6:7 [A. V. "overseer"], etc.); and apparently also of a military chief (<sup><4951></sup>2 Chronicles 26:11 [A. V. "ruler"]). See below.

3. **bxh** *aittsab*, part. Niph. of **bxh**; to *set or place, a praefect or director* (<sup><1045></sup>1 Kings 4:5, 7; 5:30 [A.V.'16]; 9:23, etc.); and **byxh** *netsib* (<sup><1047></sup>1 Kings 4:7,19). *SEE GOVERNOR*.

4. **bri** *rab* (<sup><1008></sup>Esther 1:8; <sup><2008></sup>Daniel 1:3 [A. V. "master"]); Sept. **οἰκόννομος**. *SEE RAB*.

5. **dq** *pakid*, from **dqP**; to *visit*, Hiph. to *set over, an overseer or magistrate* (<sup><0434></sup>Genesis 41:34, Sept. **τοπάρχης**; <sup><0028></sup>Judges 9:28, Sept. **ἐπίσκοπος**; <sup><1008></sup>Esther 2:3, Sept. **κωμάρχης**; <sup><1041></sup>2 Chronicles 24:11, Sept. **προστάτης**); and **hDqB** *pekuddah*, properly *office*, but used collectively for a *body of officers* (<sup><2007></sup>Isaiah 60:17, Sept. **ἄρχοντας**; also <sup><1041></sup>2 Chronicles 24:11 [A. V. "office"], Sept. **προστάτας**).

6. **hkal Mhiyc** *ἑο* "those who did the business," marg. A.V., Sept. **γραμματεῖς** (<sup><1008></sup>Esther 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 (<sup><1025></sup>Matthew 5:25 [for which Luke uses **πράκτωρ**, 12:58]; <sup><1072></sup>John 7:32, 46; 18:3,12; <sup><1072></sup>Acts 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 (<sup><1028></sup>Luke 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 <sup><028></sup>Luke 12:58). **SEE PUNISHMENT.**

The most usual and specific of the above Hebrew words is *shoterim'* (<sup><015></sup>**pyr fiv**), which is best explained as the participle of an old verb, *shatar'* (<sup><015></sup>**r fiv**), 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 (<sup><016></sup>Exodus 5:6, 14, 15, 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 (<sup><016></sup>Numbers 11:16; <sup><016></sup>Deuteronomy 29:10; 31:28), and at the exode each tribe had its own "officers" (<sup><015></sup>Deuteronomy 1:15; comp. 20:5), who, under Joshua, were the medium of communication between the commander-in-chief and their respective tribes (<sup><010></sup>Joshua 1:10; 3:2), and at different times several classes of functionaries are enumerated, the *officers* (<sup><015></sup>**pyr fiv**) being generally the last mentioned (<sup><013></sup>Joshua 8:33; 23:2; 24:1). The law indeed had already ordained (<sup><016></sup>Deuteronomy 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 (<sup><016></sup>1 Chronicles 23:4; 26:29; comp. <sup><016></sup>2 Chronicles 19:11). Other "officers" are mentioned under David (<sup><016></sup>1 Chronicles 27:1) as engaged in the services of the court, perhaps a kind of chamberlains; but in connection with the army (<sup><016></sup>2 Chronicles 26:11) not only *scribes* (<sup><016></sup>**pyr p s** **SEE SCRIBE**), but also *rulers or officers* (<sup><015></sup>**pyr fiv**) 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, *γραμματεὺς*, 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

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

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

*SEE CHRIST, OFFICES OF.*

## 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

SEE OFFICE, THE DIVINE.

## O'Fihely, 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 *extinguere*, 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.)

## Og

(Heb. *id.* gw<sup>h</sup>ϕ, probably a shortened form of gn<sup>h</sup> ρi.e. qn<sup>h</sup> ρogiant, *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 (g<sup>h</sup> ρis 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 (<sup><B0233></sup>Numbers 21:33; 32:33; <sup><B047></sup>Deuteronomy 4:47; 31:4), reigning over sixty cities, of which the chief were Ashtaroth and Edrei (<sup><B32></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><B233></sup>Numbers 21:33; <sup><B04></sup>Deuteronomy 1:4; 3:3; 29:7; <sup><B20></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><B04></sup>Deuteronomy 3:4-10), and his kingdom assigned, with its capital Ashtaroth, to the transjordanic tribes, especially the half-tribe of Manasseh (<sup><B04></sup>Deuteronomy 3:1-13; <sup><B00></sup>Joshua 9:10; 13:12, 30). **SEE BASHAN.** "In form he was a giant, so that his bedstead was preserved as a memorial of his huge stature — (<sup><B01></sup>Deuteronomy 3:11; <sup><B32></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><B23></sup>2 Samuel 12:26); but it does not therefore follow that <sup><B01></sup>Deuteronomy 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 **לזרביצר**, *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 (<sup><D51></sup>Psalm 135:11; 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 (Shoab), 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 <sup><D23></sup>Numbers 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,

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 Methodism in Tennessee*, 1:36, 40, 44, 45.

## 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, 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

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.,

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

### Picture for Ogee or Ogyve 1

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.

### Picture for Ogee or Ogyve 2

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

## 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 countrymen 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

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 decayed. 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, 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, 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.

### 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.)

## 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

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.

## O’Gorman, 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.

## O’had

(Heb. *id.* **dhāḇ** *power*; Sept. **Αώδ** v. r. **Ἰαίοδ**), the third named of the six sons of Simeon, and head of a family in Israel (<sup><0460></sup>Genesis 46:10; <sup><0065></sup>Exodus 6:15). B.C. cir. 1870. His name is omitted from the lists in <sup><1002></sup>1 Chronicles 4:24, <sup><0254></sup>Numbers 26:14, though in the former passage the Syriac has *Ohor*.

## Ohaloth

*SEE TALMUD.*

## O’hel

(Heb. *id.* **I hāpa** *tent*, as very often; Sept. **Όόλ** v. r. **Όόά**), the fifth named of the seven children of Zerubbabel, of the tribe of Judah and house of

David (~~ERR~~1 Chronicles 3:20). B.C. post 600. See Strong's *Harmony and Exposition*, p. 17.

### 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

(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,

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

(οἴκοι 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 οἴκοι βασίλειοι were always adjacent to the church.

## Oil

### Picture for 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 ἄμν, *she'men*, prop. *pressed juice* (Sept. ἔλαιον; Vulg. *oleum*), from ἄμν; “to become fat” (Gesen. *Thes.* p. 1437); sometimes joined with τρυβίαι ἔλαιον ἐξ ἔλαιων, *oleum de. olivetis*), distinguishing olive-juice from oil produced from other sources. Also sometimes in A. V. “ointment” (Celsius, *Hierob.* 2:279).

**2.** *Yitshar*, רִחַץ אֵיִתְשָׁר, ἔλαιον, *oleum*), from רִחַץ; “to shine” (Gesenius, p. 1152), *clear olive-oil* (<sup><4482></sup>Numbers 18:12; <sup><4873></sup>Deuteronomy 7:13; 11:14; 12:17; 14:23; 18:4; 28:51; <sup><4282></sup>2 Kings 18:32; <sup><4405></sup>2 Chronicles 31:5; 22:28; <sup><4611></sup>Nehemiah 5:11; 10:37, 39; 13:5, 12; <sup><4612></sup>Jeremiah 31:12; <sup><4818></sup>Hosea 2:8, 22; <sup><4011></sup>Joel 1:10; 2:19, 24; <sup><47011></sup>Haggai 1:11; <sup><4044></sup>Zechariah 4:14).

**3.** Chald. j v̄m̄] *meshach'* (ἔλαιον, *oleumn*), *an unguent* (only in <sup><4510></sup>Ezra 6:9; 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 numerous 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 (<sup><4277></sup>Ezekiel 27:17; comp. <sup><4151></sup>1 Kings

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 (<sup>אֵלֶּיךָ</sup>Esther 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 <sup>אֵלֶּיךָ</sup>Deuteronomy 24:20 (**raP**) probably corresponds to the “shaking” (<sup>אֵלֶּיךָ</sup>**āqn**) of <sup>אֵלֶּיךָ</sup>Isaiah 17:6; 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 <sup><0271></sup>Exodus 27:20; <sup><0342></sup>Leviticus 24:2; <sup><0290></sup>Exodus 29:40, and <sup><0385></sup>Numbers 28:5, was probably made by bruising in a mortar. There were presses of a peculiar kind for preparing oil called <sup><0365></sup>*ḡmv tg*, *gath-shemen* (whence the name Gethsemane, or “oil-press,” <sup><0366></sup>Matthew 26:36: <sup><0381></sup>John 18:1), in which the oil was trodden out by the feet (<sup><0365></sup>Micah 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 (<sup><0324></sup>Joel 2:24; 3:13; <sup><0318></sup>Isaiah 63:3; <sup><0315></sup>Lamentations 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 (<sup><0301></sup>1 Samuel 10:1; 16:1, 13; <sup><0103></sup>1 Kings 1:39; 17:16; <sup><0302></sup>2 Kings 4:2, 6; 9:1, 3; <sup><0378></sup>1 Chronicles 27:28; <sup><0411></sup>2



Chronicles 11:11 32:28; <sup><1217></sup>Proverbs 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 (<sup><1213></sup>2 Kings 20:13; comp. <sup><1428></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1151></sup>1 Kings 5:11; <sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 2:10, 15; <sup><1517></sup>Ezra 3:7; <sup><2316></sup>Isaiah 30:6; 57:9; <sup><3577></sup>Ezekiel 27:17; <sup><2810></sup>Hosea 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. <sup><2613></sup>Ezekiel 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 (Sirach, 39:31; comp. <sup><2812></sup>Jeremiah 31:12; 41:8; <sup><2146></sup>Luke 16:6 sq.). It is often mentioned in connection with honey (<sup><2613></sup>Ezekiel 16:13, 19; 27:17), and its abundance was a chief mark of prosperity (comp. <sup><2129></sup>Joel 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 (<sup><B114></sup>Leviticus 2:4, 7, 15; 8:26, 31; <sup><O479></sup>Numbers 7:19 sq.; <sup><S127></sup>Deuteronomy 12:17; 32:13; <sup><1172></sup>1 Kings 17:12, 15; <sup><S120></sup>1 Chronicles 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 <sup><B107></sup>Micah 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 (<sup><S80></sup>Deuteronomy 28:40; <sup><O42></sup>2 Samuel 14:2; <sup><S215></sup>Psalms 23:5; 92:11; 104:15; <sup><O746></sup>Luke 7:46); and this use of oil, which was especially frequent at banquets, became at length proverbially common among the Israelites (<sup><O117></sup>Proverbs 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 (<sup><B13></sup>Ruth 3:3; <sup><O20></sup>2 Samuel 12:20; <sup><O103></sup>Daniel 10:3; <sup><S303></sup>Isaiah 61:3; <sup><O106></sup>Amos 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 <sup><S324></sup>Deuteronomy 33:24; <sup><S206></sup>Job 29:6; <sup><S498></sup>Psalms 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, <sup><2006></sup>Isaiah 1:6; <sup><4163></sup>Mark 6:13; <sup><2104></sup>Luke 10:34; <sup><3954></sup>James 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 (<sup><1276></sup>Exodus 25:6; 27:20, 21; 35:8; <sup><1312></sup>Leviticus 24:2; <sup><4431></sup>2 Chronicles 13:11; <sup><1003></sup>1 Samuel 3:3;

<sup><3018></sup>Zechariah 4:3, 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 (<sup><4251></sup>Matthew 25:1-8; <sup><4125></sup>Luke 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 (<sup><4292></sup>Exodus 29:2, 23; <sup><4165></sup>Leviticus 6:15, 21).
2. The offering of “beaten oil” with flour, which accompanied the daily sacrifice (<sup><4294></sup>Exodus 29:40).
3. The leper’s purification offering (<sup><4140></sup>Leviticus 14:10-18 21, 24, 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 (<sup><4145></sup>Leviticus 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 (<sup><4165></sup>Numbers 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 (<sup><4168></sup>Numbers 8:8).
7. Meat-offerings in general were mingled or anointed with oil (<sup><4170></sup>Leviticus 7:10, 12).

On the other hand, certain offerings were to be devoid of oil: the sin-offering (<sup><4151></sup>Leviticus 5:11) and the offering of jealousy (<sup><4155></sup>Numbers 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 (<sup><2608></sup>Isaiah 61:3; <sup><2929></sup>Joel 2:19; <sup><4116></sup>Revelation 6:6). It is on this principle that oil is so often used in Scripture as symbolical of nourishment and comfort (<sup><4523></sup>Deuteronomy 32:13; 33:24; <sup><4896></sup>Job 29:6; <sup><4947></sup>Psalms 45:7; 109:18; <sup><2608></sup>Isaiah 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 (<sup><3229></sup>Ezekiel 22:29; 23:16; <sup><4182></sup>Numbers 18:12; <sup><4584></sup>Deuteronomy 18:4; <sup><4496></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><4527></sup>Deuteronomy 12:17; <sup><4496></sup>2 Chronicles 31:5; <sup><4607></sup>Nehemiah 10:37, 39; 13:12; <sup><3614></sup>Ezekiel 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 <sup><4022></sup>2 Samuel 1:21; Virgil, *AE.* 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, Infirmorum*" (=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 ἅγιον 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, *Romanism*, 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

### Picture for 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 (<sup><365</sup>Micah 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 lower end. 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 Treh 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

### Picture for Oil-tree 1

### Picture for Oil-tree 2

(*μν*,/[*ets-shemen*; Sept. *κυπάρισσος, ξύλα κυπαρίσσινα*; Vulg. *lignum olivse, frondes ligni pulcherrimi*; A. V. “oil-tree” in <sup>2419</sup>Isaiah 41:19, but in <sup>11123</sup>1 Kings 11:23, “olive-tree,” and in <sup>635</sup>Nehemiah 13:15, “pine-branches”). From the passage in Nehemiah, where it is mentioned as distinct from the *zaith* or “olive-tree,” writers have sought to identify it with the *Elceagnus angustifoliuzs*, Linn., sometimes called “the wild olive tree,” or “narrow-leaved oleaster,” on the supposition that this is the *zuckun-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 *rhdt* Dr. 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

**SEE OENOMANIA.**

## Ointment

is the representative in the Bible of the following words in the original: 1. **ˆmʷ**, *she'men* (so rendered in <sup><2013></sup>2 Kings 20:13; <sup><1012></sup>Psalms 133:2; <sup><1076></sup>Proverbs 27:16; <sup><2001></sup>Ecclesiastes 7:1; 9:8; 10:1; <sup><2008></sup>Song of Solomon 1:3; 4:10; <sup><2006></sup>Isaiah 1:6; 39:2; 57:9; <sup><3086></sup>Amos 6:6; “anointing,” <sup><2307></sup>Isaiah 10:27), probably *oil* (as elsewhere rendered, except “olive” in <sup><1062></sup>1 Kings 6:23, 31, 32, 33; “pine” in <sup><4085></sup>Nehemiah 8:15; “fatness” in <sup><1902></sup>Psalms 109:24; “fat things” in <sup><2316></sup>Isaiah 25:6; “fat” in <sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 28:1, 4; “fruitful” in <sup><2181></sup>Isaiah 5:1). 2. **hʷ cʷnʷ** *anishchah* (in <sup><0205></sup>Exodus 30:25), properly *anointing* (as elsewhere rendered). 3. Usually and distinctively some form of the root **j qʷ**; denoting *perfume*; either the simpler noun **j qeʷ** *ʷrokach* (<sup><0205></sup>Exodus 30:25), an odoriferous compound (“confection,” <sup><0205></sup>Exodus 30:35); or the concrete **tʷ qʷ** *ʷnirkach'ath* (<sup><1001></sup>1 Chronicles 9:30; “compound,” <sup><0205></sup>Exodus 30:25; “prepared by the apothecaries’ art,” <sup><4064></sup>2 Chronicles 16:14); **hʷ qʷ** *ʷnirkachah* (“pot of ointment,” <sup><1011></sup>Job 41:31; “well” spiced, <sup><3240></sup>Ezekiel 24:10; plur. “sweet” flowers, <sup><2163></sup>Song of Solomon 5:13), which probably signify the vessel in which perfumery was prepared. Cognate is **qʷ** *ʷrm*; *mark*. something *rubbed* in. (“things for purifying,” <sup><1022></sup>Esther 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 (<sup><1842></sup>Job 41:22; comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 29:8). Oliveoil, the valued product of Palestine (<sup><0580></sup>Deuteronomy 28:40; <sup><3165></sup>Micah 6:15), was combined with sundry aromatics, chiefly foreign (<sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 10:10; <sup><3272></sup>Ezekiel 27:22), particularly spices, myrrh, and nard [see these words]. Such ointments were for the most part costly (<sup><3086></sup>Amos

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 **מַי אֶפְרוֹכִימ**, of <sup><ARAB></sup>Exodus 30:25, 35; <sup><ARAB></sup>Nehemiah 3:8; <sup><ARAB></sup>Ecclesiastes 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” (<sup><ARAB></sup>1 Samuel 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 (<sup><ARAB></sup>Ruth 3:3; <sup><ARAB></sup>Ecclesiastes 7:1; 9:8; <sup><ARAB></sup>Proverbs 27:9,16; <sup><ARAB></sup>Song of Solomon 1:3; 4:10; <sup><ARAB></sup>Amos 6:6; <sup><ARAB></sup>Psalms 45:7; <sup><ARAB></sup>Isaiah 57:9; <sup><ARAB></sup>Matthew 26:7; <sup><ARAB></sup>Luke 7:46; <sup><ARAB></sup>Revelation 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 <sup><ARAB></sup>Esther 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 (<sup><4132></sup>Matthew 26:12; <sup><4143></sup>Mark 14:3 8; <sup><4236></sup>Luke 23:56; <sup><4813></sup>John 12:3, 7; 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 (<sup><2006></sup>Isaiah 1:6; <sup><3906></sup>John 9:6; <sup><4082></sup>Jeremiah 8:22; 46:11; 51:8; <sup><4613></sup>Revelation 3:18; Tobit 6:8; 11:8, 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 (<sup><4213></sup>Exodus 30:23,33; 29:7; 37:29; 10:9, 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 (<sup><4215></sup>Exodus 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 (<sup><1018></sup>Exodus 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 (Ges. *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 (<sup><2186></sup>Song of Solomon 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 <sup><1843></sup>Job 41:31. The charge of preserving the anointing oil, as well as the oil for the light, was given to Eleazar (<sup><4116></sup>Numbers 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” (~~Q332~~Exodus 30:32); but it seems clear from ~~Q332~~1 Chronicles 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 (~~Q332~~Exodus 29:21; ~~Q332~~Psalms 133:2: “skirts,” in the latter passage, is literally “mouth,” i.e. the opening of the robe at the neck; ~~Q332~~Exodus 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 ladanum 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 (~~Q332~~1 Samuel 10:1; 16:1,13;

~~<1003>~~1 Kings 1:39; ~~<1200>~~2 Kings 9:1, 3, 6; 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 (~~<0900>~~1 Samuel 10:1) the article is used, “the oil,” as it is also in the case of Jehu (~~<1200>~~2 Kings 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

a great god among the Indians of California.

## 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.

## O’Kelly, 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 ruinous 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 overwhelming 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 Sneathen, 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 Sneathen 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 where 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.

## O'Kelly Methodists

SEE OKELLY, JAMES.

### 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,

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, 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-Philosophie*. 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-August, 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**

*SEE TALMUD.*

## Okki

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

## Oklah

*SEE OCLAH.*

## 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 Sigismundi 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

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

*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 sainthood 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 Historie*, 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 zum Ch istenthum* (Munich, 1855-56, 2 vols.); Munter, *Kirchengesch. von 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

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 *NordiskConversationslexikon*, 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

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 praeceptiva capita* (Vienna, 1560, 4to), and in vol. ii of the *Concilia* of Peterfy; one of the best resumés 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.

### Ol'amus

(Ὠλαμός), a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdras 9:30) for MESHULLAM *SEE MESHULLAM* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (<sup><5109></sup>Ezra 10:29).

### Olaus, John

*SEE OLAUS MAGNUS.*

### 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 ascendancy 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 Statibus, 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

A fine description of the decrepitude of old age is contained in <sup><1115></sup>Ecclesiastes 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 (<sup><1812></sup>Job 12:12; 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 (<sup><1892></sup>Leviticus 19:32; Aelian, *Anim.* 6:61. Herod. *ut sup.*; comp. also <sup><1898></sup>Job 29:8; Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* — p. 686). Want of reverence for the aged was severely rebuked (<sup><1880></sup>Deuteronomy 28:50; <sup><21512></sup>Lamentations 5:12; Wisd. 2:10), and moralists often inculcated peculiar obligations to the old (<sup><1892></sup>Proverbs 23:22; Sirach 3:13; 6:35; 8:7; 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 (<sup><1121></sup>2

Kings 6:21; 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 (<sup><0816></sup>Exodus 3:16; 4:29; 12:21; comp. 17:5; 18:12), and Moses himself appointed a college of seventy “elders” (<sup><0816></sup>Numbers 6:16; but comp. <sup><0241></sup>Exodus 24:1, 9) to aid him in ruling. From this time the Israelites always had “*elders*,” sometimes of the whole nation (<sup><0806></sup>Joshua 7:6; 23:2; <sup><0043></sup>1 Samuel 4:3; 8:4; <sup><0087></sup>2 Samuel 3:17; 5:3; 17:4; <sup><1008></sup>1 Kings 8:1, 3; <sup><2490></sup>Jeremiah 19:1; 29:1), sometimes of single tribes (<sup><0528></sup>Deuteronomy 31:28; <sup><0091></sup>2 Samuel 19:11; <sup><4429></sup>2 Chronicles 34:29), who however were distinct from the princes and officers of tribes and provinces (<sup><0590></sup>Deuteronomy 29:10; <sup><0705></sup>Judges 11:5), and sometimes only of cities (<sup><0592></sup>Deuteronomy 19:12; 21:3, 6; 22:15; <sup><0903></sup>1 Samuel 11:3; 16:4; <sup><1208></sup>1 Kings 21:8, 11; <sup><4504></sup>Ezra 10:14; 2 Maccabees 14:37; comp. <sup><0784></sup>Judges 8:14). In the ceremonial order of sacrifice, also, they were representatives of the people for certain purposes (<sup><0045></sup>Leviticus 4:15; 9:1). The elders of the city formed a council, with judicial and police authority (<sup><0525></sup>Deuteronomy 22:15 sq.; 25:7 sq.; <sup><0042></sup>Ruth 4:2 sq.; Judith 10:7), which held its sessions at the gates (<sup><3897></sup>Job 29:7). Yet other judges are sometimes mentioned (<sup><4504></sup>Ezra 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 (<sup><1008></sup>1 Kings 8:1; 20:7; 2 Kings 28:1). They still retained their functions during the Captivity (<sup><3440></sup>Ezekiel 14:1; 20:7), and after the restoration to Palestine were the medium of communication between the people and their foreign rulers (<sup><4509></sup>Ezra 5:9; 6:7), and even until the time of the Maccabees were a tribunal of general resort in the internal affairs of the nation (<sup><4564></sup>Ezra 6:14; 10:8; 1 Maccabees 12:6, 35; 13:36; 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 (*q̄ezaken*) 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* (<sup><4347></sup>Matthew 26:47; <sup><4078></sup>Luke 7:3; called “*the senate of the children of Israel*” [*γεραπεσία τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*], <sup><4451></sup>Acts 5:21) usually appear as composing, in connection with the high-priests and scribes, the Jewish Sanhedrim (<sup><4363></sup>Matthew 26:3, 47; 27:1 sq.; <sup><4143></sup>Mark 14:43; 15:1; <sup><4226></sup>Luke 22:66; <sup><4045></sup>Acts 4:5; 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*,” <sup><5044></sup> Timothy 4:14; see <sup><4113></sup> Acts 11:30; 14:23 15:2 sq.; 16:4). *SEE AGE; SEE ELDERS; SEE PRESBYTERY.*

## Old Believers

*SEE STAROVERTZI.*

## 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.

### 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 breffe 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.**

## 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 numerous 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 Spire, 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 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 repräsentanz), 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 Vatican 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 future 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 Roman 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, Umfang, Hemmnisse und Aussichten der altkatholischen Bewegung* (Berlin, 1873); PBre Hyacinthe, *De la Reforme Catholique* (Paris, 1872); Michaud, *Programme de Reforme 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

*SEE REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.*

## 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 Hundsrück Mountains, and between Rhenish Prussia and Lichtenberg, is an outlying territory, situated in lat.  $49^{\circ} 30' - 49^{\circ} 52'$  N., and in long.  $7^{\circ} - 7^{\circ} 30'$  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

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 Caraibischen 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

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 Igoyro*: — *De Ophir*: — *De festivitate AEnceniorum*: — *De specularibus Veterum*: — *De origine natalitiorum Jesu Christi*.

## 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.)

## Old Flemings

*SEE MENNONITES.*

## 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.

## Old-Light Antiburghers

*SEE ORIGINAL ANTIBURGHES SYNOD.*

## Old-Light Burghers

*SEE ORIGINAL BURGHES SYNOD.*

## Old and New Light Controversy

*SEE ANTIBURGHES; SEE ORIGINAL ANTIBURGHES SYNOD; SEE ORIGINAL BURGHES SYNOD.*

## Old Lutherans

*SEE LUTHERANS.*

## Old Man of the Mountain

*SEE ASSASSINS.*

## 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

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Wessell, Suffolk County, England, Feb. 13, 1802. In 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

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.

### Old-School Baptists

*SEE BAPTISTS.*

## Old-School Presbyterians

*SEE PRESBYTERIANS.*

### Old Testament

(ἡ παλαιὰ 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 HAGIOGRAPHIA* 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 Psalm 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 (<sup><9017></sup>Psalm 40:7; <sup><2914></sup>Jeremiah 36:14; <sup><3811></sup>Zechariah 5:1; <sup><3111></sup>Ezekiel 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 Maccabean 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 **yrb[ btk**. At what date this was exchanged for the present Aramaic or square character, **tyrwça btk**, or **[brm btk**, 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 Maccabean 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 <sup><41518></sup>Matthew 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, **btk tyrwça**, i.e.

Assyrian writing, implies, though it may geographically require to be interpreted with some latitude. (The suggestion of Hupfeld that **tyrwça** may 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 be shortly anterior to the Christian era; 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: **çdwq** takes the place of **çdq dywd** of **dwd**. 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 era 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~~ Genesis 1:24 the substantive **hyj** in its construct state acquired its final **y**, 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 **p** and **s**, 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 <sup>251B</sup>Isaiah 52:3-5 (to the greater Parshioth here correspond the Haptharoth). 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 <sup>-~~CRB~~</sup>Leviticus 13:33; with our present verses it is <sup>-~~CRB~~</sup>Leviticus 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 countrymen acted. 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 Hillel 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 Pumbeditha, 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 *qwsp āws*,. *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 <sup><985></sup>Psalm 45:5, **qdxAhwn**[w. But the use of it cannot be relied on, as it often in the poetical books conflicts with the rhythm; e.g. in <sup><985></sup>Psalm 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 , **hrsm**, *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, **gyys** of 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 *minuscules*, of which they reckoned thirty-three; the *suspensae*. four in number; and the *inversae*, of which, the letter being in each case *n*, 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 Keris the 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 ⲙⲓⲣⲡⲱⲤ ⲁⲩⲧⲏ, "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 (~~1871~~ Job 7:20) confirms the present Masoretic text.

Furthermore, the Masorah contains certain ⲁⲩⲓⲣⲓⲃⲱⲤ, "Conjectures," which it does not raise to the dignity of Keris, respecting the true reading in difficult passages. Thus at ~~11823~~ Genesis 19:23, for ⲁⲩⲩⲏ was conjectured ⲁⲩⲩⲏ, because the word ⲘⲙⲘ is 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 and 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 **מִימ** [ **f**, “senses;” with respect to the latter, **טְוּנָיִן**, “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 punctuators, but the traditions which had descended to 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 **h**. 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 (<sup>2186</sup>Song of Solomon 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, *ypæd I kina* (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. Græcorum filagmenta* (Arnob. 1622, 4to); Pareus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* i); Althing, *Commentarii* [on certain parts] (in *Opp.* ii); Maldonatus, *Commentarii* [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, *Erklrdung* [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); Digby, *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. 1797/1800, 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, *Erlaut.* [Jewish] (Lpz. 1839-56, 1858, 3 vols. 4to); \*Keil and Delitzsch, *Commezentar* (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.**

## 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 Königsberg. 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 Irrthümer in den Anhaltischen Büchern.*

**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, *Erklärung des Buches Hiob in 55 Predigten* (Lips. 1633, 1645, 1672, 4to): — *Biblica theoretico-practica adnotata* (Halle, 1676, 4to): — *Homiliarum catecheticalum plus 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 Erklärung* (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 hermeneuticae 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 theologicæ 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 Königsberg, 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, cum observationibus philologicis* (Leips. 1706, 4to): — *Observationes sacrae in Evangelium 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 Eruditorum*, 1711, p. 419-424; 1713, p. 428 sq.; Jocher, A 1. *Gelehrten-Lexikon*; Hunnius, *Apologia J. G. Oleaiiii* (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; Hirschling, *Handbuch*; Lipsius, *Bibl. Numaria* (Leips. 1801), vol. ii; Ersch u. Gruber, *Encyklopidie*; Arnoldt, *HIistorie d. Königsberger Univ.* vol. ii; Chauffepi, *Dict.' Hist.*; Nicéron; *Memoires*, vol. vii; Hoefler, *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.)

## O'Leary, 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 the 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 yet 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.)

## 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 1545 he 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. Prædicat.*; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 7:460.

## Olesnicki, Nicholas

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

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 Catechism, 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 Presbyterian 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, Olevianus 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, *Vitæ Germ. Theol.* p. 596 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 10:604; Harbaugh, *Fathers of the German Ref. Ch.* 1:246-261; Hagenbach, *Vater u. Begründer 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

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.,

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, Vratslav, 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, *Lehnbuch 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,

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

*SEE FRANKINCENSE.*

### 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 Clause bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne; 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 marquis 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 Fenelon as “vir traditus gratiae 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 Seminaire de St. Sulpice* (Paris, 1853, 8vo); Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 1:330-332; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38, 615-617.

## 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 American* 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

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

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

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 Perugia, 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 apostolis facta: — De peccato in Spiritum Sanctum.: — Orationes elegantes.* (J. H. W.)

### Oliva, Fernand Perez de

a noted Spanish moralist, 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 Alcalá, 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

(*tyzē*za'yith, probably from *tWz*, to be pleasant, said esp. of odors; or, as Gesenius supposes, from *hHz*; 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 *tyzē* *μῦκ*), usually on high ground, and even on mountains (comp. <sup><0081></sup>Genesis 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 Eusropea*), 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. <sup><347></sup>Hosea 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. <sup><BIB></sup>Psalm 52:10; 128:3; <sup><BIB></sup>Jeremiah 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. <sup><BIB></sup>Jeremiah 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 charm 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-leaved, which is cultivated in the south of France and in Italy, and the broad-leaved 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 <sup><BIB></sup>Genesis 8:11 the dove is described as bringing the olive-branch to Noah. How far this early incident may have suggested the later emblematic 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 (<sup><BIB></sup>Judges 9:8, 9). The olive, being an evergreen, was adduced as an emblem of prosperity (<sup><BIB></sup>Psalm 52:8;

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 olive 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 (<sup><2816></sup>Hosea 14:6; <sup><2416></sup>Jeremiah 11:6; comp. Ecclesiasticus 1, 10). The olive is always enumerated among the valued trees of Palestine; which Moses describes (<sup><6816></sup>Deuteronomy 6:11; 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 (<sup><4420></sup>2 Chronicles 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 <sup><2822></sup>Hosea 12:12, and Jerome, *ad loc.*; *Echa Rabb.* 85:3). The Phoenicians also received much oil from Palestine (<sup><2577></sup>Ezekiel 27:17; comp. <sup><1051></sup>1 Kings 5:11; <sup><1537></sup>Ezra 3:7). The kings of Israel raised a part of their revenue in oil (<sup><4628></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><4685></sup>Nehemiah 8:15). **SEE OLIVET.** The wood also was used (<sup><1023></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><3182></sup>James 3:12; Esdras 16:29), which produce the oil, were sometimes gathered by shaking the tree (<sup><2243></sup>Isaiah 24:13), sometimes by beating it (<sup><1320></sup>Deuteronomy 24:20). Then followed the treading of the fruit (<sup><1534></sup>Deuteronomy 33:24; <sup><3165></sup>Micah 6:15). Hence the mention of “oil-fats!” (<sup><2124></sup>Joel 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).

## Picture for Olive 1

Thus we see the force of the words of Eliphaz the Temanite: “He shall cast off his flower like the olive” (<sup><1533></sup>Job 15:33). It is needless to add that the locust was a formidable enemy of the olive (<sup><1049></sup>Amos 4:9). It happened not unfrequently that hopes were disappointed, and that “the labor of the olive failed” (<sup><3117></sup>Habakkuk 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.*

## Picture for Olive 2

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 Columellus 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-Berry

(**rGr** **ἡ γάργαρος**, so called from its round and *rolling* form; **23706** Isaiah 17:6, “berry-;” **ἔλαια**, **4812** James 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,

**SEE OIL-MILL; SEE PRESS.**

### Olive-Oil

(fully **ἡ ἑλαιή**, **tyze** *olive of oil*, **4888** Deuteronomy 8:8; briefly **ἡ ἑλαιή**, **4812** Exodus 30:24, or **tyze** simply, **4812** 2 Kings 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 <sup><4020></sup>2 Chronicles 2:10, where we are told that Solomon provided Hiram's men with "twenty thousand baths of oil." Comp. <sup><5307></sup>Ezra 3:7. Too much of this product was supplied for home consumption: hence we find the country sending it as an export to Tyre (<sup><2677></sup>Ezekiel 27:17) and to Egypt (<sup><2827></sup>Hosea 12:1). This oil was used in coronations: thus it was an emblem of sovereignty (<sup><9001></sup>1 Samuel 10:1; 12:3, 5). It was also mixed with the offerings in sacrifice (<sup><8001></sup>Leviticus 2:1, 2, 6, 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" (<sup><1271></sup>Exodus 27:20), . For the burning of it in common lamps, see <sup><1023></sup>Matthew 25:3, 4, 8. The use of it on the hair and skin was customary, and indicative of cheerfulness (<sup><9275></sup>Psalms 23:5; <sup><1067></sup>Matthew 6:17). It was also employed medicinally in surgical cases (<sup><1034></sup>Luke 10:34). See, again, <sup><1063></sup>Mark 6:13; <sup><5154></sup>James 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, Wild

(Gr. *Ἀγριελαία*, Dioscorides, 1:125; N.T. *Ἀγριέλαιος*; 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 (<sup><5116></sup>Romans 11:16-25). The Gentiles are the "wild olive" (*ἄγριέλαιος*), 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 **Ἀγριελαία**, 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 **Ἀγριελαία** 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 *Elaeagnus* to bear olives of any kind. If we examine a little further the account given by Dioscorides of the **Ἀγριελαία**, 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 Ethiopian 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 **Ἀγριελαία**, the common olive, or *Olea Europea*, 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 nature, 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 quae 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-Yard

(*tyaz̄a'yith*, <sup><0231></sup>Exodus 23:11; <sup><0243></sup>Joshua 24:13; <sup><0084></sup>1 Samuel 8:14; <sup><0166></sup>2 Kings 5:26; <sup><0161></sup>Nehemiah 5:11; 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 <sup><0161></sup>Deuteronomy 6:11; 8:8; 28:40.) Olive-yards are a matter of course. in descriptions of the country, like vineyards and corn-fields (<sup><0155></sup>Judges 15:5; <sup><0084></sup>1 Samuel 8:14). The kings had very extensive ones (<sup><0127></sup>1 Chronicles 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’ (<sup><0161></sup>Deuteronomy 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*.

### 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.

### 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, 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

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 Inhorinsg 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 manly. 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

SEE OLIVET.

### Olivet

#### Picture for Olivet 1

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” (μῦτῦζῆι Ἀἰῆ; Sept. τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἔλαιῶν) occurs only once in the O.T. (<sup><3840></sup>Zechariah 14:4), but the hill is clearly alluded to in five other passages. In <sup><1050></sup>2 Samuel 15:30 we read that David, in fleeing from Jerusalem during Absalom’s rebellion, “went up *by the ascent* of the Olives” (μῦτῦζῆι ἡ [ἰ]μβ), unquestionably the western side of the mount, up which he had to go “toward the way of the wilderness” (ver. 23). In <sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 11:7 it is recorded that Solomon built “a high place for Chemosh *in the hill that is before* (ἡψη [ἰ] ῥῆα ῥῆβ,) 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 <sup><1231></sup>2 Kings 23:13 “*The Mount of Corruption*” (τῦζ ῥῆβ ῥῆ), doubtless from the idolatrous rites established by Solomon, and practiced there. In <sup><1685></sup>Nehemiah 8:15 Olivet is called emphatically “*The Mount*” (ῥῆβ), etc. Ezekiel mentions it as the mountain which is *on the east side* (ἡδῦμ) of the city.

In the N.T. its ordinary name is “The Mount of Olives” (τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἔλαιῶν), which may be regarded as a descriptive appellation—the mount on which the olives grew (<sup><1200></sup>Matthew 21:1; 24:3; 26:30; <sup><1100></sup>Mark 11:1; <sup><2157></sup>Luke 19:37; <sup><1080></sup>John 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 Ἐλαιών), not, as in the A. V., “the Mount of Olives.” The word is Ἐλαιών, the nom. sing., and not ἐλαιών, the gen. pi. of ἐλαία (see Alford, Tischendorf, Lachmann, etc., *ad loc.*), in which case it would have the article (19:29; comp. ver. 37; 21:37; 22:39). In <sup><4012></sup>Acts 1:12 Luke again employs it in the gen. sing. — “Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet” (ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος [“called Elaion”]). In Josephus also we read διὰ τοῦ Ἐλαιῶνος 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” (hj çmh rh; Mishna, *Para*, 3:6; Reland, *Palaest.* p. 337); and Jarchi, in his note on <sup><1233></sup>2 Kings 23:13, says this was its usual name; but that the sacred writers changed it to “Mount of Corruption” (tyj çmh rh) by a play upon the word, and to denote its defilement by the idolatrous rites of Solomon. The name hj çm is 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: a tyzerwf aytjzæ <sup><1053></sup>2 Samuel 15:30; <sup><1233></sup>2 Kings 23:13; Ezra 11:23; <sup><3146></sup>Zechariah 14:4), aj vñhæf’ (<sup><2188></sup>Song of Solomon 8:3; and <sup><1081></sup>Genesis 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” (rhh) in <sup><1685></sup>Nehemiah 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 descending in broken 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 stiated 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.

## Picture for Olivet 2

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 (l j n) of Kidron, toward the way of the wilderness" (~~1~~2 Samuel 15:23) — the wilderness of Judah lying between Olivet and the Jordan. Having crossed the Kidron, "he ascended by the ascent of the Olives" (ver. 30), and came to the summit, "*where he worshipped God*" (ver. 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* (ver. 13). After passing Bahurim, probably about where Bethany now stands, he continued the descent through the “dry and thirsty land” (Psalm 63), until he arrived “weary” at the bank of the river (Josephus, *Ant.* vii. 9, 2-6; ~~1064~~2 Samuel 16:14; 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” (~~1107~~1 Kings 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” (~~1233~~2 Kings 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. ~~1233~~2 Kings 23:13, 14; ~~1075~~Jeremiah 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 (~~1496~~Jeremiah 19:6-11). 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 aquilonari-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 (~~1233~~2 Kings 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 (<sup><3004></sup>Ezekiel 10:4); then it removed to a position over the east gate of the Lord's house (ver. 19); then it went up "and stood upon the mountain, *which is upon the east side of the city*" (<sup><3123></sup>Ezekiel 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 <sup><4685></sup>Nehemiah 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 (<sup><4118></sup>Mark 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" (<sup><3444></sup>Zechariah 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" (<sup><4181></sup>Matthew 8:20; <sup><3006></sup>John 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” (<sup>(4100)</sup>Matthew 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” (<sup>(4110)</sup>Mark 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” (<sup>(4120)</sup>Luke 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 traditional 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!" (<sup>4110B</sup>Mark 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" (ver. 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" (ver. 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 (<sup>4180C</sup>John 18:1; <sup>4185D</sup>Matthew 26:30, 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 Βηθάνιαν, “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” (<sup><428></sup>Luke 24:50-53; <sup><400></sup>Acts 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 Luc.* 24:50).
- (d) Bethany was fifteen stadia distant from Jerusalem (<sup><6118></sup>John 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 Jew or 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 facade 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 <sup>24123</sup>Ezekiel 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 <sup><4012></sup>Acts 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, *l. c.*; Wieseler; also Barclay, who gives important measurements, *City of the Great King*, 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, ἐντεῦθεν το τὸν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἄνοδον πεποινμένον (*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 Quaresmius, Doubdan, Mislin, and other works.

**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 (~~4291~~Luke 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 (~~4129~~Matthew 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. (~~4148~~Matthew 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 facade 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 (<sup>1839</sup>Matthew 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 circumvallation, 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 (<sup><1220></sup>2 Kings 23:1; <sup><1110></sup>1 Kings 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” (tyj æmhi rh) seems to be connected etymologically in some way with the name by which the mount is occasionally rendered in the Targums- aj vjæwlf (Jonathan. <sup><2189></sup>Song of Solomon 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 <sup>(4687)</sup>Joshua 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 (<sup>(4830)</sup>Matthew 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 century 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 Trav.* 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 Terrae 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.; *Jerusalem 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

abbot of Thouliez, 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'Academie Francaise*, 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.): — *Tusculane Quæstiones* (1737, 1747), of which the third and fifth

books are translated by Bouhier: — the *Oration*s 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 Francaise* (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).

### Olivet, 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, "Olivet 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). Olivet 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, Olivet 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. Olivet, 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 Olivet's labors became the foundation of the Genevan Bible. Olivet, 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'cirture Saiute*, ch. ii; Senebier, *Hist. Litter. de Geneve*, 1:153; Haag, *Lat France Protestante*, s.v.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:635; Merle D'Aubigne, *Hist. of the Ref.* 3:365 sq.; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* April, 1865, p. 420.

## Olivetans

*SEE MONTOLIVETENSES; SEE PTOLOMEI.*

## 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

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* (הר"ת ר"ת), and was elected in 1674 to the dignity of *chacham* in the institution called *Geniluth Chassadim*, where he delivered expositions 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, *מַיבְרָאֵי יַיִן* *the Lovely Hind*, a moral philosophical work on Hebrew rhetoric



(Amsterdam, 1665): — **ⲡⲓⲁⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** | **ⲉⲓ** *the Door of Lips*, a Chaldee grammar, with the title *Grammatica da lengoa Chaldaica*” (ibid. 1682): — **ⲡⲓⲛⲓⲟⲩⲓⲛⲓ** *a methodology and logic of the Talmud* (ibid. 1688): — **ⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** *an alphabetical index to the 613 Precepts, etc.* (ibid. 1689): — **ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** *the Green Olive*, a Portuguese translation of the words which frequently occur in the Mishna and Gemara, and of the technical expressions (ibid. 1683): — **ⲧⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** *on the Hebrew accents, printed together with No. 3* (ibid. 1688): — **ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** ; **ⲉⲓ** *on Hebrew and Chaldee grammar, to which is appended* **ⲧⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** ; *on the Biblical Aramaisms* (ibid. 1682, 1689): — **ⲡⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** / **ⲉⲓ** *Hebrew, Chaldaic, and Portuguese lexicon* (ibid. 1682): — **ⲧⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** ; *Chain of Terminations*, a lexicon on Hebrew assonance (ibid. 1665): — **ⲡⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ** *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 für Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenthums* (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 Jüdischer Kanzebledner* (Berlin, 1870), vol. i; *Beiblatt*, p. 10. (B. P.)

### 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 *Bibliothèque 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

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 l'Eglise*; Haag, *La France Protestante*.

### 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 funebre de M. l'Abbe Philippe Jean Louis Desjardins, Docteur en Sorbonne et Vicair General de Paris* (Paris, 1834, 8vo): — *Le Catholique a la sainte Table* (Paris and Lyons, 1839, 18mo): — *Delices des dñes affligees, ou lettres de consolation tirees des saints Peres* (Paris, 1840 and 1854, 18mo): — *Concordances de rapport de la thologie 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

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 rotæ Romance mille quingentæ* (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, *l'histoire des Cardinaux illustres; France pontificate.*

### 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 morale, ossia li doveri dell' uomo* (Genoa, 1828, 2 vols. 12mo). See *Votizie Romane; L'Ami de la Religion*, ann. 1834.

### 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.

### 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).

### 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.)

### 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 Vauchuse*.

### Olotzaga, Juan De,

an eminent Spanish architect, was a native of Biscay, and flourished during the latter part of the 15th century. 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 facade 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, 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 1818 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 Königsberg, 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 in 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 realize what he anticipated, and died Sept. 4, 1839, in the prime of life. Besides his prize-essay, he wrote, *Historiae Ecclesiae veteris monumenta* (Berlin, 1820-22): — *Die Aechtheit der vier kanonischen Evangelien, aus den Geschichte der zwei ersten Jahrhunderte erwiesen* (Königsberg, 1823): — *Ein Wort über tiefen Schriftsinn* (ibid. 1824): — *Die Eibl. Schriftauslegung: Noch ein Wort über 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 über sämtliche 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 religious 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 which 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. Schriftsteller 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, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 2:270, 310 (Engl. transl. 2:362-408); Kahnis, *Hist. Protestant Theol.* p. 268; Pye-Smith, *Introd. to Theology*, 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.

## Olym'pas

(*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 (<sup><5165></sup>Romans 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

*SEE MORATA.*

## Olympiad

*SEE ERA.*

## Olympic Games

*SEE GAMES.*

## Olympiodorus

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 *συλλογή ἄποσπασματίων 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.



## 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*.

## Olym'pius

(Ὀλύμπιος, 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 (2 Maccabees 6:2). *SEE JUPITER.*

## Olympius

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

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 Poloniae*. 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

a Sanscrit word of asseveration, much used in Buddhistic works as an introductory term. It is especially prominent in Lamaism (q.v.).

## 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.

## Omae'rus

(Ἰωμάηρος, v. r. Ἰσμάηρος and Μαῆρος; Vulg. *Abramus*), a corrupt Grmecized form (1 Esdras 9:34) for AMRAM *SEE AMRAM* (q.v.), a descendant of Bani (<sup>4510B</sup>Ezra 10:34).

## 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.*

## O'mar

(Heb. *Omar'*, *רמא*, *eloquent*; Sept. *Ὠμάρ*), the second named of the seven sons of Eliphaz, son of Esau (<sup><0135></sup>Genesis 36:15 [comp. ver. 11]; <sup><0136></sup>1 Chronicles 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*, <sup><0135></sup>Genesis 36:11), but the names are somewhat different (a initial, and the Arabic equivalent of [ ]).

## 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 *hajib*, 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 Mohammedans 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 was followed 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 fuel 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 Mugheyrak (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. Iabalak 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, Iabalak 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 neophyte 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. Iabalak resented the incivility by immediately striking the man a blow on the face. The man made his complaint to Omar, who, having summoned Iabalak to his presence, sentenced him to receive a similar blow from the complainant. Against this sentence, just as it was, Iabalak 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, Almuqheyrah ibn-es-shaabah, to pay him two dirhems daily, in conformity with the Mohammedan custom, for the free exercise of this religion. Firuz, 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 Medina, 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 Hafsa 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 era 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.; Almakim, *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, *Islanitische Vhlker*, p. 4787; Wright, *Chriiianity in Arabia*, p. 186 sq.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, 9:222, etc.; and especially the article in the *English Cyclopaedia*, S. .

### 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.  $8^{\circ} 8' - 8^{\circ} 28' S.$ , long.  $124^{\circ} 17' - 125^{\circ} 7'$ , 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

priests and soothsayers among the inhabitants of Madagascar (q.v.), who compound charms, which they sell to the people.

## Ombrius

a surname of Zeus, as the *rain-giver*, under which title he was worshipped on Mount Hymettus, in Attica.

## 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.”

## O’mega

[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 anything: “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending... the first and the last” (Revelation 1:8, 11; comp. 21:6 22:13). This may be compared with Isaiah 41:4; 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 quae sunt, fuerunt, quaeque post futura sunt.”*

**SEE ALPHA.** The symbol **ta**, 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 **a** to **t**,” 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. In the early times of the Christian Church the letters **A** 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

(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 Pomm. 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.*

## O’mer

(Heb. *id.* *rm[*prop. a *sheaf*, as in <sup>(12310)</sup>Leviticus 23:10, etc., from *rm[*; to *bind* or *gather*; Sept. *γομόρ*; Vulg. *gonzer*), a Hebrew dry measure (<sup>(12316)</sup>Exodus 16:16, 18, 22, 32, 33), the tenth of an ephah (ver. 36); therefore about *two quarts* according to the rabbins, but three and a half quarts according to Josephus. *SEE METROLOGY.*

## 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 Trouenne 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 Sanctorum*, Sept. 9; Mabillon, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, ix saec.; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, vol. iii; *Breviarium Paris-iense*; *France pontificale*; Longueval, *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallic*. Vol. iv.

### Omer (St.), Ecclesiastical Council Of

(*Concilium Audomarense*), 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.

### 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

canonist. *SEE GLOSSARIES; SEE GLOSSATORS.*

### 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: <sup><0170></sup>Genesis 17:1; <sup><0251></sup>Exodus 15:11, 12; <sup><0183></sup>Deuteronomy 3:24; <sup><0146></sup>1 Samuel 14:6; <sup><0211></sup>Psalms 62:11; 65:6; 147:5; <sup><0185></sup>Daniel 4:35; <sup><0163></sup>Matthew 6:13; 19:26; <sup><0181></sup>Ephesians 3:20; <sup><0106></sup>Revelation 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 (<sup><0001></sup>Genesis 1:1; <sup><0020></sup>Romans 1:20);
2. In the preservation of his creatures (<sup><0003></sup>Hebrews 1:3; <sup><0016></sup>Colossians 1:16, 17);
3. In the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ (<sup><0035></sup>Luke 1:35, 37; <sup><0019></sup>Ephesians 1:19);
4. In the conversion of sinners (<sup><0003></sup>Psalm 110:3; <sup><0002></sup>2 Corinthians 4:7);
5. In the continuation and success of the Gospel in the world (<sup><0031></sup>Matthew 13:31, 32);
6. In the preservation of the saints (<sup><0005></sup>1 Peter 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 (<sup><0234></sup>Matthew 25:34; <sup><0003></sup>Philippians 3:20, 21). This power is only limited by God's own holy nature, which renders it impossible for him to do wrong (<sup><0239></sup>Numbers 23:19; <sup><0003></sup>Hebrews 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,

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 (Psalm 139); his power, which is everywhere (<sup><0003></sup>Hebrews 1:3); his providence (<sup><0477></sup>Acts 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

the third essential or natural attribute of God, is that perfection by which he knows all things. This is:

1. *Infinite* (<sup><4175></sup>Psalm 147:5);
2. *Eternal* (<sup><2360></sup>Isaiah 46:10; <sup><4423></sup>Acts 2:23;. 15:18; <sup><4004></sup>Ephesians 1:4);
3. *Universal*, extending to all persons, times, places, and things (Psalm 1, 10-13; <sup><5043></sup>Hebrews 4:13);
4. *Perfect*, relating to what is past, present, and to come. He knows all independently, distinctly, infallibly, and perpetually (<sup><2406></sup>Jeremiah 10:6, 7; <sup><5113></sup>Romans 11:33).
5. This knowledge *is peculiar* to himself, and not communicable to any creature (<sup><1894></sup>Job 36:4; <sup><4132></sup>Mark 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 (<sup><1812></sup>Job 21:22; 28:24; <sup><1906></sup>Psalm 139:6; <sup><4183></sup>1 John 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 willer, 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

(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

(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

*SEE HESYCHASTS*.

### Om'ri

(Heb. *Omri'*, *yræi*; thought by Gesenius and Furst to be for *hYræi*; 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 *Αυβρί*; elsewhere *Αμαρία Αμαρί*, v. r. *Ζαμβρί, Μαρί*; Josephus, *Αμαρίνος*, *Ant.* 8:12, 5), the name of fourmen:

1. The fifth named of nine sons of Becher, son of Benjamin (<sup><13708></sup>1 Chronicles 7:8). B.C. cir. 1618.
2. Son of Imri and father of Ammihud, of the tribe of Judah (<sup><13904></sup>1 Chronicles 9:4). B.C. post 1618.
3. Son of Michael, and David's captain in the tribe of Issachar (<sup><13718></sup>1 Chronicles 27:18). B.C. cir. 1017.
4. The commander-in-chief of the armies of Elah, king of Israel (<sup><11616></sup>1 Kings 16:16), and the seventh king of Israel, who began to reign in B.C. 926, and reigned eleven full (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. <sup><1165></sup>1 Kings 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” (<sup><1165></sup>1 Kings 16:25). This is the same Omri mentioned (<sup><1212></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><2104></sup>Song of Solomon 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 (<sup><1165></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><1212></sup>1 Kings 20:34), and among them probably Ramoth-Gilead (<sup><1212></sup>1 Kings 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 (<sup><336></sup>Micah 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

### Picture for On

the name of a man, and also of a city.

**1.** (Heb. id.  $\hat{w}a$ , *strength*, as  $\langle 8807 \rangle$  Job 18:7; Sept.  $A\acute{\upsilon}v$ .) 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 ( $\langle 0401 \rangle$  Numbers 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  $\Phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\omicron\upsilon\delta\varsigma$ , 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,  $\hat{w}a$ ,  $\langle 0453 \rangle$  Genesis 41:50, or in the condensed form  $\hat{a}p$   $\langle 0445 \rangle$  Genesis 41:45, 50; 46:20 (Sept.

$\hat{H}\lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\varsigma$ ; Vulg. *Heliopolis*), which is doubtless of Coptic etymology. But in  $\langle 2307 \rangle$  Ezekiel 30:17, it is Hebraized  $\hat{w}a$ ; *A ven* (q.v.), i.e. *wickedness* (Sept. and Vulg. as before).

The same city is also mentioned in the Bible as BETH-SHEMESH, **vmv, tyBe** (<sup>2483</sup>Jeremiah 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, **srhhiry[æ or srj hi]** the second part being, in this case, either the Egyptian sacred name, or else the Hebrew **srj**, 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 (**ὄν ἡ ἐστὶν Ἡλιοῦπολις**, 1:11); but in Jeremiah this version seems to treat Beth-shemesh as the name of a temple (**τοὺς στύλους Ἡλιοῦπόλεως, τοὺς ἐν ὄν**), 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 **a** and **[ , w, and y**.

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 (**ὄν δὲ ἐστὶ κατ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ἥλιος**, *ad Hosea* p. 145), and the Coptic *Ouoini* (Memphitic), *Ouein*, *Ouoiein* (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” (<sup>445</sup>Genesis 41:45. comp. ver. 50; and 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 ἠκοδόμησαν πόλεις ὀχυράς τῷ Φαραῶ, τήν το Πειθῶ, καὶ Ῥαμεσσῆ, καὶ Ὠν, ἣ ἔστιν Ἡλιοῦπολις, <sup><III></sup>Exodus 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 [? <sup>twbxxm</sup>, 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).

### O'nam

(Heb. *Onam*', μνω, *strong*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ὠμάρ in Genesis, Ὠνάμ in Chron.; v. r. Ὠμάν, Σωνάν), the last named of the five children of Shobal, son of Seir the Horite (<1373>Genesis 36:23; <1314>1 Chronicles 1:40). B.C. cir. 1964.
2. (Sept. Ὀυνομά, v. r. Ὄζόμ), son of Jerahmeel, of the tribe of Judah, by his wife Atarah, and father of Shammai and Jada (<1323>1 Chronicles 2:26, 28). B.C. ante 1658.

### O'nan

(Heb. *Onanz*', ^νω, *strong*; Sept. Αὐνάν), the second son of Judah by the daughter of Shuah the Canaanite (<1334>Genesis 38:4; <1359>Numbers 26:19; <1333>1 Chronicles 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 (<1315>Deuteronomy 25:5-10; <1111>Mark 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 (<1308>Genesis 38:8 sq.). B.C. cir. 1870. His act was evidently different from the vice which has been given his name.

### Onca

a surname of *Athene*, under which she was worshipped at Oncae, in Boeotia. — Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, vol. ii, s.v.

### Oncacus

a surname of *Apollo*, from Oncaeiium, in Arcadia, where he had a temple. — Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, vol. ii, s.v.

## 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.,

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, and 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

SEE SOCIALISM.

## Ones’imus

(Ὀμήσιμος, *profitable*) is the name of the servant or slave in whose behalf Paul wrote the Epistle to Philemon (Philippians 10; <sup><5049></sup>Colossians 4:9). A.D. 58. He was a native, or certainly an inhabitant, of Colossus, since Paul, in writing to the Church there, speaks of him (<sup><5049></sup>Colossians 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 (3:22-4:1) 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 οὐδέτι ὡς 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 ἡδίκησε, 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 ver. 10 of the letter (ὄν 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 (<sup><41823></sup>Acts 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 ραβ 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 (<sup><41830></sup>Acts 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 ἵνα διακονῆ in ver. 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 (<sup>5019</sup>Colossians 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.,

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.

### Onesiph'orus

(Ὀνησιφορος, *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 (<sup><5016></sup>2 Timothy 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 <sup><5016></sup>2 Timothy 1:16, **δ ἡ ἔλεος ὁ κύριος τῷ Ὀνησιφόρου οἴκῳ**), and not separately of Onesiphorus himself. If we infer that he was not living, then we have in <sup><5018></sup>2 Timothy



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 Ὀν. Οἶκον (<sup><5048></sup>2 Timothy 4:19), and thus delicately recognized the common merit, as a sort of family distinction. The mention of Stephanas in <sup><6167></sup>1 Corinthians 16:17 shows that we need not exclude him from the Στεφανᾶ οἶκον in <sup><6116></sup>1 Corinthians 1:16. It is evident from <sup><5018></sup>2 Timothy 1:18 (ὄσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ 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

### Oni' ares

(Ὀνιάρης), a name that appears in 1 Maccabees 12:20 as the author or director of the letter of the Lacedaemonians to Onias; but it is evidently a corruption for *Onias* (Ὀνιά Ἀρεῖος, the latter name repeated from the following verse). See Josephus, *Ant.* 12:4, 10.

### Oni' as

(Ὀνιάς. perh. for ἠγναῆ a *ship*), the name of five Jewish pontiffs, mentioned by the Apocrypha and by Josephus. The following account of them I 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. Ecclesiasticus 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, as it 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 (דניאל Daniel 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 (2 Maccabees 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 (2 Maccabees 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" (2 Maccabees 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 (1 Maccabees 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 (2 Maccabees 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

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: Ἡλιοπολίτης νομός καὶ μητρόπολις Ὀνίου (4:5, § 53); where the reading Ἡλίον is not admissible, since Heliopolis is afterwards mentioned, and its different position distinctly laid down (§ 54). Josephus speaks of “the region of Onias,” Ὀνίου 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,” Ἰουδαίων 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, would, 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 (Magdulus), 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. Ap.* 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

(**l g[mh]**), 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 secrets of 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. See Josephus, *Ant.*:xiv. 2, 1; Otho, *Historia Doctorum Misnicorum*, p. 66 sq.; Frankel, *Monatsschrift*, 2:38; by the same author, *הנחמח יקרד*,’ or *Hodegetica in Mischnam* (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.; *מל צח ׳ysj wy rps*, or *Liber Juchassin sive Lexicon Biographicum et Historicum* (ed. H. Filipowski, London, 1857), 15 sq.; Schurer, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Leips. .1874), p. 133. (B. P.)

## Onion

(*l xB*, *betsel*, only found in <sup>QALIL</sup>Numbers 11:5, in the plural form *מילי אב*] from the root *l xB*; same as *l xK*, *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” (Numbers 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 *Allium 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 and 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 *Allium* 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 *κρόμμυσον* 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

(*rg h swl qnwa*), son of Kalonymus (*swmynwl q rb*), 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 (~~421~~ Acts 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 (j l mh ym) 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 (rb swl qnwa swfyfd hytj a rb swqynwl q); 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” (<sup>(R216)</sup>Deuteronomy 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 [atl m aml [b, without its appearing religious or controversial], the arwypyp carries the fire before the arwypyn, the arwypyn before the askwd =-dux, the dux before anwmgh = ἡγεμών, the ἡγεμών before the amwq = 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 (<sup>(R221)</sup>Exodus 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 (<sup>-1908</sup>Psalm 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* (<sup>-1912</sup>nymgrtmdk), *our Targums* (<sup>-1913</sup>dd μwgrt, *Kiddushin*, 49 a), *the Targum has it* (wmmwgrtk), *the Targum* (μwgrt), and as *the Targum Onkelos* (μwgrt swl qnwa). Thus the Targum is distinctly quoted as *the paraphrase of Onkelos* (swl qnwa μwgrt) in Pirke Rabbi Eliezer (cap. 38, 28 a, ed. Lemberg, 185,8), a Midrash on the principal events recorded in the Pentateuch, which is ascribed to Eliezer b.-Hyrchanus, 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 μj nm trbj m, says that (swl qna rtp) *Onkelos explains* wtçq ^tyab bçtw (<sup>-0492</sup>Genesis 49:29) by ywçw hynxj wr apqwtb (p. 23, s.v. ^tya, 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 brl wgdyw (<sup>-0486</sup>Genesis 48:16, wrmwab ^mgrwtmh swl qnwa çryp bfyh bfyhy ^wgsy amy ynwnkw, ed. Filipowski. 1855, p. 57, s.v. wgdyw; comp. also *ibid.* p. 61). Those writers alternately quote the Targum by the name of Onkelos, and simply as *the Targum* (μwgrt; comp. Menachem, p. 144,

s.v. **dj p**; p. 143, s.v. **qnp**) and *as it is paraphrased* (**wmwgrt**,- comp. *ibid.* p. 19, s.v. **l za**). The same is the case with Rashi (born in 1010, died in 1105), who, though he distinctly quotes the *Targum of Onkelos* (**swl qnwa μwgrt**) no less than seventeen times in his *Comment. on Genesis* alone (comp. *Comment. on* <sup><0006></sup>*Genesis* 6:6; 14:7; 18:23; 20:13, 19; 22:2; 24:21; 33:12; 36:4; 39:24; 43:18; 49:9, 10, 11, 17, 24, 27), yet still more frequently cites it simply *as the Targum has it* (**wmwgrtk**, comp. *Comment on* <sup><0006></sup>*Genesis* 11:6; 12:17; 13:11; 14:6, 14, 17; 15:2, 11I 16:14; 17:1; 19:15, 18; 20:17; 22:3; 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* (**rg h sl yq[ μgryt**), is Greek, and agrees for the most part with the fragments preserved of Aquila’s translation.

**3.** The description given of **sl yq[** — Aquila is almost the same as that given of **swl qnwa**: he is a heathen by birth, a native of Pontus, a relative of the emperor Hadrian (*Midrash Tanchuma Parsha*, **μyfrq̄m**), 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 is 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 Alcalá, 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 **amygrt ynym** (Breslau, 1827; Wilna, 1836); by Luzzatto, entitled **rg bha** (Vienna, 1830); and by BenZion, called **rwa hfw** [ (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, *Dizionario 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

(μονογενής, *from*. μόνος, *only*, and γίνομαι, *to be born*), an epithet of Jesus Christ, expressive of his peculiar relation to the Godhead (<sup><4014></sup>John 1:14, etc.). The term properly means an *only child* (<sup><4072></sup>Luke 7:12). *SEE SON OF GOD.*

## O'no

(Heb. *Ono'*, ונא [<sup><4075></sup>Nehemiah 7:37, ונאפ *strong*; Sept. Ὠνό, .but Ὠνόv ' in <sup><4075></sup>Nehemiah 7:37, v. r. Ὠνάv; and Αἰλάμ .r. r. Ἀδάμ 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 <sup><1382></sup>1 Chronicles 8:12, where Shamed or Shamer is said to have built Ono and Lod with their "daughter villages." It was therefore probably annexed by the Benjamites subsequently to their original settlement, like Ajalon, which was allotted to Dan, but is found afterwards, in the hands of the Benjamites (<sup><1383></sup>1 Chronicles 8:13). The tradition of the Talmudists is that it was left intact by Joshua, but burned during the war of Gibeah (<sup><4028></sup>Judges 20:48), and that <sup><1382></sup>1 Chronicles 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 (<sup><1023></sup>Ezra 2:33; <sup><4075></sup>Nehemiah 7:37; see also 1 Esdras 5:22). A valley ( h[ qβe) was attached to the town, and bore its name, "the plain of Ono" (<sup><4012></sup>Nehemiah 6:2), perhaps identical with the "valley of craftsmen" (<sup><4015></sup>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 by 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.

## 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

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 sayings 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. Pausanias states that “Onomacritus established orgies in honor of Dionysus, 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

a rabbi who lived in the house of Don Joseph Nasi at Constantinople about the middle of the 16th century, published *hm¶Yai twbGd¶kai Terrible as Bannered Hosts*, (with reference: to the <sup>2101</sup>Song of Solomon 6:4), an ethical poem, with an extensive commentary (Constantinople, 1571; Berlin, 1701): — a twofold commentary on Nachshon ben-Zadok’s work, *hm¶War] 8seRevelator Arcanum* (Constantinople, 1566): — he edited Don Joseph Nasi’s *trwθ ^Beās¶a* 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 crabbunica*, 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

(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 ἢ 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, sapientia). 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~~ *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 innumtlerabilia bona sint; quorum tam.mnltam diversitatem et sensibus corporeis experimur et ratione mentis discernimus, estne credendum esse unum aliquid, per quod unum sunt bona, quaecunque bona saunt, aut 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 quae sunt, Sunt per ipsum unum; procul dubio et ipsum unum est per se ipsum. Quaecunque igitur alia sunt, sunt per aliud, 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: quare illud, 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 quicquid est aliquidc est, id necesse est esse summe bonum et summe magnum et summum omnium. quae 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 (<sup>910</sup>Psalm 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, Vocabulary of Philos.* s.v.; Cocker, *Christianity and Greek Philos.* p. 491-494.

### 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 Paphnutius, 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 Paphnutius 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.

### 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 quatuor de imper. Rom.: — De urbis Veronce viris illustribus: Civitas Roma: — De ritu sepeliendi mortuos apud veteres Christianos: — De prcepibus 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.

## O’nus

(Ὠνούς), a corrupt Graecized form (1 Esdras 5:22) of the name of the town ONO *SEE ONO* (q.v.).

## 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.

## On’ycha

### Picture for On’ycha

a modified form of the Greek ὄνυξ, a *finger-nail*, is used in the A.V. for the Heb. **תִּלְיָשׁ** *sheche’leth* (prop. a *shell*, from a root signifying to *scale* or peel off), which occurs only in <sup>EXB</sup>Exodus 30:34 (Sept. ὄνυξ; Vulg. *onyx*) as one of the ingredients of the sacred perfume. Similarly in Ecclesiasticus 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-Kamme*, - 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; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1388.,

## 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.*

## Onyx

the uniform translation in the English version of the Hebrew word *shoharn*, **שֹׁהַרְנִי** 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 <sup><1281></sup>Exodus 25:7, 35:9, renders **σάρδιος**, *sardius*; in <sup><1289></sup>Exodus

28:9, 39:6, **σμάραγδος**, *smaragdus*; in <sup><3583></sup>Ezekiel 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 (<sup><3836></sup>Job 28:16), with Symmachius (<sup><0022></sup>Genesis 2:12; <sup><0257></sup>Exodus 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 (<sup><0022></sup>Genesis 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 (<sup><0281></sup>Exodus 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 (<sup><0281></sup>Exodus 28:20). *Shohain* stones were collected by David for adorning the Temple (<sup><1341></sup>1 Chronicles 29:2). In <sup><3836></sup>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 (<sup><3583></sup>Ezekiel 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 Ecclesiasticus 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 (<sup>(10230)</sup>Exodus 28:20; 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. (<sup>(10212)</sup>Genesis 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; Benfey, *Encyclop. Halens.* II, 17:14; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1370. *SEE GEM*.

### 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,

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 sapientiae* (Antw. 1613, 12mo; Ghent, 1627, 12mo): — *Pratum floridissimum concionum de tempore* (Antw. 1617, 4 pts. 12mo): — *Enchiridion concionatorum, ex Roseto aureo Silvestri Prieratis* (ibid. 1619, 12mo): *Syntaxis instructissima S. Scripturae* (ibid. 1622-1627, 12mo; Paris, 1682, 2 vols. 12mo): — *Officina sacra Biblica* (Douai. 1624, 12mo): — *Hierolyphica sacra* (Antw. 1627, 12mo). See Echard et Quetif, *Scriptores ord. Prædicat.* 1:551, 667 sq.; 2:7, 9, 465; Paquot, *Memoires*, vol. x.

### 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

(fr. ὄον, an egg, and σκοπέω, to observe), a method of divination by the examination of eggs. *SEE DIVINATION*.

### 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 Bruges, 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,

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 at Lille, where he acquired a distinguished reputation, and where are the greater part of his works. His historical 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. Jacob 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.

## 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

*SEE PREACHING.*

## Opera Supererogationis

*SEE SUPEREROGATION, WORKS OF.*

## 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* (<sup>4516</sup>Romans 15:16), and is used in the same general and figurative sense.

## Operation of the Holy Ghost

*SEE HOLY GHOST; SEE SPIRIT.*

## 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

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.

## O'phel

(Heb. always with the article, *ha-O'phel*, ἰ ρῆβ; *the knoll*, as in Micah 4, 8 Sept. Ὠφάλ, <sup><1035></sup>Nehemiah 3:26; Ὠφλά, ver. 27; v. r. Ὠπελ, Ὠπλά; Vulg. *Ophel*), the name of two places in Palestine.

**1.** A fortified place or quarter of Jerusalem near the walls (<sup><1478></sup>2 Chronicles 27:3; 33:44), on the east side, inhabited by the Nethinim after the rebuilding of the city (<sup><1035></sup>Nehemiah 3:26; 11:21). Ophel, or as he calls it; *Ophla* (οὨφλά), 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 (<sup>ⲉⲓⲃⲏⲗ</sup>2 Kings 5:24). *SEE GEHAZI; SEE NAAMAN.* In the Auth. Vers. it is wrongly rendered "the tower;" margin, "the secret place," after the Sept. (τὸ σκοτεινόν). 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

*SEE ROE.*

## Ophereth

*SEE LEAD.*

## Ophiomancy

(ὄφις, *a serpent*, and μαντεία, *divination*), a species of divination practiced in ancient times by means of serpents. *SEE DIVINATION.*

## O'phir

(Heb. *Ophir'*, *רֹפֵא* and *רְפֵא*), 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 *רְפֵא* and *רֹפֵא* in Gesenius's: *Thesaurus*, and compare *Ἀφάρ*, 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’ (a and [ being 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. (ῤῥῡᾶ; Sept. Οὐφείρ; Vulg. *Ophir*.) The eleventh named of the thirteen sons of Joktan, the son of Eber, a great-grandson of Shem (<sup><1016></sup>Genesis 10:26-29; <sup><1302></sup>1 Chronicles 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. (ῤῥῡᾶ; 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 (<sup><1026></sup>1 Kings 9:26, 28; 10:11; 22:49; so <sup><1488></sup>2 Chronicles 8:18; 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. <sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 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 prophetic books, that Ophir produced the purest and most precious gold then known (<sup><1011></sup>Job 20:11, 24; 28:16; <sup><1959></sup>Psalms 45:9; <sup><2832></sup>Isaiah 13:12; <sup><2078></sup>Ecclesiastes 7:18; ton which may be added <sup><2109></sup>Jeremiah 10:9; <sup><2705></sup>Daniel 10:5, if, with many interpreters, we understand *Uphaz*, ῥῡᾶ, to be simply a varied orthography of *Ophir*’ ῤῥῡᾶ; 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 (<sup><1486></sup>2 Chronicles 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 *Africa*; 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'Arabie*, 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*, <sup><14818></sup>2 Chronicles 8:18), Thenius (*Exeget. Handbuch*, <sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 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), Crawford (*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 Domingo 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*, **hl pəʃ**; similarly the Chaldee and Arabic), 'and has nothing to do with Ophir (**rpʕa**).

**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 Erythræan-Sea. In <sup>(1009)</sup>Genesis 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 (<sup><008></sup>Judges 8:24, 26; 2 Chronicles 1; <sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 10:1, 2; <sup><9725></sup>Psalms 72:15). This gold, Dr. Lee thinks, was no other than the gold of Havilah (<sup><0021></sup>Genesis 2:11), which he supposes to have been situated somewhere in Arabia and refers to <sup><0100></sup>Genesis 10:7, 29; 25:18; <sup><0457></sup>1 Samuel 15:7; <sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 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. <sup><0022></sup>Genesis 2:12; <sup><4900></sup>2 Chronicles 9:1; <sup><1100></sup>1 Kings 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 merchants, 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; <sup><6721></sup>Ezekiel 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, Σωφίρρά**, 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” (~~18316~~ 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*, טוקיאים [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 Complètes, 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.; Hittlman, *Staatsverf. d. Israel.* p. 220; Hardt, *Diss. Regionem Ophir esse Phrygiam* (1746). **SEE TARSHISH.**

## Ophites

(Gr. ὀφίται. 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 Demiurgus, 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. Orien 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 ~~John~~ John 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 **vj n** (*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 Entwicklung 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, 4to); Fuldner, *Commentaria de Ophitis*; Jdcher, *De Ophio-um heresi*; Kille, *Ophitarum mysteria resecta* (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.**

## Oph'ni

(Heb. *Ophni*', **יִנְפַי** [always with the art. **יִנְפַי הַ**; *ha-Ophni*', q. d. *the Ophnite*], *perh. pressure, famisne* [comp. **יִנְפַי**]; Sept. **Ἀφνί**, but most MSS. omit; Yulg. — 9 *hni*), a town in the north-eastern section of the tribe of Benjamin, named only in <sup><161824></sup>Joshua 18:24, between Chepharhaammonai 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* (**τῦνρωγ**), *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. **φάρραγξ 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 Ophni 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).

## Op'hrai

(Heb. *Ophrah*', **הַרְפַי**; *fawn*; Sept. **Ἀφάρρα, Ἐφρά, Ὀφερά**, v. r. **Ἐφραθα, Γοφερά**; but <sup><161824></sup>1 Chronicles 4:14, **Γοφορά**), the name of two places in Palestine, and of a man.

**1.** A town of Benjamin (<sup><161823></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><161817></sup>1 Samuel 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 (<sup><1439></sup>2 Chronicles 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 (<sup><6154></sup>John 11:54). It may also have given its name to the district or government of APHERETMA (1 Maccabees 11:34).

**2.** The native place of Gideon (<sup><0061></sup>Judges 6:11); the scene of his exploits against Baal (ver. 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 Ishmaelitic 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 Ephraim, who was one of the heads of the families of Manasseh in its Gileaditic portion (<sup><1374></sup>1 Chronicles 5:24), and who appears to have migrated to the west of Jordan with Abiezer and Shechem (<sup><0470></sup>Numbers 26:30; <sup><0670></sup>Joshua 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 (<sup><3006></sup>Micah 1:10, **tybb hrp[|** ; it appears 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 (<sup><1300></sup>Judges 9:1, 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 *Erafā*, 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 (<sup><1344></sup>1 Chronicles 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

(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

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, adeoque regulis 34 succincte absolutus.*

## 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 Dantzic, 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.

### 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(er), David ben-Abraham

a noted German rabbi, was born at Worms in 1664 or 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 (פּוּב סְפָר), Abr. ibn-Esra (פּוּב סְפָר), etc., and the Targums; in five vols. (Berlin, 1705), to which he wrote a lengthy preface; and which edition, entitled פּוּב סְפָר מִלְּפִי מַעְמָרְתִּיא, has been noticed in the *Peristylum 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 the material 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 berühmten Bibliothek*, etc. (Hamburg, 1783). Another catalogue had previously been published (Hanover, 1764), and a third was brought out by Eis. Metz (דְּוֵאֶת לְהַפֵּי *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 *Magazin für Literatur des 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. Hebraea*, 1:290 sq.; 3:178 sq.; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:346 sq., 360; Jost, *Gesch. d. Jud. u. s. Sekten*, 3:281; Cassel, *Leitfaden für die Geschichte u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), p. 105; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten* (Breslau, 1870), p. 450;

Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*, p. 445; Lieben, *Grabschrift u. Biographie des D. Oppenh.*, in *d[ ] i [ ] s* (Prague, 1856). (B. P.)

### 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 Lobgesang*). See Jocher, *A hqemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon*, 3:1085, and supplement by Rotermund, v. 1148 (Bremen, 1816); *Acta histor. ecclesiast.* 14:777 sq.; Müller, *rpshtyb*, or catalogue of Hebrew works (Amsterdam, 1868), No. 4251. (B. P.)

### 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 Sainte Olpporitune to Moussy-le-Neut, in the diocese 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 Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*, pt. ii, ssec. 3, p. 220; *Gallia Christiana*, vol. 11; Nicolas Gosset, *Vie de Sainte Oppaortune*.

### Opposants

*SEE JANSENISTS.*

## 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 (~~(-ORR)~~ Exodus 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

(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*, *Magna 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

(*wished for*), a Roman Catholic bishop of Milevia, in Asia Minor, is known by his work, still extant, entitled *De schismate Donatistarum 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. Parmeniani*, cap. 13, num. 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 suppose 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 Donatist bishop Parmenianus of Carthage, the same whose letter 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.* num. 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 (*operatris*); 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 ("criminius 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 he 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. Victorem 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; *Trithem.* 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

(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 less than 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 Leibniz (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

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.

**SEE OPITZ, HEINRICH.**

## 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

(*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

(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

(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 operato*, 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

SEE SUPEREROGATION.

### 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, sings 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 in 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."

## Oracle

occurs in several places in the Auth. Ver. as the rendering of the Heb. **rybā** *debir*, ordinarily derived from **rbd**; 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 **rbd**; *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; <sup><14816></sup>2 Chronicles 3:16; 4:20; 5:7, 9; <sup><15812></sup>Psalms 28:2), elsewhere called "*the Holy of Holies*" (Heb. **vrqayvā** **Qhi** <sup><1066></sup>1 Kings 6:16; <sup><1402></sup>2 Chronicles 4:22, and often). *SEE TEMPLE*. The Sept. in these passages simply adopts the 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 consulted their gods. In <sup><1063></sup>2 Samuel 16:23, the Hebrew



word rendered *oracle* is *dabdr* (rbD), which usually means *word*, and is often applied thus to the word or revelation of God (see margin, ad loc.; so <sup><4004></sup>Jeremiah 1:4, 11). In the N.T. only the word *oracles* is found, in the plural (as the rendering of the Greek *λόγια*, <sup><4073></sup>Acts 7:38), especially *the oracles of God* (*τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, <sup><4812></sup>Romans 3:2; comp. <sup><3852></sup>Hebrews 5:12; <sup><4041></sup>1 Peter 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 (<sup><4929></sup>1 Samuel 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 (<sup><4910></sup>1 Samuel 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 (<sup><4052></sup>Genesis 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 (<sup><100></sup>2 Kings 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 *Μυιάδης* and *Μυίαγρος*. **SEE BEEL-ZEBUB.** Other oracular means in Palestine were the Teraphim, as that of Micah (<sup><070></sup>Judges 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. <sup><342></sup>Hosea 4:12 reproaches Israel with consulting wooden idols, as does the book of Wisdom (13:16, 17) and the prophet in <sup><319></sup>Habakkuk 2:19. **SEE IDOLATRY.** For the daemoniacal responses referred to in <sup><416></sup>Acts 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 Amphilochochus, 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 Oraculorum 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* rybd (Tr. ad Bk. 1751); Milton, *Hymns on the Nativity*; E. B. Browning, *The Dead Pan*; Schiller, *Götter Griechenlands*. **SEE NECROMANCER; SEE WITCHCRAFT.**

## 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 daemonic 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 ascendancy 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 Vincit 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 *Ἀλεξίκακος*, 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 Asclepiadae. 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 tempora 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 Amphiarus and Amphiloehus. 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 oracles 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* and *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 Camene 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 Albunoe 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 vended 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 years 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. Eccl.* 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. *Würdigung 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

(*confessio oris*). *SEE PENITENCE*.

### Oral Law

*SEE TRADITION*.

### Oral Manducation

*SEE LORDS SUPPER; SEE SACRAMENT*.

### 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

*SEE PENANCE*.

### Orange, Council of

(*Concilium Arausicanum*),

(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.** Excommunicates 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 deacons 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 Boasfacius 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.

## 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.

## 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 ascendancy” 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 ascendancy 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 Protestantism 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 that the 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 to 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

(*praying men*), a class of catechumens, the same as the *Genuflectentes* (q.v.).

## 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

(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 seecula seeculorum*” (=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 Dominum*” (=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 et iustum 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.

SEE FUNERAL; SEE SERMON.

## 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” (וְיָ לִי וְבֹנֵי Sept. συνετός ἀκροατής; Vulg. and *Symm.* *prudens eloquii mystici*; Aquila, συνετός ψιθυρισμῶ; Theodot. συνετός ἐπωδῆ), <sup><231B></sup> Isaiah 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. <sup><491B></sup> Psalm 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 (<sup><424B></sup> Acts 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 <sup>420</sup>Acts 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*.