

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Oratorio - Ozora**

*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**

## Oratorio

### Picture for Oratorio

(from Ital. *oratorio*, *chapel* or *oratory*, after the place where these compositions were first performed) is the term applied to a sacred musical composition, bearing the same relation to Church music which the opera does to secular music, and, like it, consisting of airs, duets, choruses, etc. It is, in short, a *spiritual* opera, and holds an intermediate place between religious and secular compositions. The text is generally a dramatized religious poem, as Handel's *Samson* and Cimarosa's *Sacrifizio d'Abramo*. Sometimes it takes the form of a narrative, as *Israel in Egypt*; and occasionally it is of a mixed kind, as Haydn's *Creation*. *The Messiah* is a collection of passages from our received translation of the Scriptures.

Concerning the origin of the oratorio, Dr. Brown, Sir John Hawkins, and others seem to have misunderstood the pere Menestrier, who, in his work *Des Representations en Musique*, attributes to the pilgrims, on their return from the Holy Land, not the introduction of what we term *oratorios*, as those writers supposed, but of the sacred dramas called *Mysteries* (q.v.). The learned Jesuit is perhaps himself in error on this subject. It is Wharton's opinion that about the 8th century the merchants who frequented the fairs, employing every art to draw numbers together, were accompanied by jugglers, minstrels, and buffoons, who were the source of great amusement to the people. The clergy, thinking that such entertainments tended to irreligion, proscribed them; but their censures and fulminations being disregarded, they took into their own hands the management of popular recreations — they turned actors — and, instead of profane mummeries, presented stories taken from legends, or from the Bible (*Hist. of Poetry*). Voltaire conjectures that religious dramas came from Constantinople, where, about the 4th century, archbishop Gregory of Nazianzum, one of the fathers of the Church, banished plays from the stage of that city, and introduced stories from the O. and N.T. As the ancient Greek tragedy was originally a religious representation, a transition was made on the same plan, and the choruses were turned into Christian hymns. “This opinion,” says the candid Wharton, “will acquire probability if we consider the early commercial intercourse between Italy and Constantinople.” Admitting this, we need seek no farther for the original source of the sacred musical drama.

As regards the more recent introduction of the oratorio, Crescimbeni, in his *Commentario*, tells us that it is attributable to San Filippo Neri (q.v.), who in his chapel (*nel suo oratorio*), after sermons and other devotions, in order to allure young people to pious offices, and to detain them from earthly pleasures, had hymns and psalms sung by one or more voices. Bourdelot is rather more circumstantial on this subject. He says S. Filippo de Neri, a native of Florence, founder in 1540 of the Congregation of the Priests of the Oratory in Italy, observing the taste and passion of the Romans for musical entertainments, determined to afford the nobles and people the means of enjoying them on Sundays and festivals in his church, and engaged for this purpose the ablest poets and composers, who produced dialogues in verse on the principal subjects of Scripture, which he caused to be performed by the most beautiful voices in Rome, accompanied by all sorts of instruments. These performances consisted of airs, duets, trios, and recitatives for four voices; the subjects were, *Job and his Friends*, *the Prodigal Son* received by his Father, *the Angel Gabriel with the Virgin*, and *the Mystery of the Incarnation*. Nothing was spared to render these attractive; the novelty and perfection thereof drew a crowd of auditors, who were delighted with the performances, and contributed largely, by admission money, to the expenses incurred. Hence are derived what we now call oratorios, or sacred representations (*Hist. de la Musique* [1743], 1:256). Some of these poems were printed under the title of *Ludi Spirituali*, and among the first authors of them was P. Agostino Manni. One of the most remarkable was entitled *Rappresentazione di Anima e di Corpo, del Signior Emilio del Cavalieri, per recitar cantando*. It was the first attempt in the recitative style, and performed in action on a stage erected in the church of Santa Maria della Vallicella, at Rome, with scenes, dances, etc., as appears from the editor's dedication to cardinal Aldobrandini, and the composer's instructions for the performance. From the latter Dr. Burney (*Hist. of Music*, 4:88) gives some curious extracts, among which are the following: The accompanying instruments, namely, a double lyre, a harpsichord, a large guitar, and two flutes — to be behind the scenes; but the performers are desired to have instruments in their hands, as the appearing to play would help the illusion. The books of the words were printed. Instead of the modern overture, a madrigal, with all the parts doubled, and fully accompanied, is recommended. When the curtain rises, two youths, who recite the prologue, appear. Then *Time*, one of the characters, comes on, and has the note with which he is to begin given him by the instruments behind the scenes. The *chorus* is to be placed

on the stage, part sitting and part standing; and when they sing they are to be in motion, with gestures. *Il Corpo* (the body), at the words *Si che hormai alma via*, throws away his ornaments. The *World* and *Human Life* are to be gayly dressed, and when divested of their trappings are to appear poor and wretched, and finally as dead carcasses. The performance may conclude with or without a dance. If without, the last chorus is to be doubled in all its parts. But if a dance is preferred, a verse beginning “*Chiostrì altissimì*” is to be sung, accompanied reverentially by the dance. During the ritornels the four principal dancers are to perform a ballet, *saltato con capriole* (danced with *capers*), without singing. They may sometimes use the *gailliard* step, sometimes the *canary*, and sometimes the *courant*.

The name of *Oratorios* was given, some think, to these performances because they owed their birth to the *Priests of the Oratory*; we are, however, as already stated, more inclined to derive the term from the place, the *oratorio* (*oratorium*, oratory or small chapel), in which they were first heard. But the word does not appear to have been in use till about the year 1630, when Balducci applied it to two of his sacred poems. The unfortunate Stradella was one of the first of those who distinguished themselves in this exalted kind of composition; his *Oratorio di San Giovanni Battista*, produced about the year 1670, is analyzed and much praised by Burney (4:105). A fine chorus from this, in five parts, is printed in the fourth volume of “The Fitzwilliam Music.” The increasing popularity of the sacred drama at length induced poets of eminence to employ their pens in its service. Apostolo Zeno, the imperial poet-laureate, produced seventeen works of this kind, under the title of *Azioni Sacre*, most of which were set by Caldara, imperial vice-chapelmaster to Leopold I, whose reputation as a composer of sacred music stands deservedly high. The first of them, *Sisara*, was performed in 1717. Metastasio wrote seven *Azioni*, of which Caldara set two; the first, *La Passione*, in 1730. This was reset by Jomelli, and is justly reckoned among the best of his works. Sebastian Bach's *Passions-Musik* was a species of oratorio, originally performed during the service of the church, the congregation joining in the chorals. Its form arose out of the practice prevalent in the Lutheran Church of having the gospels of the day repeated on Good-Friday, and some other festivals, by different persons, in a recitative and dialogue style. *SEE PASSION*.

The oratorio was introduced into England in 1720, when Handel set *Esther* — *Racine's* tragedy abridged and altered by Mr. Humphreys — for the

chapel of the duke of Chandos (Pope's *Timon*) at Cannons. Previous to this time Handel had produced an oratorio entitled *La Resurrezione*, which he brought out at Rome when only twenty years of age, but *Esther* was his first brought out in England. In 1731 it was performed by the children of the Chapel-Royal at the house of their master, Bernard Gates. The next year it was publicly produced, as appears from the following advertisement in the *Daily Journal*: "By his majesty's command. at the King's Theatre in the Haymarket, on Tuesday, May 2, will be performed the sacred story of *Esther*, an oratorio in English, formerly composed by Mr. Handel, and now revived by him, with several additions, and to be performed by a great number of voices and instruments. N. B. — There will be no acting on the stage, but the house will be fitted up in a decent manner for the audience." The success of this was of the most decided and encouraging kind. The custom of performing oratorios on the Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent is to be dated from 1737, from which time they were, with few intermissions, continued till a very recent period. By Handel himself no oratorio was produced after the appearance of *Esther*, until, in his fifty-third year, he became afflicted with blindness. From this his declining period of life date the great oratorios which have made his name immortal. These were performed for the most part in the Old Haymarket Theatre. *Deborah* was first performed in 1733; *Athaliah*, in 1734; *Israel in Egypt*, in 1738; *The Messiah*, in 1741; *Samson*, in 1742; *Judas Maccabaeus*, in 1746; *Joshua*, in 1747; *Solomon*, in 1749; and *Jephthah*, in 1751. The two crowning works were *Israel in Egypt* and *The Messiah*—the former ranks highest of all compositions of the oratorio class. *The Messiah*—which, ill consequence of its text being taken entirely from Scripture, was called by Handel *The Sacred Oratorio*, — ranks very near it in point of musical merit, and has attained an even more universal popularity; from the time when it was first brought out, down to the present day, it has been performed for the benefit of nearly every important charitable institution in Britain, and also in the U. S., though somewhat less frequently for the same purpose. *Judas Maccabaeus* is perhaps best known from the flowing and martial grace of that unrivalled military march, "See the Conquering Hero comes;" and *Saul* is associated in every one's mind with the most solemn of all funeral marches. The orchestra was but imperfectly developed in Handel's time, and his oratorios had therefore originally but meagre instrumental accompaniments; they have since been generally performed with additional accompaniments written by Mozart. Handel was succeeded in this musical speculation by his friend, J. C. Smith, who was followed by Stanley and the

elder Linley. Linley and Dr. Arnold then in conjunction most successfully carried on the oratorios, which were continued by the latter on the retirement of his colleague. An opposition was now started by Ashley, who had been active as a subordinate agent at the commemoration of Handel in 1784. This person soon transformed the performances into secular and often vulgar concerts, though retaining the original name; and from that time the oratorios began to degenerate.

Great masters of oratorios are Haydn, Mendelssohn, Bach, Cimarosa, and Jomelli. Haydn composed three oratorios, *The Return of Tobias*, *The Seven Last Words*, and *The Creation*. The first-named work is full of sweetness and of energy, but it hardly answers to the common conditions of an oratorio; the second is rather a series of symphonies, intended to follow as many short sermons on the sentences uttered by Jesus on the cross. the text being a subsequent addition by the composer's brother, Michael Haydn. The chef-d'oeuvre, *The Creation*, originated in a visit to London in 1791, when Haydn heard for the first time some of Handel's compositions, then unknown in the great musician's native country. Though less grand than the oratorios of this Anglicized German musical master, *The Creation* is full of fresh, lovely songs, bright choruses, picturesque recitatives, and exquisite instrumentation. Beethoven's sole oratorio, *The Mount of Olives*, is a pure drama rather than the mixed composition generally designated as oratorio. Spohr's *Last Judgment*, produced in 1825, contains some grand music, especial in the choruses. Costa's *Eli* deserves mention. But *the* master of modern oratorios is Mendelssohn. Indeed, his greatest works are in this line of composition, as his *St. Paul* and *Elijah*. His great ambition was to reawaken an interest in the oratorio, especially in Great Britain; and since his day oratorios are performed on a large scale at Exeter Hall, London, and at the musical festivals throughout England, with a power, precision, and perfection before unheard of, and unknown anywhere else. The greatest oratorio performances probably in the world are those of the triennial festivals at the Sydenham Crystal Palace. In the United States musical societies are aiming for a like development, and in very recent times a number of oratorios have been printed and performed. Bradbury and Mason have labored in this direction, but the most successful compositions are by J. A. Butterfield, of Chicago, who has been called to different parts of this large country, and has trained a host of musical associations with extraordinary success. Among his best compositions are *Belshazzar* and *Ruth and Naomi*. See,

besides the works on music referred to, *Penny Cyclop.* s.nv.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; *Academy* (Lond. 1872), p. 86; *Presb. Qu. and Princet. Rev.* Jan. 1875, art. viii.

## Oratorium

*SEE ORATORY.*

## Oratory

is the Latin name which was anciently given to places of public worship in general, as being houses of prayer, *SEE PROSEUCHA*; but in later times, in contradistinction from *ecclesia*, has been applied to smaller or domestic chapels. Oratory is used among the Romanists to denote a closet or little apartment near a bedchamber, furnished with a little altar, crucifix, and other furniture, suited, in their view, to a place for private devotion. It is more correctly applied to such a place of worship as Luke refers to in Acts 13 — an upper chamber, in which the early Christians worshipped for safety, to preserve their secret discipline from the knowledge of the heathen, and in distinction from the pagan exhibition of graven images on the ground-floor of buildings, and also in memory of the place of the Last Supper. The rise of private places of worship, called *εὐκτήρια*, outlasted the times of persecution, and were permitted, under certain restrictions, by the councils of Saragossa (A.D.) 381) and Gangra. The name *oratory* is also applied to a chapel in which no mass may be said without permission of the ordinary. There are several kinds: 1, a monk's cell; 2, a private chapel, recognised by the Council of Ayde (506); 3, a chapel in the country without a district; 4, the private portion of a minster reserved for the use of the convent; the choir; a chapel attached to the chapter-house; 5, in the 6th or 7th century a burial chapel, or a chapel in a cemetery, in which mass was said at times, when the bishop sent a priest to celebrate; 6, a chantry chapel in a church. In 1027 Alexis, patriarch of Constantinople, condemned the abuse of oratories, in which persons of power had assumed to have baptism administered and to assemble congregations under a license. The private chapel of the dukes of Burgundy was rebuilt as the cathedral of Autun; the chateau of the Bourbons became that of Moulins. The ancient Cornish oratories are simple parallelograms, and contain a stone altar and well; they are sometimes raised on artificial mounds. In the Middle Ages *oratories* became a common appendage to the castles and residences of the nobility, and were of two kinds: the first simply for private and family

prayer and other devotions; the second for celebration of mass. The latter fell properly under the jurisdiction of the bishop or the parochial clergy, and many jealousies and disputes grew out of their establishment or direction. The Council of Trent (sess. 22, *Di Reformatione*) placed them under very stringent regulations, which have been enforced and developed by later popes, especially by Benedict XIV. See Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, s.v.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, , 703, 721. *SEE CHAPEL.*

## Oratory, Priests (Or Fathers) Of The

### Picture for Oratory, Priests (or Fathers) of the

is the name of two Roman Catholic congregations of devotees who flourished in Italy and France respectively. Their origin and early history has been largely detailed in the article on *SEE NERI, ST. FILIPPO DE* (q.v.). This celebrated religious enthusiast was the founder of the Italian congregation, but he never framed any rules for their government and direction. His scattered papers, from which his plans and intentions might have been collected had been burned by his orders a short time before his death. Soon after that event the fathers, at the instance of Baronius, after due counsel, compiled from the existing practices and from memory a rule for the congregation, framed so as to embody the spirit of their founder. This rule was approved by Paul V on Feb. 21, 1612. The Fathers of the Congregation are a body of priests living in community, but without vows, and under a constitution of a highly democratical character. They are at liberty to withdraw at any time. and to resume possession of the property which they brought with them at entrance; and even during their association each member manages his owl financial concerns, only contributing a fixed sum to the common expenses of the community. There is no superior-general, as in other orders. Each house is distinct and independent. In each the superior is elected only for three years, and his position does not give him any personal pre-eminence whatever. The members take their places according to seniority, not according to official rank, and the superior is compelled to take his turn in all the duties, even down to the semi-menial office of serving in the refectory. The main occupations of the fathers, beyond those of attending to the public service of the church, and the duties of the pulpit and the confessional, lie in the cultivation of theological and other sacred studies, of which “conferences” for the discussion, in common, of theological questions form a principal



feature. The congregation has produced many men of great eminence in sacred science, among whom may be named the great Church historian, cardinal Baronius, and his continuators. To these may be added the celebrated explorers of the Roman catacombs, Bosio, Severani, and Aringhi, and the no less eminent patristical scholar, Gallandi. The houses of the Oratory in Italy before the Revolution were numerous and in high repute. Few towns of any importance were without a house of the Oratory.

The Priests of the Oratory in France were established on the model of those in Italy, and owe their rise to Pierre, afterwards cardinal de Berulle, a native of Champagne, who resolved upon this foundation in order to revive the splendor of the ecclesiastical state, which was greatly sunk through the miseries of the civil wars, the increase of heresies, and a general corruption of manners. To this end he assembled a community of ecclesiastics in 1611, in the suburb of St. James. They obtained the king's letter patent for their establishment; and in 1613 pope Paul V approved this congregation, under the title of the *Oratory of Jesus* (see cut). This congregation consisted of two sorts of persons: the one, as it were, incorporated; the other only associates; the former governed the houses of the institute; the latter were only employed in conforming themselves to the life and manners of ecclesiastics. They also differed from the Italian in that the French Oratorians took charge of seminaries of theological teaching. They were decided opponents of the Jesuits; and, as many favored Jansenism, it was charged by Ultramontanes that the French Congregation of the Oratory was founded principally to spread the Jansenistic heresy. The truth is, the congregation embraced advocates of Jansenism; but they were only in the minority, and simply brought about an unhappy controversy in the society. The French Oratorians became distinguished for their many eminent scholars, as Thomassin, Malebranche, the eloquent Massillon, etc. The Revolution of 1789 put an end to this congregation as to other religious bodies; but they were reorganized in 1852 by six priests, under the guidance of abbe Petetot; and in 1864, finally, the new congregation, under the title of *the Oratory of Christ our Lord and of Mary the Immaculate*, was approved by the pope. It has a flourishing establishment at Paris, and has received its chief illustration from fathers Gratry and Perraud. It is known as the *Oratory of the Immaculate Conception*.

In 1847 the Oratorians were introduced on English soil by the Romish convert, Dr. John Henry Newman. This was the period of his secession from Anglicanism. To give strength to his Romanizing tendencies he

looked about for a moderate monastic body, and consequently established a house of the Oratorians (the members of which were for the most part ex-Anglicans like himself), first near, and finally at, Birmingham; soon afterwards a second at London, which has since been transferred to Brompton. The Oratorians have also representatives in the Low Countries, whither they spread from France. In the United States they have not as yet founded a congregation. There are houses at Madrid, Constantinople, and in Savoy. See *Zeitschrift histor. theol.* 1859, p. 142; Perraud, *L'Oratoire de France* (Paris, 1865); *Histoire du clergy* 3:144 sq.; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1866. p. 289; Henrion. *Monastic Orders*, 2:247-254; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 1:250; Hallam, *Literature*, iii. 297; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* 2:423.

### Orbison, Thomas

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Waringstown, county Down, Ireland, March 13, 1813. His parents were members of the Established Church. When thirteen years of age he was converted, and united with the Wesleyans. At seventeen he was licensed as an exhorter, and was ordained in Dublin June 22, 1844. In 1849 he removed to America. After his arrival here he united and labored in connection with the Wesleyan Church for a year and a half. A vacancy taking place about that time on the Wauwatosa Circuit of the Wisconsin Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, he was employed as supply, and at the close of the year joined that conference. His appointments were as follows: Wauwatosa, Kingston, Berlin, Plover, Brothertown, Utter's Corners, Footville, Sun Prairie, Weyauwega, Waupaca, and Stevens' Point. In 1863 he located, and lived in Appleton one year. In 1865 he preached on the Hartford charge, and at the next session of conference was readmitted, and stationed at New Berlin and Oneida Indian Mission. But failing health again obliged his retirement from active duties, and he returned to Appleton. He died in 1873. As a preacher, he was above mediocrity, as a man, he was esteemed for the purity of his character and his good common sense. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1874, p. 140.

### Orcagna, Or L'Arcagnuolo

is the name by which ANDREA DI CIONE, a celebrated old Florentine artist, is generally known. He was painter, sculptor, and architect; was born at Florence in 1329, according to Vasari, or, according to other accounts,

about 1315 or 1320, and was probably first instructed in art by his father, Cione, who was a celebrated goldsmith; from him he passed into the school of Andrea Pisano. He painted several works, together with his brother Bernardo, in the churches of Florence, and also in the Campo Santo at Pisa, where the *Triumph of Death* and the *Last Judgment* were by Andrea, and the *Hell* by Bernardo; the *Last Judgment* and the *Hell* are engraved by Lasinio on a single plate in his *Pitture del Campo Santo di Pisa*: Orcagna repeated them in Santa Croce at Florence; he had painted previously in the Strozzi chapel, in Santa Maria Novella, a picture of *Hell* from Dante's *Inferno*, in which he introduced the portraits of several of his enemies. As an architect he built the elegant Loggia de' Lanzi in the Piazza Granduca at Florence, which is still in perfect condition — it and its sculptures are engraved by Lasinio in Miaserini's *Piazza del Granduca di Firenze, con i suoi Monumenti*. (Florence, 1830). He built also the church of the monastery of Or San Michele, and designed the celebrated tabernacle of the Virgin of that monastery. It is a high Gothic pyramidal altar to the Virgin, free on all sides, is built of white marble, and is richly ornamented with figures and other sculptures. It is engraved in Richa's *Notizie delle Chiese di Firenze*, after a drawing by Andrea himself. Orcagna generally signed himself painter upon his sculptures, and sculptor upon his pictures. He was also a poet. He died at Florence, according to Vasari, in 1389, but according to Manni in 1375. Orcagna had excellent architectural taste, and has the credit of having been the first in those ages to adopt the semicircular arch in preference to the pointed; but to this merit, if one, he is not entitled, though his elegant *Loggia de Lanzi* may have contributed greatly towards the subsequent popularity of that form of the arch in Italy: Arnolfo di'Lapo, however, and other earlier architects, used the semicircular arch. Those, says Lanzi, who are fond of minute detail in minute things, may consult Baldinucci, Bottari, and Mlanni concerning Andrea di Cione; Rumohr, however, was the first to show his real name, of which' *Orcagna* is a contraction — *Lo Archagnuolo, Lo 'rchagnio, l'orchagno*. In painting. Orcagna did not go beyond Giotto; in sculpture he was a worthy follower of the Pisani. His portrait, published in Vasari's work was taken from one of the figures of the apostles in the above-mentioned tabernacle of the Virgin, which is understood to be his own. See Vasari, *Vite de' Pittori*, etc., and the *Notes* to Schorn's German translation of Vasari; 'Rumor, *Italienische 'Forschungen*.

## Orchard

is the rendering in the A.V. of **ⲥⲃⲉⲠⲓ** *pardes*, a *park* or garden planted with trees (<sup><2005></sup>Ecclesiastes 2:5; <sup><2044></sup>Song of Solomon 4:14; forest," <sup><4008></sup>Nehemiah 2:8); and of *oliretium* ("orchard of olives"), an olive-yard (2 Esdras 16:29). *SEE GARDEN; SEE OLIVE-YARD.*

## Orchard, Nicholas

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Helston, county of Cornwall, England, Nov. 14, 1806. He was the son of pious parents, and was carefully trained under the influence of the Wesleyans. In his sixteenth year he was converted, and joined their society. He came to this country about 1837, and settled in Perth Amboy, New Jersey, where his labors as local preacher, class leader, etc., were highly appreciated. In 1843 he removed to Brooklyn, and was soon employed by the presiding elder as pastor at Flatbush. The following two years he assisted on the Home Mission work in Brooklyn, and then, under the presiding elder, he ably served the societies on Good Ground Circuit. In 1852 he was received into the New York East Conference, and his successive appointments were as follows: Soutlold, Farmingdale, Riverhead, Northport, Port Jefferson, Patchogue and Sayville, Orient, Parkville, Orient, and, lastly, Bay Ridge and Unionville. He entered upon his last charge with broken health; and after a short term of labor at this charge was prostrated by paralysis, and died May 27, 1874. "As a preacher and pastor he was in labors abundant, and more than acceptable. In every appointment he was greatly beloved by his people, and men of learning held in high esteem his capabilities as a Bible student and a preacher. His touching appeals to his hearers came from the depth of a heart which longed for their salvation. He felt the sacredness of his calling, loved it, and was successful in it." See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1875, p. 52.

## Ordeals, Or Ordeal-Trials

### Picture for Ordeals, or Ordeal-trials

otherwise termed "*judgments of God*," a pretended mode of appeal to God's judgment, formerly permitted in criminal cases in the most civilized society of Europe. Ordeal is generally traced to the Anglo-Saxon *ordoele*. Spelman derives this word from *or*, "magnum," and *doel*, "judicium," which is also the derivation given by Ducange. Lye and Bosworth derive it

from *or*, privative, “without,” and *doel*, “difference,” an indifferent or impartial judgment, a judgment without distinction of persons. The German word *urtheil*, a judgment, is intimately related to it.

The earliest trace of any custom resembling the ordeals afterwards so largely-used among the northern tribes of Europe may be found in the *waters of jealousy*, which the Hebrew women, suspected of adultery, were compelled to drink as a test of innocence (<sup>ORDEAL</sup>Numbers 5). The alleged intention of it was to vindicate the truth when it could not in any other way be discovered, and to make way for the execution of law. A similar trial for incontinence is in use among the natives of the Gold Coast of Africa. *SEE ADULTERY*. Blackstone (*Comm. on the Laws of England*, 4, ch. 27, “Of Trial and Conviction”) says: “The several methods of trial and conviction of offenders established by the laws of England were formerly more numerous than at present, through the superstition of our Saxon ancestors; who, like other northern nations, were extremely addicted to divination, a character which Tacitus observes of the ancient Germans (*De Mor. Germ.* x). They therefore invented a considerable number of methods of purgation, or trial, to preserve innocence from the danger of false witnesses, and in consequence of a notion that God would always interpose miraculously to vindicate the guiltless.” Throughout Europe in the dark ages the ordeal existed under the sanction of law and of the clergy. The four chief ordeals of the Middle Ages, to which our Saxon ancestors resorted in common with the rest of Europe, were:

**a.** That of hot iron, which was generally applied to persons of quality and to ecclesiastics, the latter being prohibited from claiming the judicial combat (or duel) in person, and yet wishing to avoid the ordeals by water, which were considered ignoble, and reserved for peasants. If impeached for a single crime, a piece of iron was to weigh one pound; if prosecuted on several charges, the weight of the iron was increased in proportion. The person accused was to hold the burning ball of iron in his hand, and move with it to a certain distance, or to walk barefoot on red-hot plowshares, placed about a yard from each other. If after this trial his hands and feet were uninjured, and he gave no indication of pain, he was discharged; otherwise he was considered guilty. In the Romish Church the accused was brought in after three days of fasting and prayer the priest appeared in his canonicals, taking up the iron which lay before the altar, and, repeating the hymn of the three Hebrews, put it into the fire. He then proceeded to some forms of benediction over the fire and iron; after this he sprinkled the iron

with holy water, and made the sign of the cross in the name of the blessed Trinity, upon which the test was applied. Ordinarily, the accused was to carry the hot iron over a space of nine feet. After this his hand was to be sealed up, and not inspected till the third night was passed; then, if it was clean, he was deemed innocent; but if it appeared festered on the mark of the iron, he was to be esteemed guilty. That species of the hot-iron ordeal which consisted in treading, blindfold and barefooted, over a certain number of red-hot plowshares laid lengthwise, at unequal distances, was no uncommon test of female chastity. Among the Greeks compurgation of accused persons by fire was practiced, as is manifest from Sophocles's *Antigone*. We are informed that there were but few escapes from this judicial system among the ancients, but that in the dark ages the clergy frequently connived with the friends of the accused, and thus secured acquittal. An instance generally quoted is that of queen Emma, mother of Edward the Confessor, who, when suspected of a criminal intrigue with Alwyn, bishop of Winchester, is said to have triumphantly vindicated her character by walking unhurt over red-hot plowshares (Rudborne, *Hist. Maj. Winton*, lib. 4, ch. 1). In this connection we may state the scientific fact that a person may with impunity handle red-hot or even molten iron, if careful; the vapor actually preventing immediate contact for a few moments.

**b.** Water-ordeal was performed either by plunging the bare arm up to the elbow in boiling water, and escaping unhurt thereby, or by casting the person suspected into a river or pond of cold water, and if he floated therein without any action of swimming, it was deemed an evidence of his guilt, but if he sank he was acquitted. In this trial by water, after the three days' fast and other preliminaries, the accused drank a portion of holy water, the priest pronouncing an imprecation against him in case he were guilty; then the water into which he was to be thrown was exorcised in the following manner: By the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and by the Christianity whose name thou bearest, and by the baptism in which thou wert born again, and by all the blessed relics of the saints of God that are preserved in this church. I conjure thee come not unto this altar, nor eat of this body of Christ, if thou beest guilty in the things that are laid to thy charge; but if thou beest innocent therein, come, brother, and come freely." After the exorcism the accused was undressed, ordered to kiss the Gospels and the cross, and sprinkled with holy water, and then, all persons present fasting, the accused underwent the trial. At

the close of the adjuration holy water was tasted by all present, and the chamber sprinkled with it.

c. The *corsned*, or morsel of execration: this was a piece of bread or cheese, about an ounce in weight, which was consecrated in a peculiar form, in which the Almighty was called upon, and it was prayed that the bread might cause convulsions and paleness, and find no passage, if the man were really guilty, but might turn to health and nourishment if he were innocent. The *corsned* was then given to the suspected person, who received the holy sacrament at the same time: if indeed, as some have suspected, the *corsned* was not the sacramental bread itself. It is said that Godwin, earl of Kent, in the reign of king Edward the Confessor, on taking his oath that he had not caused the death of the king's brother, appealed to his *corsned*, “*per buccellam deglutiendam abjuravit*” (*Ingulphus*), which stuck in his throat and killed him.

Other kinds of ordeal were practiced in particular circumstances in different parts of Europe. In the ordeal of the *bier*, a supposed murderer was required to touch the body of the murdered person, and pronounced guilty if the blood flowed from his wounds. The ordeal of the *Eucharist* (*Judiciun, Eucharistice, or Purgatio per Euchaistiam*) especially was in use among the clergy: the accused party took the sacrament in attestation of innocence, it being believed that, if guilty, he would be immediately visited with divine punishment for the sacrilege by its choking him: it was a variety of the *corsned*. The trial of the cross (*Examen s. Experimenturn s. Judicium crucis*) consisted in the accused being made to hold up his arms horizontally in the form of a cross. In cases of difficulty, the one who held out longest was deemed to be in the right. The form of trial is thus described by Dr. Mackay in his *Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions*: “When a person accused of any crime had declared his innocence upon oath, and appealed to the cross for its judgment in his favor, he was brought into the church before the altar. The priests previously prepared two sticks exactly like one another, upon one of which was carved a figure of the cross. They were both wrapped up, with great care and many ceremonies, in a quantity of fine wool, and laid upon the altar or on the relics of the saints. A solemn prayer was then offered up to God that he would be pleased to discover, by the judgment of his holy cross, whether the accused person were innocent or guilty. A priest then approached the altar and took up one of the sticks, and the assistants unswathed it reverently. If it was marked with the cross, the accused

person was innocent; if unmarked, he was guilty. It would be unjust to assert that the judgments thus delivered were, in all cases, erroneous; and it would be absurd to believe that they were left altogether to chance. Many true judgments were doubtless given, and, in all probability, most Wittingly, for we cannot, but believe that the priests endeavored beforehand to convince themselves, by secret inquiry and a strict examination of the circumstances, whether the appellant were innocent or guilty, and that they took up the crossed or uncrossed stick accordingly. Although to all other observers the sticks, as enfolded in the wool, might appear exactly similar, those who unwrapped them could, without any difficulty, tell the one from the other.” This ordeal was abolished by Louis le Ddbonnaire in A.D. 816, on the ground that it betrayed irreverence towards the mystery of the cross. Another very common ordeal was that by *lot*, dependent on the throw of a pair of dice, one marked with a cross, the other plain. Another very frequent ordeal was that of single combats or duels. It is unlike any other ordeal practiced, for the result depended altogether on the personal strength or courage of the accused.

The ordeals of water and iron are first mentioned in the 77th law of Ina (Wilkins, *Leg. Anglo-Sax.* p. 27). See also the laws of Athelstan, Edward the Confessor, and the Conqueror (*ibid.* p. 198, 229). In the *Domesday Survey* the readiness of claimants to prove their title to land by ordeal or in battle occurs in a great variety of instances, as among the lands belonging to the monastery of Ely, at a place then called Photestorp, in Norfolk: “Hanc terram calumpniatur esse liberam Vichetel homo Hermeri quocunque mode judicetur, vel bello vel judio” (*Domesd.* tom. ii, fol. 212; see other instances, *ibid.* fol. 110 b, 137, 162, 166, 172 b, 193, 208; 277 b, 332). The ordeal of hot iron is the only ordeal of the *Donzesday Survey*. The reason for this is given by Glanville (*Tract. de Leg. et Consuet. Regni Anglice*, lib. 14, ch. 1): “In such a case the accused is bound to clear himself by the judgment of God, namely, by hot iron, or by water, according to the difference of rank—that is, by hot iron if he should be a free man, and by water if he should be a villain” (si fuerit rusticus). Eadmer (*Hist. Novor.* p. 48) speaks of no fewer than fifty persons of Saxon origin who, in the reign of William Rufus, being accused of killing the king's stags, were at one time sentenced to the fire ordeal. It is probable that the trial by ordeal was not discontinued in England by any positive law or ordinance, although Sir E. Coke (9 *Rep.* 32), and after him Blackstone (4 *Comm.* p. 345), have expressed an opinion that it was finally abolished by



an act of Parliament, or rather an order of the king in council, in the 3d Henry III (1219). This order is to be found in Rymer, *Federa*, 1:228; Spelman, *Glossary*, s.v. “Judicium Dei;” and in Selden, *Notes to Eadmesr*. Spelman, however, thinks that it was merely a temporary law, without any general or permanent operation, and that the trial by ordeal continued to a later period. This opinion seems confirmed by a reference in the *Cal. Rot. Pat.* p. 15, to another order in council in the 14th Henry III, “Dejustitia facienda loco ignis et aquae.” As however it is only mentioned as a former custom, and not as an existing institution, by Bracton (lib. 3; ch 16), who wrote at the end of the reign of Henry III or the beginning of that of Edward I, it is probable that, in consequence of the judgments of the councils and the interference of the clergy, the trial by ordeal fell into disuse about the middle of the 13th century; but this was long after it had disappeared from the judicial systems of most other European nations.

Efforts for the suppression of trial by ordeal were made as early as the beginning of the 11th century by influential members of the clergy, but: the custom, deeply rooted in antiquity, was not to be subverted at a blow. Conspicuous in this movement was in the zealous Agobard of Lyons, in his treatise *Contra Judicium Dei*. Pope Stephen VI (cir. 886) condemned both fire and water ordeals. He adds, “Spontanea enim confessione vel testium approbatione publicata delicta. commissa sunt regimini nostro judicare: occulta vero et incognita illi sunt relinquenda, qui solus novit corda filiorum hominum”. (Mansi, 18:25). On the other hand, the *judicium aqua frigidae et calidae* was defended even by Hincmar of Rheims (*Opp.* 2:667). In Scotland, in 1180, we find David I enacting, in one of the assemblies of the frank tenantry of the kingdom, which were the germ of parliaments, that no one was to hold an ordinary court of justice, or a court of ordeal, whether of battle, iron, or water, except in presence of the sheriff. or one of his sergeants; though if that official failed to attend after being duly summoned, the court might be held in his absence. The first step towards: the abolition of this form of trial in Saxon and Celtic countries seems to have been the substitution of compurgation by witnesses for compurgation by ordeal. The near relatives of an accused party were expected to come forward to swear to his innocence. The number of compurgators varied, according to the importance of the case; and judgment went against the party whose kin refused to come forward, or who failed to obtain the necessary number of compurgators. To repel an accusation, it was often held necessary to have double the number of

compurgators who supported it, till at length the most numerous body of compurgators carried the day. It is remarkable that "proof by duel," which was abolished in Scandinavia by the introduction of Christianity, maintained its ground in England for centuries (Worsae, p. 167). It was also called the *wager of battle*, and was a natural accompaniment of a state of society which allowed men to take the law into their own hands. The challenger faced the west, the challenged person the east; the defeated party, if he craved his life, was allowed to live as a "recreant;" that is, on retracting the perjury which he had sworn to. The Council of Valence (855) strongly denounced it, under pain of excommunication (can. xii), which incapacitated the subject of it for performing any civil function. Yet, down to the very days of the Reformation, all through Europe, instances of trial by ordeal are encountered. Thus as late as 1498 we find the truth of Savonarola's doctrine put to the test by a challenge, between one of his disciples and a Franciscan friar, to walk through a burning pile.

*Heathen Ordeals.* — Among modern heathen nations we find the ordeal not unfrequently in practice. Thus in Siam, besides the usual methods of fire and water ordeal, both parties are sometimes exposed to the fury of a tiger set upon them; and if the beast spares either, that person is accounted innocent; if neither, both are held to be guilty; but if he spares both, the trial is incomplete, and they proceed to a more certain criterion (*Mod. Univ. Hist.* 7:266). The *Asiatic Researches* (1:389-404 [Calcutta, 1788, 4to]) contain a memoir on the trials by ordeal among the Hindus, by Ali Ibrahim Khan chief magistrate of Benares, communicated by Warren Hastings, Esq., nine in number: 1, by the balance; 2, by fire; 3, by water; 4, by two sorts of poison; 5, by Gosha, in which the accused drinks of water in which the images of the sun and other deities have been washed; 6, by chewing rice; 7, by hot oil; 8, by hot iron; 9, by Dharmach, in which an image named Dharma, or the genius of justice, made of silver, and another of an antagonist genius, Adharma, made of clay or iron, or those figures painted respectively on white and black cloth, are thrown into a large jar, from which the accused is instructed to draw at hazard. The trial by ordeal seems to be prevalent throughout Africa too. "When a man says Dr. Livingstone, 'suspects that any of his wives have bewitched him, he sends for the witch-doctor,' and all the wives go forth into the field, and remain fasting till that person has made an infusion of the plant called 'goho.' They all drink it, each one holding up her hand to heaven in attestation of her innocency. Those who vomit it are considered innocent, while those whom

it purges are pronounced guilty, and are put to death by burning. The innocent return to their homes, and slaughter a cock as a thank-offering to their guardian spirits. The practice of ordeal is common among all the negro nations north of the Zambesi." The women themselves eagerly desire the test on the slightest provocation; each is conscious of her own innocence, and has the fullest faith in the *muavi* (the ordeal) clearing all but the guilty. There are varieties of procedure among the different tribes. The Barotse pour the medicine down the throat of a cock or dog, and judge of the innocence or guilt of the person accused by the vomiting or purging of the animal.

Among the natives of Northern Guinea this species of ordeal is in use for the detection of witchcraft. It goes by the name of the *red-water ordeal*, the red-water used for this purpose being a decoction made from the inner bark of a large forest tree of the mimosa family. The mode in which this ordeal is practiced is thus described by Mr. Wilson: "A good deal of ceremony is used in connection with the administration of the ordeal; the people who assemble to see it administered form themselves into a circle, and the pots containing the liquid are placed in the center of the enclosed space. The accused then comes forward, having the scantiest apparel, but with a cord of palm-leaves bound around his waist, and seats himself in the center of the circle. After his accusation is announced, he makes a formal acknowledgment of all the evil deeds of his past life then invokes the name of God three times, and imprecates his wrath in case he is guilty of the particular crime laid to his charge. He then steps forward and drinks freely of the red-water. If it nauseates and causes him to vomit freely, he suffers no serious injury, and is at once pronounced innocent. If, on the other hand, it causes vertigo, and he loses his self-control, it is regarded as evidence of his guilt, and then all sorts of indignities and cruelties are practiced upon him. A general howl of indignation rises from the spectators. Children and others are encouraged to hoot at him, pelt him with stones, spit upon him, and in many instances he is seized by the heels and dragged through the bushes and over rocky places until his body is shamefully lacerated and life becomes extinct. Even his own kindred are required to take part in these cruel indignities, and no outward manifestation of grief is allowed in behalf of a man who has been guilty of so odious a crime. On the other hand, if he escapes without injury, his character is thoroughly purified, and he stands on a better footing in society than he did before he submitted to the ordeal. After a few days, he

is decked out in his best robes, and, accompanied by a large train of friends, he enjoys a sort of triumphal procession through the town where he lives, receives the congratulations of his friends and the community in general, and not unfrequently presents are sent to him by friends from neighboring villages. After all this is over, he assembles the principal men of the town, and arraigns his accusers before them, who, in their turn, must submit to the same ordeal, or pay a large fine to the man whom they attempted to injure.” A similar process is followed in Southern Guinea for the detection of witchcraft. At the Gabun the root used is called *nkazy*. See Grimm, *Deutsche Rechts-Alterthumer*; Pierer, *Universal-Encyklop.* art. Gottesurtheil; *Penny Cyclop.* s.v.; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s.v.; Hardwick, *Middle Ages*; Lea, *Studies in Church.Hist.* p. 164; and his *Superstition* (see Index); *Eclectic Magazine*, July, 1876, art. vii, by E. B. Tyler.

## Order

a word synonymous with *method*, is applied to any methodical or regular process of performing a thing. .

**1.** Nothing can be more beautiful in religion and morals than order. The neglect of it exposes us to the inroads of vice, and often brings upon us the most perplexing events. Whether we consider it in reference to ourselves, our families, or the Church, it is: of the greatest importance.

**(1.)** As to ourselves, order should be attended to as respects our principles (<sup><3839></sup>Hebrews 13:9; <sup><5008></sup>James 1:8), our tempers (<sup><2074></sup>Proverbs 17:14; <sup><4061></sup>Ephesians 4:31), our conversation (<sup><5046></sup>Colossians 4:6), our business (<sup><4122></sup>Proverbs 22:29), our time (<sup><1902></sup>Psalm 90:12; <sup><2080></sup>Ecclesiastes 3:1), our recreations, and our general conduct (<sup><5027></sup>Philippians 1:27; <sup><6006></sup>2 Peter 1:5), etc.

**(2.)** As regards our families, there should be order as to the economy or management of their concerns (<sup><4125></sup>Matthew 12:25); as to devotion, and the time of it (<sup><0245></sup>Joshua 24:15), as to the instruction thereof (<sup><4061></sup>Ephesians 6:1; <sup><0189></sup>Genesis 18:19; <sup><5006></sup>2 Timothy 1:5).

**(3.)** In respect to the Church, order should be observed as to the admission of members (<sup><4065></sup>2 Corinthians 6:15), as to the administration of its ordinances (<sup><4343></sup>1 Corinthians 14:33, 40), as to the attendance on its worship (<sup><4274></sup>Psalm 27:4), as to our behavior therein (<sup><5010></sup>Colossians 1:10;

Matthew 5:16). To excite us to the practice of this duty, we should: consider that God is a God of order (1 Corinthians 14:33); his works are all in the exactest order (Ephesians 1:11; Psalm 104:25; Ecclesiastes 3:11); heaven is a place of order (Revelation 7:9). Jesus Christ was a most beautiful example of regularity. The advantages of order are numerous. "The observance of it," says Dr. Blair, "serves to correct that negligence which makes us omit some duties, and that hurry and precipitancy which makes us perform others imperfectly. Our attention is thereby directed to its proper objects. We follow the straight path which Providence has pointed out to us, in the course of which all the varied business of life presents itself regularly to us on every side" (*Serm.* 2:23).

Philosophers lay great stress on man's right comprehension of order. They teach that while other beings tend blindly towards it, man knows the end of his being, and the place he holds, in the scheme of the universe, and can freely and intelligently endeavor to realize that universal order of which he is an exponent or constituent. "There is one parent virtue, the universal virtue, the virtue which renders us just and perfect, the virtue which will one day render us happy. It is the only virtue. It is the love of the universal order as it eternally existed in the divine reason, where every created reason contemplates it. The love of order is the whole of virtue, and conformity to order constitutes the morality of actions." Such is the theory of Malebranche (*Traite de Morale*), and more recently of Jouffroy. In like manner, science, in all its discoveries, tends to the discovery of universal order. Art also, in its highest attainments, is only realizing the truth of nature; so that the true, the beautiful, and the good ultimately resolve themselves into the idea of order. For order is the intelligent arrangement of means to accomplish an end, the harmonious relation established between the parts for the good of the whole. The primitive belief that there is order in nature is the ground of all experience. In this belief we confidently anticipate that the same causes, operating in the same circumstances, will produce the same effects. This may be resolved into a higher belief in the wisdom of an infinitely perfect being who orders all things. See Krauths Fleming, *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, s.v.

**2.** The word order is also used to designate the rules or laws of a monastic institution; and in a secondary sense, the several monastics living under the same rule or order. Thus the *Order of Clugni* signifies literally the new rule of discipline prescribed by Odo to the Benedictines already assembled in the monastery of Clugni; but secondarily, and in the more popular sense,

the great body of monastic institutions, wherever established, who voluntarily subjected themselves to the same rule. *SEEOORDERS, RELIGIOUS.*

**3.** In Classic Architecture the word order is used as synonymous with ordonnance, and comprises the column with its base and capital and the entablature. There are five orders:

- (1) Tuscan,
- (2) Doric,
- (3) Ionic,
- (4) Corinthian,
- (5) Composite.

The first and fifth are Roman orders, and are simply modifications of the others. The remaining three are the Greek orders.

**a.** Of the Tuscan order little can be said, there being no regular example of it among the remains of antiquity. The best masters of classic architecture have failed to furnish the needed information. Piranesi has given a drawing of a Tuscan base, but of what date is uncertain; Vitruvius, in an indistinct manner, has mentioned the general proportions, but through his whole book does not refer to one structure of this order. *SEE TUSCANS.*

### Picture for Order 1

### Picture for Order 2

**b.** The *Doric Order* is the oldest and simplest of the three orders used by the Greeks, but it is ranked as the second of the five orders adopted by the Romans. The shaft of the column has twenty flutings, which are separated by a sharp edge, and not by a fillet as in the other Orders, and they are less than a semicircle in depth; the molding below the abacus of the capital is an ovolo; the *architrave* of the entablature is surmounted with a plain fillet called the *tenia*; the frieze is ornamented by flat projections, with three channels cut in each, which are called triglyphs; the spaces between these are called metopes; under the triglyphs and below the *tenia* of the architrave are placed small drops, or gutte; along the top of the frieze runs a broad fillet, called the capital of the triglyphs; the soffit of the cornice has broad and shallow blocks worked on it called mutules, one of which is placed over each metope and each triglyph; on the under surface are several rows of guttules or drops. In these respects the order as worked

both by the Greeks and Romans is identical; but in other points there is considerable difference. In the pure Grecian examples the column has no base, and its height rises from about four to six and a half diameters; the capital has a perfectly plain square abacus, and the ovolo is but little if at all curved in section, except at the top, where it is quirked under the abacus; under the ovolo are a few plain fillets and small channels, and a short distance below them a deep narrow channel is cut in the shaft; the flutes of the shaft are continued up to the fillets under the ovolo. In the Roman Doric the shaft is usually seven diameters high, and generally has a base, sometimes the Attic and sometimes that which is peculiar to the order, consisting of a plinth and torus with an astragal above it; the capital has a small molding round the top of the abacus, and the ovolo is in section a quarter circle, and is not quirked; under the ovolo are two or three small fillets, and below them a collarino or neck. According to the Roman method of working this order, the triglyphs at the angles of buildings must be placed over the center of the column, and the metopes must be exact squares. Sometimes the mutules are omitted, and a row of dentils is worked under the cornice.

### **Picture for Order 3**

### **Picture for Order 4**

### **Picture for Order 5**

**c.** The *Ionic Order*. The most distinguishing feature of this order is the capital, which is ornamented with four spiral projections called volutes; these are arranged, in the Greek examples, and the best of the Roman, so as to exhibit a flat face on the two opposite sides of the capital, but in later works they have been made to spring out of the moldings under the angles of the abacus, so as to render the four faces of the capital uniform, the sides of the abacus being worked hollow like the Corinthian; the principal molding is an ovolo, or echinus, which is overhung by the volutes, and is almost invariably carved; sometimes also other enrichments are introduced upon the capital: in some of the Greek examples there is a collarino, or necking, below the echinus ornamented with leaves and flowers. The shaft varies from eight and a quarter to about nine and a half diameters in height; it is sometimes plain, and sometimes fluted with twenty-four flutes, which are separated from each other by small fillets. The bases used with this order are principally varieties of the Attic base, but another of a peculiar

character is found in some of the Asiatic examples, the lower moldings of which consist of two scotiae, separated by small fillets and beads, above which is a large and prominent torus. The members of the entablature in good ancient examples are sometimes perfectly plain, and sometimes enriched, especially the bed-moldings of the cornice, which are frequently cut with a row of dentels. In modern or Italian architecture, the simplicity of the ancient entablature has been considerably departed from, and the cornice is not unfrequently worked with modifications in addition to dentels.

## Picture for Order 6

**d.** The *Corinthian Order* is the lightest and most ornamental of the three orders used by the Greeks. "The capital," says Rickman, "is the great distinction of this order; its height is more than a diameter, and consists of an astragal, fillet, and apophyges, all of which are measured with the shaft, then a bell and horned abacus. The bell is set round with two rows of leaves, eight in each row, and a third row of leaves supports eight small open volutes, four of which are under the four horns of the abacus, and the other four, which are sometimes interwoven, are under the central recessed part of the abacus, and have over them a flower or other ornament. These volutes spring out of small twisted husks, placed between the leaves of the second row, and are called caulicoles. The abacus consists of an ovolo, fillet, and cavetto, like the modern Ionic. There are various modes of indenting the leaves, which are called from these variations acanthus, olive, etc. The column, including the base of half a diameter, and the capital, is about ten diameters high." The base which is considered to belong to this order resembles the Attic, with two scotiae between the tori, which are separated by two astragals; the Attic base is frequently used, and other varieties sometimes occur. The entablature of this order is often very highly enriched, the flat surfaces as well as the moldings being sculptured with a great variety of delicate ornaments. The architrave is generally formed into two or three faces or facies; the frieze in the best examples is flat, and is sometimes united to the upper fillet of the architrave by an apophyge the cornice has both modillions and dentels.

**e.** The *Composite Order*, called also *Roman*, being invented by that people, and composed of the Ionic grafted upon the Corinthian, is of the same proportion as the Corinthian, and retains the same general character, with the exception of the capital, in which the Ionic volutes and echinus are



substituted for the Corinthian caulicole and scrolls. It is one of the five orders of classic architecture, when five are admitted; but modern architects allow of only three, considering the Tuscan and the Composite as merely varieties of the Doric and Corinthian. See Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, s.v.; Elme, *Dict. of the Fine Arts*, s.v. **SEE ARCHITECTURE.**

### Ordericus, Vitalus

a noted mediaeval English ecclesiastical historian, was born at Attingesham, now Atcham, near Shrewsbury, in 1075. His parents were of Norman descent, and belonged to the nobility. But few particulars are extant regarding the life of Ordericus. From incidental notes in his own writings it appears that he was sent to France in his infancy, and there placed under monastic instruction. His first French home was in the abbey of Ouche, at Lisieux, in Normandy. In 1086 he received the tonsure, and changed his English name of *Ordericus* for that of *Vitalis*, using only the latter name himself; but custom has joined the two in writing of him. He devoted himself to study, and did not take priest's orders till 1107. He never quit the convent but three times: he once attended a chapter of the order; once went to England, visiting Worcester and Croyland; and once went to Cambray—the last two visits being apparently for the purpose of procuring materials for his work, *Historia Ecclesiastica*. This history, which consists of thirteen volumes, is brought down to 1141, in which year, or the succeeding one, it is most probable that Ordericus Vitalis died. The *Ecclesiastical History* begins with the birth of Christ, and gives in two books a rapid summary, not always correct, of the succession of the Roman emperors and popes. These two books were an after-thought, and are of no great value. It is with the third book that the interest of the work commences. The early history of the dukedom of Normandy, with the collateral relations of France and Brittany, are given in minute detail. Then follows the narrative of the conquest of England. But by far the most valuable portion of the work is the last half of it, treating of the events of which Ordericus was a contemporary observer. The first edition of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* was published by Duchesne, in his *Hist. Norm. Script. Antiq.* (Paris, 1619, fol.). It has also been printed by the French Historical Society (1840, 2 vols.), and was translated into French by Dubois (1825-27, 4 vols.). An English translation was prepared and brought out by Forester in Bohn's *Antiquarian Library* (Lond. 1853-54, 4 vols. 12mo). To the French edition of 1825-27 M. Guizot wrote an

introduction, in which he says of the work: "No book contains so much and such valuable information on the history of the 11th and 12th centuries; on the political state, both civil and religious, on society in the west of Europe; and on the manners of the times, whether feudal, monastic, or popular." See Piper, *Monumental-Theologie*, § 114; Wright, *Biog. Lit.* (A.N. Period) p. 111 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Lappenberg, *Gesch. von England*, 2:378-393; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 2:220; Oudin, *Comment. de Script. Eccles.* 2:209; and the sketches prefaced to the different editions of his works.

## Orders, Holy

is an expression used to denote the *sacred character* or position peculiar to ministers of the Christian religion, and to which they are admitted at the time of their ordination. *SEE ORDINATION*. The following is the prelatival view of the subject: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—bishops, priests, and deacons; which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation that no man might presume to execute any of them except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority" (Preface to the *English Ordinal*). In the ancient Church the (three) orders of ministry established by Christ and his apostles universally prevailed. But along with them there were gradually introduced into most of the churches other ecclesiastical persons of inferior rank, who were allowed to take part in the ministrations of religion. The three belong to the sacred, or major orders; the others to the petty, or minor orders, the number of which varies in the different churches, and even at times in the same Church. In the Romish Church there are seven orders, including, in addition to the three sacred orders, doorkeeper, exorcist, reader, and acolyth. All these the Council of Trent enjoins to be received and believed on pain of anathema. The priesthood is the principal order, and is supposed to impress an indelible character on those who receive it. The origin of the inferior orders is obscure, and they are not mentioned before the days of Cyprian and of Tertullian; and, indeed, although some modern Romanists count five (including subdeacons), and sometimes have assigned mystical reasons for so doing, the number varied in different periods. The reputed Ignatius (*Ep. ad Antioch.* 12) excludes acolyths, and yet, by adding singers and copiatæ,

swells the list to six; the constitutions bearing the name of Clemens Romanus (3:11) count but four—subdeacons, readers, singers, and doorkeepers. The Apostolical Canons, as they are called (69), name only the first three; and, in a word, the number five is perhaps less selected than any other by the majority of ancient Church writers, whether authentic or pseudonymous. Their use in early times was to form a nursery for the regular clergy, and to assist in the performance of certain lower and ordinary offices, to which laymen, if authorized by the bishop, were equally competent. More than one council, indeed, prohibited those who had once embarked even in this inferior ministry from returning to secular employments; nevertheless they were esteemed *insacрати* by the ancient canons. They did not receive any ordination at the altar, nor, for the most part, any imposition of hands. By the fifth canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, subdeacons, on their appointment, were to receive an empty cup from the hands of the bishop, and a ewer and towel from the archdeacon — a ceremony implying their duties, namely, the preparation of the sacred utensils for the service of the altar. But they were not allowed in any way to minister at the altar, to step within its rails, nor even to place the holy vessels upon it. So the duties of the acolyths were symbolized when the archdeacon presented them with a taper in a candlestick and an empty pitcher: they were to light the Candles in the church, and to supply wine for the Eucharist. Concerning the duty of the exorcists, from the obscurity attaching to the history of the energumens entrusted to their care, it is difficult to speak with certainty; it is thought that peculiar sanctity and especial reservation must have been required in persons who were to exercise so important a gift as the adjuration of evil spirits. Nevertheless, some of the occupations of the exorcists, as noticed by the ninetieth canon of the fifth Council of Carthage, belong rather to inferior keepers than to spiritual guardians of the doemoniacs. Thus, although at times in which the Church was not assembled they were enjoined to pray over their unhappy charges, they were also to take heed that they were busied in wholesome exercises, such as sweeping the church pavement, etc., by which idleness might be banished, and the tempter thereby be deprived of favorable opportunities for assault. They were also to look after the daily meals of their patients. The bishop, on their appointment, presented them with a book containing the forms of exorcising. The readers, as their name implies, read the Scriptures publicly, not, however, at the *bema* of the altar, but at the *pulpitum* in the body of the church; and the bishop's words, upon placing in their hands the Bible, by which he conferred the privilege,

sufficiently denote their separation from the regular clergy: “Accipe, et esto lector verbi Dei, habiturus, si fideliter et utiliter impleveris officium, partem cum eis qui Verbum Dei ministraverunt” (*IV Conc. Carth. c. viii*). To the *ostiarii* the bishops delivered the keys of the church; and they appear to have had about as much claim to the spiritual gifts conferred by ordination on the regular ministry as is possessed by the beadle or pew-openers of a modern chapel. Besides them, at different periods of ecclesiastical history, we read of *psalmistae*, or singers, sometimes called ὑποβολεῖς, because as precentors they prompted and suggested the musical parts of the service to the remainder of the congregation; of *copiatae* (κοπιᾶσθαι, to labor), or *fossarii*, who looked after funerals, and seem to have united in one the functions both of a sexton and an undertaker; and of *parabolani*, who undertook the dangerous work (παράβολον ἔργον) of attending the sick.

The Church of England declines admitting orders as a sacrament, for the reasons stated in her twenty-fifth article: “For that they have not like nature of sacraments with baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony *ordained of God*.” The doctrine of the Church of Rome on the subject of orders is thus given:

“Canon I. If only one shall say that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the the body and blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sins, but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all: let him be anathema. Canon II. If any one shall say that, besides the priesthood, there are not in the Catholic Church other orders, both greater and lesser, by which, as by certain steps, advance is made into the priesthood: let him be anathema. Canon III. If any one shall say that orders or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a certain human figurment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters; or that it is only a certain kind for choosing ministers of the Word of God and of the sacraments: let him be anathema. Canon IV. If any one shall say that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given: and that the bishops do therefore vainly say, *receive ye the Holy Ghost*; or that a character is not thereby imprinted; or that he who has once been a priest can again become a layman: let him be anathema.”

In all episcopal churches, including under that general description the Church of England, the Protestant Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, and Romish churches, three ranks of clergy are recognized: the bishop (q.v.), the priest or presbyter or pastor (q.v.), and the deacon (q.v.). The various higher officials in the episcopal churches — archbishop, primate, metropolitan, etc. — all belong to the order of bishop; and the lower officials curate, rector, parson, etc. — all belong to the order of priests or presbyters. The non-episcopal churches, i.e. the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, some Lutherans, and others, recognize only one order, the presbyterate, no other officers being considered ministers, although lay elders and deacons are sometimes set apart by the imposition of hands. In no Reformed Church are there more than three orders — bishops, priests, and deacons. In the primitive Church the word *ordo* simply denoted the distinction between the clergy and the laity, the former being the *ordo ecclesiasticus*. **SEE ORDO.**

Different opinions prevail as to the source whence the authority of Holy Orders is derived. Some, who hold there is in Holy Orders a sacramental virtue which is indispensable for all the Christian ordinances and means of grace, maintain also that this virtue is inherent indefeasibly in each individual, who (according to this system) has derived it in no degree from any particular *community*, but solely from the bishop whose hands were laid on him; who derived *his* power to administer this sacrament altogether from consecration by another bishop, not necessarily a member of the same particular Church, but obtaining his power again from another; and so on, up to the apostolic times; a system, this, it will be seen, which makes the Church a sort of appendage to the priesthood, not the ministry to the Church. The opponents of this system consider that it is an error to make the authority of a Church emanate from that of its ministers; and place the title of the latter on the secure basis of a clear sanction given, once for all, to *every* regularly appointed minister of any Christian community constituted on Gospel principles, instead of being made to depend on a long chain, the soundness of many of whose links cannot be ascertained. — Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Cyclop.* s.v.; Eden, *Ch. Dict.* s.v.; Watson, *Bible Dict.* s. v; Hook, *Ch. Dict.* s.v.; Buck, *Ch. Dict.* s.v. See also Bergier, *Dict. de Theologie*, s.v.; Watson, *Institutes*, 2:572-575; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*; Siegel, *Christliche Alterthumer*; M'Elhinney, *Doct. of the Ch.* p. 192-194, 201; Palmer, *Orig. Lit.* 2:49, 257, 258; Walcott, *Sacred Archaeol.* s.v.; Burnet, *Articles of the Ch. of*

England; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, p. 102; and his *Ritualism and Prelacy*, p. 153; Willett, *Synop. Pap.* s.v.; Proctor, *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*; Calvin, *Institutes*; *Princet. Rev.* 15:314; and the literature in Malcom, *Theol. Index*, s.v., **SEE OFFICE**; **SEE ORDINATION**; **SEE PRELACY**.

## Orders, Religious

are conventual communities comprehended under one rule, subject to one superior, and wearing the same dress. Religious orders may be reduced to five kinds, viz. monks, canons, knights, mendicants, and regular clerks. They are, however, generally classified simply as monastic, military, and mendicant. *White order* denotes the order of regular canons of St. Augustine. *Black order* denotes the order of St. Benedict. Religious military orders are those instituted in defense of the faith, privileged to say mass, prohibited from marriage, etc.

The earliest comprehension of monastic societies under one rule was effected by St. Basil, archbishop of Caesarea, who united the hermits and coenobites in his diocese, and prescribed for them a uniform constitution, recommending at the same time a vow of celibacy. The Basilian rule subsists to the present day in the Eastern Church. Next in order of time was the Benedictine Order, founded by St. Benedict at Nursia, who considered a mild discipline preferable to excessive austerity. The offshoots from the Benedictine Order include some of the most important orders in ecclesiastical history, among others the Carthusians, Cistercians, and Praemonstrants. The Order of Augustinians professed to draw their rule from the writings of St. Augustine; they were the first order who were not entirely composed of laymen, but of ordained priests, or persons destined to the clerical profession. The military orders, of which the members united the military with the religious profession, arose from the necessity under which the monks lay of defending the possessions which they had accumulated, and the supposed duty of recovering Palestine from the Saracens, and retaining possession of it. The most famous orders of this kind were the Hospitallers or Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, the Knights Templars and the Teutonic Order. Many other military orders existed, and not a few continue to exist, particularly in Spain and Portugal. The phraseology of the old military orders is preserved in the orders of knighthood of modern times, into which individuals are admitted in reward for merit of different kinds, military and civil. The three mendicant orders

of Franciscans, Dominicans, and Carmelites were instituted in the 13th century. Their principal purpose was to put down the opposition to the Church, which had begun to show itself, and also to reform the Church by example and precept. At a later period the Order of the Jesuits was founded, with the object of increasing the power of the Church and putting down heresy. Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v. Notices of the more important orders, monastic, military, and mendicant, will be found under separate articles. *SEE KNIGHTS; SEE MONASTICISM; SEE MENDICANTS.*

### Ordibarii

a sect of the Catharists, who held that a Trinity only began to be when Jesus Christ was born — that is, Jesus became Son of God by his reception of the Word; and when this preaching attracted others the Holy Ghost began to exist. In their patois, that of the south of France, their adherents were called “*bos homes*,” good men, and “*credentes*,” believers: these last at a later period joined the *bos ordo*, whence probably the name. See Neander, *Church Hist.* 3:366; Kuirtz — *Manual of Ch. Hist.* sec. 138. *SEE ALBIGENSES; SEE BOGOMILES; SEE CATHARI; SEE ORTLIBENSES.*

### Ordinal

is the name of the book which contains the forms observed in the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church for the ordination and consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons. It was prepared by a commission appointed in the third year of Edward VI (1550), and was added to the Book of Common Prayer, after approval by Parliament. It was slightly modified in the reign of Elizabeth, and was again revised by the Convention of 1661.

The English ordinal, in its general structure, resembles the ancient services used for a like purpose, but possesses much greater simplicity, and has some features — e.g. the numerous questions addressed to the candidates — peculiar to itself. There are separate services for the “making of deacons” and the “ordering of priests,” but these are practically joined in one, and used on the same day. The service for the consecration of bishops is altogether distinct. The ordination takes place at one of the Ember seasons, and during the public service, after morning prayer and a sermon on the subject, and begins with the presentation of the candidates by the archdeacon. The bishop inquires as to their fitness, and commends them to

the prayers of the congregation. — The litany is then said, with special petitions for the candidates for each order, and the communion service commences with a special collect, epistle, and gospel. Between the epistle and gospel the oath of supremacy is administered, and the candidates for deacons' orders are questioned by the bishop and ordained. The gospel is read by one of the newly ordained deacons. The candidates for priests' orders are then solemnly exhorted and interrogated, and the prayers of all present are asked for the divine blessing upon them. For this purpose a pause is made in the service for private prayer. After this: the hymn *Veni Creator Spiritus*. (Come; Holy Ghost, our Souls inspire) — a composition of great antiquity, supposed to be as old as the 4th century is sung, and, the candidates kneeling before the bishop, he and the assistant presbyters lay their hands upon the head of each, with the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God," etc. — The only other ceremony is the presentation of each candidate with the Bible in token of authority to preach; as the deacons had been before presented with the New Testament in token of authority to read the Gospel. The service concludes with the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In the office for the ordering of deacons the bishop lays on his hands, but does not use the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc., or grant authority to forgive or retain sins. The consecration of bishops is performed by an archbishop, or some bishop appointed in his place, and two or more of his suffragans, and may take place on any Sunday or holy day. In the service for the consecration of bishops the form is this:

"Then the archbishop and bishop present shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected bishop, kneeling before them upon his knees, the archbishop saying, 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the laying on of our hands, in the huine of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And member that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by the imposition of our hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power and love and soberness.'" See Procter, *Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*; M'Elhinney, *Doct. of the Church*, p. 164, 167, 305; Hook, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Churton, *Defence of the English Ordinal* (Lond. 1873, 8vo).



## Ordinance

an institution established by lawful authority. Religious ordinances must be instituted by the great institutor of religion, or they are not binding: minor regulations are not properly ordinances. Ordinances once established are not to be varied by human caprice or mutability.

Human ordinances, established by national laws, may be varied by other laws, because the inconveniences arising from them can only be determined by experience. Yet Christians are bound to submit to these institutions, when they do not infringe on those established by divine authority; not only from the consideration that if every individual were to oppose national institutions no society could subsist, but by the tenor of Scripture itself. Nevertheless, Christianity does not interfere with political rights, but leaves individuals, as well as nations, in full enjoyment of whatever advantages the constitution of a country secures to its subjects.

The course of nature is the ordinance of God; its laws are but “the ordinances of heaven;” and every planet obeys that impulse which the divine Governor has impressed on it. (<sup><4836></sup>Jeremiah 31:36).

### Ordinances, Christian

*SEE ORDINANCES OF THE GOSPEL.*

### Ordinances Of The Gospel

are institutions of divine authority relating to the worship of God; such as,

- 1,** baptism (<sup><4839></sup>Matthew 28:19);
- 2,** the Lord's Supper (<sup><4824></sup>1 Corinthians 11:24, etc.);
- 3,** public ministry, or preaching and reading the Word (<sup><5015></sup>Romans 10:15; <sup><4013></sup>Ephesians 4:13; <sup><4165></sup>Mark 16:15);
- 4,** hearing the Gospel (<sup><4021></sup>Mark 4:24; <sup><5017></sup>Romans 10:17);
- 5,** public prayer (<sup><4345></sup>1 Corinthians 14:15, 19; <sup><4066></sup>Matthew 6:6; <sup><4071></sup>Psalms 5:1, 7);
- 6,** singing of psalms (<sup><5016></sup>Colossians 3:16; <sup><4069></sup>Ephesians 5:19);
- 7,** fasting (<sup><5009></sup>James 1:9; <sup><4095></sup>Matthew 9:15; <sup><4022></sup>Joel 2:12);

**8**, solemn thanksgiving (Psalm 1, 14; ~~1~~ 1 Thessalonians 5:18). See these different articles; also *SEE MEANS OF GRACE*.

## Ordinary

(Lat. *ordinarius*) is a word used in common and canon law to designate one who has regular or immediate jurisdiction, in opposition to those who are extraordinarily appointed. In England the bishops: commonly the ordinary for a diocese, and the archbishop for a province. Says Coke, in his *Second Institute*, p 398, “This word signifieth a bishop, or he or they *ih*t have ordinary jurisdiction, and is derived *ab’ordine* and gives this quaint reason, that the name was selected for the purpose of keeping the individual who bears it in perpetual remembrance of “the high order and office that he is called unto.” When the word is used at the present day, it generally, denotes either the individual who has the right to grant letters of administration of the effects of deceased persons, or him who has the right of ecclesiastical visitation. The ordinary of assizes and sessions was formerly a deputy of the bishop appointed to give malefactors the neck-verse — i.e. the verse which was read by a party to entitle him to the benefit of clergy. The ordinary of Newgate is a clergyman who attends on condemned culprits, and, as it is commonly expressed, prepares them for death.

## Ordination

in a common, but limited and technical sense, is the ceremony by which an individual is set apart to an order or office of the Christian ministry; As the laying on of hands is usually a distinctive feature of that ceremony, many persons have very inadequately treated of ordination to the Christian ministry as identical with it; whereas imposition of hands (q.v.) has various other uses, and only belongs to the ceremony in question as a symbolic act indicative of the bestowment of spiritual gifts or power. In a broader, and in fact its only important sense, ordination signifies the appointment or designation of a person to a ministerial office, whether with or without attendant ceremonies. The term ordination is derived directly from the Latin *ordination* signifying, with reference to things or affairs, a setting in order, an establishment, an edict, and with reference to men, an appointment to office. It is used in all languages derived from the Latin, and chiefly in application to this one idea of induction to the- ministerial office. As used in the English language, the term is not fixed and invariable

in its signification. In fact it has many variations of meaning, as it is made to represent the peculiar theories and practices which have prevailed in different periods and churches with reference to the character and effect of ordination; yet all these variations of meaning may be harmonized under the general idea of ministerial appointment, whether by the Savior's command, or through multiplied ceremonies of human devising.

It is but just to consider the subject of ordination one of no small intrinsic interest, since, by the consent and practice of the Christian world, it is an act, or the peculiar feature of a series of acts, by which all ministers have received their order or office, in distinction from the laity of the Church. Nevertheless much of the prominence which has been given to it in theological controversy has not arisen from its intrinsic importance, but from the accident of its being a pivotal question in reference to the dogma of a lineal apostolical succession, and the consequences supposed to flow through it as a channel of transmitted grace. It has also entered largely into the sacramentarian controversies of the past. Whoever would properly comprehend the subject of ordination as now defined should give primary attention to whatever teachings the Scriptures contain respecting it. Of necessity the Word of God, rightly interpreted, is the one source of authority in reference to a subject so closely connected with the establishment of Christ's kingdom upon the earth. Hence any theory or practice that is not sustained by inspired precept or example cannot be regarded as of religious authority, or deserving attention other than as a matter of history or curiosity.

A scriptural investigation of this subject can hardly fail to impress any ingenuous mind with the great significance. The fact that neither the Lord Jesus Christ nor any of his disciples gave specific commands or declarations in reference to ordination. The facts of the institution of the ministerial office in the Church and of the ordination, in the sense of the appointment, of faithful believing men to serve in that office, stand forth prominently through out the New Testament. But the manner in which those facts are stated suggest the inference that ministerial ordination, like the more comprehensive subject of Church organization itself, was not designed to be a matter of minute prescription or of constrained uniformity, but rather was to be left open, within the range of certain great principles, to minor variations of detail that might be appropriate to the circumstances of the future. Had any particular form of ordination been essential to the perpetuity of the Church, the validity of the sacraments, or the salvation of

men, it seems but reasonable to infer that the Head of the Church himself would have appointed that special form, and have given precepts for its continuance. In the absence of any such appointment by the Lord Jesus, we have to ascertain to what extent the apostles became the instructors of the Church in reference to the subject in question; and, finding in their writings an absence of specific precepts, it is necessary to collate the several examples of ordination which they have recorded, and to draw from them impartial inferences as to their import and bearing upon the future practice of the Church. When once the canon of Scripture is closed nothing remains but to follow the course of history, and to observe how different churches, at different periods, have sought to improve upon the simplicity and godly sincerity of the apostolic practices, and with what results, inclusive of far-reaching corruptions. As the subject essentially demands historic treatment, attention is first invited to —

**I.** *The Analogies and Counter-Analogies of Judaism* — Many writers, without due consideration, have assumed that Christian ministerial ordination was derived directly from Judaism, whereas the whole system of induction into the office of the Jewish priesthood is in marked contradistinction to that practiced by Christ and his apostles in reference to the Christian ministry.

**1.** The consecration of Jewish priests was by means of the anointing oil upon their persons and their garments. (see <sup><0280></sup>Exodus 28:40, 41; 29:1, 19, 30; <sup><0882></sup>Leviticus 8:12, 30; 10:7; 21:12). The Levites, as assistants to the priests, were consecrated by the sprinkling of the water of purification, washing their clothes, and the offering of sacrifice (<sup><0486></sup>Numbers 8:6-22). The laying on of hands appointed for the Levitical consecration was performed by the people, not as conferring an office or spiritual gifts, but as symbolical of the transmission of their sins to the Levites, who, in turn, transmitted the same by laying their hands upon the heads of the bullocks offered for a sin-offering and a burnt-offering (ver. 10-12).

**2.** The appointment of the Jewish prophets was by direct command or inspiration from God, without any ceremonial induction to their sacred office. In this feature the appointment of the holy prophets prefigured the Messianic period, and Christ's own mode of appointing his disciples to their ministry.

**3.** The most direct, if not the only real analogy of the Old-Testament Scriptures to the Christian custom of ordination to the office of the ministry is found in the ceremony by which, under the command of God, Moses transferred to Joshua a portion of his responsibilities as a leader and guide to the congregation of Israel (see <sup><02715></sup>Numbers 27:15-23). In this narrative it may be seen that Moses, prior to his departure from the people whom he had been appointed to lead out of Egypt to the land of promise, prayed to the Lord to “set a man over the congregation, . . . that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd. And the Lord said unto Moses, Take the Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him’. . . And Moses did as the Lord commanded him: and he took Joshua, and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation; and he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge, as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses.” In this transaction the office of the Christian pastor, his necessary spiritual qualification, his mode of appointment, and his duty as an under-shepherd of Christ's flock, are beautifully prefigured.

## **II.** *The Example of Christ and the Practice of the Apostolical Church.* —

**1.** In the introduction of the Christian dispensation no exterior act of ordination was practiced by Christ. The calling, appointing, and ultimate commissioning of the twelve apostles was his personal act, unattended, so far as the inspired record shows, with any symbolical action or ceremony. When it is narrated (Mark- 3:14) that “he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach,” the original word employed is ἐποίησε, signifying *he made,-in the sense of constituted or appointed*. When to the same disciples he declared (John 15, 16), “Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye 'should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain,” the word rendered *ordained* is ἔθηκα, *I have set or appointed you*. In <sup><02018></sup>Luke 10:1, where it is recorded that he “appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face,” the Greek word rendered *appointed* is ἀνέδειξεν, literally signifying ‘*he pointed out or appointed by designation*. In all. these cases. Christ illustrated the divine authority which he asserted in his preface to the great and final commission given prior to his ascension: “And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have

commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world” (~~4038~~ Matthew 28:18-20). “He needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man” (~~4025~~ John 2:25). Hence, while he remained on earth as the visible Head of his own Church, he chose and ordained his own ministers in the exercise of his omniscience and kingly power. If it be objected that one of the original twelve apostatized and betrayed him, the proper answer is that ministers of the Lord Jesus are in this melancholy fact admonished of the danger of yielding to temptation and falling into the snare of the devil, notwithstanding the grace imparted in an unquestionably divine appointment. Although in other acts the Savior employed symbolical actions, as when in healing lepers he touched them (~~4083~~ Matthew 8:3; ~~4044~~ Mark 1:41; ~~4053~~ Luke 5:13), or when in healing blind men he touched their eyes (~~4029~~ Matthew 9:29), spit on their eyes and put his hands upon them (~~4023~~ Mark 8:23), anointed the eyes of the blind with clay (~~4016~~ John 9:6, 7, 11), and in curing a deaf man he put his fingers in his ears and touched his tongue (~~4033~~ Mark 7:33), yet in no case of his ordination of his disciples to their ministerial or apostolic office is it recorded that he *laid his hands upon them*. Nevertheless, in the final period of his earthly sojourn, between his resurrection and ascension, when about to bestow upon his disciples a higher manifestation of spiritual power “he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost” (~~4022~~ John 20:22). By this symbolic action he illustrated the nature of the spiritual influence which was to come upon them in its full manifestation at the Pentecost. It was in this connection that he also uttered the words, so often and so grossly perverted, “Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” A literal and materializing construction of the above passage, together with the kindred passages in Matthew relating to the keys, and the power of binding and loosing (~~4019~~ Matthew 16:19; 18:18), became at an early period of the history of the ancient Church a great fountain of error in reference to the office and power of the clergy. That the design of our Lord in employing these strong figures was not to confer upon the disciples a divine prerogative, but rather to impress upon them the responsibility of their office, and their essential need of a constant reliance on the aid of the Holy Ghost to enable them to discharge their duties as ministers of the Gospel, is evident, not only from a just interpretation of the passages themselves, but specially so from the practical illustration of their meaning, given by the actions and teachings of the apostles throughout all their subsequent ministry. In pursuance of the Savior’s instructions they proceeded, not to

assume personal or official prerogatives, but to employ the Gospel plan of salvation as the one and only agency for securing the remission of sins. In so doing they faithfully warned the wicked of their certain condemnation and ruin outside of the provisions of the Gospel, while they: taught all men the necessity of prayer and personal faith in Christ as the indispensable condition of pardon and salvation.

**2.** In the whole apostolic history not a single intimation is given of the possibility of the absolution of sin by human or priestly power. On the contrary, that idea was terribly rebuked in the case of the ex-sorcerer Simon, who, although a baptized believer, committed a heinous sin by thinking “that the gift of God might be purchased with money” or imparted by ceremonial acts. For this Peter charged him, saying, “repent of this thy wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee” (~~4813~~ Acts 8:13-24). In this transaction, as well as in his address to the Jews at Jerusalem, and in fact throughout his entire ministry, the teachings of the apostle Peter illustrate the scriptural doctrine that God only can remit sin through the merits of Christ (see ~~4006~~ Psalm 130:4; ~~2709~~ Daniel 9:9; ~~4051~~ Acts 5:31; 13:38; 26:1.8). Moreover, in his denunciations of sin and encouragements to righteousness, Peter showed precisely the nature and extent of the apostolic prerogative of the keys, and of binding and loosing, which was no more nor less than that of organizing the Christian Church, and administering its government on the strict principles of moral purity established by the Gospel itself.

It was a sad and ominous day for the cause of Christianity when a different interpretation began to be put upon the Savior's instructions, and men, lacking the essential elements of Christian experience and all claim to the Holy Spirit's influence, began to imagine and proclaim themselves competent to remit sins, on account of some magical power acquired by clerical ordination. That there was no scriptural foundation for such errors, and that in fact they might have been corrected by due attention to the teachings of the New Testament, may be shown from the recorded examples of ordination as practiced by the apostles.

**3.** *The Appointment of Matthias to the Apostleship.* The peculiar feature in this transaction (see ~~4021~~ Acts 1:21-26) was a pervading anxiety to ascertain whom the Lord had chosen for the vacant place among the commissioned witnesses of his resurrection. Hence the election or nomination by the Church of two candidates, prayer by the apostles, and the casting of lots to

determine which of the two should be numbered with the eleven apostles. In this case, as in those of the Lord's direct appointment, there was no imposition of hands.

**4. *The Ordination of the Seven Deacons.*** — This marked event in the history of the Church occurred in immediate sequence of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost at the Pentecost, and from the space allotted to it in the sacred record (~~400~~ Acts 6:2-6), as well as from the fact that all the apostles were present, it may now be considered, as it doubtless was during the whole apostolic period, a model ordination for the subsequent Church. Its characteristic features were:

- (1) A demand for men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom;
- (2) An election or choice by the Church “on that basis;
- (3) Prayer by the apostles;
- (4) The laying on of hands, presumably by several of the apostles, as representative of the whole body.

In this act the apostles illustrated their ideas of the proper functions of the Church in reference to its future ministers, and established a precedent of perpetual authority. It was a precedent moreover, in obvious harmony with the precept of our Lord, given in connection with his appointment of the seventy (~~200~~ Luke 10:2), “Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest.” The apostles evidently regarded this as the standing commission and perpetual duty of the Church in reference to the promotion of Christ's kingdom in the earth. In it they saw that the Lord claimed the work of evangelizing the world as his own, and also the prerogative of calling and sending forth laborers, while at the same time he charged the Church with the responsibility of prayer and cooperation. This, too, was in harmony with the Savior's promised gift of the Holy Ghost as the guide of then Church when he should no longer be present as its visible Head. The Spirit's influence was specially promised in answer to prayer, and it was only a praying Church endowed with the Holy Ghost that could become the light of the world and the agency of its salvation. So long as the Church illustrated these characteristics it gloriously fulfilled its mission. It grew rapidly by the addition of regenerated believers, many of whom, in proportion to the demands of its



widening work. were called of God and moved of the Holy Ghost to preach to others the same Gospel that had become to them the power of God unto salvation. The function of the Church, therefore, as to ordination was not to create or bestow the gift of the ministry, but simply to recognize and authenticate it when bestowed by the Head of the Church. Hence ensued prayer that the Lord would show the men whom he had chosen for that work, and the laying on of hands, to express the cooperative action and benediction of the Church.

**5.** These principles were illustrated in the *experience and ordination of Paul*. On no subject did the great apostle speak more emphatically and repeatedly than that of his divine call, in the absence of which he would have regarded himself no true minister or apostle, whatever ceremonies might have been enacted over him: “Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God” (<sup><400></sup>Romans 1:1); “Paul, an apostle (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead)” (<sup><400></sup>Galatians 1:1). Such were the terms in which the apostle to the Gentiles expressed his personal consciousness of the divine call, and yet he submitted himself to ordination on the part of the Church, and that in company with a brother of lower degree, and at the hands of prophets (preachers) and teachers who were not numbered among the apostles.

**6.** *Ordination of Barnabas and Saul.* — The full inspired account of this transaction is worthy of special attention: “And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark. Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas. and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus” (<sup><4125></sup>Acts 12:25; 13:1-4). The events above narrated occurred some ten years after the commission of Saul of Tarsus, following which “straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues” (<sup><410></sup>Acts 9:20). Becoming associated with Barnabas, he also “spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus” at Jerusalem. Both these men seem to have labored as evangelists whenever they had opportunity, and their ministry having been

given of God, was honored by his blessing. They were now called to higher responsibilities. They were to go forth “under the sanction of the Church, and not only to proclaim the truth, but also to baptize converts, to organize Christian congregations, and to ordain Christian ministers. It was therefore proper that, on this occasion, they should be regularly invested with the ecclesiastical commission. In the circumstantial record of this proceeding, in the Acts of the Apostles, we have a proof of the wisdom of the Author of Revelation. He foresaw that the rite of the laying on of hands would be sadly abused; that it would be represented as possessing something like a magic potency; and that it would at length be converted, by a small class of ministers, into an ecclesiastical monopoly. He has therefore supplied us with an antidote against delusion by permitting us, in this simple narrative, to scan its exact import. And what was the virtue of the ordination here described? Did it furnish Paul and Barnabas with a title to the ministry? Not at all. God himself had already called them to the work, and they could receive no higher authorization. Did it necessarily add anything to the eloquence, or the prudence, or the knowledge, or the piety of the missionaries? No results of the kind could be produced by any such ceremony. What, then, was its meaning? The evangelist himself furnishes an answer. The Holy Ghost required that Barnabas and Saul should be *separated* to the work to which the Lord had called them, and the laying on of hands was the *mode* or form in which they were set apart or designated to the office. This rite, to an Israelite, suggested grave and hallowed associations. When a Jewish father invoked a benediction on any of his family, he laid his hand upon the head of the child; when a Jewish priest devoted an animal in sacrifice he laid his hand upon the head of the victim; and when a Jewish ruler invested another with office, he laid his hand upon the head of the new functionary. The ordination of these brethren possessed all this significance. By the laying on of hands the ministers of Antioch implored a blessing upon Barnabas and Saul, and announced their separation or dedication to the work of the Gospel, and intimated their investiture with ecclesiastical authority” (Killen, *Ancient Church*, p. 71 sq.).

It is sometimes asserted that this ordination was a special one to the missionary work. Nevertheless it is the only one recorded as having been received by either of the apostles named, and it illustrates the conditions observed in the ordination of the deacons, viz. (1) The candidates were men called of the Holy Ghost; (2) They were separated unto the work of

the Lord by prayer, accompanied with fasting; (3) Hands were laid upon them by representative men of the Church, doubtless the elders. among whom no apostle was present, and as yet the office of bishop had not been instituted.

**7. The Ordination of Elders.** — When Paul and Barnabas went forth upon their mission, it is recorded of them that “they ordained them (i.e. for the disciples) elders in every Church” (~~4423~~ Acts 14:23). As to the ceremonies employed in these ordinations, only prayer, fasting, and commending the persons ordained to the Lord, on whom they believed, are mentioned. But in the narrative the word *χειροτονήσαντες*. (*ordained*) is for the first time introduced. It is again used in ~~4089~~ 2 Corinthians 8:19, where Paul speaks of Titus as “the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches.” “And not that only, but who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord.” *Being chosen of the churches* signifies *elected* or *appointed*, and implies ordination by the laying on of hands, as well as being elected by the holding up of hands. The employment of the word quoted, and the subsequent use of it by Christian writers as signifying all that belonged to ministerial ordination (see subscriptions to the 2d Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus), implies that the ordination of elders throughout the churches involved the cooperative action of those churches. In so important a matter the apostles obviously did not act arbitrarily or alone; but when, for the confirming of the souls of the disciples, they judged it important to ordain elders in every Church, they doubtless called on the several churches to determine by prayer, attended with fasting, whom among their number the Holy Ghost would make their spiritual overseers. Upon those designated they doubtless, in connection with other elders, laid their hands, with corresponding prayer, and thus ordained them to the special service of the Lord. A comparison of several passages in Paul's epistles will show that this view of the apostolic custom of ordination is by no means conjectural. In ~~5044~~ 1 Timothy 4:14, he says, “Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.” The word *prophecy* in this verse may be understood in the sense of the divine gift or designation. Again, in ~~5106~~ 2 Timothy 1:6, referring to the same subject, he says, “Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands.” Comparing the two verses quoted, it becomes evident that ordination, even by al apostle, was not an

individual act, but one participated in by the elders of the Church, who, in connection with the apostle, laid their hands upon the head of the subject. Hence, when the apostle in his charge to Timothy says (~~5492~~1 Timothy 5:22),” Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins,” we may understand that he warns his son in the Gospel alike against hasty and individual action, in which he might be deceived. Again he-says (~~5004~~Titus 1:4, 5), “To Titus, mine own son after the common faith: Grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior. For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.” He then proceeds, as he had already done in his letters to Timothy, to state in detail the essential qualifications of ministers, those which he had himself required, and those which he demanded that his successors should require; and by reference to his own example in both cases (see ~~4440~~Acts 16:2; ~~4189~~2 Corinthians 8:19) he clearly intimates their duty of enlisting the prayers and the godly judgment of the churches ill the selection and ordination of ministers of the Word and administrators of the ordinances of God.

Such was apostolic ordination, so far as we can know from the inspired writers, and since they have written nothing on the subject further for our learning, we may safely infer that nothing more is essential. A few points involved in the above scriptural examples may be summarily noted:

- (1.)** Christ ordained in the sense of appointing his disciples to ministerial service by his own authority, and without employing any exterior ceremony.
- (2.)** In the election of Matthias to the place in the apostolate from which Judas fell, it was deemed sufficient to ascertain by prayer and the lot whom the Lord had chosen; and in like manner, without any exterior ceremony, “he was numbered with the eleven apostles.”
- (3.)** The laying on of hands as a ceremony of ministerial ordination was first practiced by the apostles. in the case of the seven deacons, in immediate sequence of the miracle of the Pentecost.
- (4.)** It was subsequently practiced in the ordination of Paul and Barnabas, and the elders of the New-Testament Church.

(5.) No account is given of any one having been ordained to the office of bishop in distinction from that of elder, still less is there any intimation that bishops were or were to become the only officers in the Church competent to ordain ministerial candidates; whereas elders were frequently, if not always, associated even with apostles in the act of ordination.

Such, as to form and ceremony, was ministerial ordination as practiced in the apostolic Church. As to effect, it claimed only to separate, by solemn acts on the part of the Church, holy men, already called of God to the exclusive work of the ministry. No intimation is given that ordination conferred priestly functions or prerogatives in any form or degree, while, on the other hand, various cautions are given, both in the example and precepts of the apostles, against such an idea. That a large body of ministers thus ordained and instructed were at the head of the various Christian churches at the close of the apostolic period is a matter of the clearest inference both from the sacred record and the earliest accounts we have of the post-apostolic Church. Then followed a shadowy period of Church history, in which, by persecution from without and dissensions and corruptions within, many changes were wrought in the customs and theories of Christians.

**II.** *Introduction of Corrupt Theories and Practice.* The greater part of these changes originated in a tendency, itself the result of a decline in spirituality, to incorporate with the ritual of the Church certain ceremonies of Judaism, while corresponding ideas from Greek and Roman paganism were not rigidly excluded. Most startling among these corruptions, and most prolific of other outflowing errors, was the idea of a Christian priesthood parodied from the Jewish. There not having been one word or act in all the teachings of Christ or his apostles to countenance such an idea, we may well be amazed that before the end of the 3d century such declarations as the following were put forth in the name of the apostles for the teaching -and guidance of the Church. The subjoined extracts are from the so-called *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, **SEE CANONS, ECCLESIASTICAL**, a notorious collection of disciplinary prescriptions and forms which, although, as seen in the light of modern criticism, obviously spurious, nevertheless were circulated and received both as authentic and authoritative for centuries. Having been put forth at a period when literary criticism was unknown, and having been adroitly harmonized with the drift of corrupt practice then gaining currency in the Greek and Roman churches, neither the literary nor the religious authority of this strange

collection of documents was questioned for more than a thousand years. The lowest and the true view to be taken of these documents is that they are descriptive of theories and practices that prevailed when they were written, and from that time forward:

*Pretended Authorship.* — “The apostles and elders to all those who, from among the Gentiles, have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ” (bk. i, § 1).

“We who are now assembled in our place, Peter and Andrew, James and John, sons of Zebedee, Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew, James the son of Alphasns, and Lebbeeus, who was surnamed Thadduens, and Simon the Canaanite, and Matthias who, instead of Judas, was numbered with us, James the brother of the Lord and bishop of Jerusalem, and Paul the teacher of the Gentiles, the chosen vessel — all being present, have written to you this catholic doctrine for the confirmation of you to whom the oversight of the Church universal is committed” (bk. 6 §14).

*Pretended Establishment of the Hierarchy.* — “As to those things which have happened among us, ye yourselves are not ignorant. For ye know perfectly that those who are by us named bishops and presbyters and deacons were made by prayer and by the laying on of hands, and that' by the difference of the names is indicated the difference of their employments. For not everyone that will is ordained, as the case was in that spurious and counterfeit priesthood of the calves under Jeroboam. For if there were no rules or distinction of orders, it would suffice to perform all the offices under one name. But being taught by the Lord the series of things, we distributed the functions of the high-priesthood to the bishops, those of the priesthood to the presbyters, and the ministrations under them both to the deacons, that the divine worship might be performed in purity. For it is not lawful for a deacon to offer the sacrifice, or to baptize, or to give the blessing, either small or great. Nor may a presbyter perform ordination, for it is not agreeable to holiness to have order overturned. For such as these do not fight against us nor against the bishops, but against the universal bishop, even the high-priest of the Father, Jesus Christ our Lord. High-priests, priests, and Levites, were ordained by Moses, the most beloved of God. By our Savior we, the thirteen apostles, were ordained; and by the apostles St. James and St. Clement, and others with us (that we may not make the catalogue of all those bishops over again). Moreover, by us

all in common were ordained presbyters and deacons and subdeacons and readers” (bk. 8, § 46).

*Affirmation of Priestly Prerogatives and Emoluments.* “Ye, therefore, at the present day, O bishops, are to your people, priests and Levites, ministering to the holy tabernacle, the holy Catholic Church; who stand at the altar of the Lord your God, and offer to him reasonable and unbloody sacrifices through Jesus the great high-priest. Ye are to the laity prophets, rulers, governors, and kings the mediators between God and his faithful people, who receive and declare his Word, well acquainted with the Scriptures. Ye are the voice of God and witnesses of his will, who bear the sins and intercede for all” (bk. 2, § 25).

*Episcopal Assumptions.* — “The bishop is the minister of the Word, the keeper of knowledge, the mediator between God and you in the several parts of your divine worship. He is the teacher of piety, and next after God he is your father, who hath begotten you again to the adoption of sons by water and the Spirit. He is your ruler and governor; he is your king and potentate; he is next after God your earthly god, who hath a right to be honored by you” (bk. 2:26). Let the above strange language be contrasted with the inspired utterances of the apostle Peter himself (see ~~ACTS~~ 1 Peter 5:1-4): “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.”

*Concerning Ordination*— “Wherefore we, the twelve apostles of the Lord, who are now together, give you in charge these our divine constitution concerning every ecclesiastical form; there being present with us Paul the chosen vessel, our fellow-apostle, and James the bishop and the rest of the presbyters, and the seven deacons.

“In the first place, therefore, I Peter say that a bishop to be ordained is to be, as we have already all of us appointed, unblamable in all things, a select person, chosen by the whole people. And when he is named and approved, let the people assemble, with the presbytery and bishops that are present, on the Lord's day, and let them give their consent. And let him who is preferred among the rest ask the presbytery and the people whether this is

the person whom they desire their ruler. And if they give their consent, let him ask further whether he hath a good testimony from all men, etc. And if all the assembly together do, according to truth and not according to prejudice, testify that he is such a one, let theon the third time ask again whether he is truly worthy of this ministry; and if they agree the third time that he is worthy, let them all be demanded their vote; and when they all give it willingly, let them be heard. And, silence being made, let one of the principal bishops, one with two others, stand near the altar, the rest of the bishops and presbyters praying silently, and the deacons holding the holy Gospels open upon the head of him that is to be ordained; and say no God—”

The form of prayer prescribed is a long one, but contains the following passages:

“Grant to him (the bishop), O Lord Almighty, through thy Christ, the communion of the Holy Spirit, that so he may have power to remit sins according to thy command; to distribute clerical offices according to thine ordinance; to loose every bond according to the power which thou gavest to the apostles; that he may please thee, in meekness and a pure heart, steadfastly, inblamably, irreproaclably, while he offereth to thee a pure and unbloody sacrifice, which by thy Christ thou hast appointed as the mystery of the new covenant... 'And when he hath prayed for these things, let the rest of the priests add Amen, and, together with them, all the people. And after the prayer, let one of the bishops elevate the sacrifice upon the hands of him that is ordained; and early in the morning let him be enthroned, in a place set apart for him, among the rest of the bishops- they all giving him the kiss in the Lord” (bk. 8, § 4, 5).

**I.** “Let a bishop be ordained by two or three bishops.

**II.** “Let a presbyter be ordained by one bishop as also a deacon and the rest of the clergy” (bk. 8, § 47).

The above are merely specimen extracts from the Apostolical Constitutions, nevertheless sufficient to show that in the ancient Church not only were bishops and priests ordained to offer “the unbloody sacrifice” of the mass and to remit sin, but also that the number of officers in the Church admitted to ordination was beginning to be increased. (For



the forms of ordination for subdeacons, deaconesses, and readers, see bk. 8, § 19, 20, 21, 22.) Other parts of the same Constitutions prescribe the preparation by ordained bishops of the mystical oil, the mystical water, and the mystical ointment to be used in baptism, and also prayers to be offered for the dead. On the enthronement of bishops, the practice of singing hosannas to them, and many customs in reference to ordination, consult Bingham's *'Antiquities of the Christian Church, bk. 2 and 4.* His explanation, that every bishop having liberty to frame his own: liturgy tended to the multiplication and variation of the ceremonies employed, finds many confirmations in *fact*, and accounts for some differences of a minor character between the Greek and Roman churches. Although he finds the signing of the cross and the kiss of peace added to the ancient ceremonial, he affirms that the use of anointing oil, the presentation of the sacred utensils in clerical ordination, and the exclusive practice of the rite during Ember weeks (q.v.) are modern inventions, i.e. inventions of the medieval period.

Another practice, however, that of *forcible ordination*, is thus described by Bingham:

“Anciently, while popular elections were indulged, there was nothing more common than for people to take men by force, and have them ordained against their wills. For though many men were too ambitious in courting the preferments of the Church, yet there were some who ran as eagerly from them as others ran to them; and nothing but force could bring such men to submit to an ordination. Ecclesiastical history furnishes many instances of this, including some who were plainly ordained against their wills. It was a common practice in those times for persons that fled to avoid ordination by their own bishop, to be seized by any other bishop to be ordained by them, and then returned to the bishop from 'whom they were fled.' 'Nor was it any kind of remonstrance or solicitation whatsoever which the party could make that would prevent his ordination in such cases, except he chanced to protest solemnly upon oath against such ordination.' To hinder this protest, cunning and violence were employed. At the ordination of Macedonius by Flavian, bishop of Antioch, 'they durst not let him know what they were about till the ceremony was over; and when he came to understand that he was ordained presbyter, he broke forth into a rage.' Paulinias, Jerome's brother, fled from ordination, but

Epiphanius caused his deacons to seize him, and to hold his mouth, that he might not adjure them in the name of Christ to set him free. 'Such ordination stood good, and was accounted as valid as any other.' Even when in the following age the sentiment of the Church was so far modified as to permit deacons and presbyters ordained against their wills to 'be set at liberty as if they had never been ordained,' bishops were excluded from this reasonable provision. 'Though the imperial law gave liberty to all inferiors, so ordained, to relinquish their office that was forced upon them, if they pleased, and betake themselves to a secular life again, yet it peremptorily denied the privilege to bishops, decreeing that their ordination should stand good, and that no action brought against their ordainers should be of force to evacuate or disannul their consecration'" ( *Antiq.* bk. 4, ch. 7).

Could it have been certain that these forced ordinations were conferred only on good men, such proceedings would by no means have been so bad as the more common act of ordaining men of unquestioned vileness of character, who by intrigue or simony secured clerical offices, and consequently the so-called sacrament of orders, and "the indelible mark" by which the pretended apostolical (?) succession was to be handed down to remote generations.

When under ecclesiastical sanction the attempt was fully inaugurated to improve on the simplicity of the apostolical customs as to ordination by the multiplication of materialistic ceremonies, it was not likely soon to stop. So, in fact, between bishops emulous of ceremonial splendor and the enactments of rival councils, the process of adding ritual forms went forward in steps parallel to increasing corruptions of doctrine until a culmination was reached in the fully developed —

**IV.** *Sacerdotal System of the Roman Catholic Church.* — That system, as practiced from about the 10th century and fully restated by the Council of Trent, as well as in the formularies of the Roman pontifical, has the following with other less objectionable characteristics:

**1.** It affirms that clerical orders constitute a sacrament, the sixth of the seven enumerated by that Church.

2. It enumerates seven clerical orders exclusive of seven grades of bishops, of which the pope is supreme in authority. The seven orders are those of priest, deacon, subdeacon, acolyth, exorcist, reader, and porter.
3. It affirms that bishops only are competent to confer ordination.
4. That the effect of ordination is to impress on the recipient an indelible mark or character, so that he who has once been a priest cannot again become a layman.
5. That ordination to the priesthood confers the power of offering sacrifice in the Church for the living and for the dead.

The above positions are sufficiently supported by the following extracts from the *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*:

*On the Sacrament of Orders.* —

“**Canon** If any one shall say that there is not in the New Testament a visible and external priesthood, or that there is not any power of consecrating and offering the true body and blood of the Lord, and of remitting and retaining sin, but only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel, or that those who do not preach are not priests at all: let him be anathema.

“**Canon II.** If any one shall say that, besides the priesthood, there are not in the Catholic Church other orders, both greater and lesser, by which, as by certain steps, advance is made into the-priesthood: let him be anathema.

“**Canon III.** If any one shall say that orders or sacred ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament instituted by Christ the Lord; or that it is a certain human figment devised by men unskilled in ecclesiastical matters, or that it is only a certain kind for choosing ministers of the Word of God and the sacraments: let him be anathema.

“**Canon IV.** If any one shall say that by sacred ordination the Holy Ghost is not given; and that the bishops do therefore vainly say, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; or that a character is not thereby given; or that he who has once been a priest can again become a layman: let him be anathema.”

*Touching the Sacrifice of the Mass.* —

**“Canon III.** If any one shall say that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; or that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it avails him only that receiveth, and that it ought not to be offered for- the living and the dead for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be anathema.”

It is true that Roman Catholic theologians have differed not a little in their discussions of some of these topics, as, for instance, in reference to the number of the sacraments and the matter and form of the sacrament of orders; but in the main they have acquiesced in the points stated above, and in the sequences inseparable from them. It may be added that the formula of ordaining a priest corresponds to the last-quoted canon. It is this: *“Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate masses as well for the living as for the dead, in the name of the Lord. Amen.”*

The principal features of the above-stated theory of ordination were developed before the separation of the Greek and Roman churches, and the ceremonies with which, the rite was administered differed in the two churches only in unimportant particulars, such as that of anointing the ordained person with oil, which the Roman Church practiced and the Greek Church did not. In the Roman Church, in particular, great stress is laid upon the presentation of sacred utensils and symbols as a part of the ceremony of ordination. To the priest is presented a chalice and paten (a small plate used to hold the host or consecrated wafer); to the bishop a ring, a crosier, and a pallium (q.v.) are given; and to the cardinal a hat, as symbolical of their functions and obligations. While, theremore, both churches propagated in its essentially erroneous features a common theory as to ordinations, it was the Romish Church which carried out the greatest extreme of ceremonies, and made the worst uses of the theory in connection with the dogma and assumptions of papal supremacy — a system of sacerdotalism that embodied blasphemous pretensions, and that was often prostituted to the most wicked and selfish purposes.

Examination shows that this very theory of the Roman Church as to orders and sacraments lies at the center of the system referred to, and is the fountain-head of some of its worst corruptions. Once grant that ordination in direct line and by direct sanction from the pope of Rome is the one essential channel for the descent of God's grace to man, and there is conceded a power as far-reaching and dangerous as it is far removed from scriptural truth. That the Roman see made this claim without disguise, and

enforced it during successive centuries by the most unscrupulous measures, is proved by multitudinous facts of history. As a specimen, take the following statement concerning pope Boniface IX:

“At first Boniface did not publicly take money for the higher promotions; he took it only in secret, and through trustworthy agents. At length after ten years, at once to indulge, palliate, and to establish this simony, he substituted as a permanent tax the Annates (q.v.), or first-fruits of every bishopric and rich abbey, calculated on a new scale, triple that in which they stood before in the papal books. This was to be paid in advance by the candidates for promotion, some of whom never got possession of the benefice. That was matter of supreme indifference to Boniface, as he could sell it again. But as these candidates rarely came to the court with money equal to the demand, usurers, with whom the pope was in unholy league, advanced the sum on exorbitant interest. The debt was sometimes sued for in the pope's court. The smaller benefices were sold from the day of his appointment with shameless and scandalous notoriety. Men wandered about Lombardy and other parts of Italy searching out the ages of hoary incumbents, and watching their diseases and infirmities. For this service they were well paid by the greedy aspirants at Rome. 'On their report the tariff rose or fell. 'Benefices were sold over and over again. Graces were granted to the last purchaser, with the magic word 'Preference,' which cost twenty-five florins.' That was superseded by a more authoritative phrase (at fifty florin), a prerogative of precedence. Petitions already sometimes cancelled in favor of a higher bidder; the pope treated the lower offer as an attempt to defraud him. In the same year the secretary, Theodoric a Niem, had known the same benefice sold in the course of a one week to several successive claimants. The benefices were so openly sold that, if money was not at hand, the pope would receive the price in kind — in wine, sheep, oxen, horses, or grain. The officers were as skillful in these arts as himself. His auditors would hold twenty expectatives, and receive the first-fruits. The argus-eyed pope, however, watched the death-bed of all his officers. Their books, robes, furniture, money, escheated to the pope. No grace of any kind, even to the poorest, was signed without its florin fee. The pope, even during mass, was seen to be consulting with his

secretaries on these worldly affairs. The accumulation of pluralities on unworthy men was scandalous even in those times” (Milman's *Latin Christianity*, vol. 7, bk. 13, ch; 3).

It is obvious that such a shameless traffic in clerical ordinations and appointments could only have been maintained in a Church in which and in an age when the people had been taught to believe that their salvation depended on the absolution of priests fitted for their task by the indelible mark of papal ordination irrespective of moral character. The same idea made the theories of purgatory and indulgence sources of illimitable pecuniary exactions, while it also made the power of the popes terrible in their long struggle with emperors in reference to the right; of investiture (q.v.) and temporal sovereignty. In those struggles monarchs and nations were reduced to submission by the culmination of bulls, bans, and interdicts, which, aside from the fundamental idea of divine grace flowing solely through the-channel of papal ordination and authority, would have been as powerless as they are now seen to be absurd.

**V. Protestant Reaction.** — The above-stated theory of ordination, attended by corresponding practice, may be said to have had universal and unquestioned prevalence throughout the Christian world from the 6th to the 16th century. Irrespective of its gradual and insidious beginnings, it was fully developed in the ritual of Gregory the Great (A.D. 595-606), and it reached its present form of administration in the *Pontificale Romanum* (q.v.) of pope Clement VIII, in 1596. A prominent feature of the great Reformation was a violent and general reaction against the dogmas and abuses of the Roman system of ordinations. Without exception, Protestants rejected the five factitious sacraments of the Roman Church, including orders. The Reformed churches not only rejected the doctrines but the ceremonies of the Roman Catholic Church in reference to ordination, falling back on scriptural precedents as their sole guide in reference to the modes, of appointing and ordaining their clergy. A partial exception has to be stated in reference to the Church of England, which retained a portion of the Roman ritual of ordination. In reference to this as well as many other subjects, different interpretations of Scripture prevailed, and consequently different customs of ordination were established. Most of the Reformed churches, doubtless owing to the great abuses so long associated with the name and character of bishop, rejected the episcopal office entirely, although the Lutheran Church retained it under the name of superintendent. There was great unanimity in accepting the ordination by

elders as appropriate and valid, but in some of the churches two classes of elders were recognized — teaching (clerical) and ruling (lay) elders. In some, as in the Church of Scotland, the clerical presbyters only join in the imposition of hands. Among the Independents and Baptists the power of ordination is considered to inhere in any given congregation of believers. The qualifications of a candidate are first ascertained and approved by a Church, which, having called him to its ministry, and he accepting, proceeds to confer ordination upon him by prayer and the imposition of hands.

The Protestant churches of Germany, Holland, Switzerland, France; Denmark, Poland, Hungary, Scotland, etc., have only presbyterial ordination, and place no reliance on the derivation of their clerical orders, from the fact that their founders, such as Luther, Calvin, and others, had been episcopally ordained as presbyters. They all unite in considering the call of God expressed through the suffrage of the Church as the essential prerequisite to true ministerial character, while ordination is simply an appropriate ceremony designed to authenticate that call, and to publicly separate ministers to the sacred office. In most of the churches named, as well as- in the American Presbyterian, Baptist, and Congregational churches, deacons are only lay officers of the Church, and do not receive the imposition of hands.

As we have not thought proper to allot space for the formulae of the Greek and Roman ordinations, so now we deem it unimportant to introduce details as to ceremonies and variations in the practice of ordinations among Protestants. Such variations find their prototype in the scriptural ordinations, of which no two recorded were conducted in all respects alike, a fact that plainly indicated the non-essentiality of fixed forms, as well as the Christian liberty of adapting forms to circumstances. With a single exception, substantial unity may be said to prevail throughout the Protestant world in the view that the validity or propriety of ministerial ordinations does not hinge on any form of ceremony, or any, pretense of tactual succession, and this, unity of sentiment is sustained by a corresponding charity and mutual respect. The exception referred to, though not stated in the creed of any Protestant Church, has nevertheless existed from the period of the Reformation, and has resulted in a voluminous, and not seldom acrimonious controversy, which passes to descend to future generations.

**VI. High-Church Controversy on Ordination.** — In order to comprehend the nature and bearings of this controversy, it is necessary to take into view some well-known facts respecting the peculiar constitution of the Church of England. They are indicated in the following, language, abridged from lord Macaulay's introduction to his *History of England*.

“Henry VIII attempted to constitute an Anglican Church differing from the Roman Catholic-Church on the point of the supremacy, and on that point alone. His success in this attempt was extraordinary. The English Reformers were eager to go as far as their brethren on the Continent. They unanimously condemned as anti-Christian numerous dogmas and practices to which Henry had stubbornly adhered, and which Elizabeth reluctantly abandoned. Many felt a strong repugnance even to things indifferent which had formed part of the polity or ritual of the mystical Babylon. Thus bishop Hooper, who died manfully at Gloucester for his religion, long refused to wear the episcopal vestments. Bishop Ridley, a martyr of still greater renown, pulled down the ancient altars of his diocese, and ordered the Eucharist to be administered in the middle of churches, at tables which the papists irreverently termed oyster-boards. Bishop Jewell pronounced the clerical garb to be a stage-dress, a fool's coat, a relique of the Amorites, and promised that he would spare no labor to extirpate such degrading absurdities. Archbishop Grindal long hesitated about accepting a mitre from dislike of what he regarded as the mummery of consecration. Bishop Parkhurst uttered a fervent prayer that the Church of England would propose to herself the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community. Bishop Ponet was of opinion that the word bishop should be abandoned to papists, and that the chief officers of the purified Church should be called superintendents. When it is considered that none of these prelates belonged to the extreme section of the Protestant party, it cannot be doubted that, if the general sense of that party had been followed, the work of reform would have been carried on as unsparingly, in England as, in Scotland. But as the government needed the support of the Protestants, so the Protestants needed the protection of the government. Much was therefore given up on both sides; a union was effected, and the fruit of that union was the Church of England. The man who took the chief part in settling the conditions of the alliance which produced the Anglican Church was Thomas Cranmer. He was the representative of both the parties, which at that time needed each other's assistance. He was at once a divine and a courtier. In his character of divine he was perfectly ready to



go as far in the way of change as *any* Swiss or Scottish Reformer.' In his character of courtier he was desirous to preserve that organization which had during many ages admirably served the purposes of the bishops of Rome, and might be expected now to serve equally well the purposes; of the English kings and of their ministers. Ton this day the constitution, the doctrines, and the services of the Church retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprang. She occupies a middle position between the churches of Rome and Geneva. The Church of Rome held that episcopacy was of divine institution, and that certain supernatural graces of a high order had been transmitted by the imposition of hands through fifty generations, from the eleven who received their commission on the Galilean mount to the bishops who met at Trent. A large body of Protestants, on the other hand, regarded prelacy as positively unlawful, and persuaded themselves that they found a very different form of ecclesiastical government prescribed in Scripture. The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course. They retained episcopacy, but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the sacraments. Cranmer, indeed, on one important occasion, plainly avowed his conviction that in the primitive times there was no distinction between bishops and priests, and that the laying on of hands was altogether superfluous."

This formidable array of antitheses — by no means exhausts the list of practical contradictions embodied in the Church of England. Rejecting, the supremacy of the pope, she accepted, or, rather, had forced upon her, that of the temporal Sovereign, subjecting her to the most extravagant assumptions of an unscrupulous monarch. — Macaulay, on this point, says, "What Henry and his favorite counselors meant at one time by supremacy was certainly nothing less than the whole power of the keys. The king was to be the pope of his kingdom, the vicar of God, the expositor of catholic verity, the channel of sacramental graces. He arrogated to himself the right of deciding dogmatically what was orthodox doctrine" and what was heresy, of drawing up and imposing confessions of faith, and of giving religious instruction to his people; He proclaimed that all jurisdiction; spiritual as well as temporal, was derived from him alone, and that it was in his power to confer episcopal authority and to take it away. He actually ordered his seal to be put to commissions by which bishops were appointed, who were to exercise their functions as his deputies and during his pleasure... As he appointed civil officers to keep his seal, to collect his

revenues, and to dispense justice in his name, so he appointed divines of various ranks to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments. It was unnecessary that there should be any imposition of hands. The king-such was the opinion of Cranmer, given in the plainest words might, in virtue of authority derived from God, make a priest, and the priest so made needed no ordination whatever.”

Under Edward VI there was a speedy revolt from such extreme absurdities, and a form of ordination by the imposition of hands was incorporated in the ritual. But even in that ritual, which is generally considered to represent the best Protestantism of the English Reformation, while the mass is rejected, yet the idea and order of a priesthood is retained in a form for ordaining all ministers of second grade as priests. Notwithstanding that serious error, the ritual in question is specially distinguished for the prominence it gave the scriptural idea of a personal divine call — an idea that had been obscured, if not obliterated, in the rituals of the Church for a thousand years previously. It required a solemn declaration on the part of every candidate for holy orders of his personal conviction that he is “moved by the Holy Ghost” to take upon himself this sacred ministration. Bishop Burnet explains the action of the British Reformers in this regard in the following language:

“Our Church intended to raise the obligation of the pastoral care higher than it was before, and has laid out this matter more fully and more strictly than any Church ever did in any age, as far, at least, as my inquiries can carry me... No Church before ours at the Reformation took a formal sponsion at the altar from such as were ordained deacons and priests. That twas, indeed, always demanded of bishops, but neither in the Roman nor Greek pontifical do we find any such solemn vows and promises demanded or made by priests or deacons, not does any print of this appear in the constitutions or the ancient canons of the Church. Bishops were asked many questions, as appears by the first canon of the fourth Council of Carthage. They were required to profess their faith and to promise to obey the canons, which is still observed in the Greek Church. The questions are more express in the Roman pontifical, and the first of these demands a promise that they will instruct their people in Christian doctrine according to the ‘Holy Scriptures,’ which was the foundation upon which our bishops justified the Reformation, since, the first and chief of all their vows binding

them to this, it was to take place of all others, and if any other parts of those sponsions contradicted this, such as their obedience and adherence to the see of Rome, they said that these were to be limited by this... Our Reformers, observing all this, took great care in reforming the office of ordination, and they made both the charge that is given and the promises that are to be taken to be very express and solemn, so that both the ordainers and the ordained might be rightly instructed in their duty, and struck with the awe and dread that they ought to be under in so holy and so important a performance;... yet to make the sense of these promises go deeper, they are ordered-to be made at the altar, and in the nature of a stipulation or covenant... Our Church, by making our Savior's words the form of ordination, must be construed to intend by that that it is Christ only that sends, and that the bishops are only his ministers to pronounce his mission.”

Yet the very ritual which required the candidate for ordination to solemnly profess that he was “inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him this office and ministration to serve God,” and that he was truly called “according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ,” also required him, in the “Oath of the-King's Supremacy,” to swear, “I from henceforth will accept, repute, and take the king's majesty to be the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England.”

To embody in any system such a series of contradictions and oppugnances was to plant the seeds of interminable strife, and to such a strife has the Church of England been subjected from the days of the Reformation downward. Nor has the strife been limited to words. In its earlier periods, persecutions, bloodshed, and martyrdoms were frequent results. Sometimes one party was in the ascendancy, sometimes the other, and in the progress of extents the controversy of which our subject was the center assumed a variety of phases. Sometimes the issue was direct, as between popery and Protestantism. Sometimes it was triangular, as between the papacy, Protestant prelacy, and Puritanism. At length various forms of dissent and independency began to appear, only to multiply forms of discussion, into nearly all of which questions relating to ordination entered more or less prominently. While separation led forth into distinct organizations perhaps the greater part of the more pronounced anti-prelatists, there has always remained in the Church of England an influential body of evangelical or Low Churchmen, who, while they accept

episcopacy as a scriptural form of Church government, and episcopal ordination as both appropriate, expedient, and scriptural, nevertheless disclaim its exclusive validity, its uninterrupted prelatical succession, and its claims to be of special divine appointment *de jure divino*. On the other hand, the same Church has never lacked prelatists of the highest pretensions who, notwithstanding their own clerical orders are scouted by the Romanists as null, both on the ground of irregularity and illegality, nevertheless zealously assert the main principle of the Romish theory of succession. Indeed, the bigotry and pretensions of the Anglican High-Churchmen have rarely found a parallel, unless in the groundlessness of their claims, both as judged from opposite points by Romanists and other Protestants. The debate between them and their brethren of lower views, as well as with those larger branches of the Protestant Church whose orders and ministry they have affected to despise, has never known an intermissions; yet the excitement attending it has gradually decreased in proportion as the principles of tolerance have become recognized in the legislation of the kingdom. It was exceedingly bitter in the days of the vestment controversy, when ministers were constrained by law to wear garments- symbolical of a priestly office which they rejected as unchristian, and also bindd thr Act of Uniformity, by which thousands of good ministers rejected from their churches and their livings because they declined an oath of conform it to requirements with which their consciences forbade compliances. Fdresu severities had toned down under the advance of general enlightenment, the subject was debated more as a matter of opinions and ecclesiastical partisanship; in which tastes and associations largely governed individual action.

The 18th century Witnessed a new phase of this old controversy, growing out of the rise of Methodism. When John Wesley, as an evangelical clergyman, found himself providentially called on to provide for the administration of the Christian ordinances to the religious societies which he had been instrumental in organizing, first within the Church of England, and subsequently in America, he first applied to the bishop of London for the ordination of sons of his lay-preachers. Having been repeatedly refused he associated with himself other presbyters; and preceded to ordain deacons, elders, and a superintendent or bishop for America. "In justification of this act he pleaded the urgency of the providential necessity his conviction, of the utter baselessness Of the theory of ininterrupted lineal succession, and the precedent established by the apostolical Church of

Alexandria; in which, as recorded by Jerome, the presbyters elected their whole line of bishops, from the days of Mark the Evangelist downward, for one hundred and fifty years. From this action of Wesley there not only arose the Wesleyan Methodist churches of Great Britain, Canada, and Australia, in which presbyterial ordination is practiced, but also the Methodist Episcopal churches of the United States and Canada. In the last-named churches the episcopal office, apart from any prelatical idea or assumptions, has had a wide, field of action, and, in connection with an earnest spirit of evangelical effort, has been attended with a measure of success worthy of apostolic times. In the Methodist Episcopal churches the formula of ordination is that of the Church of England expurgated of the word priest and of every term that might be constituted to express the idea of sacerdotalism, or any temporal headship of the Church of Christ. — Two, clerical orders only are recognized, those of deacon and elder. The bispHORIC is regarded not as a third order, but as an office to which an elder having been elected is consecrated by prayer and the imposition of hands by other bishops and presbyters. It is a special function of the bishop to ordain ministers, not singly, but its cooperation with presbyters. In all this the churches in question claim to follow ancient, if not strictly apostolical usage. They also insist with great urgency upon the personal conviction of each candidate for any form of the ministerial office—that he is moved thereto by the Holy Ghost.

In America the High-Church controversy as respecting ordination has had but a limited range, and a corresponding influence. -It was inherited by the Protestant Episcopal Church as a direct legacy from the mother Church of England, but, having been wholly disassociated from questions of temporal 'sovereignty and state emolument, it was for a long period entirely quiescent, merely arising as a matter of opinion between clergymen of different altitude in the same Church, or between zealons representatives of that Church and those of other Protestant churches, all agreeing in opposition to the prelatical claims of Romanists.

A new phase of this controversy arose about 1830 in connection with the issue of the Oxford Tracts (q.v.) in England. Although the days of persecution were then past, the spirit of intolerance was by no means extinct, and the attempt to secure a Romanistic reaction in England and other Protestant countries was so determined and so skillfully urged that a somewhat formidable movement towards the Romish Church was actually secured. In England scores of clergymen from the Established Church, and

in the United States some dozens from the Protestant Episcopal Church, became (to employ a phrase that then came into common use) perverts to Romanism, and both countries became rife with the controversy. One of the first objects of the Tractarian movement, sometimes called Puseyism, from the prominence of Dr. E. B. Pusey, of Oxford, as one of the Tract writers, was to reassert the importance of ordination in the line of a lineal and tactual succession direct from the apostles. Assuming the prerogatives of such an ordination for themselves, they unscrupulously attacked the validity of all other ordinations, except those of the Greek and Roman churches, and thus with as little charity as consistency, presumed to denounce the greater part of Protestant Christians throughout the world as irregular and schismatic, if not heretical. The eagerness with which many ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church caught up or gave prominence to similar assumptions, and proceeded, under the stimulus from Oxford, to flaunt their claims of superiority in the face of the other Protestant churches of America, caused the controversy to be more extensively opened in this country than it had ever been before. Ministers of other churches who felt that the validity of their ministerial character was impugned by these pretensions were not slow to accept the discussion, which, by aid of free pulpits and a free press, became very general. Every phase of the argument — from the Scriptures, from the fathers, from history, and from the nature of the case, was reopened. While in many instances the result of the discussion of doubtless was to confirm the disputants and partisans on both sides in their old opinions, yet it can hardly be doubted that the effect of the discussion as a whole was largely to influence the public mind both of England and the United States against the prelatical claims, and in favor of the inherent right of churches; to establish their own minor ceremonies as well as their forms of Church government, subject to the cardinal principles of God's Word. In short, the principle and spirit of exclusiveness and of hierarchical pretension were effectually rebuked in a contest of their own provoking. While such principles yet has numerous adherents, still it cannot be questioned that they stand reprobated before the popular mind as unsustainable by scriptural precedent or precept, and unworthy of the spirit of an enlightened age. Nevertheless the mediaeval theories of ordination, both as to its magical effect, its indelible mark, and its lineal descent from the apostles, however polluted the line through which, it has come down, still have their advocates. The Roman Catholic Church is bound by the canon and decrees of the Council of Trent, while its Anglican imitators struggle to maintain

similarly far less consistency. In their emergency they seek, affiliations with the Greek Church and the Old Catholics, without direct acknowledgment from either. — Meantime, the logic of events is working out very important demonstrations, by showing, on the one hand, how little the truth and power of Christianity are dependent on external ceremonies, and, on the other, not only how powerless, but how misleading, ceremonies are as a substitute for divine grace in the hearts and lives of professed ministers of Christ. A survey of the active and progressive agencies of Christianity in the world. shows that, a very large proportion of them are sustained by churches which reject as baseless the theory that covenanted grace descends solely through a series of ceremonial ordinations. When, indeed, a comparison as to purity of life, zeal in Christian good works, and fruits following is instituted between churches practicing presbyterial ordination and those making high assumptions of ecclesiastical prerogative, based on a line of ordination succession, running through the worst popes of Rome, the former certainly are not found wanting. To the ordinary mind such facts are more convincing than theoretical arguments, whether based on questionable precedents or on quotations from the fathers; and the more such facts are multiplied the less need there will be of a perpetual reproduction of the arguments so often stated and restated during the last three hundred years. Nevertheless a knowledge of the controversy, is more or less a necessity to every candidate for ordination, not only as a means of satisfying his own mind, but also of being prepared for any new phase the controversy may assume hereafter.

The most recent phase of High-Church development as won for itself the title of *Ritualism* (q.v.). Ritualists, as such, are usually identical with high pretenders to the importance of successional ordinations, but in their, extreme attention to the reproduction of medieval ceremonies they are not followed by. all who accept the theory of tactual succession. The attempts of the ritualistic party of the Church of England to reintroduce Roman Catholic ceremonies into the worship of Protestant churches has been greatly held in check by certain laws. of the realm. In America similar attempts have found but in the favor before an eminently practical people, who, so far as they choose Romanism at all, evidently prefer the system without disguises to a feeble imitation.

The most active controversy in reference to the question of ordination prevailing in the United States at the present time is between the high and

low churchmen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The former appear to have been advancing within recent years both in numbers and the assertion of principles of exclusiveness and intolerance. As a result a new organization was formed in 1873, entitled the Reformed Episcopal Church. That Church, organized under the supervision of the late bishop George D. Cummins, claims to represent the Protestant views and practices of the Church of England as understood and vindicated by the Reformers of the period of Edward VI, and prior to the papal reaction under Bloody Mary. While professing and practicing episcopal ordination, it does not deny the validity of other forms following Scripture precedent and applied to godly men. On the principle of succession, whatever of validity inhered in the orders of the Protestant Episcopal Church was handed down to the Reformed Episcopal Church by episcopal ordinations from the seceding bishop before the attempt to invalidate his authority by excommunication could be consummated. Thus a somewhat new form of issue pertaining to the question of ordination is opened between prerepresentative classes or grades of Episcopalians.

**VI.** The *literature* of the subject of ordination and orders is mingled from first to last with that of the Roman Catholic and High-Church controversies, being rarely find in direct and separate, treatises on either side in an exhaustive list would require altogether too much space, the classified section herewith give an with be found sufficient for any: ordinary extent of investigation.

**1. Historical.** — Schaff, *Hist. of the Apostolic Church*; Killen, *Ancient Church*; Mosheim, *Hist. of the First Three Centuries*; The, “*Apostolic Constitutions*,” Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*; Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*; Campbell, *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*; *The Bible, the Missal, and the Breviary*. ‘

**2. Romanistic.** — Bellarmine, *De Ordine*; *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*; *Catechism of the Council of Trent*; Kenrick, *On the Primacy*; *id. On Anglican Ordinations*; Wiseman, *On High-Church Claims* Milner, *End of Controversy*.

**3. Anti-Romanistic,** — Beza, *De Ecclesia*; Willet, *Synopsis. Papismi*; Cramp, *Text-Book of Popery*; Elliott, *Romanism*; Barrow, *On the Supremacy*; Palmer, *Letters to Wiseman on the Errors of Romanism* Hopkins, “*End of Controversy*”, *Controverted*.



**4. Anglican Prelatical.** — Bancroft, *Survey of the Pretended. Holy-Discipline.*; Hooker, — *Ecclesiastical Polity*; Bishop Hall, *Episcopacy by Divine Right*; Mason, *Defence of the Church of England Ministry*; Courayer, *Validity of Angilican Ordinations*; Jeremy Tayior, *Oe Episcopacy*; Cave, *Ancient Church*; Wheatley, *On Conmmon Prayer*; Percival, *On Apostolic Succession* Jeremy Collier, *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*; Palmer, *On the Church*; “*The Oxford Tracts*,” Wordsworth, *Theophilus Anglicanus*; Manning, *Unity of the Church*; Pusey. *Eirenikon*; Stubb, *Episcopal Succession*; Marshall, *Notes on Episcopacy*; Wordsworth, *The Christian Ministry*.

**5. Anglican Anti-Prelatical.** — Jewell, *Apology of the Church of England*; “*Field of the Church*,” Lord King, *Prinimitive Church*; Bishop Burnet, *Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England*; also *Church of Scotland*; Stillingfleet, *Irenicuz*; Isaac Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*; Archbishop Whately, *Kingdom of Christ*; also *Origin of Romish Errors*; Litton, *On the Church of Christ*; Harrison, *Whose are the Fathers?* Bridges, *On the Christian Ministry*; Nolan, *Catholic Character of Christianity*; Goode, *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*.

**6. Puritan, Presbyterian, etc.** — Rutherford, *Due Right of Presbyteries*; Drury, *Model of Church Government*; Seamen, *Vindictaion of the reformed Churches*; Milton, *Prelatical Episcopacy*; also *Reason of Church Government*; Prynne, *Testimonies of Bishops and Presbyters*; Baxter, *Treatise of Episcopacy*; also *English Non-Confoirimity*; Calamy, *Defence of Non-Conformity*; James:Owen, *Plea for Scripture Ordination*; Nichol, *Vindication of Dissenters.*; Ayton, *Oritintal Constitution of the Christian Church*; Campbell, *Vindication of the Presbyterians of Ireland*; M'Crie, *Unity of the Church*; Conder, *Protestant Non-Conformity*; Vaughan, *Polity of Congregationalism*; Powell. *On Apostolical Succession*; sundry Ministers of old, *On the Divine Right of Church Government*; Brown, *Puseyite Episcopacy*.

**7. American Prelatical.** — Wilmer, *Episcopal Manual*; Hobart, *On Apostolic Order*; How, *Vindication of the Protestant Episcopal:Church*; Bowden, ‘*Apostolic Origin of Episcopacy*’; Carnochan, *Early Fathers*; Ogilby, *Catholic Church in England and America*; Chapin, *Prinitive Chuch*; Kip, *Double ‘Witness of the Church’*; Doane, *Sermons and Charges*; Ewer, *Protestantism a Failure*; Mines, *Presbyterian Clergyman Looking for the Church*.

**8. Arminian and Prelatical.**— Dickinson, *Defence of Presbyterian Ordination*; Welles, *Divine Right of Presbyterian Ordination*; Mason (John M.), *Essays on Episcopacy*; Miller, *On the Christian Ministry* Wilson, *Primitive Government of Christian Churches*; Sparks, *Letters on the Ministry and Ritual of the Episcopal Church*; Wood, *Objections to Episcopacy*; Emory, *Episcopal Controversy Reviewed*; Bangs, *Ordinal Church of Christ*; Duffield, *On the Claims of Episcopal Bishops*; Snodgrass, *On Apostolical Succession*; Barnes, *On the Apostolic Church*; M'Ilvaine, *on the Oxford Divinity*; Hopkins, *Novelties which Disturb our Peace*; Shimeal, *End of Prelacy*; Smyth, *On Apostolical Succession*; also *Presbytery and Prelacy*; also *Ecclesiastical Republicanism*; Tydings, *Apostolical Succession*; Abbe, *Apostolical Succession*; — Gallagher, *Primitive Eirenicon*; Cheever, *Hierarchical Despotism*; Upham, *Ratio Disciplinae*; Punchard, *Congregationalism*; Magoon, *Republican Christianity*; Kidder, *Christian Pastorate*; Coleman, *Manual of Prelacy*; *New-Englander*, Oct. 1873, art. 3. (D. P. K.)

## Ordo

(*order*), as applied to the clergy, has been the occasion of controversy. Many contend that it is adopted from the Roman language, and used by Tertullian and others of the classic sense, to exhibit the patrician rank of the clergy, like the *ordo senatorius* of the Romans. The fact is, that the word is used to denote the difference between the clergy and the people—the *ordo ecclesiasticus* and the laity; and in this sense it has been understood since the close of the second century. See Riddle, *Christiati Antiquities*, p. 203, 212.

## Ordo Romanus

is the name given to every rule of the Romish Church in general, and particularly to the rules concerning worship. Like τάξις, διάταξις, the rule and its exposition, or τακτικός (τακτική sc. βίβλος), or *ordo or ordinarius* (sc. liber), or *ordinale and ordinalis* (sc. liber) (Du Fresne), signifies a collection of rules for worship. In the course of time there appeared many such *libelli*, which in so far as they related to the same subject, were compiled together. The exact time when these different *libelli* appeared is not ascertained, nor that of their compilation. As early as the 5th century there was a distinction between the *sacramentarium*, containing the prayers for the Eucharist, the *antiphonarius* (liber), with the

liturgic chants, and finally the *ordo*, constituting the ritual. See F. Probst, *Verwaltung d. hochheiligen Eucharistie* (Tübing, 1853), p. 9 sq.

Various *ordines* appeared in the different churches, but they were gradually all superseded by the Roman *ordo*, for the popes as early as the 5th century used every exertion to have the worship conducted everywhere according to the usages of Rome. The subsequent publishers of rituals often confounded the Roman with other rituals, hence the number of those which were published. See Mabillon, *In Ordinem Romanum commentarius*, preceding his edition of the *Atiqui libri rituales sanctae Romanae ecclesiae*, in the *Museum Italicum*, t. ii (Paris, 1724, 4to). The oldest *Ordo Romanus* is attributed to bishop Gelasius († 496) by Mabillon (as above) and Muratori, *Liturgia Romana vetus* (Venice, 1748), 1:289 sq. Yet from the *Epist. I* of Innocent I, *Ad Decentium*, in 416 (in cap. 11, dist. 11), there appears to have existed an older *ordo*, which is now lost. The *ordo* attributed to Gelasius, although it often refers to Leo I, seems to have been written by an unknown author in the time of Felix III, the predecessor of Gelasius (Bahr, *D. christlich-romische Theologie*, p. 364). This *ordo*, as well as that published by Mabillon and Muratori as No. 1, was in general use in the 9th century, as is proved by the use made of it by Amalarius. These two *ordines*, together with those published as Nos. 3 and 4 by Mabillon, and which are of somewhat later date, treat of the *missa pontificalis*. The *ordines* 5 to 10 of Mabillon, which are of much later origin, and belong probably in part at least to the 11th century, refer to the *missa episcopalis*, the *ordo scutini ad electos, qualiter debeat celebrari* (in baptism), the forms of ordination from the different degrees, as also the *ordo, qualiter agendum sit quinta feria in cesna Domi, feria sexta. Parasceve, in sabbato stincto, ad-reconciliandum poenitentem, ad visitandum infirmum, ad consignandum pueros-sive iuniores, ad unguendum infirmos, ad communicandum infirmos, ordo sepeliendi clericos Romance fraternitatis*. We now possess but fragments of most of these *ordines*. It is therefore doubtful whether Bernard of Pavia, who quotes numerous passages of the *Ordo Romanus* in his *Breviarium Extravagantium* (which are also given in the collection of decretals of Raymundus a Pennaforte, c. 9, *De officio archidiaconi*, 1, 23; c. 9, *De officio-primicerii* 1; 25; c. 9, *De officio custodis*, 1, 27), obtained or borrowed them from an ancient *Ordo Romanus* or from a later one. At any rate, those passages are not to be found in any of the printed *ordines*.

Among the oldest published *Ordines Romani* are those of George Cassander (Colon. 1559, 1561; also in his works, Paris, 1616), Melchior Hittorp (Colon. 1568). and G. Ferrarius (Romans 1591; Paris, 1610, 1624. fol.). About 1143 Benedict, a canon and chorister of St. Peter's, compiled an *ordo* entitled *Liber pollicitus ad Guidonem de Castello* (the future pope Celestine II, then cardinal of St. Marc). He describes the divine worship for the whole ecclesiastical year, with special reference to the papal affairs (published in Mabillon, No. 11). At the Council of Pavia, in 1160; the clergy made use of *aliber de vita et ordinatione Romanorum pontificum* (Pertz, *Monumenta Germ.* 4:126). The *Ordo Romanus* contained also the forms to be used at the coronation of the emperor. On the form used in 1192 see Pertz. (p. 187 sq.), Mabillon, and Martene. This form was adopted in the *ordo* written in 1192 by cardinal Cencius (Mabillon, No. 12). Since the 13th century the *expression Ceremoniale Romanum* seems to have gradually taken the place of that of *Ordo Romanus*. Gregory X (1272) caused a new one on the election and the functions of popes to be compiled (Mabillon, No. 13). A subsequent one appeared in the middle of the 14th century (Mabillon, No. 14), which Mabillon attributes to cardinal Gaietanus. One on the ecclesiastical functions of the Roman clergy was compiled by Petrus Amelius, bishop of Sinigaglia († 1398); a larger work of the same kind, by Augustinus Piccolomini, was published at Venice in 1516, with the sanction of Leo X under the title of *Rituum ecclesiasticorum sive sacrarum ceremoniarum libri tre*. The *Pontificale Romanum* of Clement VIII (1596), and his *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* (1600, often reprinted and revised) have finally taken the place of the old *Ordines Romani*. At present there is an ecclesiastical calendar published each year in every diocese, which fills the place of an *Ordo Romanus*, and generally bears the title *Ordo officii divini juxta ritum Romanum*, or *Juxta rubricas breviarii et missalis Romani atque denreta sacrae rituum congregationis*.

See Hoffmann, *Nova scriptorum ac monumentorum collectio*, 2:16 sq. (Leips. 1733, 4to); Rheinwald, *Ordo Romanus*, in Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgem. Encyclopadie*, sec. iii, pt. v; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9. 693 sq. (J.N. P.)

## Ordo Salutis

SEE SALVATION.

## Ore

*SEE GOLD; SEE METAL.*

## O'reb

(Heb. *Oreb'*, **oreb** [<sup>-0075</sup>Judges 7:25; <sup>-2306</sup>Isaiah 10:26, **bre** *ra* raven; *Sept.* <sup>Ωρήβ</sup> v. r. <sup>Όρήβ</sup>; Josephus, <sup>Ωρηβός</sup>, *Ant.* v. 6, 5), the name of a sheik of the Midianites, who, with Zeeb (“the wolf”), invaded Israel and was defeated and driven back by Gideon. B.C. cir. 1362. *SEE GIDEON*. The title given to them (**myræ**, A. V. “princes”) distinguishes them from Zebah and Zalmunna, the other two chieftains, who are called “kings” (**mykl m**), and were evidently superior in rank to Oreb and Zeeb. “They were killed, not by Gideon himself, or the people under his immediate conduct, but by the men of Ephraim, who rose this entreaty and intercepted the flying horde at the fords of the Jordan. This was the second act of that great tragedy. "It is but slightly touched upon in the narrative of Judges, but the terms in which Isaiah refers to it (<sup>-2306</sup>Isaiah 10:26) are such as to imply that it was a truly awful slaughter. He places it in the same rank with the two most tremendous disasters recorded in the whole of the history of Israel — the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea, and of the army of Sennacherib. Nor is Isaiah alone among the poets of Israel in his reference to this great event. While it is the terrific slaughter of the Midianites which points his allusion, their discomfiture and flight are prominent in that of the author of Psalm 83. In imagery both obvious and vivid to every native of the gusty hills and plains of Palestine, though to us comparatively unintelligible, the Psalmist describes them as driven over the uplands of Gilead like the clouds of chaff blown from the threshing-floors; chased away like the spherical masses of dry weeds which course over the plains of Esdraelon and Philistia — flying with the dreadful hurry and confusion of the flames that rush and leap from tree to tree and, hill to hill when the wooded mountains: of a tropical country are by chance ignited (<sup>-18313</sup>Psalm 83:13, 14). The slaughter was concentrated around the rock at which Oreb fell, and which was long known by his name (<sup>-0075</sup>Judges 7:25; <sup>-2306</sup>Isaiah 10:26). This spot appears to have been in the valley of the Jordan, from whence the heads of the two chiefs were brought to Gideon to encourage him to furtler pursuit after the fugitive Zebah and Zalmunna.” See below.

## O'reb, The Rock

(**brw** **rllx**; Sept. in Judges **Σούρ**, v. r. **Σουρείν**; in Isaiah, **τόπος θλίψεως**; Vulg. *Petra Oreb*, and *Horeb*), the “raven's crag,” the spot at which the Midianitish chieftain Oreb, with thousands of his countrymen, fell by the hand of the Ephraimites. and which probably acquired its name therefrom. It is mentioned in <sup><0075></sup>Judges 7:25, and <sup><2306></sup>Isaiah 10:26. Some have inferred that the rock Oreb and the winepress Zeeb were on the east side of the Jordan (Gesenius, Rosenmüller, etc.). Perhaps the place called *Orbo* (**wbr** **[ ]**), which in the *Bereshith Rabba* (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 913) is stated to have been in the neighborhood of Bethshean, may have some connection with it. Rabbi Judah (*Ber. Ra'bba*, ib.) was of opinion that the *Orebim* (“ravens”) who ministered to Elijah were no ravens, but the people of this Orbo or of the rock Oreb, an idea upon which even St. Jerome himself does not look with entire disfavor (*Comm. in* <sup><2380></sup>*Isaiah* 15:7), and which has met in later times with some supporters. But a more careful examination' of the same narrative renders it clear that the locality of Oreb's death was on the *west* side of the Jordan, and that the Ephraimites, having there intercepted the Midianites, afterwards brought the heads of the foe to Gideon after he had crossed the Jordan (see *Keil, Comment.* ad loc.). A writer in Fairbairn's *Dictionary*, s.v. Keiz, suggests the low projecting point opposite the Jericho ford, still bearing the, equivalent title of *Eshel-Ghirah*, “the Raven's Nest” (Robinson, *Later Bib. Res.* p. 293).; but this is rather far south, and needs further examination.

## O'reb

(Lat. *O-eb*), the Occidental form (2 Esdras 2:33) of the name of Mount HOREB **SEE HOREB** (q.v.).

## Oreb

**SEE RAVEN.**

## Orebites Or Horebites

**SEE HUSSITES**

## Oregim

**SEE JAARE-OREGIM.**

## Oregio, Agostino

a learned Italian prelate, was born in 1577 at Santa Sofia, in Tuscany. Sent to Rome to pursue his studies, he ran there the same risk as Joseph in the house of Potiphar, and had, like him; sufficient force of character to overcome the temptation. This virtuous act touched the heart of cardinal Bellarmine so vividly that he became quite well affected towards the young pupil, and was induced to place him in a noble college at his private expense. It is said Oregio learned the Greek language by means of seeing and hearing his patron write and dispute in that tongue. After being theological counselor to pope Urban VIII, he was made cardinal Nov. 18, 1633, and archbishop of Benenvento, where he died, July 12, 1656. The collection of his works has been published by his nephew (Rome, 1637, fol.), in which are distinguished a dissertation entitled *Aristotelis vera de rationalis animae immortalitate sententia*, written at the request of cardinal Barberini, afterwards Urban VIII. In it Oregio takes pains to defend Aristotle against the reproach of materialism. Other noteworthy treatises of his are, *De Deo*: — *De Trinitate*: — *De Incarnatione*: — *De Angelis*: — *De Peccatis*, etc., which, frequently reprinted, have for a long time been used in the Italian Roman Catholic seminaries.

## Oremus

(*Let us pray*) is an exclamation used in the early Christian Church to invite the different classes of praying ones to worship. It was usually followed by *Flectamus genua*, and at the conclusion of the prayer was heard the exclamation *Levate* from the mouth of the deacons. See Siegel, *Christliche Alterthume*, 3:241, 242.

## O'ren

(Heb. *id.* ἵρασ-*tree*, as in <sup>2344</sup>Isaiah 44:14; Sept. Ἀρόν, v. r. Ἀρόμ, and Ἀμβρόμ), third named of the five sons of Jerahmeel, of the house of Judah (1 Chronicles 2:25). B.C. ante 1658.

## Oren

*SEE ASH-TREE.*

## Orenburg

one of the eastern frontier governments of European Russia, is bounded on the south-east by the River Ural, and extends between the governments of Tobolsk on the north-east and Samara on the southwest, covering an area of 73,885 square miles, and containing a population of 1,198,360. This is the government proper; but the so-called Orenburg Country, including the recently organized government of Samara, the lands of the Orenburg and Ural Cossacks, and of Khirghiz tribes, under different names, extends over an area of 539,830 square miles, from the Volga, to the Sir-Daria and the Amu-Darima, has 2,370,275 inhabitants. The populations, the surface, soils, flora, and fauna of this extensive country are of the most various kinds. The country is traversed by numerous navigable rivers, by means of which and by canals it is in communication with the Caspian and Baltic seas and with the Arctic Ocean. The main streams are the Kama, a branch of the Volga, with its affluents the Bielaia and Tchussovaia; the Tobol, a branch of the Obi, and the Ural. Forests abound, except in the south; the soil is fertile, but is not yet much cultivated; and other natural, especially mineral, resources are rich, but in great part undeveloped. The climate is in general healthy. The government is divided into nine districts; the center of the governor-generalship is at Orenburg, though the chief town is Ufa.

The inhabitants of Orenburg are made up of Russians, Kalmucks, and Bashkir, Tartar, Khirghiz, and certain Finnish tribes. The trade, mainly in the hands of the Bashkir tribes, is chiefly with Bokhara, Khiva, Tashkent, and the Khirghiz (q.v.); the exports are gold, silver, and other metals, corn, skins, and manufactured goods; the imports cattle, cotton — the demand for and supply of which have greatly increased since the American rebellion — and the other articles of Asiatic trade. The imports are either disposed of to Russian merchants in the custom-house on the frontier, or are carried by Asiatic traders into Russia, and sold at the great national market of Nijni- Novgorod. See Daniel, *Handbuch der Geographie*, 2:926, 927; Brooks, *The Russians of the South* (1854); Haxthausen, *The Russian Empire* (1856). .

## Oresme, Nicolas

a learned French prelate, was born at Caen, Normandy, in the 13th century. He was educated at the university in Paris, and was appointed grand master



of the College of Navarre in 1355, and was finally made bishop of Lisieux in 1377. He died in 1382. He published several scientific treatises, translated the *Ethics* and *Politics* of Aristotle into French, and contributed to theological literature the following work: *Liber de Anti-Christo ejusque ministris ac de ejusdem indventu, signis propinquis simul ac remotis IV continens particulas*, and several *Sermons*. He has also been credited with a French popular version of the Scriptures, but there is no ground for such assertion. See Du Pin, *Bibliothèque des Aut. Eccles. 14ième Seicle*; Moreri, *Grand. Dict, Hist s.v.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.*

## Orestes

(Ὀρέστης), a Christian physician of Tyana, in Cappadocia, called also *Arestes*, suffered martyrdom during the persecution under Diocletian, A.D. 303, 304. An interesting account of his tortures and death is given by Simeon Metaphrastes (ap. Surius, *De Probat. Sancto: Histor.* 6, 231), where he is named *Aresters*. See also *Menolog. Graec.* 1:178 (ed. Urbin. 1727). Orestes has been canonized by the Greek and Roman churches, and his memory is celebrated on Nov. 9. See Bzovius, *Nomenclator Sanctor. Profess. Medicor.*

## Orfand, Jacinto

a Spanish Dominican, noted as a missionary, was born at Jana in 1578. He early took an interest in religious life, and finally entered the Dominican Order in Barcelona. In 1605 he asked to be sent to the Philippines. In 1607 he went to Japan, and there he labored about fifteen years. He wrote an account of the progress of Christianity in that country, entitled *Historia ecclesiastica de los successos de la Cristiandad de Japon* (Madrid, 1633, 4to). It was originally prepared to cover only the years 1602-1621, but Collado brought it down to 1622. Orfand was put to death by the Japanese in 1622. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.*; Fernandez, *Hist. Eccles. de Nuestros Tiempos*, p. 289; Echard, *Scriptor. ord. Praedic.* 2:425.

## Organ

### Picture for Organ 1

occurs in the Authorized Version as the rendering of the Hebrew *ugab'*, **bgw** [ (<sup><0102></sup>Genesis 4:21; <sup><0212></sup>Job 21:12), or *uggab'*, **bg** [ **u**Job. 20:31; <sup><0304></sup>Psalms 150:4), which properly means that which is *inflated or blown*,

from **bg̃l̃**; to blow; hence, a wind instrument. It was applied to a reed or pipe, either simple or complex, and is so understood by most interpreters (see Dudelsack, *Hist. Trin.* p. 301.; Gesenius, *Thesaur*, p. 988). Thus the Septuagint, in Psalm 150, renders . ὄργανον, which means properly an instrument for any purpose; but is applied by Plato (*Lact.* 188 D.) and others to the pipe; and from which comes our word “organ.” In Job the Sept. vaguely renders by ψαλμός; but in the other passages this version renders κιθάρα, the word from which guitar is corrupted. This cannot be right, for many reasons; indeed, in two of the passages quoted it is named in connection with the cithara or lyre (Heb. **ר/נקב**) as a different instrument (<sup><000></sup>Genesis 4:21; <sup><000></sup>Job 30:31). “In <sup><000></sup>Genesis 4:21 it appears to be a general term for all wind-instruments opposed to kinnor (A. V. 'harp'), which denotes all stringed instruments. In Job. 21:12 are enumerated the three kinds of mystical instruments which are possible, under the general terms of the timbrel, harp, and organ. The *ugab* is here distinguished from the timbrel and harp, as in <sup><000></sup>Job 20:31, compared with <sup><000></sup>Psalm 150:4. Our translators adopted their rendering, ‘organ,’ from the Vulgate, which has uniformly *organum*, that is, the double or multiple pipe. The Chaldee in every case has **ab̃Baiabbuba**, which signifies 'the pipe,' and is its rendering of the Hebrew word so translated in our version of <sup><000></sup>Isaiah 30:29; <sup><000></sup>Jeremiah 48:36. Joel Brill, in his second preface to the Psalms in Mendelssohn's Bible, adopts the opinion of those who identify it with the *Pandean* pipes, or *syrinx*, an instrument of unquestionably ancient origin, and common in the East. It was a favorite with the shepherds in the time of Homer (*Il.* 18:526), and its invention was attributed to various deities: to Pallas Athene by Pindar (*Pyth.* 12:12-14), to Pan by Pliny (7:57; comp. *Virg. Ecl.* 2:32; *Tibull.* 2:5, 30), by others to Marsyas or Silenus (*Athen.* 4:184). In the last-quoted passage it is said that Hermes first made the syrinx with one reed, while Silenus, or, according to others, two Medes, Seuthes and Rhonakes, invented one with many reeds, and Marsyas fastened them with wax. The reeds were of unequal length, but equal thickness, generally seven in number (*Virg. Ecl.* 2:36), but sometimes nine (*Theocr. Id.* viii). Those in use among the Turks sometimes numbered fourteen or fifteen (*Calmet, Diss. in Mus. Inst. Haebr.*, in *Ugolini Thes.* 32, p. 790). Russell describes those he met with in Aleppo. The syrinx, or Pan's pipe, is still a pastoral instrument in Syria; it is known also in the city, but very few of the performers can sound it tolerably well. The higher notes are clear and pleasing, but the longer reeds are apt, like the dervis's flute, to

make a hissing sound, though blown by a good player. The number of reeds of which the syrinx is composed varies in different instruments from five to twenty-three (*Aleppo*, 1:155,2d ed.).” *SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.*

## Picture for Organ 2

ORGAN (ὄργανον, an *instrument* of any kind), THE, is the noblest and most powerful species of musical instruments. It appears, however, that the word *organ* was applied indiscriminately to almost every kind of musical instrument used in religious worship by the early Church. But after a time the word came to be reserved to a wind instrument consisting of reeds or pipes, which, the Greeks and the Romans, and also the Eastern Christians, used in civil and private festivals, and which since the 8th century has been used in religious worship in the Western churches. The name is in all probability derived from the fact of its being the instrument of all instruments. It was often called *organs*, in the plural, and only at a later date in the singular, *organ*. The original of this kind of instruments is traced back to the syrinx, or pipes of Pan (according to Virgil), and the hydraulos, or water-flute; which was the invention of Ctesibius, a mathematician of Alexandria, B.C. 520, and also noted as a machinist. He is reported to have written several works on hydraulics, which are lost, but his inventions are noticed by Vitruvius (x 13). (See the preceding article.)

**I.** *Description and History.* — The musical instrument now known as organ is played by finger-keys, and in general partly also by foot-keys, and consists of a large number of pipes of metal and wood made to sound by a magazine of wind accumulated by bellows, and admitted at will by the player. The following description is unnecessarily restricted to the most fundamental arrangements of this very complicated instrument:

## Picture for Organ 3

“As met with in cathedrals and large churches, the organ comprises four departments, each in most respects a separate instrument with its own mechanism, called respectively the *great-organ*, the *choir-organ*, the *swell-organ*, and the *pedal-organ*. Each has its own clavier or keyboard, but the different claviers are brought into juxtaposition, so as to be under the control of one performer. Claviers played by the hands are called *manuals*; by the feet, *pedals*.<sup>rJ</sup> Three manuals, belonging to the choir, great, and swell-organs respectively, rise above each other like steps, in front of

where the performer sits; while the pedal-board by which the pedal-organ is played is placed on a level with his feet. The condensed air supplied by the *bellows* is conveyed through wooden tubes or trunks to boxes, called *windchests*, one of which belongs to each department of the organ. Attached to the upper part of each wind-chest is a *sound-board*, an ingenious contrivance for conveying the wind at pleasure to any individual pipe or pipes exclusively of the rest. It consists of two parts, an *upper board* and an *under board*. On the upper board rest *the pipes*, of which a number of different quality, ranged behind each other, belong to each note. In the under board is a row of parallel *grooves*, running horizontally backwards, corresponding each to one of the keys of the clavier. On any of the keys being pressed down, a valve is opened which supplies wind to the groove belonging to it. The various pipes of each key stand in a line directly above its groove, and the upper surface of the groove is perforated with holes bored upwards to them. Were this the whole mechanism of the sound-board, the wind, on entering any groove, would permeate all the pipes of that groove; there is, however, in the upper board another series of horizontal grooves at right angles to this of the lower board, supplied with *sliders*, which can, to a small extent, be drawn out or pushed in at pleasure by a mechanism worked by the *draw-stops* placed within the player's reach. Each slider is perforated with holes, which, when it is drawn out, complete the communication between the wind-chest and the pipes; the communications with the pipes immediately above any slider being, on the other hand, closed up when the slider is pushed in. The pipes above each slider form in continuous set of one particular quality, and each set of pipes is called a *stop*. Each department of the organ is supplied with a number of stops, producing sounds of different quality. The *great-organ*, some of whose pipes appear as show-pipes in front of the instrument, contain the main body and force of the organ. Behind it stands the *choir-organ*, whose tones are less powerful, and more fitted to accompany the voice. Above the choir-organs is the *swell-organ*, whose pipes are enclosed in a wooden box, with a front of louvre-boards like Venetian blinds, which may be made to open and shut by a pedal, with a view of producing *crescendo* and *diminuendo* effects. The *pedal-organ* is sometimes placed in an entire state behind the choir-organ, and sometimes divided, and a part: arranged on each side. The most usual compass of the manuals is from C on the second line below the bass staff to D on the third space above the treble staff; and the compass of the pedals is from the same C to the D between the bass and treble- staves. The real compass of notes is, as will be seen, much

greater. *Organ pipes* vary much in form and material, but belong to two great classes, known as *mouth-pipes* (or *flute-pipes*) and *reed-pipes*. A section of one of the former is represented in the figure. Its essential parts are the *foot a*, the *body, b*, and a flat plate, *c*, called the *language*, extending nearly across the pipe at the point of junction of foot and body. There is an opening, *de*, in the pipe, at the spot where the language is discontinuous. The wind admitted into the foot rushes through the narrow slit at *d*, and, in impinging against *e*, imparts a vibratory motion to the column of air in the pipe, the result, of which is a musical note, dependent for its pitch on the length of that column of air, and consequently on the length of the body of the pipe: by doubling the length of the pipe we obtain a note of half the pitch, or lower by an octave. Such is the general principle of all mouth-pipes, whether of wood or of metal, subject to considerable diversities of detail. Metal pipes have generally a cylindrical section; wooden pipes a square or oblong section. A mouth-pipe may be stopped at the upper end by a plug called a *tompon*, the effect of which is to lower the pitch an octave, the vibrating column of air being doubled in length, as it has to traverse the pipe twice before making its exit. Pipes are sometimes half-stopped, having a kind of chimney at the top. The *reedpipe* consists of a reed placed inside a metallic or occasionally a wooden pipe. *This reed* is a tube of metal, with the front part cut away, and a tongue or spring put in its place. The lower end of the spring is free, the upper end attached to the top of the reed; by the admission of air into the pipe the spring is made to vibrate, and, in striking either the edge of the reed or the air, produces a musical note, dependent for its pitch on the length of the spring, its quality being determined to a great extent by the length and form of the pipe or be within which the reed is placed. When the vibrating spring does not strike the edge of the reed, but the air, we have what is called the *free reed*, similar to what is in use in the harmonium. To describe the pitch of an organ pipe, terms are used derived from the standard length of an open mouth-pipe of that pitch. The largest pipe in use is the 32-foot C, which is an octave below the lowest C of the modern piano-forte, or two octaves below the lowest C on the manuals and pedal of the organ: any pipe producing this note is called a 32-foot C pipe, whatever its actual length may be. By a 32-foot or 16-foot stop, we mean that the pipe which speaks on the lowest C on which that stop appears has a 32-foot or a 16-foot tone.

“The *stops* of an organ do not always produce the note properly belonging to the key struck; sometimes they give a note an octave, or, in the pedal-

organ, even two octaves lower, and sometimes one of the harmonics higher in pitch. *Compound* or *mixture stops*. — have several pipes to each key, corresponding to the different harmonics of the ground-tone. There is an endless variety in the ground-tone. There is an endless variety in the number and kinds of stops in different organs; some are and some are not continued through the whole range of manual or pedal. Some of the more important stops get the name of *open* or *stopped diapason* (a term which implies that they extend throughout the whole compass of the clavier): they are for the most part 16-feet, sometimes 32-feet stops; the *open diapason* chiefly of metal, the *close* chiefly of wood. The *dulciana* is an 8-foot manual stop, of small diameter, so-called from the sweetness of its tone. Among the reed-stops are the *clarion*, *oboe*, *bassoon*, and *vox humana*, deriving their names from real or fancied resemblances to these instruments and to the human voice. Of the compound stops, the most prevalent in Britain is the *sesquialtera*, consisting of four or five ranks of open metal pipes, often a 17th, 19th; 22d, 26th, and 29th from the ground-tone. The resources of the organ are further increased by appliances called *couplers*, by which a second clavier and its stops can be brought into play or the same clavier can be united to itself in the octave below or above.”

### Picture for Organ 4

Instruments of a rude description, comprising more or less the principle of the organ, seem to have existed early. But they were much smaller in size, and they were supplied with wind in various ways. At first a person was employed to blow into the pipes; later, to avoid this difficulty, a leathern wind-pouch was attached to the instrument, which pouch was worked by being held under the arm (*tibia utriculariac*); then, for larger instruments, water-power was used to compress the air in a suitable receptacle (*organum hydraulicum*); and, finally (some say earlier), the bellows (*organum pneumaticum*) was employed. Besides these large instruments there was also a small portable organ, sometimes called a “pair of *Regals*,” formerly in use, and this was occasionally of such a size as to admit of its being carried in the hand and inflated by the player; one of these is represented among the sculptures in the cornice of St. John's, Cirencester, and another on the crosier of William of Wykeham, at Oxford.

Nero greatly admired the water-organ (*Sueton?* c 41: “Reliquam diei partem per organma hydraulica novi et ignoti generis circumdixit”). In ecclesiastical history pope Vitalian I figures as the introducer of the organ,

and the date assigned is A.D. 666. St. Augustine and Isidore of Seville serve as authority for this statement. It appears, however, from the records of the Spanish Church, that the organ was used there two centuries previous to this date. In Africa the organ had been in common use for some time previous, and it is from that country probably that it was introduced into Spain. In the West the organ was not common until the 10th century. St. Aldhelm, who died A.D. 709, describes one with golden pipes in England; but as late as 757; when Pepin the Short received from Constantine Copronymus an organ as a present, it is mentioned as a great wonder. It was placed in the church of St. Corneille, at Compiègne, but whether that instrument was then used for ecclesiastical purposes is a matter of controversy. On the other hand, it is well known that Charlemagne caused an organ to be placed in the cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle. This organ, which is described by Walafrid Strabo, was undoubtedly the same which was sent him from Constantinople by Constantine Michael, and of which the chronicler of St. Gall said (*De Carol. M. 2:10*), “*Musorum organum praestantissimum, quod doliis ex aere conflatis follibusque taurinis per fistulas aereas mire perflantibus ru. gitu quidem tonitruum boatum, garrulitatem vero lyrae vel cymbali dulcedine coequabat.*” Organ-building was now followed in Germany with such success that in the second half of the 9th century pope John VIII got an organ and singers sent from thence to Rome through the bishop of Freysingen. In the middle of the 10th century organs became quite common in England; and, among others, the Benedictine monks of Winchester became possessed of a large organ with four hundred pipes, and twelve upper and fourteen lower bellows, requiring seventy strong men to work them.

The time when the wind-organ took the place of the water-organ is not ascertained; some say in the 7th century. We have no trustworthy evidence of any improvement having been made in the organ from that time until the 15th century, when the pedals were invented in Italy by Bernhard, a German organist at the court of the doge of Venice. In the 11th century a monk, named Theophilus, wrote a curious treatise on organ-building, but it was not until the 15th century that the organ began to be anything like the noble instrument which it now is. In the 16th century the system of pipes was divided into registers. The family of Antigiati, in Brescia, had a great name as organ-builders in the 15th and 16th centuries. The organs of England were also in high repute, but the puritanism of the civil war

doomed most of them to destruction; and when they had to be replaced after the Restoration it was found that there was no longer a sufficiency of builders in the country. Foreign organ-builders were therefore invited to settle in England, the most remarkable of whom were Bernhard Schmidt (generally called Father Schmidt) and his nephews, and Renatus Harris. Christophet Schreider, Snetzler, and Byfield succeeded them; and at a later period Green and Avery, some of whose organs have never been surpassed in tone, though in mechanism those of modern builders are an immense advance on them. The German organs are remarkable for preserving the balance of power well among the various masques, but in mechanical contrivances they are surpassed by those of England. In the United States organ-building has been carried to a perfection rivalled only by England. The largest organ in this country is at Boston; it was built by a German, Walcker, of Ludwigsbourg, and has 4 manuals, 89 stops, and 4000 pipes. Many of the large churches have organs built by Americans which nearly rival the great instrument at Boston. One of the largest organs used in churches is that of the Roman Catholic cathedral at Montreal. It was built by R. S. Warren, of that city. The largest organ in the world is in Albert Hall, London, was built by Henry Willis in 1870, and contains 138 stops, 4 manuals, and nearly 10,000 pipes, all of which are of metal. The wind is supplied by steam-power. Thirteen couplers connect or disconnect the various subdivisions of the organ at the will of the performer.

**II.** *Opposition to the Use of the Organ in Christian Worship.* — The question as to the propriety of using the organ in Christian song in churches has been debated from the days of Hospinian down to our own. It was never adopted in the Eastern Church. In the West it is to the present day excluded from the papal chapel. In the 16th century the abuse which had been made of it was so great as to lead to a strongly supported motion being presented to the Council of Trent for its suppression. It was retained, however; through the influence of emperor Ferdinand. The Reformed Church discarded the organ from the first, and although it has since been reinstalled in the Reformed churches of Basle and some other places, it has never been resumed by the denomination at large. In the Lutheran Church, on the contrary, it has always been used, notwithstanding Luther's prejudice against it. *SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS*, in vol. 6, p. 762, col. i (3). The Presbyterian churches of Scotland have made stout and continued resistance against the use of organs. In the Church of Scotland the matter was discussed in connection with the use of an organ by the



congregation of St. Andrew's, Glasgow. The case was brought before the Presbytery of Glasgow, and no appeal was made. On Oct. 7, 1807, the following motion was carried:

“That the presbytery are of opinion that the use of the organ in the public worship of God is *contrary to the law of the land*, and to the law and constitution of our Established Church, and therefore prohibit it in all the churches and chapels within their bounds.”

In 1829 the question was brought up in the Relief Synod, as an organ had been introduced into Roxburgh Place Chapel, Edinburgh. The deliverance, given by a very large majority, was as follows:

“It being admitted and incontrovertibly true that the Rev. John Johnston had introduced instrumental music into the public worship of God in the Relief Congregation, Roxburgh Place, Edinburgh, which innovation the synod are of opinion is unauthorized by the laws of the New Testament, contrary to the universal practice of the Church in the first and purest periods of her history, contrary to the universal practice of the Church of Scotland, and contrary to the consuetudinary laws of the synod of Relief, and highly inexpedient, the synod agree to express their regret that any individual member of their body should have had the temerity to introduce such a dangerous innovation into the public worship of God in this country, which has a manifest tendency to offend many serious Christians and congregations, and create a schism in the body, without having first submitted it to the consideration of his brethren according to usual form. On all these accounts the synod agree to enjoin the Rev. John Johnston to give up this practice instanter, with certification if he do not, the Edinburgh Presbytery shall hold a meeting on the second Tuesday of September next, and strike his name off the roll of presbytery, and declare him incapable of holding office as a minister in the Relief denomination. And further, to prevent the recurrence of this or any similar practice, the synod enjoin a copy of this sentence to be sent to every minister in the synod, to be laid before his session, and read after public worship in his congregation, for their satisfaction, and to deter others from following similar courses in all time coming.”

An organ having been erected in the new Claremont Church, Glasgow, the same question came up in 1856 before the United Presbyterian Synod, with

which the Relief Synod had been for some years incorporated. Again more formally in 1858, when the following motion was carried alike against one for toleration, which had many supporters, and against another, which certainly had few supporters, and contained the assertion, "Instrumental music was one of the carnal ordinances of the Levitical economy." The motion which passed into law was:

"That the synod reaffirm their deliverance of 1856 respecting the use of instrumental music in public worship, viz., 'The synod refused the petition of the memorialists, inasmuch as the use of instrumental music in public Worship is contrary to the uniform practice of this Church, and of the other Presbyterian churches in this country, and would seriously disturb the peace of the churches under the inspection of this synod: and at the same time enjoined sessions to employ all judicious measures for the improvement of vocal psalm and the synod now declare said deliverance to be applicable to diets of congregational worship on weekdays as well as on the Lord's day.'"

It is to be observed that in each of these three instances a constitutional principle of Presbyterianism was violated, the organ was introduced, and the innovation made without consulting the brethren, without asking the advice or sanction of the presbytery. Presbyterians, Independents, and Methodists now, however, use organs, so that they have ceased to be a denominational characteristic. And why not? The question is one of taste rather than conscience or Scripture. The passage in <sup>415</sup>Ephesians 5:19, so often appealed to by both parties, says nothing for either (see Eadie, *Commentary* on the place, and the works of Alford, Ellicott, Meyer, Hodge). Instrumental music was no Jewish thing in any typical sense, the choristers and performers of David's orchestra were no original or essential element of the Levitical economy. The music of the Temple stood upon a different basis from sacrifice, which has long been formally superseded. The service of song is not once alluded to in the Epistle to the Hebrews as among the things which "decayed and waxed old." Its employment in the Christian Church is therefore no introduction of any point or portion of Jewish ritual, nor any digression into popish ceremonial. Indeed, the employment of an organ to guide the music is properly not ritualistic at all. The leader has his pitch-pipe, and the hundred pipes of the organ only serve to guide and sustain the voice of the people. Nobody wishes to praise God by the mere sound of the organ: its music only helps and supports the

melody and worship of the church. It has been abused certainly, but the sensuous luxury, of some congregations should: be no bar to the right and legitimate use of it by others. In fact, the proper employment of it might be pleaded for on the same grounds as scientific education in music. Both are simply helps to the public worship of God. See Cromar, *A Vindication of the Organ* (Edinb. 1854, 12mo); Campbell, *Two Papers on Church Music*, read before “The Liverpool Eccles. Musical Society” (Liverpool, 1854).

**III. Objections against its Use in modern Jewish Worship.** — The introduction of the organ in the Jewish religious service, especially in Germany, has excited great and fierce discussion, and a small library could be filled with the works written *pro* and *con*. About the year 1818 an organ was introduced into a temple at Hamburg, When twenty-two rabbins, among them Mordecai Benet and Moses Sopher, gave their decision against such innovation in a work entitled **tyrbh yrbd hl a** . On the other hand, Shem Tob Samun, a noted rabbi, supported by rabbins of Jerusalem, J. C. Ricanati, of Verona, and the renowned A. Chorin, published an opinion in **qdxh hgrn** and **hgn rwa** in favor of reforms and the introduction in the organ. The first works for and against the reform were in Hebrew. At a later time the reformers and their opponents continued their debates mostly in German, in periodicals and pamphlets. The objections against the introduction of the organ are of three classes.

- (1.) It is prohibited to play music on the Sabbath. A Jew is not allowed to play on the Sabbath, and everything prohibited to a Jew we are not allowed to have done by a Gentile.
- (2.) In obedience to the prohibition of the Torah, “In their statutes thou shalt not walk;” and, as the organ is a specific Christian invention used in churches, we are prohibited from its use.
- (3.) In obedience to a Talmudical law (*Sotah*, 49; also copied in *Orach Chayim*, 560), that, in memory of the destruction of the Temple, Jews should not play any musical instrument.

The first of these objections has been refuted by Wiener in his *Referate uber die der ersten israel. Synode zur Leipzg uberreichten Antrige* (1871). He argues that “to play music on the Sabbath is not among the thirty-nine kinds of labor enumerated in the Talmud Sabbath, nor even among those derived from that class. To play a musical instrument is called an art, and

no labor **hkal m wnyaw hmkj** (*Rosh Hashanah*, 29, c). Music is not only not prohibited, but even commanded for the holidays by the Torah. The Talmud (*Erubim*, 102) allows repairing a musical instrument in the Temple, but not in any other place: 'It is allowed to fix a broken string (on the Sabbath) in the Temple, but not outside.'" From this prohibition, Dr. Wiener concludes "that to make music must have been allowed, **hnydmb**, otherwise the Talmud would have used the words 'as to make music is prohibited, the more so is repairing,'" and he considers this omission as an evident proof that music was allowed. A prohibition is deduced from the Talmud (*Beza*, 36, c) by those who are opposed to the use of the organ, but this is an expression whose meaning is differently understood by Maimonides and Josaphath; the latter even allowed the playing of musical instruments. Among the rabbinical authorities we find a great difference of opinion. Thus the Shulchan Aruch, or, rather, Moses Isserles, prohibited playing a musical instrument (*Orach Chayim*, 349, 3). Rabbi Nissim allowed manual work (**hl wdg hkal m**) unto be done by a Gentile if it were necessary for a religious function. Rema (R. Moses Isserles) also stated (*Orach Cchayinz*, 276), "Some allow a Gentile to light lamps on the Sabbath for a religious meal, and in consequence of such permission some even went so far as to allow this for every meal and festivity." And (*ib.* 338)," Some allow a Gentile to play musical instruments on the Sabbath in honor of a wedding, but in our times they are inclined to lighten the precepts(!)." Of Mehril it is related that, at the time he made the nuptials of his son, it was forbidden by the government to make music, and he sent the bridal party to another city in order that they might enjoy music there on the Sabbath (see *Rema*, 339, and Eliah Rabah).

To the second objection it is replied by those who favor its use in the synagogue that the organ did not come to be generally used in the churches until musical instruments were used in the synagogue of Bagdad, as reported by the German traveler Petachya, of. Regensburg. The venerable Alt-Neu synagogue of Prague possessed an organ in the commencement of the 17th century, while for some time previous to this a similar instrument existed in several synagogues in Spain and Corfu, as authentically reported. Certainly song and music formed an essential part of the religious service of the Temple, and was highly esteemed by the Jewish sages (see *Erubim*, ch. ii). The Talmudists declare religious singing a Biblical precept, and **açrhm** explain the importance of that command, that singing disperses melancholy, as we see with Saul, and excited a divine spirit, as seen with

Elisha. Music must therefore be pronounced an ancient institution with the Israelites, and by no means an imitation of the worship of other creeds. The organ also forms no part of any religious statute with other creeds, and the objection **pywgh tqj** cannot be raised for that reason. But even if such were the case, or would still cause some scruples, there is against it all answer in the Talmud (*Sanhedrin*, 39, c). While Ezekiel in one passage reproached the Israelites. “Neither have ye done according to the judgments of the nations that are round about you” (~~צרי~~Ezekiel 5:7), in another passage he says, “And ye have done after the mannere of the nations that are round about you” (~~צרי~~Ezekiel 11:12). This apparent contradiction the Talmud reconciles by paraphrasing, “You have conformed with those that are bad, and disregarded those that are good.” Rashi, in explaining that passage of the Talmud, remarks. “Good acts are such as that of Eglon, king of Moab, who honored the name of God by rising from his seat” (~~צרי~~Judges 3:20), which is recommended for imitation, although a heathen custom. Rabbenu Nissim says positively, “The law does not prohibit or imitating idolatrous customs, except foolish acts, but customs founded in reason are admissible” (*To Aboda Sara*, 33).

Against the third objection, that the Talmud (*Sotah*, 49; *Gittin*, 7) prohibits the playing of a musical instrument because of the destruction of the Temple, it is answered that the enjoyment of music was at all times allowed without any objection by the rabbins. Rabbi Shem Job Samun, of Leghorn, in his decisions, published in **qdxh hgyn**, relates, “In Modena, a very pious and important city, where many learned and wise Italian and German rabbins lived, among them Padubah, Lipschitz, and Ephraim Cohen — the latter German scholars of great renown — existed a musical society, without any objection from the rabbins. One of the most esteemed and learned rabbins, R. Ismael Cohen, gave permission, on inquiry, to a person to attend the performance of that society on the night of Hoshana Raba.” The whole literature of the Middle Ages, moreover, proves that, wherever song and music were cultivated, the Jews participated and showed great talents, and, according to the assertion of D’Israeli, the Jewish race is peculiarly fond of music. Even a pious scholar, author of the book of the pious, who lived at a very dark time, asserted that the practice of music is allowed on Chanuka, Purim, and at weddings. The practice of music was also allowed to disperse melancholy in hard times, and to incite to the study of the law, which formed the center of all activity. See Deutsch, *Die Orgel in der Synagoge*.

See, for a full account of the structure of the organ, Hopkins and Reinbault, *The Organ, its History and Construction* (2d ed. Lond. 1870); Topfer, *Lehrbuch d. Orgelbaukunst* (Weimar, 1855, 4 vols. 8vo); and the literature referred to under MUSIC.

### Organ-Cases

are not earlier in date than the 15th century. At St. James's, Liege, is an early example of the beginning of the 16th century; that of Amiens was made 1422 to 1429; one at Old Radnor is carved, and of the early part of the 17th century; In Spain the organ-pipes are arranged in specified compartments, with those of one stop projecting from the principal range. They often have printed wings or shutters.

### Organa, Andrea

a noted Italian painter, was born at Florence in 1329. In his youth he devoted himself to the study of sculpture, and later to architecture. Only in middle life did he take up the brush, but he soon secured a very enviable reputation as an artist in this branch. He died in 1389. Some of Organa's paintings are among the most noted of the 14th century. Most of them are at Pisa. A very remarkable production of his is *The Universal Judgment*. In it he painted his friends as in heaven, and his enemies as the residents of hell.

### Orgia

Engl. ORGIES (probably from Gr. ἕρδω, in the perfect ἕοργα, *to sacrifice*), or MYSTERIES, are the secret rites or customs connected with the worship of some of the pagan deities; as the secret worship of Ceres, and the festival of Bacchus, which was accompanied with mystical customs and drunken revelry. These festivals are the same as the *Bacchanalia*, *Dionysia*, etc., which were celebrated by the ancients to commemorate the triumph of Bacchus in India. The word *orgies* is now applied to scenes of drunkenness and debauchery.

### Oriel Or Oriole

#### Picture for Oriel or Oriole

(Lat. *Oratoriolum*, or little place for prayer, its original meaning) was a portion of an apartment set aside for prayer, and in the mediaeva houses it

was not an uncommon practice to arrange the domestic *oratory* so that the sacrarium was the whole height of the building, while there was an upper floor looking into it for the lord and his guests to attend to the service. This upper part more especially received the name of Oriole. Thus any projecting portion of a room, or even of a building, was called an oriole, such as a penthouse, or such as a closet, bower, or private chamber, an upper story, or a gallery; and the term became last of all applied to a projecting window, hence oriel window; also called *bow* or *bay* window.

## Orient

ST., a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Huesca, on the frontier of Aragon, near the middle of the 4th century. After the death of his parents, who were wealthy, he gave all his goods to the poor, and lived a time as a hermit in the valley of Lavedan. His reputation caused him, however, to be appointed bishop of Auch about 410. He at once applied himself to uprooting heathenism in his diocese: he destroyed a temple of Apollo at Atch, and erected a church over the ruins. Theodoric I, king of the Goths, and an Arian, sent him as ambassador to the Roman general Aetius, and to his lieutenant Littorius. Orient died soon after his return at Auch, May 1, 439. One of the parishes of Amch bears his name. Part of his remains was transferred as relics to Huesca, Sept. 16, 1609. He wrote a Latin poem in elegiac verses, entitled *Commonitorium*, which is mentioned by Fortunatus of Poitiers. Although not equal to some of the poetry of the early part of the 5th century, it is forcible and fluent, and the language is good. The work is divided into two books. The first was published at Antwerp in 1599 or 1600 (12mo), with notes by the Jesuit Martin Delrio, who had discovered it in a MS. of the abbey of Auchin. It was afterwards republished at Salamanca in 1604 and 1664 (4to); at Leipsic in 1651 (8vo), with notes by Andrew Rivinus; at Cologne in 1618 in the *Bibl. Pair.*, and afterwards at Paris and Lyons in similar collections. Dom Martene having discovered a MS. of the whole work, some 800 years old, in the convent of St. Martin, at Tours, had it published in the new collection of ancient writers (Rouen, 1700, 4to) in his *Thesaurus Anecdotorum* (1717, fl., vol. v), together with some small pieces of Orient found in the same MS. The *Memoires de Trevoaux*, July and September, 1701, contain remarks and corrections by Commire. A new edition was published by Schurtzfleisch (Wittemberg, 1706, 4to), and a supplement, containing variations derived from a MS. in the Oxford library, at Weimar, in 1716. An edition in Latin and French, preceded by a life of the author according to the Bollandists,

was published under the title of *Commonitoire* by Z. Collombet (Lyons, 1839, 8vo). Some writers, deceived by the resemblance of the name, have attributed this work to Orese, bishop of Urgel, known for his correspondence with Sidonius Apollinaris. See Bollandists, *Acta Sanct.* May 1; *La Vie du glorieux Saint Orens, eveque d'Auch, composee sur les memoires tirez des anciennes legendes et des plus fideles historiens* (Toulouse, no date); *Gallia Christiana*, 1:973; *Hist. litter. de la France*, 2:251-256.

## Oriental Churches

*SEE EASTERN CHURCH; SEE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.*

## Oriental Languages

*SEE SHEMITIC LANGUAGES.*

## Oriental Liturgy

*SEE LITURGY.*

## Oriental Philosophy

is an ancient system seeking to explain the nature and origin of all things by the principle of emanation from an eternal fountain of being. *SEE MAGI.* Those who professed to believe the Oriental philosophy were divided into three leading sects, which were subdivided into others. Some imagined two eternal principles, from whence all things proceeded the one presiding over light, the other over matter; and by their perpetual conflict explaining the mixture of good and evil that appears in the universe. *SEE MANICHAEANS; SEE ORMUZD.* Others maintained that the being which presided over matter was not an eternal principle, but a subordinate intelligence; one of those which the Supreme God produced. They supposed that this being was moved by a sudden impulse to reduce into order the rude mass of matter which lay excluded from the mansions of the Deity, and at last to create the human race. A third sect entertained the idea of a triumvirate of beings, in which the Supreme Deity was distinguished both from the material evil principle and from the Creator of this sublunary world. From blending the doctrines of the Oriental philosophy with Christianity, the Gnostic sects, which were so numerous in the first centuries, derived their origin. *SEE GNOSTICISM.* Other sects arose which aimed to unite Judaism with Christianity. Many of the pagan



philosophers, who were converted to the Christian religion, exerted all their art and ingenuity to accommodate the doctrines of the Gospel to their own schemes of philosophy. In each age of the Church new systems were introduced, till, in process of time, we find the Christian world divided into that variety of heretical sentiment which is exhibited under the various articles in the Cyclopaedia. *SEE PHILOSOPHY.*

## Orientation

As Christians from an early period turned their faces eastward when praying, so Christian churches, especially in the Western countries, for the most part were placed east and west, in order that the worshippers, as they looked towards the altar, might also look towards the east. The Council of Milan gave approval to this custom, and pope Virgilius even ordered the priests to celebrate towards the east. The custom seems at first thought a very foolish one, for God is everywhere present. Yet the east is, as it were, his proper dwelling-place, and that quarter where heaven seems to rise. Then, too, the window in the ark is believed to have faced the east. In the primitive Church prayer was made to the east, according to Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Origen, Augustine and Basil: (1) in allusion to ~~<407>~~Psalm 132:7; ~~<344>~~Zechariah 14:4, “His feet shall stand in the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east;” (2) as the day-spring (~~<407>~~Luke 1:78); (3) as the place of light; and (4) of Paradise (Genesis 52:8); and (5) of in the crucifixion and ascension, Pentecost, and second advent. Not only did churches, therefore, face the east, but the dead were laid with their faces to the east. The altar represents the Holy of Holies of the Temple; at it the death of Christ is commemorated; and from it the sacred food is administered to the faithful. Leo I (A.D. 443) condemned the custom of the people at Rome who used to stand on the upper steps in the court of St. Peter's and bow to the rising sun; partly out of ignorance, and partly from a lingering paganism. In later times the custom continued of turning eastward before entering St. Peter's, but with the intent of praying to God. To avoid, however, any suspicion of superstition, in the time of Boniface VII a mosaic of the ship which is one of the symbols of the early Church for Christ, *SEE INSCRIPTIONS*, was erected, towards which devotions were to be made. Urban VIII placed it over the outer great door. In some early churches (as those of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem, erected by Constantine, and Tyre, built by Paulinus at the beginning of the 4th century) — three great gates faced the east, the central being the loftiest, like a queen between her attendants. The arrangement adopted was that of

the Jewish Temple. Modern investigation has determined that few churches stand exactly east and west, the great majority inclining a little either to the north or to the south. Thus, of three ancient churches in Edinburgh, it was ascertained that one (St. Margaret's Chapel in the Castle) pointed E.S.E.; another (St. Giles's Cathedral), E. by S.<sup>1/2</sup>S.; a third (Trinity College Church, now destroyed), E.<sup>1/2</sup>S. The cause of this variation has not been satisfactorily explained. Some have supposed that the church was turned not to the true east, but to the point at which the sun rose on the morning of the feast of the patron saint. But, unfortunately for this theory, neighboring Churches, dedicated in honor of the same saint, have different orientations. Thus, All-Saints' at West Beckham, in Norfolk, points due east; while All-Saints' at Thwaite, also in Norfolk, is 8<sup>0</sup> to the north of east. There are instances, too, in which different parts of the same church have different orientations; that is to say, the chancel and the nave have not been built in exactly the same line. This is the case in York Minister and in Lichfield Cathedral. Another theory is that orientation "mystically represents the bowing of our Savior's head in death, which Catholic tradition asserts to have been to the right [or north] side." But his theory is gainsaid by the fact that the orientation is as often to the south as to the north. Until some better explanation is offered, it may perhaps be safe to hold that orientation has had no graver origin than carelessness, ignorance, or indifference. In several early Roman churches, and in the western apses of Germany, the altars face westward, but the celebrant fronts the congregation.

### Oriflamme

(*Auri flamma*, or fanon. i.e. *flame of gold*) was a red flag of sendal, carried on a lance shafted with gilt-copper. It was preserved in the abbey of St. Denis, to which it belonged; and was taken by the kings of France, on occasions of great emergency, from, the altar of that abbey, and on such occasions it was always consecrated and blessed. Louis VI received the oriflamme A.D. 1119 and 1125, and a writer of that period speaks of this as an *ancient* custom of the French kings. The consecration of a knight's pennon or gonfanon was indeed an essential feature in the solemn religious ceremonial by which he was elevated to the rank of knighthood in those ages. The consecration of standards for an army or a regiment is merely a different form of the same general idea. *SEE KNIGHT-HOOD*. The oriflamme is said to have been lost at Agincourt, in the Flemish wars, by Philip de Valois. It passed with the county of Vexin, the counts having

been the protectors of the Church, and became the standard of France in the time of Philip I. Other accounts state that it was last seen in the battlefield in the time of Charles I; and Felibrin says that in 1535 it was still kept in an abbey, but was almost devoured by moths. The oriflamme was charged with a saltire wavy, or with rays issuing from the center crossways. In later times it became the ensign of the French infantry. The name seems also to have been given to other flags; according to Sir N. H. Nicolas, the oriflamme borne at Agincourt was an oblong red flag, split into five parts. See Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, s.v.; *Student's History of France*, p. 132. *SEE JOAN OF ARC.*

## Origen

(Ὠριγένης, *from . ἐν ὄρει γενηθείς*, because he was *born in the mountain* region, to which his parents had retired to escape persecution),' also surnamed ADAMANTIUS, on account of his remarkable firmness and iron assiduity, is called the father of Biblical criticism and exegesis in the Church. But it is not only in this line of literary activity that he has distinguished himself. Origen may well be pronounced one of the ablest and worthiest of the Church fathers — indeed, one of the greatest moral prodigies of the human race. He is universally regarded as one of the most laborous and learned scholars that has appeared in Christendom, and although his orthodoxy has on some important doctrinal points been called in question, his fame and influence will endure to the end of time, and his memory be revered among all followers of Jesus Christ.

*Life.* — Origen was born, according to the most trustworthy computation, at the city of Alexandria, in Egypt, in A.D. 185. His father, Leonidas, who was a Christian, is reputed to have been a man of culture and of piety; and while he sought to imbue the mind of the youth, whose first instructor he was, with the love of letters and the sciences, which every free Greek was to be conversant with, he yet paid particular attention to sacred knowledge, so that Origen might truly understand the contents of the Scriptures; and before the boy had reached maturity he evinced that his mind had not only been filled with knowledge, but that his bosom glowed with an equal zeal for the practice of the truths he had learned from the sacred pages. In A.D. 202, during the persecution under Severus, which raged through all the churches, but fell with most tremendous devastation on the Church at Alexandria, many of the most distinguished Christians from other parts were brought to suffer martyrdom in this conspicuous city. Instead of

hiding his own convictions, Origen boldly came forward, and exposed himself to a savage multitude by ministering to these holy men; and when his own father, too, was for his fidelity to the Christian religion imprisoned, and likely to suffer martyrdom, Origen was with great difficulty prevented by his mother from sharing his father's fate. Indeed, so firmly were his convictions rooted that he sent exhortation after exhortation to the prison of his parent to buffer death rather than recant. "Take heed," wrote the beardless youth of seventeen — "take heed, father, that you do not change your mind for our sake." Leonidas remained firm and was beheaded; and Origen, his mother and younger brothers — six in all — were left destitute of protection, and of property too, as the estate which they owned was confiscated. In this forlorn condition Origen found a noble patron and supporter in a rich lady, who longed to be taught the truths of Christianity. But he did not long depend on her, for in the following year he 'abandoned' her home because she entertained a renowned heretic, whom, though high in repute for his learning; Origen would not consider a fit associate. He supported himself for a while by teaching the Greek language and literature, and by copying MSS. In A.D. 203 bishop Demetrius, afterwards his opponent, placed him in charge of the catechetical school left vacant by the flight of Clement (q.v.), whose instructions Origen had enjoyed, and whose friendship and esteem he had secured while a pupil. To worthily fill this important office Origen made himself acquainted with the various heresies, especially the Gnostic, and with the Grecian philosophy. He was not even ashamed to study under the Heathen Ammonius Sacas (q.v.) the celebrated founder of Neo-Platonism (q.v.). Of course such a faithful application to research was rewarded with popular applause, and crowds of people flocked to his lectures. Among his pupils were many of the weaker sex; and as in his studies he employed females as copyists, he decided to put away every possible appearance of evil by his own emasculation, basing this unwarranted act upon the words of Christ (<sup><4192></sup>Matthew 9:12), which Origen interpreted in a literal sense at that time, though in a later period of life he greatly regretted his early views. He also in this early period of life sought strict conformity with the doctrine preached by Paul in <sup><4175></sup>1 Corinthians 7:25, and practiced voluntary poverty, and led a strictly ascetic life. He made it a matter of principle to renounce every earthly thing not indispensably necessary; refused the gifts of his pupils had but one coat, no shoes, and took no thought of the 'morrow. He rarely ate flesh, never drank wine; devoted the greater part of the night to prayer and study, and slept on the bare floor. By these means he commanded the respect of both

the learned and the unlearned in an age and country where such a mode of life was held in the highest repute both by Christians and heathen, and thus, in connection with his public and private instruction, he made a multitude of converts from all ranks of pagans. Among those whom his preaching, backed by a life so replete with consistency, reclaimed was one Valentinian heretic, a wealthy person, named Ambrose, who afterwards assisted Origen materially in the publication of his Commentaries on the Scriptures.

It was a little while preceding these important acts (about A.D. 211) that Origen visited Rome in order to acquaint himself with the doctrines, practices, and general character of its truly ancient Church. The Alexandrian and Roman views of the Church were widely different. By the latter, the one Church and body of Christ were contemplated as a visible organization, by the former as an invisible. In Rome and Carthage nepotism was dreaded as the worst of evils, and the baptized were looked upon as constituting the Church. In Alexandria the alienation of the mind and of the heart from the truth was regarded as the chief evil, and the holy, both in heaven and on earth, were viewed as constituting the true Church. Origen's opinions in regard to ecclesiastical organization and discipline were substantially the same as those which are most commonly entertained by evangelical Christians. They were far more spiritual and rational than those held by the Roman Church, and by Cyprian and Augustine. (The chapter in which Redepenning presents a summary of Origen's system of practical Church discipline is a very valuable treatise, on the subject for practical purposes in general; the golden mean between formalism and latitudinarianism is happily chosen: still it appears that Origen admitted a modified supremacy of the Church of Rome.) Origen's stay at Rome was short. Upon his return to Alexandria, by request of bishop Demetrius, he resumed his lessons, and then met with the remarkable and blessed results in his labors above referred to. Troubles likely to lead to serious dissension which broke out in that city in A.D. 215 made it evident that Christian teachers could not effectually prosecute their work, and Origen retired secretly to Palestine. This incensed the bishop; and when the clergy of that province asked Origen to expound the Scriptures in public, Demetrius wrote to expostulate with them, on the ground that such a mission should not be entrusted to one who was not an ordained priest. Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theocritus of Casarea defended their conduct on the ground that bishops had always employed for that purpose such as were best qualified for it by their learning and piety, without inquiring whether

they were priests or laymen. Demetrius finally recalled Origen and afterwards sent him to Greece to oppose some new heresies which had arisen in Achaia. On his way thither, in 228, he was ordained a presbyter at Caesarea, in Palestine, by Theocritus. This so displeased Demetrius that he held two councils (A.D. 231 and 232) at Alexandria, by which Origen was forbidden to teach, and excommunicated. He was accused, 1. of having castrated himself; 2. of having been ordained without the consent of his regular bishop; 3. of teaching erroneous doctrines, such as saying that the devil would be saved, and be redeemed from the torments of hell, etc. Origen denied the correctness of these accusations, and withdrew to Caesarea in 231, where he was received with great honor by Theocritus; for the churches of Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, and Achaia, which were too well informed regarding Origen, disapproved of this unrighteous sentence, in which envy, hierarchical arrogance, and blind zeal for orthodoxy joined. The Roman Church, always ready to anathematize, alone concurred, without further investigation. Jerome states that the proceedings of the councils were not due to any belief in Origen's guilt of heresy, but solely to jealousy of his eloquence and reputation.

While resident in Caesarea, Origen there opened a new philosophical and theological school, which soon outshone that of Alexandria. The Caesarean institution was resorted to by persons from the most distant places, who were anxious to hear his interpretations of the Scriptures. Among his disciples were several who afterwards rose to great eminence in the Church. With the death of Demetrius all opposition to Origen died out, and thereafter his advice was everywhere eagerly sought for. He was called into consultation in various ecclesiastical disputes, and had an extensive correspondence; even his personal attendance was frequently asked for. Thus Mammaea, mother of the emperor Alexander Severus, sent for him to Antioch, that she might converse with him on religion; and at a later period he had a correspondence with the emperor Philip and his wife Severa. The persecutions renewed under Maximin against the Christians, and particularly against priests and teachers caused Origen to retire into quiet for two years. When peace was restored by Gordian in 237, Origen availed himself of it to visit Greece. He remained for some time at Athens; and having returned to Caesarea he went at the request of the bishops of Arabia to take part in two synods held in that country. Here he enjoyed the success (rare, indeed, in religious controversy) of convincing his opponents: these were Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, in Arabia, who denied

the pre-existence of Christ; and some who held that the soul dies with the body, to be revived with it at the resurrection. When about sixty years of age Origen permitted his discourses to be taken down in shorthand, and in this way over a thousand of his homilies were preserved. In the Decian persecution (A.D. 250) Origen was again imprisoned, endured great torture, and came near suffering martyrdom. He was, however, finally released, but died shortly after, some say at Tyre, in 253 or 254, probably in consequence of violence inflicted while in prison. He belongs, therefore, as Schaff has aptly said, "at least among the confessors, if not among the martyrs" (*Ch. Hist.* 1:504). His tomb, near the high-altar of the cathedral at Tyre, was shown for many centuries, until it was destroyed during the Crusades.

Origen is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable men among the ancient Christian writers. His talents, eloquence, and learning have been celebrated not only by Christian writers, but also by heathen philosophers, including Porphyry himself. Jerome calls him "a man of immortal genius, who understood logic, geometry, arithmetic, music, grammar, rhetoric, and all the sects of the philosophers, so that he was resorted to by many students of secular literature whom he received chiefly that he might embrace the opportunity of instructing them in the faith of Christ" (*De Vir. Illust.* c. 54). Elsewhere he calls him the greatest teacher since the apostles. We find this same Jerome, however, at a later period of his life violently attacking Origen, and approving of the persecution against his followers. "Origen," says Prof. Emerson (in the *Biblical Repository*, Jan. 1834, art. i, p. 47), "is one among the few who have graced the annals of our race, by standing up as a living definition of what is meant by a man of genius, learning, piety, and energy. All these he possessed in amiable combination. Any subject that was worth mastering he had mastered, and when he had done it would devote the acquisition to a specific purpose for which he sought it. Thus he learned music, philosophy, and heathen literature, that he might gain the esteem and win the souls of the devotees to such accomplishments. Thus he studied Hebrew, that he might impart the Scriptures and meet the Jews; and then he wrote commentaries without end. He pursued nothing without a design. The soul of man was his great object; the world was his theater; it was his purpose to make himself at home everywhere and in all things, that he might gain all men. Like the great apostle, we find him everywhere true to his purpose and prepared for his work: at Alexandria, in the school and amid its philosophers, and multifarious population; in Arabia, in Palestine,

in Athens; among Christians and among heathen; among persecutors and heretics as well among friends. It was worse than in vain for opposition to do anything to such a man short of putting him to death. Drag him, half dead, to the heathen temple, and bid him distribute the emblems of heathen rites, and you hear him preaching Jesus to those who approach to grasp the sacred branches. Let Demetrius and his councils expel and expose him, he does but retire to Caesarea, where he opens a new school of greater numbers, and 'myriads' throng around him. He is the stamp of a truly great and good man. Sacrificed to the world in his youth, and the world to him, there remained nothing in the world to do except to kill him — and even this he courted, instead of dreading. He wished for no excuse to cease from his Christian toils; they were his meat and drink.” Indeed, his whole life was occupied in writing and teaching, and principally in explaining the Scriptures. No man — certainly none in ancient times — did more to settle the true text of the sacred writings, and to spread them among the people; yet, whether from a defect in judgment or from a fault in his education, he applied to the Holy Scriptures the allegorical method which the Platonists used in interpreting the heathen mythology. He says himself that “the source of many evils is the adhering to the carnal or external part of Scripture. Those who do so shall not attain to the kingdom of God. Let us, therefore, seek after the spirit and the substantial fruit of the Word, which are hidden and mysterious.” Again, “the Scriptures are of little use to those who understand them as they are written.” In the 4th century the writings of Origen led to violent controversies in the Church. Epiphanius, in a letter preserved by Jerome, enumerates eight erroneous opinions.

*Works.* — All the extant works of Origen have been very much corrupted, either intentionally or accidentally, by copyists and annotators, etc. The number of his works is stated by Epiphanius and Rufinus to have exceeded 6000, and although this is probably only meant as an exaggerated round number, yet the amount of writings that issued from his always busy brain and hands cannot but have been enormous. Seven secretaries and seven copyists, aided by an uncertain number of young girls, are by Eusebius reported to have been always at work for him. The great bulk of his works is lost; but among those that have survived the most important by far is his elaborate attempt to rectify the text of the Septuagint by collating it with the Hebrew original and other Greek versions. On this he spent twenty-eight years, during which he traveled through the East collecting materials. The form in which he first issued the result of his labors was that of the



*Tetrapla*, which presented in four columns the texts of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. He next issued the *Hexapla*, in which the Hebrew text was given, first in Hebrew and then in Greek letters. Of some books he gave two additional Greek versions, whence the title *Octapla*; and there was even a seventh Greek version added for some books. The arrangement was in columns, in the following order: Hebrew in its proper characters; Hebrew in Greek characters; Aquila; Symmachus; Sept.; Theodotion; 5th version; 6th; 7th. Unhappily this great work, which extended to nearly fifty volumes, was never transcribed, and so perished. It had been placed in the library at Caesarea, and was still much used in the times of Jerome. It was probably destroyed by the Saracens in 653. Extracts from it, however, had been made, and of these some are preserved. They were collected by Montfaucon, entitled *Hexaplorum quae supersum, multis partibu. auctiora, quam a Flaminio Nobilis et Jonne Drusio edita fueint. Ex MSS. et ex libris editis eruit et notis illustravit* D. Bernardus de. Montfaucon, Monachus Benedictinus (Paris, 1713, 2 vols. fol.). This edition was brought out in a revise by Bahrtdt, entitled *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt. Edidit, notisque illustravit* C. F. Bahrtdt (Leips. 1769-70, 2.Yols.8vo), A few additions have been made to this collection since by various editors. Had this great work been preserved, it would have done more for the criticism of the Bible than Origen's exegetical works have done for its interpretation; for though at first he followed the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, he soon abandoned it for the allegorical, in which he indulged to a pernicious extent. We think Waddington (*Eccles. Hist.*) has best estimated Origen: "His works exhibit the operation of a bold and comprehensive mind, burning with religious warmth, unrestrained by any low prejudices or interests, and sincerely bent on the attainment of truth. In the main plan and outline of his course he seized the means best calculated to his object; for his principal labors were directed to the collection of correct copies of the Holy Scriptures, to their strict and faithful translation; to the explanation of their numerous difficulties. In the first two of these objects he was singularly successful; but in the accomplishment of the last part of his noble scheme the heat of his imagination and his attachment to philosophical speculation carried him away into error and absurdity; for he applied to the explanation of the Old Testament the same fanciful method of allegory by which the Platonists were accustomed to veil the fabulous history of their gods. This error, so fascinating to the loose imagination of the East, was rapidly propagated by numerous disciples, and became the foundation of

that doubtful system of theology called philosophical or *scholastic*.” *SEE ORIGENISTS*.

**1.** Origen's *commentaries* covered almost *all* the books of the Old and New Testaments, and contained a vast wealth of profound suggestions, with the most arbitrary allegorical and mystic fancies. They were of three kinds:

- (a) Short notes on single difficult passages for beginners; all these are lost.
- (b) Extended expositions of whole books, for higher scientific study; of these we have a number in the original.
- (c) Hortatory or practical applications of Scripture for the congregation ( *Ομιλίαι* ), which are important also to the history of pulpit oratory.

But we have them only in part, as translated by Jerome and Rufinus, with many unscrupulous retrenchments and additions, which perplex and are apt to mislead investigators.

**2.** Next to his Biblical works stand his *apologetic* and *polemic* works. Of these, the *Κατὰ Κέλσου τόμοι ἦ*, or in Latin entitled ‘*Contra Celsum*’ (libri 8), which is a refutation of Celsus, (q.v.), or, better, Origen's defense of the Christian faith against the objections of that Platonist, in eight books; written in his old age, about 249, is preserved complete in the original, and is one of the ripest and most valuable productions of Origen, and of the whole ancient apologetic literature. It exists also in an English version, entitled *Origen against Celsus*, translated from the original into English by James Bellamy, Gent. (Lond. 8vo, n. d.). His other and quite numerous polemic writings against heretics are all gone.

**3.** Of Origen's *dogmatic* writings we have, though only in the inaccurate Latin translation of Rufinus, his juvenile production, *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* (*De Principiis*), on the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, in four books. This was the first attempt in the Christian Church at a complete dogmatic; but it is full of the author's peculiar Platonizing and Gnosticizing errors, some of which he retracted in his riper years. Before Origen there existed no system of Christian doctrine. The beginnings of a systematic presentation were contained in the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The necessity of reducing the teachings of the Bible and the doctrines developed in the course of controversies against

heretics and non-Christians to a systematic form was first felt by the teachers in the school for catechists, and they, in going to work to meet this necessity, were guided by the baptismal confession and the *Regula Fidei*. In the writings of Clement the subjects of his Gnosis are loosely combined, and the treatises disclose no plan followed in detail; they are only labors preparatory to a system. Setting out with these materials, Origen laid the foundation of a regular system of Christian dogmas. Yet his order was not very exact, and the gain of a systematic doctrinal form was not secured without material loss. The doctrine relating to the premundane existence of God, being placed first in the regular scholastic order, concealed those living germs seated in man's religious feeling or contained in the history of religion, which might otherwise have influenced beneficially the historical development of Christian doctrine; and the doctrine of Soteriology was left comparatively undeveloped. Origen says, "The apostles taught only what was necessary; many doctrines were not announced by them with perfect distinctness; they left the more precise determination and demonstration of many dogmas to the disciples of science, who were to build up a scientific system on the basis of the given articles of faith" (*De Princ. Praef. p. 3.sq.*). The principle that a systematic exposition shall begin with the consideration of that which is naturally first is expressly announced by Origen (*Tom. in Joan. 10:178*), where, in an allegorical interpretation of the eating of fishes, he says "In eating, one should begin with the head, he should set it from the highest and most fundamental dogmas concerning the heavenly, and should stop with the feet, he should end with those doctrines which related that realm of existence which is farthest removed from the heavenly source, whether it be that which is most material or to the subterranean, or to the evil spirits and impure daemons." The order of presentation in the four books respecting fundamental doctrines is (according to the outline given by Redepenning (*Orig. 2:276*) as follows: "At the commencement is placed the doctrine of God, the eternal source of all existence, as a point of departure for an exposition in which the knowledge of the essence of God, and of the unfoldings of that essence, leads on to the genesis of the eternal in the world, viz. the created spirits, whose fall first occasioned the creation of the coarser material world. This material is without difficulty arranged around the ecclesiastical doctrines of the Father, Son, and Spirit, of the creation, the angels, and the fall of man. All this is contained in the first book of Origen's work on fundamental doctrines. In the second book we set foot upon the earth as it is new we see it arising out of the ante-

mundane though not absolutely eternal matter, in time, in which it is to lead its changing existence until the restoration and emancipation of the fallen spirits; Into this world comes the Son of God, sent by the God of the Old Testament, who is no other than the Father of Jesus Christ; we learn of the incarnation of the Son, of the Holy Ghost as he goes forth from the Son to enter into the hearts of men, of the psychical in man as distinct from the purely spiritual in him, of the purification and restoration of the physical man by judgment and punishment, and of eternal salvation. In virtue of the inalienable freedom belonging to the spirit, it fights its way upward in the face of evil powers of the spiritual world and against temptations from within, supported by Christ himself, and by the means of grace, i.e. by all the gifts and operations of the Holy Ghost. This freedom, and the process by which man becomes free, are described in the third book. The fourth book is distinct from the rest and independent, as containing the basis on which the doctrine of the preceding books rests, viz., the revelation made by the Holy Scriptures” (whereas later dogmatists have been accustomed to place the doctrine before the other contents of the system).

**4.** Among Origen's practical works are specially noteworthy his treatise on prayer, with an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, and exhortation to martyrdom. It was written during the persecution of Maximinus. Besides these works, Origen wrote many letters, *Ἐπιστολαί* (*Epistoli*), of which Eusebius collected over eight hundred. We have, too, a few fragments of answer to Julius Africanus on the authenticity of the history of Susanna. Delarue has given (1:1-32), whether complete or fragmentary, all that remains of them. Among the works of Origen is also usually inserted *the Philocalia* (*Φιλοκαλία*), a collection of extracts from his writings on various exegetical questions. The compilation was made, however, by Gregory of Nazianzum and Basil the Great. It is entitled *Philocalia, de obscuris S. Scripturae locis, a SS. PP. Basilio Magno et Gregorio theologo, ex variis Orogenis commenfaais excerpta, Omnia nunc' primum Greece edita, ex Bibliotheca Regia, opere et studio Jo. Tarini, Andegavi, qui et Latine fecit et notis illustravit* (Paris, 1619' 4to).

The completest edition of Origen's works has been published under the style, *Opera omnian quae Greece vel Latine tantun extanu t et ejus nomine circumferuntur, ex variis editionibus et codicibus nmanu exaratis, Gallicanis, Italicis, Germanicis, et Anglicis, collecta, recensita, Latine versa, atque annotatiosnibus illustrata, curm copiosis indicibus, vita auctoris, et multis- dissertationibus. Opere et studio Domini Caroli*

Delarue, Presbyteri et Monachi Benedictini b Congregatione S. Mauri (Paris, 1733-59, 4 vols. fol.); but a more critical edition is that entitled, *Opera omnia quae Graece vel Latine tantum extant*. Edidit C. H. E. Lommatszsch (Berlin, 1831-48, 25 vols. 8vo). 'Other good editions are: *Opera* [Latine, studio J. Merlini] (Paris, 1512, 4 vols. fol.); *Contra Celsum, libri viii, Ejusdem Philocalia*, Gr. et Lat. cum annotationibus Gul.' Spenceri (Cantab. 1658, 4to; reprinted 1677).

*Doctrines* — Ecclesiastical history, as Fabricius observes, cannot furnish another instance of a man who has been so famous through good report and ill report as Origen. The quarrels and disputes which arose in the Church after his death, on account of his person and writings, seem scarcely credible to any who have not examined the history of those times. The universal Church was split into two parties; and these parties fought as furiously for and against Origen as if the Christian religion had itself been at stake. *SEE ORIGENIAN CONTROVERSY*. Huetius has employed the second book of his *Origeniana*, which consists of above 200 pages in folio, in pointing out and adverting on such dogmas of this illustrious father as are either quite inexcusable or very exceptionable. Cave (*Hist. Liter.* Oxon. 1740) has collected within a short compass the principal tenets which rendered him obnoxious; and thence we learn that Origen was accused of maintaining different degrees of dignity among the persons of the Holy Trinity; as that the Son was inferior to the Father, and the Holy Spirit inferior to both, in the same manner as rays emitted from the sun are inferior in dignity to the sun himself; that the death of Christ was advantageous, not to men only, but to angels, devils, nay, even to the stars and other insensible things, which he supposed to be possessed of a rational soul, and therefore to be capable of sin; that all rational natures, whether devils, human souls, or any other, were created by God from eternity, and were originally pure intelligences, but afterwards, according to the various use of their free will, dispersed among the various orders of angels, men, or devils; that angels and other supernatural beings were clothed with subtle and ethereal bodies, which consisted of matter, although in comparison with our grosser bodies they may be called incorporeal and spiritual; that the souls of all rational beings, after putting off one state, pass into another, either superior or inferior, according to their respective behavior; and that thus, by a kind of perpetual transmigration, one and the same soul may successively, and even often, pass through all the orders of rational beings; that hence the souls of men

were thrust into the prison of bodies for offenses committed in some former state, and that when loosed from hence they will become either angels or devils, as they shall have deserved; that, however, neither the punishment of men or devils, nor the joys of the saints, shall be eternal, but that all shall return to their original state of pure intelligences, to begin the same round again, and so on forever. Says Schaff (*Ch. Hist.* 1:270): “Origen felt the whole weight of the Christological and Trinitarian question, but obscured it by his foreign speculations and wavered between the homoousian, or orthodox, and the subordination theories, which afterwards came into sharp conflict with each other in the Arian controversy. On the one hand he brings the Son as near as possible to the essence of the Father; not only making him the absolute personal wisdom, truth, righteousness, reason (αὐτοσοφία, αὐτοαλήθεια, αὐτοδιχαιοσύνη, αὐτοδύναμις, αὐτόλογος, etc.), but also expressly predicating eternity of him, and propounding the Church dogma of the *eternal* generation of the Son. This generation he usually represents as proceeding from the Will of the Father; but he also conceives it as proceeding from his essence; and hence, at least in one passage, in a fragment on the Epistle to the Hebrews, he already applies the term ὁμοούσιος to the Son, thus declaring him coequal in substance with the Father. This idea of eternal generation, however, has a peculiar form in him, from its close connection with his doctrine of an eternal creation. He can no more think of the Father without the Son, than of an almighty God without creation, or of light without radiance (*De Princip. iv*, 28: 'Sicut lux numquam 'msine splendore esse potuit' ita nec Filius quidem sine Patre intelligi potest'). Hence he describes this generation not as a single, instantaneous act, but, like creation, ever going on. But on the other hand he distinguishes the essence of the Son from that of the Father; speaks of a difference of substance (ἑτερότης τῆς οὐσίας, or τοῦ ὑποκειμένου which the advocates of his orthodoxy, probably without reason, take as merely opposing the Patripassian conception of the ὁμουσία); and makes the Son decidedly inferior to the Father, calling him, with reference to ~~John~~ John 1:1 merely θεός without the article, that is God in a relative sense (Deus de Deo), also δεύτερος θεός, but the Father God in the absolute sense, ὁ θεός (Deus per se), or αὐτόθεος, also the fountain and root of the divinity (πηγή, ρίζα τῆς θεότητος). Hence he also taught that the Son should not be directly addressed in prayer, but the Father through the Son in the Holy Ghost. This must be limited, no doubt, to absolute worship, for he elsewhere recognizes prayer to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. Yet this

subordination of the Son formed a stepping-stone to Arianism, and some disciples of Origen, particularly Dionysius of Alexandria, decidedly approached that heresy.”

“In his Pneumatology,” says Schaff, “Origen vacillates still more than in his Christology between orthodox and heterodox views. He ascribes to the Holy Ghost eternal existence, exalts him, as he does the Son, far above all creatures, and considers him the source of all charisms (not as ὕλη τῶν χαρισμάτων, as Neander and others represent it, but as ν ὕλην τῶν χαρισμ. παρέχον, as offering the substance and fullness of the spiritual gifts; therefore as the ἀρχή and πηγὴ of them [*In Joh*, ii, § 6].), especially as the principle of all the illumination and holiness of believers under the Old Covenant and the New. But he places the Spirit in essence, dignity, and efficiency below the Son, has far as he places the Son below the Father; and though he grants in one passage (*De Princip.* 1:3, 3) that the Bible nowhere calls the Holy Ghost a creature, yet, according to another somewhat obscure sentence, he himself inclines towards the view, which, however, he does not avow, that the Holy Ghost had a beginning (though, according to his system, not in time but from eternity), and is the first and most excellent of all the beings produced by the Logos (*In Joh.* ii, § 6: Τιμιώτερον — this comparative, by the way, should be noticed as possibly saying more than the superlative, and perhaps designed to distinguish the Spirit from all creatures- πάντων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ γεγεννημένων). In the same connection he adduces three opinions concerning the Holy Ghost: one, regarding him as not having an origin; another, ascribing to him no separate personality; and a third, making him a being originated by the Logos. The first of these opinions he rejects, because the Father alone is without origin (ἀγέννητος) *thoc*); the second he rejects, because in <sup><0123></sup>Matthew 12:32 the Spirit is plainly distinguished from the Father, and the Son; the third he takes for the true and scriptural view, because everything was made by the Logos (according to <sup><000B></sup>John 1:3). Indeed, according to <sup><0123></sup>Matthew 12:32, the Holy Ghost would seem to stand above the Son; but the sin against the Holy Ghost is more heinous than that against the Son of Man only because he who has received the Holy Ghost stands higher than he who has merely the reason from the Logos” (*Ch. Hist.* 1:280).

These errors, and others connected with and flowing from these, together with that “furor allegoricus” above mentioned, which pushed him on to turn even the whole law and Gospel into allegory, are the foundation of all

that enmity which has been conceived against Origen, and of all those anathemas with which he has been loaded. His damnation by Romanists has been often decreed in form; and it has been deemed heretical even to suppose him saved. John Picus, earl of Mirandula, having published at Rome, among his 900 propositions, that it is more reasonable to believe Origen saved than damned, the masters indivinity censured him for it, asserting that his proposition was rash, blamable, favoring of heresy, and contrary to the determination of the Catholic Church. This is what Picus himself relates in his *Apolog. c. 7*. Stephen Binet, a Jesuit, published a book at Paris in 1629, concerning the salvation of Origen, in which he took the affirmative side of the question, but not without diffidence and fear. This work is written in the form of a trial; witnesses are introduced and depositions taken, and the cause is fully pleaded pro and con. The witnesses for Origen are Merlin, Erasmus, Genebrard, and Picus of Mirandula: after this, cardinal Baronius, in the name of Bellarmine, and of all who are against Origen, makes a speech to demand the condemnation of the accused. After having expatiated on Origen's heresies, the cardinal adds "Must I at last be reduced to such an extremity as to be obliged to open the gates of hell, in order to show that Origen is there? otherwise men will not believe it. Would it not be enough to have laid before you his crime, his unfortunate end, the sentence of his condemnation delivered by the emperors, by the popes, by the saints, by the fifth general council, not to mention others, and almost by the mouth of God himself? Yet, since there is no other method left but descending into hell and showing there that reprobate, that damned Origen, come, gentlemen, I am determined to do it, in order to carry this matter to the highest degree of evidence: let us, in God's name, go down into hell to see whether he really be there or not, and to decide the question at once." The seventh general council has quoted from *the Platium Spirituale* (Baron. *Annal.* ad ann. 532), and by quoting it has declared it to be of sufficient authority to furnish us with good and lawful proofs to support the determination of the council with regard to Origen. "Why should not we, after the example of that council, make use of the same book to determine this controversy, which besides is already but too much cleared up and decided? It is said there that a man being in great perplexity about the salvation of Origen, after the fervent prayers of a holy old man, saw plainly, as it were, a kind of hell open; and, looking in, observed the heresiarchs, who were all named to him one after another by their own names; and in the midst of them he saw Origen, who was there damned among the others, loaded with horror, flames, and confusion."



Protestants have always revered his memory. The orthodox and heterodox have frequently quarreled over his relative position in the Church. It would be difficult for us to determine his relation to the Church at large better than it has already been done by Dr. Schaff. We therefore prefer to let this learned Church historian speak. "Origen," says Schaff, "was the greatest scholar of his age, and the most learned and genial of all the ante-Nicene fathers. Even heathens and heretics admired or feared his brilliant talents. His knowledge embraced all departments of the philology, philosophy, and theology of his day. With this he united profound and fertile thought, keen penetration, and glowing imagination. As a true divine, he consecrated all his studies by prayer, and turned them, according to his best convictions, to the service of truth and piety. It is impossible to deny a respectful sympathy to this extraordinary man, who, with all his brilliant talents and a host of enthusiastic friends and admirers, was driven from his country, stripped of his sacred office, excommunicated from a part of the Church, then thrown into a dungeon, loaded with chains, racked by torture, doomed to drag his aged frame and dislocated limbs in pain and poverty, and long after his death to have his memory branded, his name anathematized, and his salvation denied; but who nevertheless did more than all his enemies combined to advance the cause of sacred learning, to refute and convert heathens and heretics, and to make the Church respected in the eyes of the world. Origen may be called in many respects *the Schleiermacher of the Greek Church*. He was a guide from the heathen philosophy and the heretical Gnosis to the Christian faith. He exerted an immeasurable influence in stimulating the development of the catholic theology and forming the great Nicene fathers, Athanasius, Basil, the two Gregories, Hilary, and Ambrose, who consequently, in spite of all his Deviations, set great value on his services. But his best disciples proved unfaithful to many of his most peculiar views, and adhered far more to the reigning faith of the Church. For, and in this, too, he is like Schleiermacher — he can by no means be called orthodox, either in the Catholic or in the Protestant sense. His leaning to idealism, his predilection for Plato, and his noble effort to reconcile Christianity with reason. and to commend it even to educated heathens and Gnostics, led him into many grand and fascinating errors" (*Ch. Hist.* 1:504, 505). "Christian science," says Pressense (*Heresy and Christian Martyrs*, p. 297 sq.), "is in Origen's view the full faith or knowledge, which rises to the direct contemplation of its object. and ascends from the visible Christ, 'known after the flesh,' to the Eternal Word. He falls into the same error as Clement in thinking too lightly of the

foundation of this transcendent knowledge that historical Gospel which is the very substance of the truths and in treating the letter of the Scriptures as a seal that needs to be broken. It remains none the less true that speculation is never with him a mere mental feat; that it is rather the aspiration of the entire being after the living and complete possession of the truth. Origen spoke the philosophical language, of his time. He resolutely dealt with the problems which occupied the minds of his contemporaries. In order rightly to estimate and understand him, we must bear constantly in mind that sublime and subtle pantheism which was the primary inspiration both of Valentinian Gnosticism and of Platonism. If his mind frequently forsakes the solid ground of psychological observation and exact history, to soar into vague regions which are neither heaven nor earth, it is because he is desirous to occupy a sphere as wide as that of his adversaries. Anxious to excel them in science no less than in faith he will not abandon to them any vantage ground. Like them, he peoples the infinite void with the creations of his imagination. To the AEons he opposes good and bad angels; he does not hesitate to invent a sort of mythology, of which the inspiration is Christian, but which in its bold additions to the positive statements of revelation necessarily becomes visionary. Herein is not the strength and beauty of his system. These are found in that bold vindication of liberty which is its central and vital principle. It may be said that the vast theological edifice reared by him is, as it were, the temple of liberty. Liberty is its foundation and its topstone; nay, it is more, it is the animating soul of the whole doctrine taught therein. Pantheistic naturalism had struck the whole world with a death chill. Origen reawakened it with the breath of liberty, restored it to life, and snatched it from the petrifying grasp of fatalism. In the boldness of his thought he denies the existence of necessity altogether. All the phenomena of the material world are free acts. Bodies owe their existence to the motions of the will. If matter gravitates or ascends, it is not by a simple physical law, but is connected with moral action. Liberty is the explanation of all things. The great merit of Origen is his endeavor to trace back all the diversity of things to one and the same idea. Unhappily his conception of liberty was incomplete, and his error on this fundamental point produced results all the more serious because of the close logical coherence of his system." "But such a man might in such an age," says Schaff, "hold heretical opinions without being a heretic. For Origen propounded his views always with modesty, and from sincere conviction of their agreement with Scripture, and that in a time when the Christian doctrine was as yet very indefinite in many points." For this

reason even unprejudiced Roman divines, such as Tillemont and Mohler, have shown Origen the greatest respect and leniency; a fact the more to be commended, since the Romish Church has steadily refused him, as well as Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, a place among the saints and the fathers in the stricter sense. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* bk. 6:1-6 et pass.; Hieronymus, *Cat.* c. liv, and *Ep.* 29, 41; Gregorius Thaumaturgus, *Oratio panegyrica in Ori. genenm*; Pamphilus, *Apologia Orig.* (all in the last vol. of Delarue); Huetius, *Origeniana* (Par. 1679, 2 vols.); Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. ii, ch. 38; Thomasius, *Origenes, ein Beitrag z. Dogmengeschichte* (Nuremberg, 18-37); Ritter, *Gesch. d. christlichen Philosophie*, I, 465 sq.; Baur, *Gesch. d. Dreieinigkeitslehre*, 1:186-243, 560-566; Meier, *Trinitatslehre*; Dr. Kahnis, *Monographie* (1847); Mohler, *Patrologie*; Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 33, 34; and especially Redepenning, *Origenes, eine Darstellungs. Lebens u. s. Lehre* (1841-1846, 2-vols.). See also Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i, 501-509 et pass.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 1:693 sq., et pass.; id. *Dognzaf*, p. 21 sq.; Pressense, *Early Years of Christianity Heresy and Doctrine*, bk. ii, ch. iv; *Martyrs. and Apologists*, bk. ii, ch. ii, § ii); Killen, *Anc. Ch.* p. 375 sq.; Hagenbach, *Gesch. der ersten 3 Jahrhr.* — ch. xiii, xiv.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. i; Bohringeri *Kiircheiiesch.* 1:104 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctrines* (see Index in vol. ii); Sefirockh, *Kirchengesch.* 4:29 sq. — ; Guericke, *Ch. Hist.* 1:104 sq.; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i; Neale *Hist. East. Ch. (Patriarchate. of Alexatdna;* bk.i.-§ 53)-; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol.*; v.; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 50 sq.,; 285, 404, 457, 460; Ueberweg, *Hist. Philos.* 1:315 sq.; Donaldson, *Literature* (see Index in vol. ii); Tillemont, — *Memoires Eccles.*; Ceillier, *Hist. des Auteurs Eccles.* 2:130 sq.; Rust, *Origen and his Chief Opponents; Taughn's Life and Writings of Origen; Bampton Lectures*, 1813, 1824,-1829, 1839; *Amer. Bibl. Repos.* 4:833 sq.' *Bib.Sac.* 2:378 sq.; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* 2:491 sq.; *Christian Examiner*, 10:306; 11:22; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 11:645; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* July, 1851; *Amer. Ch. Rev.* Oct. 1868; *Mercersburg Rev.* Oct. 1871, art. ii; *Univ. Qu.* April, 1874, art. vii; April, 1875, art. iv.

## Origenian Controversy

So distinguished a man as Origen could not fail to have great influence on the Church, not only while living, but even after his death. As during his lifetime he had opponents as well as partisans, so two parties continued in the Church a long time afterwards. As late as the 3d century we find bishop Methodius (d. 311) opposing the doctrine of Origen, and asserting the

absoluteness of God, in opposition to Origen, who teaches the creation as having had no beginning. Methodius also combated Origen's realistic views, particularly his eschatological doctrines, i.e. his spiritualizing tendencies. Many of his arguments, however, like those of other opponents of Origen, were based on a misunderstanding of his doctrines. On the other hand, the learned and pious Pamphilus of Caesarea, in Palestine († 309), in collaboration with his friend Eusebius, wrote in prison an apology for Origen. In this work the writers reveal and oppose the narrow-mindedness which led to the accusations of heresy preferred against Origen. It contains six books: the last is the work of Eusebius alone, being written after Pamphilus's martyrdom, and defended by him against the attacks of Marcellus of Ancyra. We now possess only the first book, in the incorrect translation of Rufinus, and a few fragments of the Greek text (published in Delarue's edition of Origen.; Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.*; and Routh, *Reliq. sacrae*).

Origen's name was also drawn into the Arian controversies, and used and abused by both parties for their own ends. The question of the orthodoxy of the great departed became in this way a vital issue of the day, and increased in interest with the increasing zeal for pure doctrine and the growing horror of all heresy. Upon this question three parties arose: free, progressive disciples, blind adherents, and blind opponents.

**1.** The true, independent followers of Origen drew from his writings much instruction and quickening, without committing themselves to his words, and, advancing with the demands of the time, attained a clearer knowledge of the specific doctrines of Christianity than Origen himself, without thereby losing esteem for his memory and his eminent services. Such men were, in the 4th century, Pamphilus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Didymus of Alexandria, and in a wider sense Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa; and among the Latin fathers, Hilary, and at first Jerome, who afterwards joined the opponents. Gregory of Nyssa, and perhaps also Didymus, even adhered to Origen's doctrine of the final salvation of all created intelligences.

**2.** The blind and slavish followers, incapable of comprehending the free spirit of Origen, clung to the letter, held all his immature and erratic views, laid greater stress on them than Origen himself, and pressed them to extremes. Such mechanical fidelity to a master is always apostasy from his spirit which tended towards continual growth in knowledge. To this class

belonged the Egyptian monks in the Nitrian mountains; four in a particular Dioscurus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, who are known by the name of “the tall brethren” (Ἀδελφοὶ μακροί, on account of their bodily size), and were very learned.

**3.** The opponents of Origen, some from ignorance, others from narrowness and want of discrimination, shunned his speculations as a source of the most dangerous heresies, and in him condemned at the same time all free theological discussion, without which no progress in knowledge is possible, and without which even the Nicene dogma would never have come into existence. To these belonged a class of Egyptian monks in the Scetic desert, with Pachomius at their head, who, in opposition to the mysticism and spiritualism of the Origenistic monks of Nitria, urged grossly sensuous views of divine things, so as to receive the name of Anthropomorphites. The Roman Church, in which Origen was scarcely known by name before the Arian disputes, shared in a general way the strong prejudice against him as an unsound and dangerous writer.

The leaders in the crusade against the bones of Origen was the bishop Epiphanius of Salamis (Constantia), in Cyprus († 403), an honest, well-meaning, and by his contemporaries highly respected, but violent, coarse, contracted, and bigoted monastic saint and heresy hunter. He had inherited from the monks in the deserts of Egypt an ardent hatred of Origen as an arch-heretic; and in his *Panarion*, or chest of antidotes for eighty heresies, branded Origen as the father of Arianism and many other errors (*Hoer.* 64); Epiphanius gave to documentary justification for this hatred from the numerous writings of Origen. Not content with this publication, he also endeavored, by journeying and oral discourse, to destroy everywhere the influence of the long-departed teacher of Alexandria, and considered himself, as doing God and the Church the greatest service thereby. With this object the aged bishop journeyed in 394 to Palestine, where Origen was still held in the highest consideration, especially with John, bishop of Jerusalem, and with the learned monks Rufinus and Jerome, the former of whom was at that time in Jerusalem and the latter in Bethlehem. Epiphanius delivered a blustering sermon in Jerusalem, excited laughter, and vehemently demanded the condemnation of Origen. John and Rufinus resisted; but Jerome, who had previously considered Origen the greatest Church teacher after the apostles, and had learned much from his exegetical writings, without adopting his doctrinal errors, yielded to a solicitude for the fame of his own orthodoxy, passed over to the

opposition, broke off Church fellowship with John, and involved himself in a most violent literary contest with his former friend Rufinus, which belongs to the *chronique scandaleuse* of theology. The schism was terminated indeed by the mediation of the patriarch Theophilus in 397, but the dispute broke out afresh. Jerome condemned in Origen particularly his doctrine of pre-existence, of the final conversion of the devils and of demons, and his spiritualistic sublimation of the resurrection of the body. Rufinus, having returned to the West (398) to meet this opposition, translated several works of Origen into Latin. He proceeded with great caution, altering occasionally the text, so as not to depart too greatly from the doctrine then prevailing in the Church, and succeeded in satisfying orthodox taste. Origen was accused by Jerome of being the originator of the Arian doctrine concerning the Trinity that it should not be said that the Son could see the Father, or the Spirit the Son; but this charge was certainly most unjust. True, his Christology had in it contradictory elements. He, on the one hand, attributed to Christ eternity, and other divine attributes which logically lead to the orthodox doctrine of the identity of substance; so that he was vindicated even by Athanasius, the two Cappadocian Gregorien, and Basil. But, on the other hand, in his zeal for the personal distinctions in the Godhead, he taught with equal clearness a separateness of essence between the Father and the Son, and the subordination of the Son, as a second or secondary God beneath the Father, and thus furnished a starting-point for the Arian heresy. The eternal generation of the Son from the will of the Father was, with Origen, the communication of a divine but secondary substance, and this idea, in the hands of the less devout and profound Arius, who, with his more rigid logic, could admit no intermediate being between God and the creature, deteriorated of the notion of the primal creature. But in general Arianism was much more akin to the spirit of the Antiochian school than to that of the Alexandrian, Origen was also accused of holding the doctrine of pre-mundane existence, and regarding the body as the prison of the soul; of teaching the resurrection of the corporeal body with different sexes; the unhistorical signification of paradise and of the history of creation; and the assertion of the loss of the divine image in man. The object of both was principally to defend themselves against the charge of Origenism, and to fasten it upon each other, and this not by a critical analysis and calm investigation of the teachings of Origen, but by personal denunciations and miserable invectives (comp. the description of their conduct by Zockler, *Hieronymus*, p. 396 sq.). The result of this controversy was that Rufinus

was cited before pope Anastasius (398-402), who condemned Origenism in a Roman synod, notwithstanding that Rufinus sent a satisfactory defense. Rufinus thereafter sought an asylum in Aquileia. He enjoyed the esteem of such men as Paulinus of Nola and Augustine, and died in Sicily (410).

Meanwhile a second act of this controversy was opened in Egypt, especially by the theologians of Alexandria, among whom the unprincipled, ambitious, and intriguing bishop Theophilus of Alexandria plays the leading part. This bishop at first as an admirer of Origen, and despised the anthropomorphite monks, but afterwards, through a personal quarrel with Isidore and "the four tall brethren," who refused to deliver the Church funds into his hands, he became an opponent of Origen, attacked his errors in several documents (399-403) (in *hisispistola Synodica ad episcopos Palestinos et ad Cyprios*, 400, and in three successive *Epistole Paschales*, from 401-403, all translated by Jerome, and forming Ep. 92, 96, 98, and 100 of his *Epistles*, according to the order of Vallarsi), and pronounced an anathema on Origen's memory, in which he was supported by Epiphanius, Jerome, and the Roman bishop Anastasius. At the same time he indulged in the most violent measures against the Origenistic monks, and banished them from Egypt. Most of these monks fled to Palestine; but some fifty, among whom were "the four tall brethren," went to Constantinople, and found there a cordial welcome with the bishop, John Chrysostom, in 401. But in this way that noble man, too, became involved in the dispute. As an adherent of the Antiochian school, and as a practical theologian, he had no sympathy with the philosophical speculations of Origen. Yet Chrysostom knew how to appreciate Origen's merits in the exposition of the Scriptures, and was impelled by Christian love and justice to intercede with Theophilus in behalf of the persecuted monks, though he did not admit them to the holy communion till they proved their innocence. Theophilus at once set every instrument in motion to overthrow the long-envied Chrysostom, and employed even Epiphanius, then almost an octogenarian, as a tool of his hierarchical plans. This old man journeyed in midwinter in 402 to Constantinople, in the imagination that by his very presence he would be able to destroy the thousand-headed hydra of heresy; and he would neither hold Church fellowship with Chrysostom, who assembled the whole clergy of the city to greet him, nor pray for the dying son of the emperor, until all Origenistic heretics should be banished from the capital, and he might publish the anathema from the altar. But he found that injustice was done to the Nitrian monks, and soon took ship again to Cyprus, saying to the

bishops who accompanied him to the seashore, "I leave to you the city, — the palace, and hypocrisy; but I go, for I must make great haste." He died in the ship in the summer of 403. However, what the honest coarseness of Epiphanius failed to effect was accomplished by the cunning of Theophilus, who now himself traveled to Constantinople, and immediately appeared as accuser and judge. He well knew how to use the dissatisfaction of the clergy, of the empress Eudoxia, and of the court with Chrysostom on account of his moral severity and his bold denunciations. In Chrysostom's own diocese, on an estate "at the oak" (πρὸς τὴν δρῦν, Synodus ad Quercum) in Chalcedon, he held a secret council of thirty-six bishops against Chrysostom, and there procured, upon false charges of immorality, unchurchly conduct, and high-treason, his deposition and banishment in 403' (see Hefele; 2:78 sq.). Chrysostom was recalled indeed in three days in consequence of an earthquake and the dissatisfaction of the people, but was again condemned by a council in 404, and banished from the court.

*SEE CHRYSOSTOM.*

The age could not indeed understand and appreciate the bold spirit of Origen, but was still accessible to the narrow piety of Epiphanius and the noble virtues of Chrysostom. Yet in spite of this prevailing aversion of the time to free speculation, Origen always retained many readers and admirers, especially among the monks in Palestine, two of whom, Domitian and Theodorus Askidas, came to favor and influence at the court of Justinian I; But under this emperor the dispute on the orthodoxy of Origen was renewed about the middle of the 6th century, in connection with the monophysite controversy; and, notwithstanding Theodorus's influence, his opponents, with the assistance of Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, caused Origen to be condemned in the *σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα* in 544. That this judgment was confirmed by the fifth oecumenical synod is highly improbable. But as the reading of Origen's writings had been made a heretical act by reason of their condemnation, no one ventured until very recent times he raised his voice for Origen, and his works and doctrines have gone out of sight, or passed out of existence. Says Schaff: "The vehement and petty personal quarrels over the orthodoxy of Origen brought no gain to the development of the Church doctrine. Indeed, the condemnation of Origen was a death-blow to theological science in the Greek Church, and left it to stiffen gradually into a mechanical traditionalism and formalism."

*Literature.* —



(I.) Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 64; several epistles of Epiphanius, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Jerome (in Jerome's *Ep.* 51 and 87-100, ed. Vallarsi); the controversial works of Jerome and Rufinus on the orthodoxy of Origen (Rufini *Prefatio ad Orig.* *περὶ ἄρχῶν*; and *Apologia s. invectivarium in Hieron.*; Hieronymi *Ep.* 84 *ad Panimdchium et Oceanuni de erroribus Origenis*; *Apolo cia ad Rufinum libri iii*, written 402, 403, etc.); Palladius, *Vitta Johannis Chrysostomi* (in Chrysost. *Operst*, vol. 13, ed. Monitfaucon); Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:3-18; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 8:2-20; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 5-27 sq.; Photius, *Biblioth. God.* 59; Mansi, *Con.* 3:1141 sq.

(II.) Huetius, *Origeiana (Opera Orig.* vol. iv, ed. Delarue); Doucin, *Hist. des mouvements arrives dans l'eglise au sujet. d' Origine* (Par. 1700); Walch, *Gesch. d. Ketzereien*, 7:427 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte*, 10:108 sq. Comp. also the monographs of Redepenning and Thomasius on Origen; and Neander, *Der heil. Joh. Chrysostomus* (Ber. 1848, 3d ed.), 2:121 sq.; Hefele (R. C.), *Origenistenstreit*, in the *Kirchen-Lexikon* of Wetzer und Welte, 7:847 sq., and in his *Conciliengeschichte*, 2:76 sq.; Zockler, *Hieronymus* (Gotha, 1865), p. 238 sq., 391 sq.; and especially Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* iii, 698-705; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* ii 536-538, 678-704; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* ii. 43.

## Origenians

SEE SKOPTSI.

## Origenism

SEE ORIGENISTS.

## Origenists

a title of two entirely distinct classes of heretics.

**1.** It is the name of certain heretical Christians who professed to adopt the theological views of the Church father *Origen* (q.v.). They developed as a body in the 4th century, and taught —

(1.) A pre-existent state of human souls, prior to the Mosaic creation, and perhaps for eternity which souls were clothed with ethereal bodies suited to their original dignity. SEE PRE-EXISTENTS.

(2.) That souls were condemned, to animate mortal bodies, in order to expiate faults they had committed in a pre-existent state; for we may be assured, from the infinite goodness of their Creator, that they were at first joined to the purest matter, and placed in those regions of the universe which were most suitable to the purity of essence that they then possessed. For that the souls of men are an order of essentially incorporate spirits, their deep immersion into terrestrial matter, the modification of all their operations by it, and the heavenly body promised in the Gospel, as the highest perfection of our renewed nature, clearly evince. Therefore, if our souls existed before they appeared as inhabitants of the earth, they were placed in a purer element, and enjoyed far greater degrees of happiness. And certainly he whose overflowing goodness brought them into existence would not deprive them of their felicity, till by their mutability they rendered themselves less pure in the whole extent of their powers, and became disposed for the susception of such a degree of corporeal life as was exactly answerable to their present disposition of spirit. Hence it was necessary that they should become terrestrial men.

(3.) That the soul of Christ was united to the Word before the incarnation; for the Scriptures teach us that the soul of the Messiah was created before the beginning of the world (<sup>4145</sup>Philippians 2:5, 7). This text must be understood of Christ's human soul, because it is unusual to propound the Deity as an example of humility in Scripture. Though the humanity of Christ was so godlike, he emptied himself of this fullness of life and glory to take upon him the form of a servant. It was this Messiah who conversed with the patriprs under human form; it was he who appeared to us on the holy mount; it was he who spoke to the prophets under a visible appearance; and it is he who will at last come in triumph upon the clouds to restore the universe to its primitive splendor and felicity.

(4.) That at the resurrection of the dead we shall be clothed with ethereal bodies; for the elements of our terrestrial composition are such as almost fatally entangle us in vice, passion, and misery. The purer the vehicle the soul is united with, the more perfect are her life and operations. — Besides, the Supreme Goodness who made all things assures us he made all things best at first, and therefore his recovery of us to our lost happiness (which is the design of the Gospel) must restore us to our better bodies and happier habitations, which is evident from <sup>4150</sup>1 Corinthians 15:49; <sup>4151</sup>2 Corinthians 5:1; and other texts of Scripture.

(5.) That, after long periods of time, the damned shall be released from their torments, and restored to a new state of probation; for the Deity has such reserve in his gracious providence as will vindicate his sovereign goodness and wisdom from all disparagement. Expiatory pains are a part of his adorable plan; for this sharper kind of favor has a righteous place in such creatures as are by nature mutable. Though sin has extinguished or silenced the divine life, yet it has not destroyed the faculties of reason and understanding, consideration and memory, which will serve the life which is most powerful. If, therefore, the vigorous attraction of the sensual nature be abated by a ceaseless pain, these powers may resume the goods of a better life and nature. As in the material system there is a gravitation of the lesser bodies towards the greater, there must of necessity be something analogous to this in the intellectual system; and since the spirits created by God are emanations and streams from his own abyss of being, and as self-existent power must needs subject all beings to itself, the Deity could not but impress upon intimate natures and substances a central tendency towards himself; an essential principle of reunion to their great original. (This doctrine, in a somewhat modified form, is now advocated by some English divines. — Very recently the Rev. Edward Eliot has come out as the advocate of *conditional* immortality in his *Life in Christ* [Lond. 1875; See *Brit. and For. Evang. Rep.* Jan. 1876.)

(6.) That the earth, after its conflagration, shall become habitable again, and be the mansion of men and animals, and that in eternal vicissitudes. For it is thus expressed in Isaiah: “Behold, I make new heavens and a new earth,” etc.; and in <sup>8010</sup>Hebrews 1:10, 12, “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed,” etc. Where there is only a change, the substance is not destroyed, this change being only as that of a garment worn out and decaying. The fashion of the world passes away like a turning scene, to exhibit a fresh and new representation of things; and if only the present dress and appearance of things go off, the substance is supposed to remain entire. *SEE MILLENARIANS.*

By the 6th century the Origenists had completely subsided, and there have been no attempts in the Church at revival. — *SEE ORIGEN; SEE ORIGENIAN CONTROVERSY.*

2. Origenists is also the name given to a sect of heretical Christians who, as appears from Epiphanius, were followers of some unknown Origen, a

person quite different from the father of the 2d and 3d centuries. In one place indeed Epiphanius (a very bitter opponent of Origenistic opinions) says he is ignorant whether or not the sect was derived from him. (Epiph. *Panar.* 63, 64); but in another he speaks of them without doubt as followers of some other Origen (*Anacephal.*). These Origenists are spoken of as given to shameful vices, but nothing further is mentioned of them. There was an Alexandrian philosopher of the same name, contemporary with the great Origen, but there is nothing known which connects him with the sect. Philaster is silent about them, while Augustine and Praedestinatus are only able to repeat the statement of Epiphanius.

### Origin of Evil

*SEE EVIL; SEE SIN.*

### Origin of Man

*SEE MAN; SEE PREADAMITES.*

### Origin of Species

*SEE CREATION; SEE SPECIES.*

### Original Antiburghers

is the name usually given to those Scotch Presbyterians who seceded in 1806 from the General Associate (Antiburgher) Synod of Scotland. *SEE ANTIBURGHERS.* The occasion of their secession is generally called the "Old and New Light Controversy." This was a consideration of the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. The early seceders had held what is commonly termed the Establishment principle. Gradually a change of opinion came over a part of the body, and some were disposed to question, the expediency and New-Testament authority for national Church establishments. In 1793 it became a subject of debate in the General Associate Synod, and from that time New-Light or Anti-Establishment principles gained many advocates. Year after year the subject was keenly discussed, and in 1804 the *Narrative and Testimony*, or a new Secession Testimony, embodying these proposed views as those of the secession body, was adopted by the General Synod. A small number of members, however, headed by Dr. Thomas M'Crie, protested against the New Testimony as embodying, in their view, important deviations from the original principles of the first seceders. When at length the Narrative and

Testimony came to be enacted as a term of communion, Dr. M'Crie, and the brethren who adhered to his sentiments, felt that it was difficult for them conscientiously to remain in communion with the synod. They were most reluctant to separate from their brethren, and accordingly they retained their position in connection with the body for two years after the New Testimony had been adopted by the synod. At length the four brethren, Messrs. Bruce, Aitken, Hogg, and M'Crie, finding that they could no longer content themselves with mere unavailing protests against the doings of the synod, solemnly separated from the body, and constituted themselves into a presbytery, under the designation of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery. But though they had taken this important step, they did not consider it prudent to make a public announcement of their meeting until they had full time to publish the reasons for the course they had adopted. Yet, as they did not affect secrecy in the matter, intelligence of the movement reached the General Associate Synod, then sitting in Glasgow, which accordingly, without the formalities of a legal trial, deposed and excommunicated Dr. M'Crie. The points of difference between the original Secession Testimony and the "Narrative and Testimony" which led to the secession of the four protesters and the formation of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery cannot be better stated than in the following extract from the explanatory address which Dr. M'Crie delivered at the time to his own congregation:

"The New Testimony expressly asserts that the power competent to worldly kingdoms is to be viewed as respecting only the secular interests of society, in distinction from their religious interests. It is easy to see that this principle not only tends to exclude nations and their rulers from all interference with religion, from employing their power for promoting a religions reformation and advancing the kingdom of Christ, but also virtually condemns what the rulers of this, land did in former times of reformation), which the original Testimony did bear witness to as a work of God. Accordingly this reformation is viewed as a mere ecclesiastical reformation; and the laws made by a reforming Parliament, etc., in so far as they recognized, ratified, and established the Reformed religion, are either omitted, glossed over, or explained away. In the account of the first Reformation the abolition of the laws in favor of popery is mentioned, but a total and designed silence is observed respecting all the laws made in favor of the Protestant Confession and Discipline, by which the nation in its most public capacity stated itself to be on the side of Christ's cause; and

eves the famous deed of civil constitution; settled on a reformed footing in 1592, is buried and forgotten. The same thing is observable in the account of the second Reformation. On one occasion it is said that the king gave his consent to such acts as were thought necessary for securing the civil and religious rights of the nation, without saying whether they were right or wrong. But all the other laws of the reforming parliaments during the period, which were specified and approved in the former papers of the secession, and even the settlement of the civil constitution in 1649, which was formerly considered as the crowning part of Scotland's Reformation and liberties, is passed over without mention or testimony. Even that wicked act of the Scottish Parliament after the restoration of Charles II., by which all the laws establishing and ratifying the Presbyterian religion' and covenants were rescinded, is passed over in its proper place in the acknowledgment of sins, and when it is mentioned is condemned with reserve; nor was this done inadvertently, for if the Presbyterian religion ought not to have been established by law, it is not easy to condemn a Parliament for rescinding that establishment.

“Another point which has been in controversy is the national obligation of the religions covenants entered into in this land. The doctrine of the New Testimony is that ‘religions covenanting is entirely an ecclesiastical duty;’ that persons ‘enter into it as members of the Church, and not as members of the State;’ that those invested with civil power have no other concern with it than as Church members; and accordingly it restricts the obligation of the covenants of this land to persons of all ranks only in their spiritual character and as Church members. But it cannot admit of a doubt that the National and Solemn League and Covenant were national oaths in the most proper sense of the word; that they were intended as such by those who framed them, and that they were thus interpreted by the three kingdoms; the civil rulers entering into them, enacting them, and setting them forward in their public capacity, as well as the ecclesiastical. And the uniform opinions of Presbyterians from the time they were taken has been that they are binding in a national as well as ecclesiastical point of view. I shall only produce the testimony of one respectable Writer (principal Forrester): “The binding force” says he, “of these engagements appears in the subjects they affect; as, first, our Church in her representatives, and, in their most public capacity, the general assemblies in both nations: second, the state representatives and parliaments. Thus all assurances are given that either civil or ecclesiastical laws can afford; and the public faith of Church and

State, is plighted with inviolable ties, so that they must stand while we have a Church or State in Scotland. Both as men and as Christians, as members of the Church and State, under either a religious or civil consideration, we stand hereby inviolably endangered; and not only representatives, but also the incorporations (or body) of Church and State are under the same. On this broad ground have Presbyterians stated the obligation of the covenants of this kind. And why should they not? Why should we seek tomorrow their obligation? Are we afraid that these lands should be too closely bound to the Lord? If religious covenanting be a moral duty, if oaths and vows are founded in the light of nature as well as in the Word of God, why should not men be capable of entering into them, and of being bound by them in every character in which they are placed under the moral government of God, as men and as Christians, as members of the Church and of the State, whenever there is a call to enter into such covenants as have respect to all these characters, as was the case in the covenants of our ancestors, which seceders have witnessed for and formally renewed? In the former Testimony witness was expressly borne to the national obligation of these covenants. In speaking of the National Covenant, it says, 'By this solemn oath and covenant this kingdom made a national surrender of themselves unto the Lord.' It declares that the Solemn League and Covenant was entered into and is binding upon the three kingdoms; that both of them are binding upon the Church and lands, and the Church and nations. The deed of civil constitutions is said to have been settled in consequence of the most solemn covenant engagements, and the rescinding of the law in favor of the true religion is testified against as an act of national perjury. Yet by the New Testimony, all are bound to declare that religious covenanting is entirely an ecclesiastical duty, and binding only on the Church and her members, as such; and that those invested with civil power have no other concern with it but as Church members. Is it any wonder that there should be seceders who cannot submit to receive such doctrine? The time will come when it will be matter of astonishment that so few have appeared in such a cause, and that those who have appeared, should have been borne down, opposed, and spoken against. It is not a matter of small moment to restrict the obligation of solemn oaths, the breach of which is chargeable upon a land, or to explain away any part of that obligation. The quarrel of God's covenant is not yet thoroughly pleaded by him against these guilty and apostatizing lands, and all that have any due sense of the inviolable obligation of them should tremble at touching or enervating them in the smallest point."

At the request of the brethren Dr. M'Crie drew up and published a paper explanatory of the principles involved in the controversy which had led to the breach. This work appeared in April, 1807, and was regarded by those who took an interest in the subject as exhibiting a very satisfactory view of the principles of the Constitutional Associate Presbytery. But, however able, this treatise attracted little attention at the time, although copies of it were eagerly sought many years after, when the Voluntary Controversy engrossed much of the public interest. The Constitutional Presbytery continued steadfastly to maintain their principles, along with the small number of people who adhered to them, and from all who sought to join them they required an explicit avowal of adherence to the principles of the secession as contained in the original Testimony. For twenty-one years the brethren prosecuted their work and held fast their principles in much harmony and peace with one another, and to the great edification of the flocks committed to their care. In 1827 a change took place in their ecclesiastical position, a cordial union having been effected between the Constitutional Presbytery and the Associate Synod of Protesters, under the name of the *Associate Synod of Original Seceders*. **SEE ORIGINAL SECEDERS** (ASSOCIATE SYNOD OF).

### Original Burghers

is the name of that body of secessionists from the Scotch Establishment who in the schism of 1747 remained steadfast to the oath obligation, and favored the National Establishment, though they did not form a part of it. **SEE ANTIBURGHERS**. In the agitation regarding the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion, and the binding obligation of the covenants upon posterity, towards the close of the 18th century, the Associate General (Antiburgher) Synod had deemed it necessary to remodel the whole of their testimony, a proceeding which led to the formation of the *Original Antiburghers* (q.v.). The Associate (Burgher) Synod, however, did not proceed so far as to remodel their Testimony, but simply prefixed to the formula of questions proposed to candidates for license or for ordination a problem or explanatory statement not requiring an approbation of compulsory measures in matters of religion, and, in reference to the covenants, admitting their obligation on posterity, without defining either the nature or extent of the obligation. The introduction of this preamble gave rise to a violent controversy in the Associate (Burgher) Synod, which commenced in 1795, and has usually been known by the name of the Formula Controversy. The utmost keenness and even 'violence'



characterized both parties in the contention, the opponents of the preamble declaring that it involved a manifest departure from the doctrines of the original standards of the secession, while its favorers contended with equal vehemence that the same statements as those which were now objected to had already been given forth more than once by the Church courts of the secession. At several successive meetings of the synod the adoption of the preamble was strenuously resisted, but at length, in 1799, it was agreed to in the following terms:

“That whereas some parts of the standard of this synod have been interpreted as favoring compulsory measures in religion, the synod hereby declare that they do not require an approbation of any such principle from any candidate for license or ordination. And whereas a controversy has arisen among us respecting the nature and kind of the obligation of our solemn covenants on posterity — whether it be entirely of the same kind upon us as upon, our ancestors who swore them the synod hereby declare that, while they hold the obligation of our covenants upon posterity, they do not interfere with that controversy which has arisen respecting the nature and kind of it; and recommend it to all their members to suppress that controversy as tending to a general strife rather than godly edifying.”

The adoption of this preamble having been decided upon by a large majority of the synod, Messrs. William Fletcher, William Taylor, and William Watson, ministers, with ten elders, dissented from this decision; and Mr. Willis gave in the following protestation, to which Mr. Ebenezer Hyslop and two elders adhered:

“I protest in my own name, and in the name of ail ministers, elders, and private Christians who adhere to this protest, that as the synod has obstinately refused to remove the preamble prefixed to the Formula, and declare their simple and unqualified adherence to our principles I will no more acknowledge them as over me in the Lord until they return to their principles.” Messrs. Willis and Hyslop having thus, in the very terms of their protest, declared themselves no longer in connection with the synod, their names were erased from the roll; and those who adhered to them were declared to have cut themselves off from the communion, of the Associate body. Accordingly, on Oct. 2, 1799, the two brethren who had thus

renounced the authority of the synod met at Glasgow, along with William Watson, minister to Kilpatrick, and solemnly constituted themselves into a presbytery, under the name of the Associate Presbytery. This was the commencement of that section of the secession formerly known by the name of "Old Light" or "Original Burghers." In the course of the following year the brethren who had thus separated themselves from the Associate Burgher Synod were joined by several additional ministers, who sympathized with them in their views of the preamble as being an abandonment of secession principles. Gradually the new presbytery increased in numbers until, in 1805, they had risen by ordinations and accessions to fifteen. They now constituted themselves into a synod, under the name of the "Associate Synod;" but the name by which they have been usually known is the *Original Burgher Synod*. In vindication as well as explanation of their principles, they republished the "Act, Declaration, and Testimony" of the Secession Church. They also published, in a separate pamphlet, an Appendix of the Testimony, containing "A Narrative of the origin, progress, and consequences of late innovations of the Secession, with a Continuation of that Testimony to the present time."

In course of time a union was proposed to be effected between the Original Burgher and Original Antiburgher sections of the secession, and, with a view to accomplishing an object so desirable, a correspondence was entered into between the synods of the two denominations, committees were appointed, and conferences held to arrange the terms of union. But the negotiations, though continued for some time, were fruitless, and the project of union was abandoned. In 1837 a formal application was made by the Original Burgher Synod to be admitted to communion with the Established Church of Scotland. The proposal was favorably entertained by the General Assembly and a committee was appointed to cope with a committee of the Original Burgher Synod and to discuss the terms of union. The negotiations were conducted in the most amicable manner; and a General Assembly having transmitted an overture to presbyteries on the subject, the union was approved, and in 1840 the majority of the Original Burgher Synod became merged in the National Church of Scotland. A small minority of the synod declined to accede to the union, preferring to maintain a separate position, and to adhere to the secession Testimony, still retaining the name of the Associate or *Original Burgher Synod*. On May

18, 1842, most of the Original Burghers who remained after their brethren had joined the Established Church, united with the synod of *Original Seceders*, henceforth to form one association for the support of the covenanted Reformation in the kingdoms, under the name of *Synod of United Original Seceders*. It had previously been agreed that the Testimony adopted by the Synod of Original Seceders in 1827, with the insertion in it of the alterations rendered necessary by the union, was to be held as the Testimony of the United Synod, and made a term of religious fellowship in the body. The Synod of Original Burghers was understood to approve of the acknowledgment of sins and bond appended to: the Testimony, and it was agreed to by the Synod of Original Seceders that the question of the formula regarding the burghess-oath should be dropped. On these conditions the union was effected, and the Synod of Original Burghers as then constituted ceased to exist.

At the present time, however, there appear to remain in existence twenty-seven. congregations of Original Burghers. They have arranged upon the preliminaries for union with a small body in Ireland holding identical views, and calling themselves the *Associate Secession Synod*. This body consists of only eleven congregations. These Original Burghers have to this day continued consistently to maintain the views upon which the secession was at its origin based. They strongly vindicate the duty and necessity of national religion, and are therefore in favor of national establishments in opposition to the United Presbyterians and other advocates of the voluntary system. They are consequently also opposed to schemes for reunion among all Presbyterians, as these would involve the admission of voluntarism in making the principle of establishment an open question. But their establishment must be one which is based upon the Solemn League and Covenant, which was declared to be binding at the union of the two bodies in 1840, and in 1866 was solemnly renewed by the synod. They are Calvinists of the strictest type, holding the doctrine of a limited atonement that Christ suffered only for the elect. They are opposed to the use of hymns and instrumental music in public worship. The *Original Secession Magazine*, a periodical which appears once in two months; is the authorized organ of the views and proceedings of the synod. See *Original Secession Magazine*; Oliver and Boyd's *'Edinb. Almanac*; Marsdeni, *Hist. of Churches and Sects*, ii 293 sq.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, vol. ii, s.v.; and the references under **SEE SCOTLAND** and **SEE SCOTCH PRESBYTERIANISM**.

## Original Seceders (1) (Associate Synod Of)

is the name of a body of Scotch Presbyterians who originated in 1827 by union of what was then the *Constitutional Associate Presbytery* and the *Associate (Antiburgher): Synod*, now generally known as *Protesters* (q.v.) because they took exception in 1820 to the Basis of Union between the two great branches of the secession. **SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE PRESBYTERIANISM IN SCOTLAND.** The articles agreed upon as such a basis were drawn up by Dr. M'Crie, on the one side, and Prof. Paxton on the other. The Testimony, which was enacted as a term of fellowship, ministerial and Christian, in the *Associate Synod of Original Seceders*, was drawn up in the historical part by Dr. M'Crie, and nowhere do we find a more noble, luminous, and satisfactory view of the true Seceders, and of their contendings for the Reformation in a state of secession. Dr. M'Crie shows that the four brethren who formed the first Seceders, though soon after this deed of secession they formed themselves into a presbytery (Dec. 6, 1733), still for some time acted in an extra-judicial capacity, and in this capacity they issued, in 1734, a "Testimony for the Principles of the Reform Church of Scotland." It was not, indeed, until two years more had elapsed that they resolved to act in a judicative capacity, and accordingly, in December, 1736, they published their judicial Testimony to the principles and proceedings of the Church of Scotland, and against the course of defection from them. This Testimony, as Dr. M'Crie shows, was not limited to those evils which had formed the immediate ground of secession, but included others also of a prior date, the condemnation of which entered into the Testimony which the faithful party in the Church had all along borne. The whole of that Testimony they carried along with them to a state of secession. In prosecuting their Testimony, they deemed it their solemn duty to renew the national covenants, the neglect of which had often been complained of in the Established Church since the Revolution. The points of difference between the *Original Seceders* and the *Cameronians* or *Reform Presbyterians* are thus admirably sketched by Dr. M'Crie in the historical part of the Testimony of 1827:

“1. We acknowledge that the fundamental deed of constitution in our reforming period, in all moral aspects, is essentially unalterable, because of its agreeableness to the Divine will revealed in the Scriptures, and because it was attained to and fixed in the presence of our solemn covenants; and that the, nation sinned in overthrowing it.

2. We condemn the conduct of the nation at the Revolution in leaving the Reformed Constitution buried and neglected; and in not looking out for magistrates who should concur with them in the maintenance of true religion, as formerly settled, and rule them by laws subservient to its advancement.
3. We condemn not only the conduct of England and Ireland, at that period, in retaining episcopacy, but also the conduct of Scotland in not reminding them of their obligations, and in every way competent exciting them to reformation, conformably to a prior treaty and covenant; and particularly the consent which this kingdom gave at the union to the perpetual continuance of episcopacy in England, with all that flowed from this and partakes of its sinful character.
4. We condemn the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown as established by laws in England and Ireland and all the assumed exercise of it in Scotland, particularly by dissolving the assemblies of the Church, and claiming the sole right of appointing fasts and thanksgivings, together with the practical compliances with it on the part of Church courts or ministers in the discharge of their public office.
5. We condemn the abjuration-oath, and other oaths which, either in express terms or by just implication, approve of the complex constitution.
6. We consider that there is a great difference between the arbitrary and tyrannical government of the persecuting period and that which has existed since the Revolution, which was established with the cordial consent of the great body of the nation, and in consequence of a claim of right made by the representatives of the people, and acknowledged by the rulers; who, although they want (as the nation does) many of the qualifications which they ought to possess: according to the Word of God and our covenants, yet perform the essential duties of magistratical office by maintaining justice, peace, and order to the glory of God, and protecting us in the enjoyment of our liberties and the free exercise of our religion. Lastly, holding these views, and endeavoring to act according to them, we can, without dropping our testimony in behalf of a former reforming period, or approving of any of the evils which cleave to the constitution or administration of the state, acknowledge the present civil government, and yield obedience to all

its lawful commands, not for wrath but for conscience sake; and in doing so we have this advantage, that we avoid the danger of partially disregarding the numerous precepts respecting the obedience to magistrates contained in the Bible — we have no need to have recourse to gloss upon these, which, if applied to other precepts running in the same strain, would tend to loosen all the relations of civil life — and we act in unison with the principles and practice of the Christians of the first ages who lived under heathen or Arian emperors; of Protestants who have lived under popish princes; of our reforming fathers in Scotland under queen Mary, and of their successors during the first establishment of episcopacy, and after the Restoration down to the time at which the government degenerated into an open and avowed tyranny.”

On the question as to the lawfulness of taking the burgess-oath, which so early as 1747 rent the secession body into two sections, the Original Seceders avowed in their Testimony a decided coincidence in statement with the Antiburghers. This is plain from the following explanations given by Dr. M'Crie, in which the religious clause in the oath is shown to be inconsistent with the secession Testimony:

**1.** As it is a matter of great importance to swear by the great name of God, so the utmost caution should be taken to ascertain the lawfulness of any oath which we are required to take; and it is the duty of ministers and Church courts to give direction and warning to their people in such cases, especially when the oath embraces a profession of religion, and more especially when the persons required to take it are already under the obligation of another oath sanctioning an explicit profession of religion, in consequence of which they may be in danger of involving themselves in contradictory engagements.

**2.** We cannot be understood as objecting to the clause in question on account of its requiring an adherence to the true religion, and in an abstract view of it as determined by the standard of the Scriptures (if it could be understood in that sense), in opposition to the Romish, which is renounced, or an adherence to the Confession of Faith, and any part of the standards compiled for uniformity in the former Reformation, so far as these are still approved of by the acts of the Church- of Scotland, and authorized by the laws. In these respects we account the Revolution settlement and the present laws a privilege, and agree to all

which the Associate Presbytery thankfully expressed in commendation of them in their Testimony, and in the declaration and defense of their principles concerning the present civil government.

**3.** The profession of religion required by the burgess-oath is of a different kind. If this were not the case, and if it referred only to the true religion in the abstract, and every swearer were left to understand this according to his own views, the oath would not serve the purpose of a test, nor answer the design of the imposer. The Romish religion is specially renounced; but there is also a positive part in the clause, specifying in the religion professed in this realm and authorized by the laws of the land; while the word *presently* will not admit of its applying to any professions different from that which is made and authorized at the time when the oath is sworn.

**4.** The profession of the true religion made by Seceders, agreeing with that which was made in this country *in* and authorized *by* the laws between 1638 and 1650, is different from, and in some important points inconsistent with that profession which is presently made by the nation and authorized by the laws of the land. The judicial Testimony finds fault with the national profession and settlement made at the Revolution, both materially and formally considered, and condemns the state for excluding, in its laws authorizing religion, the divine right of presbytery and the intrinsic power of the Church — two special branches of the glorious leadership of the Redeemer over his spiritual kingdoms — and for leaving the covenanted reformation and the covenants under rescissory laws; while it condemns the Church for not asserting these important parts of religion and reformation. On these grounds we cannot but look upon the religions clause in question as inconsistent with the secession Testimony; and accordingly must disapprove of the decision of the synod commended in the swearing of it by Seceders.

**5.** As that which brought matters to an extremity, and divided the body, was a vote declaring that all might swear that oath, while at the same time it was condemned as unlawful, we cannot help being of opinion that this held out a dangerous precedent to Church courts to give a judicial toleration or allowance to do what they declare to be sinful; but provided this were disclaimed, and proper measures taken to prevent the oath from being sworn in the body for the future, and as the use of

the oath has been laid aside in most burghs, we would hope that such an arrangement may be made, so far as regards this question, as will be at once agreeable to truth and not hurtful to the conscience of any. With respect to the censures which were inflicted, and which had no small influence in embittering the dispute, we think it sufficient to say that they were transient acts of ill discipline, and that no approbation of them was ever required from ministers or people. If any difference of opinion as to the nature or effects of Church censure exist, it may be removed by an amicable conference."

At the formation of the *United Secession Church*, in 1820, by the union of the "Associate (Burgher) Synod" and the "General Associate (Antiburgher) Synod," a number of ministers belonging to the latter body protested against the Basis of Union. And one of them formed themselves into a separate court, under the name of Associate Synod. This body of Protesters, as they were generally called, having merged themselves in 1827 in the body which took the name of the Synod of Original Seceders, it was only befitting that the Testimony then issued should speak in decided language on the defects of the Basis of Union, which led the Protesters to occupy a separate position. Dr. M'Crie accordingly thus details the chief points protested against:

**1.** The Basis is not laid on an adherence to the covenanted Reformation and Reformed principles of the Church of Scotland. In seceding from the established jurisdictions, our fathers, as we have seen, espoused that cause; declared their adherence to the Westminster standards as parts of the uniformity in religion for the three nations; declared the obligation which the ranks in them were under to adhere to these by the oath of God; testified against several important defects in the Revolution settlement of religion; and traced the recent corruptions of which they complain to a progressive departure from the purity obtained in the second period of Reformation. The United Synod, on the contrary, proceeds in the Basis on the supposition that the Revolution settlement was faultless — agreeably to it they receive the Westminster Conference and Catechisms, not as subordinate standards of uniformity for the three nations, but merely (to use their own words) 'as the confession of our faith, expressive of the sense in which we understand the Holy Scriptures;' they exclude entirely from their Basis the propositions concerning the Church government and the Directory for public worship drawn up by the Westminster Assembly; and they merely recognize presbytery as the only form of government which



they acknowledge as founded upon the Word of God, although the first Seceders, in their Testimony, condemned the Church at the Revolution for not asserting expressly the divine right of the Presbyterian government. Besides, the exception which they made to the confessions and catechisms is expressed in such a manner as to give countenance to an unwarranted stigma on these standards as teaching persecuting principles: and as it was well known that this was offensive to not a few, by agreeing to it they on that matter perpetrated two divisions in attempting to heal one.

**2.** The testimony to the continued obligation of the National Covenant and the Solemn League is dropped. These deeds are not so much as named in the Basis. When the United Synod approved of the method adopted by our reforming ancestors for mutual excitement and encouragement, by solemn confederation and vows to God, this can never be considered as a recognition of the present and continued obligation of our national covenants; and still less can we regard in this light the following declaration, including all they say on the subject: 'We acknowledge that we are under high obligations to maintain and promote the work of reformation begun and to great extent carried on by them.'

**3.** Though the morality of public religious covenanting is admitted by the Basis, yet the present seasonableness of it is not asserted; any provision made for the practice of it is totally irreconcilable with the Presbyterian principles, being adapted only to covenanting on the plan of the Congregationalists or Independents, and not for confining the conforming the profession of the united body; and in the bond transmitted by the general synod, and registered by the general synod, and to be taken by, those who choose all idea of the renovation of the covenants of our ancestors is set aside, and the recognition of their obligations, formally made, is expounded.

**4.** By adoption the Basis, any testimony which had been formerly borne against sinful oaths, and other practical evils inconsistent with pure religion and a scriptural and consistent profession of it, was dropped; and all barriers against the practice of what is called free communion, which has become so general and fashionable, are removed.

**5.** With respect to the burgess-oath, we have already expressed our views, and candidly stated what we judge to best way of accommodating the difference which is occasioned in the Associate Body. Of the method adopted for this purpose in the Basis we shall only say that, while. on the

one hand, by making no provision for preventing the sealing of an oath, which all along has been viewed as sinful by one half of the secession, it tends to bring all contending against public evils, and for purity of communion, into discredit with the generation; so, on the other hand, by providing that all in the united body shall carefully abstain from agitating the questions which occasioned the breach, it retains ministerial and Christian liberty in testifying against sin, and on that matter absolves the ministers and elders of one of the synods from an express article in their ordination vows." At the meeting of the synod in 1828, the Original Seceders enacted that all the ministers of their body, together with the preachers and students of divinity under their inspection, should enter into the bond for renewing the covenants at Edinburgh on the 18th of the following September. Two years thereafter the synod authorized a committee of their number to prepare and publish an address to their people on the duty of public covenanting and on practical religion. In 1832 a controversy arose in Scotland, which is usually known by the name of Voluntary Controversy (q.v.), involving important principles touching the duty of nations and their rulers to recognize, countenance, and support the true religion. In the heat of the controversy, the Synod of Original Seceders deemed it right to issue an address on the subject. This production, entitled "Vindication of the Principles of the Church of Scotland, in Relation to the Questions presently agitated," was published in 1834. It condemned the voluntary system on various grounds:

- 1, On account of its atheistical character and tendency;
- 2, as at variance with sound policy;
- 3, as unscriptural;
- 4, as directly opposed to one important design of supernatural relations — the improvement of human society;
- 5, as striking at the foundation of God's moral government, so far as regards nations or bodies politic.

While thus maintaining in the strongest and most decided manner the principles of establishments in opposition to the voluntary principle, the Original Seceders took occasion, in the course of the same pamphlet, to lay down with equal distinctness the ground on which they felt themselves

excluded from all prospect of an immediate return to the communion of the Established Church.

“Our objections,” they say, “to the Established Church of Scotland are not confined to the administration: we cannot unreservedly approve of her constitution as it is established in the Revolution. Though our fathers were in communion with that Church, yet they, together with many faithful men who died before the secession, and some who continued in the Establishment after that event, were all along dissatisfied with several things in the settlement of religion at the Revolution, and in the ratification of it at the union between Scotland and England. The first Seceders, in their 'Judicial Testimony and Declaration of Principles,' specified several important points, with respect to which that settlement involved a sinful departure from the previous settlement of religion in Scotland (that, namely, between 1638 and 1650), which they distinctly held forth as exhibiting the model, in point of scriptural purity and order, of that reformed constitution to which they sought by their contending to bring back the Church of their native land. This synod occupy the same ground with the first seceders. They are aware that the Established Church of Scotland has it not in her power to correct all the evils of the Revolution settlement which they feel themselves bound to point out; but they cannot warrantably quit their position of secession until the Established Church shows a disposition to return to that former constitution by using means to correct what is inconsistent with her, in the use of those powers which belong to her as an ecclesiastical and independent society under Christ, her Head, and by due application to the state for having those laws rescinded or altered which affect her purity and abridge her freedom. It will be found, on a careful and candid examination that a great part of the evils, in point of administration, which are chargeable on the Church of Scotland may be traced, directly or indirectly, to the defects and errors cleaving to her establishment at the Revolution; and as it is her duty, so it will be her safety seriously to consider these, and, following the direction of, Scripture and the example of our reforming ancestors, to confess them before God, and seek for their removal.”

The evils to which the document here refers were chiefly a want of a formal recognition of the national covenants, of the divine right of presbytery, and of the spiritual independence of the Church.

The year in which the “Vindication” appeared formed an important era in the history of the Established Church of Scotland, since from that date commenced that line of policy in the General Assembly which resulted at length in the disruption in 1843. It was not to be expected that the *Original Seceders*, feeling, as they did, a lively interest in every movement of the National Church, could look with indifference on the crisis of her history upon which she was entering. In the following year, accordingly, a pamphlet was drawn up, remarkable as being the last production which issued from the pen of the venerable Dr. M’Crie, entitled “Reasons of a Fast,” appointed by the Associate Synod of Original Seceders, and containing several remarkable allusions to the peculiar circumstances of the Church of Scotland. Nor were such allusions inappropriate or unreasonable. From that period the struggles of the Established Church to maintain spiritual independence, and to protect the rights of Christian people against the intrusion of unacceptable ministers, became the all-engrossing subject of attention in Scotland. The views of the Original Seceders were in harmony with the majority of the General Assembly; and the important proceedings from year to year of that venerable court were watched with deep and ever-increasing anxiety. At length, in 1842, a change took place in the position of the Original Seceders, a union having been formed between that body and the Associate Synod, commonly called the Synod of Original Burghers, which gave rise to a new denomination, entitled the *Synod of United Original Seceders* (see next article).

### Original Seceders (2) (Synod Of United)

is that body of Scotch Presbyterians organized in 1842, as was seen in preceding article, by union of the Synod of Original Burghers with the Synod of Original Seceders. Previous to the final act for this union it had been agreed that the Testimony adopted by the Synod of Original Seceders in 1827, with the insertion in it of several alterations rendered necessary by the union, should be taken as the Testimony of the United Synod. One important alteration agreed to by the Synod of Original Seceders was that the question in the formula regarding the burgess-oath should be dropped. To understand the position which the United body of Original Seceders occupied after the union, it must be borne in mind that the Testimony of 1827, which was drawn up in its historical part by Dr. M’Crie, was essentially Antiburgher in its whole nature and bearings. This element was dropped in the Testimony of 1842, and thus the character of the

Testimony underwent an important change. On this the united body gave the following explanation in the historical part of the Testimony of 1842: “The Synod of Original Seceders, in their Testimony, published in 1827, after stating their reasons for not continuing to approve of the decision condemning the swearing of the oath by seceders, suggest it as their opinion that an agreement might be made of the subject of difference which would be at once agreeable to truth and not hurtful to the conscience of any.” This suggestion was readily and cordially met by the Synod of Original Burghers, and joint measures were in consequence adopted, with the view of ascertaining the practicability of such an arrangement. In concluding the negotiation, both parties proceeded on the principle that, desirable as union is, if the reality of the thing is sought, and not the appearance merely, this would be secured more effectually, and with more safety to truth, by candid explanations on the points of question, than by studiously avoiding the agitation of them — a plan which, while it makes greater pretensions to charity and peace, lays a ground for subsequent irritation and dissension. “In the course of explanation, it was found that the only difference of opinion between the two bodies related to the exact meaning and necessary application of certain terms of the oath, which, as the question originally came before the session courts as a question of practice, did not appear to be an insuperable obstacle to a spiritual adjustment of the dispute. After repeated conferences, it was satisfactorily ascertained that the members of both synods were agreed on all points with the judicial Testimony of the first Seceders, particularly in its approval of the profession of religion made in this country, and authorized by the laws between 1638 and 1650, on the one hand, and its disapproval of the defects in the settlement of religion made at the Revolution on the other. Encouraged by this harmony of settlement as to the great cause of reformation, so much forgotten and so keenly opposed from various quarters in the present time. and feeling deeply the solemn obligations under which they in common lie to support and advance that cause; and the burgess-oath, the original ground of separation, being now in the providence of God, abolished, and both parties having now for various reasons seen it to be their duty to refrain from swearing that oath, shall it be re-enacted? the two synods agreed to unite upon the following explanatory declarations and resolutions, calculating, in their judgment, to remove the bars in the way of harmonious fellowship: and cooperation, and to prevent, through the blessing of God, the recurrence of any similar difference in future:

1. That when the Church of Christ is in danger from adversaries who hold persecuting principles, or who are employing violence or insidious arts to overturn it, the legislature of a country may warrantably exact an oath from those who are admitted to official and influential stations calculated for the security of the true religion; and that, in these circumstances, it is lawful and proper to swear.
2. That no Christian, without committing sin, can on any consideration swear to maintain or defend any known or acknowledged corruption or defect in the profession or establishment of religion.
3. That a public oath can only be taken according to the declared, and known sense of the legislature or enacting authority, and no person is warranted to swear it in a sense of his own, contrary to the former.
4. That no Church court can warrantably give a judicial toleration or allowance to do what they declare to be sinful, or what there is sufficient evidence from the Word of God is sinful.“

Those who hold high Antiburgher views maintain that the ruling element of the Original Secession Testimony of 1827 involves the decision come to by the Antiburgher party of the secession in 1746, viz. that “those of the secession cannot safely of conscience and without sin swear any burgessoath with the said religious clause: while matters, with reference to the profession and settlement of religion, continue in such circumstances as at present; and particularly that it does not agree unto or consist with an entering-into the bond for receiving our solemn covenants.” So strongly did the Antiburgher Synod of that time regard this decision as virtually comprehending the whole secession clause, that they declared that the Burghers who had opposed this decision “had materially dropped the whole Testimony among their hands, allowing of, at least for a time, a material abjuration thereof.” Thus it is plain that the Antiburgher Synod made the decision of 1746, in regard to the burgessoath, the exponent of the judicial Testimony, as well as of the declination and the act of renewing the covenants. Hence the Original Seceders, in uniting with the Original Burghers, and adopting the Testimony of 1842, might be regarded as acting in opposition to the decision of 1746, which was the ruling expository element of the Testimony of 1827. Another peculiarity which distinguished the secession Testimony was the formal recognition and actual renewing of the covenants. To this peculiarity the original secession body steadfastly adhered, allowing no student to be licensed and no

probationer to be ordained who had not previously joined the bond, or solemnly promised that he would so on the very first opportunity that offered. The descending obligation of the covenants was distinctly maintained according to the Testimony in 1827, and the same doctrine as avowed also by the United Original Seceders in their Testimony of 1842. In this respect they were only following in the steps of the first seceders, who had no sooner broken off their connection with the Established Church of that day than they fell back upon the Church of the former period, and proceeded to identify their cause with that of the Reformed Covenanted Church, and this they did by actually renewing the covenants. By their act relating to this subject, published in 1743, "they considered the swearing of the bond was called for and rendered necessary by the strong tide of defection from the Reformation cause which had set in," and that by so acting they would make themselves heirs to the vows of their fathers. Dr. M'Crie accordingly, in referring to this part of the history of the first seceders, tells us in the historical part of the Testimony of 1827: "The ministers having entered into the bond, measures were taken for having it administered to the people in their respective congregations; and at a subsequent period (1744) they agreed that all who were admitted to the ministry should previously have joined in renewing the covenants, while such as opposed or slighted the duty should not be admitted to sealing ordinances." Thus both the formal recognition and the actual renewing of the covenants came to be necessary terms of fellowship in the early Secession Church. The work of renewing the covenants had, in the summer of 1744, been gone through in only two settled congregations, when a stop was put to it by the synod having forced upon it the settlement of the question, "Whether those in communion with them could warrantably and consistently swear the following clause in some burgess-oaths: 'Here I protest, before God and your lordships, that I profess and allow with my heart the true religion professed within this realm, and authorized by the laws thereof.'" The question involved in swearing the burgess-oath respected the character of the Revolution settlement or legally authorized profession of religion. It was on this point that the secession body became divided into two conflicting synods. From the Testimony of 1827 it is plain that the Original Seceders regarded both the principle and practice as inherited by them from the first seceders. Nor does there seem to be any moral difference between the Testimony of 1827 and that of the United Original Seceders in 1842, insofar as regards the question as to the descending obligation of the covenants. But in the latter Testimony a

clause occurs which seems to indicate a somewhat modified view of the necessity of actually renewing the covenants. The clause in question reads thus: "It is also agreed that while all proper means are used for stirring up and preparing the people of their respective congregations to engage in this important and seasonable duty, *there shall be no undue haste in those congregations where it has not been formerly practiced.*" The clause marked in italics is not found in the Testimony of 1827, and must therefore be considered as one of those alterations in the Testimony of the Original Seceders which was deemed necessary in order to the accomplishment of the union of the Original Burghers.

The year which succeeded the formation of the Synod of Original Seceders was the year of the disruption of the Established Church of Scotland, an event which was one of deepest interest to the Christians of Scotland, if not of the world, but more especially to the representatives of the first seceders. The formation of the Free Church of Scotland, in a state of entire independence of all state interference and professing untraveled to prosecute the great ends of Christ's Church, submissive to the guidance and authority of her Great Head alone, was hailed by the newly formed body of United Original Seceders as realizing the wishes, the hopes, and the prayers of their forefathers, who had concluded the protest which formed the basis of the secession in these remarkable words: "And we hereby appeal unto the first free, faithful, and reforming General Assembly of the Church of Scotland." As years passed on, after the memorable events of 1843, the conviction was growing stronger and stronger in the minds of many both of the ministers and people of the United Original Seceders that in the Assembly of the Free Church they could recognize the General Assembly to which the first fathers of the secession appealed, and that therefore the time had come when the protest of Nov. 16, 1733, must be fallen from. At length it was resolved in the synod of the body to lodge a representation and appeal on the table of the Free Church Assembly, with a view to the coalescing of the two bodies. The union thus sought was accomplished in May, 1852, on the express understanding that the brethren of the United Original Secession Synod who thus applied for admission into the Free Church of Scotland should be allowed to retain their peculiar views as to the descending obligation of the covenants, while at the same time the Free Church did not commit itself, directly or indirectly, in any way, either to a positive or negative opinion upon these views. Several ministers and congregations connected with the United Original Seceders effected to



accede to the union with the Free Church, and preferred to remain in their former position; and accordingly a small body of Christians still exists holding the principles and calling, themselves by the name of the United Original Seceders. One congregation of Original Seceders in Edinburgh, under the ministry of the Rev. James Wright, with not a few adherents in various parts of the country, disclaims all connection with those who adhered to the Testimony of 1842, and professes to hold by the Testimony of 1827, thus claiming, in the principles which they avow, to represent the first seceders in so far as in the advanced state of the secession cause they held their principles to be identical with those of the Reformed Covenanted Church of Scotland. See Marsden, *Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects*, ii, 290 sq.; Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, ii, s.v.; Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, p. 352, 361; Stanley, *Lect. on the Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, lect. ii Sq.; and the authorities quoted in the article. **SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE PRESBYTERIANISM IN SCOTLAND.**

## Original Sin

This expression is frequently used in a twofold sense, to denote the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, and also that native depravity which we have derived by inheritance from our first parents. The first view of the subject — the imputation of Adam's first sin — has already been considered under the articles **SEE IMPUTATION** and **SEE HOPKINSIANS**. According to the second view we came into the world, in consequence of the sin of Adam, in a state of depravity. On this point the Westminster Confession of Faith explicitly declares: "By this sin," referring to the sin of our first parents, "they fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of the soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation." Again, in another article the Confession teaches: "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, has wholly lost all ability to any spiritual good accompanying salvation, so that a natural man, being altogether averse from that good and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or prepare himself thereunto." This doctrine pervades the whole of the sacred writings, and may be called indeed a fundamental and essential truth of revelation. Thus before the flood we find the inspired penman declaring (<sup>GEN</sup>Genesis 6:5): "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the

thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” Again, after the flood, the same statement is repeated (<sup><ORR></sup>Genesis 8:21): “The imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth.” David also (<sup><SIB></sup>Psalm 51:5) declares: “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.” The original and innate depravity of man might be deduced from the doctrine of Scripture respecting the necessity of regeneration. Our blessed Lord affirms (<sup><RR></sup>John 3:3): “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.” We are said to be “saved by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior.” Such language has no meaning if it be not true that we are utterly depraved by nature. How early does this innate corruption manifest itself in children! It is impossible for us to examine our own hearts, or look around us in the world, without having the conclusion forced upon us that the wickedness which everywhere prevails must have its seat in a heart that is “deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.” The doctrine of original sin has been denied by heretics of different kinds. Socinians treat it as a foolish and absurd idea. The followers of Pelagius maintain that, notwithstanding the results of the fall, a man still retains the power, independently of divine grace, of originating, prosecuting, and consummating good works. God, they allege, gives us the ability to believe, but we can experience the ability without further assistance. This doctrine has been revived in our own day by the members of the Evangelical Union, commonly called Morrisonians. Some theologians admit that we were born less pure than Adam, and with an inclination to sin; but in so far as this inclination or concupiscence, as it is called, is from nature, it is not properly sin. It is merely the natural appetite or desire, which, as long as the will does not consent to it, is not sinful. Romanists believe that original sin is taken away by baptism, and maintain, like the above, that concupiscence is not sinful. The apostle Paul, however, holds a very different opinion, declaring in the plainest language that the proneness to sin is in itself sinful. Thus in <sup><STO></sup>Romans 7:7, 8, he says: “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead.” A keen controversy concerning the nature of original sin arose in the 16th century in Germany. A party of Jena, led by Matthias Flacius, endeavored to prove that the natural man could never cooperate with the divine influence in the heart, but through the working of innate depravity

was always in opposition to it. Flacius met with a keen opponent in Victorinus Strigelius, and a public disputation on the subject of original sin was held at Weimar in 1560. On this occasion Flacius made the strong assertion that original sin was the very essence of man, language which was believed to imply either that God was the author of sin, or that man was created by the devil. Hence even the former friends of Flacius became his bitterest opponents. *SEE SIN.*

### Orioli, Bartolomeo

an Italian painter who devoted himself largely to the cultivation of sacred art, flourished at Trevigi about 1616. He executed numerous works for the churches in his native city, which are commended by Federici. Orioli was also a good portrait painter, and frequently introduced portraits into his pictures, instead of ideal forms. There is a painting of this class in the church of S. Croce, representing a numerous procession of the people of Trevigi. Laizi says he painted more pictures for public exhibitions at Trevigi than any other artist, and that he belonged to that “numerous tribe of painters who in Italy were ambitious of uniting in themselves the power of poetry and painting; but who, not having received sufficient polish, either in precept or in art, gave vent to their inspirations in their native place by covering the columns with sonnets, and the churches with pictures, but without exciting the envy of the adjacent districts.”

### Ori'on

occurs three times (<sup><809></sup>Job 9:9; Sept. “Ἐσπερος, Vulg. *Orion*; 38:31, <sup><809></sup>Ὠρίων; *Arctuus*; <sup><308></sup>Amos 5:8, μετασκευάζων *Orion*) in the A.V. as the rendering of the Heb. **l yskē** *kesil* “from **l sk**; *to be fat*, and hence either *to be strong* or *to be dull, languid*. The last sense prevails in most derivatives, and thus **l yskē** *kesil*, commonly means *fool* or *impious person* (as <sup><890></sup>Psalm 49:10; <sup><204></sup>Ecclesiastes 2:14), but in <sup><809></sup>Job 9:9 (comp. 38:31; <sup><308></sup>Amos 8:5) is plainly applied to one of the greater constellations of the sky. It is here understood by most ancient interpreters to refer to the large and brilliant constellation *Orion*, or “*the Giant*,” situated in the southern hemisphere with respect to the ecliptic, but which is crossed near its middle by the equinoctial. It is known by the three bright stars in its belt. The “giant” of Oriental astronomy was Nimrod; the mighty hunter, who was fabled to have been bound in the sky for his impiety. The two dogs and the hare, which are among the constellations in the neighborhood of Orion,

made his train complete. There is possibly an allusion to this belief in “the bands of *kesil*” (<sup><1888></sup>Job 38:31), with which Gesenius (*Jes.* 1:458) compares <sup><1072></sup>Proverbs 7:22. In the *Chronicon Paschale* (p. 36) Nimrod is said to have been “a giant, the founder of Babylon, who, the Persians say, was deified and placed among the stars of heaven, whom they call Orion” (comp. Cedrenus, p. 14) **SEE NIMROD**. In <sup><2130></sup>Isaiah 13:10 the word *kesilim* is rendered “constellations,” i.e. *the Orions* or giants of the sky, the greater constellations similar to Orion. Some Jewish writers, the rabbins Isaac Israel and Jonah among them, identified the Hebrew *kesil* with the Arabic *sohail*, by which was understood either *Sirius* or *Canopus*. The words of R. Jonah: (Abulwalid), as quoted by Kilm'chi (*Lex. heb. s.v.*), are, “Kesil is the large star called in Arabic *Sohail*, and the stars combined with it are called after its name *kesilim*.” The name *Sohail*, “foolish,” was derived from the supposed influence of the star in causing folly in men, and was probably an additional reason for identifying it with *kesil*. See Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 701; Niebuhr, *Descript. Arabice*, p. 112; Ideler, *Ueber Ursprung und Bedeutung der Sternnamen*, p. 240, 263; Michaelis, in *Suppl.* p. 1319 sq. **SEE ASTRONOMY**.

## Orion

a mythological personage of the Greeks, was represented as a gigantic hunter, and reputed the handsomest man in the world. His parentage is differently stated. According to the commonly received myth he was the son of Hyrieus, of Hyria, in Boeotia, and was called in his native country *Kandaon*. Another account makes him a son of Poseidon and Eurvale, while some say that he was *Autochthonos*, or “earthborn.” So immense was his stature that when he waded through the deepest seas he was still a head and shoulders above the water, and when he walked on dry land his stature reached the clouds. Orion was a general favorite, and soon rendered himself celebrated. Diana took him among her attendants, and even became deeply enamored of him. His gigantic stature, however, displeased Enopion, king of Chios, whose daughter Hero or Merope he demanded in marriage. The king, not daring to deny him openly, promised to make him his son-in-law as soon as he delivered his island from wild beasts. This task, which Enopion deemed impracticable, was soon performed by Orion, who eagerly demanded his reward. Enopion, on pretense of complying, intoxicated his illustrious guest, and put out his eyes on the sea-shore, where he had laid himself down to sleep. Orion, finding himself blind when he awoke, was conducted by the sound to a

neighboring forge where he placed one of the workmen on his back, and, by his directions, went to a place, where the rising sun was seen to the greatest advantage. Here he turned his face towards the luminary, and, as is reported, he immediately recovered his eyesight, and hastened to punish the perfidious cruelty of Enopion. Aurora, whom Venus had inspired with love, carried him away into the island of Delos, to enjoy his company with greater security; but Diana, who was jealous of this destroyed Orion with her arrows. Some say that Orion had provoked Diana's resentment by offering violence to Opis, one of her female attendants, or, according to others, because he had attempted the virtue of the goddess herself. According to Ovid, Orion died of the bite of a scorpion, which the earth produced, to punish his vanity in boasting that there was not on earth any animal which he could not conquer. It is said that Orion was an excellent workman in iron, and that he fabricated a subterraneous palace for Vulcan. After death Orion was placed in heaven, where one of the constellations still bears his name. The constellation of Orion, situated near the feet of the bull, was composed of seventeen stars, in the form of a man holding a sword, which has given occasion to the poets often to 'speak' of Orion's sword. As the constellation of Orion, which rises about March 9, and sets about June 21, is generally supposed to be accompanied at its rising, with great rains and storms, it has acquired the epithet of *aquosus*, given it by Virgil. Orion was buried in the island of Delos, and the monument which the people of Tanagra, in Boeotia, showed, as containing the remains of this celebrated hero, was nothing but a cenotaph. The daughters of Orion distinguished themselves as much as their father, and when the oracle had declared that Boeotia should not be delivered from a dreadful pestilence before two of Jupiter's children were immolated on the altars, they joyfully accepted the offer and voluntarily sacrificed themselves for the good of their country. Their names were Menippe and Metioche.

## Orissa

an ancient Indian kingdom, now a province of India, is situated near the head of the Bay of Bengal, on its north-western shore, a short distance south-west from Calcutta, and is bounded on the north by Bengal east by the Bay of Bengal, south by the country of the Telugus, and west by Nagopore. It is irregularly shaped, about 300 miles long, and 240 wide, and had in 1872 a population of 4,317,999. It is supposed that the province was anciently much larger than it is now, and that its sovereigns formerly

sustained a rank much above that of most Hindu rajahs, and that it was numbered among the most powerful of the ancient Indian sovereignties.

Before the 6th century B.C., *Orissa*, *Odra*, or *Ulkala*, names whose very meaning is not yet fixed, must have been a land of swamps, lakes, and jungles, amid which few people cared to live. Its earliest dwellers appear to have been hill-tribes: and fishermen of the aboriginal non-Aryan stock, whose types are well preserved in the Savars and Khonds of the present day. At what time Aryan immigrants from Northern India settled in the country. it is not easy to say, but the rock inscriptions of a later Buddhist period date back to the middle of the 3d century B.C. The hills and wilds of Orissa abound in rock-hewn caves, shrines, and statues of Buddha, and the lonely dwelling-places of Buddhist monks have since been tenanted in their turn by worshippers and ascetics of the various Brahmanic schools that rose upon the ruins of the faith proclaimed by the semi-mythical Hindu reformer Sakya Muni, and were established by the Hindu Constantine Asoka. In Orissa the spread of Buddhism appears to synchronize curiously with the progress southward of the Yavanas, whose name at once suggests their identity with the Javan of Hebrew writ and the Ionian Greeks of history. There is no doubt, we think, with Dr. Hunter, who only follows up the clues furnished by former scholars, that the Yavanas who invaded Orissa in the 3d century, B.C. were chiefly descendants of the merin who under Alexander and his successors ruled Afghanistan and the Punjaub, whence they roved or were driven onwards into Behar, and down the Ganges to Orissa. One of Asoka's edicts carved on the rocks of the last-named country speaks of "Antvoko the Yona king," or, in other words, of Antiochus, the Yavan, or Ionia. It is well known that a Yavan dynasty ruled Orissa for 146 years, from the early part of the 4th century A.D., and that with its final overthrow in A.D. 473 fell the supremacy of that Buddhist faith which for more than seven centuries had supplanted the older Brahmanic systems. It is worth noting that a like revolution from Buddhism to Brahminism marks the downfall of yet later Yavan dynasties in Central and Southern India. In the buildings of the Buddhists and their religious heirs the Jains, traces of Greek art are unmistakably visible wherever Buddhism and the Yavanas once held sway; strongest in the Puisjaub, and gradually growing fainter on its way to the Orissa shore. From the remains of sculptures, inscriptions, etc., we may infer that the early civilization of Orissa was high. The temple of the sun at Kanarak — erected about the 12th century — exhibits carvings representing the

planets, sculptured figures of animals, etc., which show that at that date the plastic and mechanical arts were in a more advanced state in that part of India than they are in England.

Orissa maintained its position as an independent monarchy till 1558, when, its royal line having become extinct, it was made an outlying province of the empire of the Great Mogul. On the breaking up of this empire, the more valuable portions of Orissa were seized by the nizam of Hyderabad. The French, who had taken possession of a part of the country long known as the Northern Circars, attempted to drive the English (who had also formed commercial settlements on the coast) out of India. The Mahrattas, who had seized a portion of Orissa in 1740, were forced to surrender it to the English in 1803. The soldiers of the East India Company were marched into Orissa at the opening of the present century, and an engagement was subsequently entered into between the company and the native chiefs and princes, by which the former bound themselves to perform certain services for the country (as maintaining the river-banks in good repair), while the latter engaged to pay a yearly tribute. Of the many principalities into which the country was divided, a large number got into arrears with the government, and the result was that numbers of the estates were sold, and the government, as a rule, became the purchaser. Much of the territory originally forming a portion of this kingdom thus fell into the hands of the British.

Orissa is divided into three civil districts, viz. Puru in the south, Cuttack in the center, and Balasore on the north. The sea-coast, which is the eastern part of the province, is level, and far more populous than the central and western divisions, which are mountainous and covered in many places with primeval forests, inhabited by wild beasts, or men almost as untamed and rude as they. The climate, soil, productions, animals, insects, birds, reptiles, and fish of Orissa are similar to those of Bengal and other adjacent portions of Hindostan lying near the tropic of Cancer. The villages, houses, food, clothing, dress, literature, and trades of the Orissans are also much like those of the Bengalese and the people of other large portions of India. The present population of Orissa is principally made up of Hindus, Mohammedans, Santals, and Bhumijas, the Hindus constituting by far the larger number. From its liability to inundation, the country is not much inhabited for three or four miles inland from the sea. Beyond this low tract the plains are sufficiently elevated for security, and are highly cultivated and densely peopled. Farther inland the country becomes mountainous,

covered in part by forests, where are found the Oriyas, Gonds, Koles, Surahs, Santals, and Bhumijas. The *Gonds* or *Khonds* are believed to be the descendants of the aboriginal inhabitants of the country. This tribe occupied an area extending from north of the Mahanaddi, south to the banks of the Godavari. Their mountain haunts are admirably suited for defense, as the districts which they inhabit are almost inaccessible; and although they do not yet appear to have adopted fire-arms, they manage their battle-axes and bows and arrows with an adroitness and courage that make them formidable enemies. The *Khonds* are a totally distinct race from the inhabitants of the plains, and there is but little resemblance between them and the other hilltribes. *SEE KHONDS*. Some ethnologists claim the *Santals* to have been the aborigines of Orissa, but there does not seem to exist very good ground for such assertion. *SEE SANTALS*.

In Orissa, as elsewhere in India, the history of the people resolves itself for the most part into the history of their religion. As Buddhism faded away, successive forms of Vishnu and Siva worship took its place. Bhuvaneswar, with its 7000 shrines, now reduced to less than 600, attested the prevalence of Siva-worship under the long line of Kesari, or Lion-kings, who displaced the Yavanas. Thousands of high-caste Brahmins imported from Oude commended the new worship to their future countrymen. In the twelfth century the milder worship of Vishnu rose into the ascendant under a new line of kings, and about the same period architecture reached its zenith, producing one of its noblest masterpieces in the temple of the sun at Kanarak. on the Orissa shore, In the holy city of Piri, sacred to Vishnu under his title of Jagannath, the Lord of the World, these and other religions find their common meeting place. "The fetichism and bloody rites of the aboriginal races, the mild flower-worship of the Bedas, and every compromise between the two, along with the lofty spiritualities of the great Indian reformers, have here found refuge." Once every year the holy city of Puri is the attraction to the poor, ignorant natives, drawn thither simply by a superstitious veneration, which formerly cost the lives of millions. The humane policy of the British. has largely done away with human sacrifices in every form. But though the car of Jaggernaut (q.v.) no longer crushes out the lives of thousands, and the *Meriah* (*SEE KHONDS, Religious Rites and Sacrifices*) victims are saved from a horrible death, thousands yet fall a prey to an impure atmosphere and unwholesome food to which the 90,000 pilgrims are subject while they are packed for weeks together into 5000 small lodging-houses of two or three windowless cells each, in the



very height of India's rainy season, with a temperature ranging from 90 to 105<sup>0</sup> in the shade, in streets and alleys innocent of drainage, and fed for the most part on ill-cooked compounds of putrefying rice. And if any escape all this uninjured, they are sure to be further tried in their homeward journeys — oftentimes hundreds of miles long — through the pouring rain, sleeping many of them on the grass or mud, and consequently dying of exposure in numbers by the way, or carrying home with them the seeds of life-long suffering. It is reckoned that at least 10,000 people perish every year in Puri or on the way, and the number was far greater some years ago, before the government took measures to alleviate the worst horrors of this deadly pilgrimage.

The natives of Orissa, composed, as we have seen, of different tribes, of course do not all speak in one tongue, but though there are a score or more of dialects, there are only three principal vernacular languages spoken by the Orissans.

1. The Oriya, one of the Hindui family of languages, derived principally from the Sanscrit. This is spoken by the greater part of the Hindu population.
2. The Hindostani, derived principally from the Arabic and Persian, and spoken by the Mohammedans.
3. The Sanital, with which may be classed the Bhumija, they both being dialects of the same language. The Oriya contains many religious and literary works, some translated from the Sanscrit, and others original. Most of the religious books are poetical, and some of them possess a great degree of literary merit.

*Missionary Labors.* — Thus far comparatively little has been effected for Christianizing the natives of Orissa. The districts of Paru and Cuttack are occupied by the English General Baptist missionaries, who began labors there in 1821. Although they had to wait six years for their first convert, many followed, and this mission is now in a flourishing condition. It has furnished many native teachers and preachers. In 1888 there were 18 stations, with 9 ordained and 8 unordained foreign workers, and 22 ordained and 12 unordained native workers; 3816 adherents, 1344 communicants, and 25 schools with 1330 scholars. A carefully executed version of the Bible into the Oriya tongue was prepared by Mr. Sutton, one of the missionaries. He also prepared a dictionary and a grammar. The

district of Balasore is the site of the Free-will Baptist mission. This district lies on the west side of the Bay of Bengal. It is about eighty miles long, and on an average thirty or forty miles wide, and contains about 500,000 inhabitants. On its northern boundary lies a considerable tract belonging to the province of Bengal, which is inhabited by Oriyas. The Free-will Baptists began their labors in 1835, and now employ there 10 missionaries, 22 native preachers, 5 churches with 654 members, and several well-conducted schools. See Bachelier, *Hinduism and Christianity in Orissa*; Sterling, *Orissa*; Sutton, *Narrative of the Orissa Mission*; Hunter, *Orissa under Native and British Rule* (1872, 2 vols. -12mo); Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Aikman, *Cyclop. of Christian Missions*, p. 158, 339; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* July, 1872, p.120 sq.

### Orkney Islands

(Norse, *Orkneyar*, from *ork*. "whale," and *eyar*, "islands;" Latin, *Orcades*), a compact group, separated from Caithness by the Pentland Firth, and counted a Scottish possession, are situated between 58° 41' 24" and 59° 23' 2' N. lat., and-between 2° 22' 2"; and 3° 25' 10" W. long.; and cover an area of 244.8 square miles, or 156,672 acres. The surface is very irregular, and the land is indented by numerous arms of the sea. Previous to the middle of the last century the agriculture of Orkney was, in more than an ordinary degree for the time, in a primitive state. There was little communication then with the mainland, and improvements were slowly adopted. The spinning-wheel for instance, was not introduced there for half a century after it was in use elsewhere. Until towards the end of last century, little advance seems to have been made in the management of the land, the inhabitants deeming it more important and profitable to direct their attention to the manufacture of kelp. They suffered periodically from bad seasons and violent storms, when less help could be afforded to them from without. In recent times the agricultural and mechanical industries have been in a more healthy state, and their exports, which in 1848 amounted only to £49,308, now run up to £200,000 annually. The temperature of the Orkneys is comparatively mild, considering their northern latitude. This arises partly from the surrounding sea, but chiefly from the neighborhood of the Gulf Stream to the western shores. the mean temperature in February, the coldest month, taking a series of thirty-three years from 1826, was 38<sup>o</sup>, and in July 55.14<sup>o</sup>. Only twice during that period did the mean monthly temperature fall below the freezing-point, in February, 1838 and 1855, when it fell to 31<sup>o</sup> and 31.64<sup>o</sup>; and during the

same period it was never so high as 60<sup>0</sup>, except in 1852, when it reached 60.64<sup>0</sup>. Of the 67 islands, only about 30 are inhabited, by 32,395 (in 1885) people. The principal of these inhabited islands are Pomona, or Mainland, Hoy, North and South Ronaldshay, Westray, Salida, Eday, Stronsay, Rorgsay, Ind Shapinshay. The chief towns are Kirkwall, the capital, and Stromness.

*History.*—The Orkneys, under the name *Orcades* (whence the modern adjective Orcadian), are mentioned by the ancient geographers, Pliny, Ptolemy; Mela, and by other classical writers, but of their inhabitants we know almost nothing till the dawn of the Middle Ages. They were most probably of the same stock as the British Celts. From an early period, however, the Norsemen resorted to these islands, as a convenient spot from which to make a descent on the Scotch and English coasts. In 876 Harald Haarfager conquered both them and the Hebrides. During the greater part of the 10th century they were ruled by independent Scandinavian jarls (earls), but in 1098 they became formally subject to the Norwegian crown. Thus they remain till 1488, when they were given to James III of Scotland as a security for the dowry of his wife, Margaret of Denmark. The islands were never redeemed from this pledge; and in 1590, on the marriage of James I with the Danish princess Anne, Denmark formally resigned all pretensions to the sovereignty of the Orkneys. During their long connection, however, with Norway and Denmark, all traces of the primitive Celtic population disappeared, and the present inhabitants are of the pure Scandinavian stock.

*Religion.* — Christianity was introduced into the Orkneys by the Norsemen in the beginning of the 11th century. Down to the time of the Reformation the Orkneys and Shetland Isles formed a separate bishopric, under the archbishop of Trondhjem, and the bishop's seat was Kirkevaag, the present Kirkwall. After the establishment of Presbyterianism Orkney was divided into 32 parishes, having 8 parishes of the Church of Scotland. At present, however, the -Orkneys are divided into 22 parishes, forming 3 presbyteries and 1 synod. There are also about 30 congregations belonging to the Free and United Presbyterian churches, besides 3 Independent, and one or two others. See *Orkneyinga Saga*; Munch, *Det norske Folks Historie*.

## Orlah

*SEE TALMUD.*

## Orlandini, Niccolo

one of the, most noted characters of the Order of the Jesuit, was born at Florence, Italy, in 155. He entered the society in 1572, where he was distinguished by the purity of his morals and proficiency in literature. He became rector of the college at Nola, and afterwards president of the seminary for novices at Naples. He died at Rome in 1606. He was engaged on a history of his order, but did not live to complete more than the first volume of it. It was afterwards continued by Sacchini, Everard, Jouveny, and Cordara; in all seven volumes. The work is published under the title *Historiae Societatis Jesu prima pars* (sive Ignatius, A.D. 1540-1556) (Romae; 1615, fol.). See Sacchini, *Notice*, which forms the introduction to the history above referred to.

## Orlando, Bernardo

a Piedmontese painter, flourished at Turin in the first part of the 17th century. At that time the rich collections of pictures and drawings in the royal galleries at the court were made subservient to the instruction of young artists, which was intrusted to a painter of the court. Orlandt was invested with this charge, and appointed painter to the duke in 1617. But we call attention to him here because he also painted some pictures for churches.

## Orlay, Bernard Van

or *Bernard of Brussels*, a celebrated painter, largely devoted to the development of sacred art, was born in that city about the year 1490. He went to Rome when he was very young, where he had the good fortune to become a pupil of Raphael. On his return to Brussels he was appointed principal painter to the governess of the Netherlands, and was likewise employed for many years by the emperor Charles V. The style of his design was noble, and his tone of coloring agreeable. He very frequently painted on a ground of leaf-gold, especially if he was engaged on a work of importance, a circumstance which is said to have preserved the freshness and luster of his colors; in his hunting-pieces, in which he introduced portraits of Charles V and the nobles of his court, he usually took the scenery from the forest of Soignies, which afforded him ample variety. He was engaged by the prince of Nassau to paint sixteen cartoons, as models for tapestry, intended for the decoration of his palace. Each cartoon contained only two figures, a knight and a lady on horseback, representing

some members of the Nassau family. They were designed in an elevated style; and by the prince's order they were afterwards copied in oil by Jordaens. He painted for the chapel, of a monastery at Antwerp a picture of the *Last Judgment*, which was much admired. Bernard van Orlay died in 1560. Waagen mentions several excellent pictures by him in the collections in England, especially in those of the duke of Devonshire at Devonshire House, Piccadilly, and at Chiswick; at Keddieston Hall, the seat of the earl Scarsdale, where is a picture of the Virgin with the infant Christ, addressing St. John in the presence of Joseph and Elizabeth — the figures are three quarters the size of life — which is one of the finest remaining by Van Orlay; and at lord Spencer's, at Althorpe, where is a bust of Anne of Cleves, very carefully painted.

## Orleans

an important commercial town of France, capital of the department of Loiret, and formerly capital of the old province of Orlealnnais, which now forms the greater part of the departments of Loiret, Eure-et-Loir, and Loir-et-Cher, is situated on the right bank of the Loire, here crossed by a bridge of nine arches, and is seventy-five miles and a half south-south-west of Paris by railway. Close to the city is the forest of Orleans, one of the largest in the country, consisting of 94,000 acres planted with oak and other valuable trees. The city stands on the verge of a magnificent plain sloping towards the Loire, and watered by that river and the Loiret, and is surrounded on the land-side by a wall and dry ditches, on either side of which there are pleasantly shaded boulevards. Around it are eight prosperous and populous suburbs. Among its principal buildings are the cathedral, with two lofty and elegant towers, one of the finest Gothic edifices in the country; the tower; bishop's residence; the houses of Joan of Arc, of Agnes Sorel, of Diane de Poitiers, of Francois I, of Pothier; the churches and hospitals, which are numerous, etc. The place is noted in ecclesiastical history for the several Church councils which have been held there;

**I.** The FIRST COUNCIL OF ORLEANS (*Concilium Aurelianense*) was held July 10, 511, by order of Clovis. It was attended by the archbishops of Bordeaux, Bourges, Auch, Tours, and Rouen, with twenty-seven bishops, among whom were Quintianus, bishop of Rodez, near Clermont, Melanius, bishop of Rennes, and Theodosius of Auxerre. Thirty-one canons were published:

- 1.** Establishes the inviolability of churches as places of refuge.
- 3.** Declares that a runaway slave taking refuge in a church shall be given up to his master, an oath having been first made by the latter not to hurt him.
- 4.** Forbids to ordain lay persons without the king's permission. The children of clerks are left to the bishop's discretion.
- 5.** Directs that the revenue arising from property given to any church by the prince shall be employed (1) in the repair of the building, 2) for the support of the clergy, (3) for the relief of the poor, and (4) for the redemption of slaves.
- 7.** Forbids clerks and monks to go to the prince to obtain favors without letters from their bishop.
- 8.** Enacts that a bishop willfully ordaining a slave unknown to his master shall pay twice his price to the master.
- 12.** Permits deacons and priests in a state of penance to baptize in cases of necessity.
- 13.** Forbids the wife of a priest or deacon to marry.
- 17.** Submits to the bishop's jurisdiction all churches built within his territory.
- 18.** Forbids to marry a brother's widow, or a sister's widower.
- 19.** Submits to the bishop's jurisdiction all abbots, and directs that they shall attend him once a year at the place which he shall appoint.
- 20.** Forbids monks to use the stole or handkerchief ("tzangas") in their monasteries.
- 21.** Declares a monk who shall leave his monastery and marry to be forever excluded from taking orders.
- 24.** Orders a fast of forty, and not fifty, days before Easter.
- 27, 28.** Order the proper observation of the Rogation days.
- 29.** Forbids all familiarity between clerks and women.
- 30.** Excommunicates all who have dealings with diviners.

**31.** Enjoins bishops to attend the offices of the Church every Sunday in the nearest place of worship. See Pagi in Baromius, A.D. 507 x, xii; Labbe, *Conc.* 4:1403.

**II.** A SECOND COUNCIL was held in 533, on May 24, by order of Theodoric, Childebert, and Clothaire, the three kings of France. Twenty-six archbishops, and bishops attended from the provinces, Lyons, and Aquitaine. Twenty-one canons were published against simony and other abuses, most of which were old regulations renewed:

The 12th warns those persons who have made a vow to drink and sing and frolic in any church that they ought not to fulfill their vow.

**13.** Forbids abbots, chaplains, recluses, and priests to give letters dismissory to clerks.

**15.** Forbids to accept the bequests of suicides; permits those of persons killed in the commission of any crime.

**20.** Commands that they be excluded from communion who have eaten of meats offered to idols, or of things strangled, etc.

**21.** Excommunicates abbots who despise the orders of their bishops. See Labbe, *Conc.* 4:1779.

**III.** A THIRD COUNCIL was held at Orleans May 7, 538. Nineteen bishops attended, among whom were Lupus of Lyons, who presided, Pantathagus of Vienne, Leo of Sens, etc. Thirty-three canons were published:

**1.** Orders that a metropolitan who shall permit two years to pass without convoking a provincial synod shall be suspended from celebrating mass for one year, and also those bishops who neglect to attend it without just hinderance.

**3.** Directs that metropolitans be consecrated by a metropolitan in the presence of all the bishops of the province, and the bishops of each province by the metropolitan.

**7.** Directs that clerks who have received orders of their own free will shall, if they marry afterwards, be excommunicated; that if they were ordained without their own consent they shall be only deposed; that clerks committing adultery shall be shut up in a monastery for life, without, however, being deprived of communion.

- 25.** Orders that persons who fall back from a state of penance into a worldly life shall be deprived of communion until at the point of death.
- 28.** Forbids to work in the fields on Sunday, but permits traveling on horseback or in a carriage, the preparation of food, and all things needful for the proper neatness of house and person: the denial of which things it states to belong rather to the Jewish than the Christian observance of the day.
- 29.** Forbids lay persons to leave church at mass before the end of the Lord's Prayer, or if a bishop be present, before he has given his blessing.
- 30.** Forbids Jews to mix with Christians from Holy Thursday to Easter-day. See Labbe, *Conc.* v. 294.

**IV.** A FOURTH COUNCIL was convened at Orleans in 541. Thirty-eight bishops and the deputies of twelve absent attended; Leontius, archbishop of Bordeaux, presided. Thirty-eight canons were published; most of them similar to those published in the preceding councils. The following are among those which differ:

- 1.** Orders the celebration of Easter every year according to the table of Victorius (or Victor).
- 4.** Orders that no one at the oblation of the holy chalice shall presume to offer anything but wine mixed with water, because it is held as sacrilegious to offer anything different from what the Savior instituted in his most holy commandments.
- 16.** Excommunicates those who swear, after the fashion of pagans, upon the heads of beasts, or who invoke the names of false gods.
- 33.** Declares that any person desirous of having a parish upon his property, must, in the first place, give a sufficient endowment for the clerks who shall serve it.

Such is supposed to have been the origin of Church patronage. See Labbe, *Conc.* v. 380.

**V.** A FIFTH COUNCIL was held at Orleans, October 28, 549, by Childebert, king of France. Fifty bishops (among whom were ten afterwards revered as saints) and twenty-one deputies of those who were absent attended, collected from the three kingdoms of France and all the provinces



of the Gauls, except that of Narbonne, which was still in the occupation of the Goths. Sacerdos, bishop of Lyons, presided. Twenty-four canons, for the most part renewing those of the preceding councils, were published:

1. Condemns the errors of Entyches and Nestorius.
2. Forbids excommunication for small offenses.
6. Forbids to ordain a slave without the master's consent.
11. Forbids to give the people a bishop whom they dislike, and declares that neither the people nor clergy ought to be intimidated in making their election.
- 20, 21. Direct that deacons shall visit prisoners every Sunday, and that bishops shall take care of lepers. See Labbe, *Conc.* v. 390.

**VI.** — A COUNCIL of less importance was convened at Orleans in 1022 by king Robert, at which several bishops were present. Several Manichaeans were condemned to be burned, among whom were Stephen (or Heribert) and Lysoye, ecclesiastics of Orleans. See Labbe, *Conc.* 9:836; *Spicil.* p. 740.

### Orley, Jean Van,

a Belgian painter, was born at Brussels in 1656. He first studied with his father, but afterwards devoted himself to historical painting with considerable success, and was much employed in painting for the churches in the Netherlands. In the church of St. Nicholas at Brussels is a picture by him representing *St. Peter delivered from Prison*, and in the parochial church of Asch a picture of the *Resurrection*, which are highly commended. His masterpiece is a large picture of the *Adoration of the Magi* in the refectory of the abbey of Dillighem. He etched a part of the plates, from his own designs, for the New Testament. He died in 1740.

### Orman, Samuel L.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Williamson County, Tenn., March 22, 1838. He was converted Oct. 7, 1858, joined the Church in 1859, and was licensed to preach the year following; but his mother being a widow, and he the only son at home, he believed it to be his duty to remain with her, and did not join Conference until October, 1866, though he was employed one year on the Savannah

Circuit, beginning October, 1862, and one year on the Russellville Circuit, commencing in the autumn of 1865. After his admission into the Tennessee Conference, he filled successively the Moulton and Smithville circuits, and the Trinity Station. While at the latter charge his health failed, and he was the next year made supernumerary to the Elm Street Church, in Nashville; recovering his strength somewhat, he was stationed in Springfield at the session of the Conference held in 1870; but his health soon failed him here, and he died Dec. 25, 1871. He was greatly beloved by all who knew him. — He was intelligent, prudent, amiable, good. See Dr. J. B. McFerrin, in *Nashville Christian Advocate*, Jan. 27, 1872; *Minutes of the Meth. Episc. Church, South*, 1872, p. 717.

### Orme, William

a noted Scotch divine, was born at Falkirk, Scotland, in 1787. He removed early to Edinburghs where he was apprenticed to a wheelwright in 1800. He then joined the Independents, and in 1805 entered as a student for the ministry in a class supported by Mr. Haldane. He became minister of a Congregational Church at Perth in 1807; removed afterwards to London, and was appointed minister of a congregation at Camberwell, and foreign secretary to the London Missionary Society. He died in 1830. He wrote *Bibliotheca Biblica, a select list of books on sacred literature, with notices*, etc. (Edinb. 1824, 8vo): — *Life of Baxter* (in *Baxter's Practical Works* [Lond. 1830, 23 vols. 8vo] vol. i): — *Memoirs of the Life Writings, and Religious Connections of John Owen, D.D.* (ibid. 1820, 8vo): — *Remarkable Passages in the Life of William Kiffin* (ibid. 1823) *Memoirs, including Letters and select Remains of John Urquhart* (ibid. 1827, 2 vols. 12mo): — *The Ordinance of the Lord's Supper illustrated* (1826, 12mo): — *Memoir of the Controversy respecting the Heavenly Witnesses*, <sup>1</sup>John 5:7, including *Critical Notices of the Principal Writers on Both Sides of the Question by Criticus* (1830, 12mo; new edition, with Appendix by Ezra Abbot, N. Y. 1866, 12mo). See Darling, *Cyclop.B ibliog.* 2:2248; Nicholls, 2:786, s.v.; Horne, *Bibliotheca Biblica* (see Index); *Christian Examiner*,: 1866 (May), p. 398. (J. N. P.)

### Ormerod, Oliver

a noted English Churchman of king James I's reign, flourished as rector of Huntspill, Somersetshire, and died in 1626. He was a great polemic, and wrote severely against Papists and Puritans. Among his works the most

noted is *The Picture of a Puritane* (Lond. 1605, 4to), which, though it deserves to be passed by as unworthy in tendency, claims the recognition of scholars because of the thorough knowledge of men and things which it exhibits. It is replete with classical allusions, and abounds in quotations from the Church fathers, the schoolmen, and other abstruse writers. Other noteworthy productions of Ormerod's are, *The Picture of a Papist* (1606):— *A Discovery of Puritan Papisme and a Discovery of Popish Paganism* (1612, 4to). See Chalmers, *Biog. Dict.* 23:389. (J. H. W.)

### Ormond, William

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Green County, N. C. Dec. 22, 1769; was converted Dec. 11, 1787; entered the itinerancy in 1791; traveled and preached extensively from Maryland to Georgia; and died in Brunswick County, Va., Oct. 30, 1803. He was a good and zealous man, and many souls were converted under his labors. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1:116.

### Ormuzd And Ahriman.

The most difficult religious problem for the mind to solve is that of the existence of evil in this world. If there be a God, then must that God be good; and as nothing can happen without his will, naturally we should expect that the world which he governs would be a place where everything would be good, virtuous, and happy. But the contrary is the case. The world, as a matter of fact, is full of evil, of sin, and of misery. Whence, then, comes this? Is the Deity not good? or is his power limited? or how is this conflict which we see actually going on in the world to be explained? Without the higher ideas given us by revelation, the problem could not be solved; but it is interesting to examine what were the conclusions to which the mind of man, unaided by the light of revelation, came by the exercise of its own reasoning powers. It then attempted to solve the problem in two ways: the one was pantheism, the other dualism. In pantheism it is denied that there is any real difference between good and evil. Things do not exist, but merely seem to exist. This whole external world is a mere illusion, in which the world-spirit develops itself in various ways, and which finally it will absorb back into itself. Just as the bubbles upon a stream seem to have a separate existence for a time, and float upon its surface, bright in the sunshine with reflected colors, and dark and lustreless in the shade, but finally as they break all fall back into the main flood of

waters, so is it with men. They seem to have a separate existence for a time, and live some in sunshine and some in shade, but really they are all portions of the world-spirit, and at death become again indistinguishable parts of his existence, none the better and none the worse for what happened to them in life, It is this same world spirit which makes the plants grow. They have no merit and no blame for their wholesome or noxious qualities. Beauty, richness of odors, utility earn them no praise; nor is the poisonous hemlock blamed when it destroys man's life. So human actions are bit higher developments of the activity of this same-world-spirit; and as they are his doings, he cannot praise or blame them. Like want, squalor, and crime in a picture, they are unrealities, and nothing follows from them.

It was in India that pantheism was elaborated into a perfect system; but the religions both of Egypt and Babylon were based upon the same fundamental idea, which is at the root of pantheism, that good and evil are not essentially opposed, but in appearance only In the religion of the ancient Medes and Persians we find a totally different conception. Zoroaster, its reputed author, had views too high and noble to be contented with a solution which ignores the reality of this entire present state of things. On the other hand, he could not believe that the Deity, whom he conceived to be essentially good and altogether perfect, could himself have created evil, and admitted it into the world which he had created. There seemed, therefore, but one way to escape from the dilemma, and that was to suppose that evil also had an independent existence, and that there was a struggle in the moral world as well as in material nature. There cold and heat, light and darkness, tempest and sunshine seemed ever at variance, waging perpetual war for the ascendancy; and so he conceived that in opposition to Ormuzd, the good god, and principle of goodness, there stood Ahriman, an evil god, and the author of all evil and sorrow and death. Ahriman likewise seemed to him an independent power, not called into being, but equally eternal with Ormuzd himself; eternal as regards his pre-existence, but not eternal in the future. Zoroaster could not bring himself to believe that this struggle was to go on forever; and therefore, not very logically, he taught that a being endowed with an infinite pre-existence was nevertheless finite. In distant ages three prophets, sprung from Zoroaster, were to bring into the world the three remaining books of the Zend-Avesta, and convert the world to the faith; and thereupon evil was to disappear, and the whole world become pure and happy, as it was

when first created by Ormuzd, before Ahriman had entered it, and marred it by his mischievous activity.

On closer examination, however, it appears that the Zend-Avesta is not all of the same date, and that this dualism is not found in its most ancient sections. There are very early chapters that contain traces even of a polytheistic nature-worship, in which the gods have no personal existence, but are mere powers, such as the sunshine, the wind, the earth, and fire. As the same sort of worship is found in the older religious basis of India, it seems as if this was the primitive religion of the whole Aryan stock. But this system was too sensuous to long satisfy men's minds, and the next stage in the Zend-Avesta is that in which we have a distinct recognition of deities who are real persons, possessed of self-consciousness and intelligence. These deities are some good and some bad, the former being called *Asuras*, "spiritual beings," while the latter are the *Devas*, or *Divs* — a word etymologically the same as the Latin *Deus*, but originally signifying *the sky*. In Sanscrit, Greek, Latin, and most languages the word has a good meaning, and signifies the Supreme Deity. But the Iranians, in their recoil from nature-worship, gave it a bad sense, and it soon became equivalent with them to fiends and devils.

The Zend-Avesta, however, soon went one step farther. In the old nature-worship there had been no attempt to subordinate one power to another. But when the deities were regarded as persons, the question soon arose, How did these various beings combine to act together? was there among them any order of agreement? or any superiority of one over another? Now here it is the especial glory of Zoroastrianism that it conceived of the existence of one supreme God. Ormuzd is the highest object of adoration, "the true Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the universe." Mr. Rawlinson (*Ancient Monarchies*, ii,3 24) spells the name *Ahuro-Mazdao*, and gives several explanations of it, the most probable being that of Haug, "the living wise." He is set forth "as the source of all good, and the proper object of the highest worship. He is the creator of life, both the earthly and the spiritual. He made the celestial bodies, all earthly substances, all good creatures, and all things good and true." "He is himself good, holy, pure, true, the holy God, the holiest of all, the essence of truth, the father of all truth, the best being of all, the master of purity." Moreover "he is supremely happy, and possesses every blessing, health, wealth, virtue, wisdom, immortality." From him comes all good to man. On the pious and the righteous he bestows not only earthly advantages, but precious spiritual

gifts, truth, devotion, “a good mind,” and everlasting happiness; and as he rewards the good, so he punishes the bad, though this is an aspect in which he is but seldom represented.

In this description of Ormuzd, gathered by Mr. Rawlinson from the *Yacna*, or Book of Sacrifice, a part of the Zend-Avesta, we are moving among thoughts grand as those of the Old Testament, though, as this writer remarks, the conception of Ormuzd is less spiritual and less awful than that of Jehovah. The ascription to him of health, and also of the physical qualities of brightness and lucidity, shows that they did not regard him as purely spiritual; while his being so predominantly the author only of good things in a great measure deprives him of Jehovah's most sublime attribute of justice.

But Zoroastrianism did not stop here. The contemplation of the evil that is in the world led in time to a highly developed dualism, in which Ahriman stands opposed to Ormuzd as a being possessed of almost equal power, but using it only for the worst purposes. Though we do not find this doctrine, as was said above, in the most ancient sections of the Zend-Avesta, yet even there the distinctions between good and evil, truth and falsehood, right and wrong, are described in strong colors; and the name Ahriman (in ancient Persian, *Angro-Maingus*, the dark spirit) occurs but in a highly poetical passage, not as a real personage, but as a figure of speech. But in course of time this “dark spirit” came to be regarded as a living power; and as men noticed how in the struggle of life evil seemed as mighty as good, he was invested with attributes as great as those of Ormuzd himself. As, too, it was inconceivable that the good deity would have allowed such a being to come into existence, it was concluded that evil must be co-eternal with good. But as man's heart dictates to him that good is better than evil, and must finally prevail, and as the thought was unendurable that the struggle could go on forever, and this world be eternally miserable, the conclusion was arrived at that at some distant period Ormuzd would gain the victory, and evil depart out of the world forever.

Meanwhile a fierce war is carried on, in which every act of Ormuzd is watched by his enemy, and immediately spoiled. The good deity spends his time in devising schemes of benevolence for the happiness of his people, and Ahriman is equally active, and even more successful in inventing pests and annoyances, which turn every creation of Ormuzd into a place of trial

and misery. The imagination, too, soon called into existence numerous personages to be the allies and ministers of these dread powers in the conflict, and each especially had his council of six, by whose instrumentality the conflict was maintained. On the side of Ormuzd the council is more completely defined than on that of Ahriman. It is composed of six Amshashpands, or immortal saints, of whom the first, *Bahman*, "the good mind," originally a mere attribute of Ormuzd, has for his office the maintenance of life in animals and of goodness in man. *Ardibesht*, the second, means "the clearest truth." He was regarded as the light of the universe, and his business was to maintain the splendor of the various luminaries, and enable them to dispense heat and light. The third, *Shahravar*, was the dispenser of riches. The fourth, *Isfand-Armat*, represented the earth. As the Iranians were a purely agricultural people, the earth always held a high place in their esteem, and Armaiti, the earth-goddess, was also goddess of piety. Under her charge was all growth and fertility, and she was the giver of abundant harvests. The last two were *Khordad*, "health," and *Amerdat*, "immortality." The vegetable world was especially intrusted to their charge. Besides these, the armies of Ormuzd are commanded by the angel *Serosh*, described as "the sincere, the beautiful, the victorious, the true, the master of truth." Under his command they wage perpetual war with the Devas, whom sometimes he even stays, and guard the whole world, and especially the Iranian territory, from their attacks. Ahriman's council of six consists of *Ako-mano*, "the bad mind;" *Indra*, the Vedic god of storms and war, but simply a destructive being in the Zoroastrian mythology; *Caurva*, who may be Siva; *Naonhaitya*, *Taric*, and *Zaric*, the two latter being "darkness" and "poison;" but this council is not elaborated with so much care as that of Ormuzd, and several of its members are very shadowy persons.

In his general summary of Mazdeism, as the worship of Ormuzd is called, after *Mazda*, the second part of the deity's name, Mr. Rawlinson (p. 337) points out that, besides their belief in a spiritual world, composed partly of good, partly of evil intelligences, the Zoroastrians held very enlightened views with respect to human duties and hopes. In their system truth, purity, piety, and industry were the virtues chiefly valued and inculcated. Evil was traced up to its root in the heart of man; and it was distinctly taught that no virtue deserved the name but such as was co-extensive with the whole sphere of human activity, including the perfect triad of thought, word, and deed. Man's industry was to exert itself in reclaiming the soil from the

thorns and weeds and barrenness with which it had been cursed by Ahriman. Thus tillage became a religious duty, in which man was a fellow-worker with Ormuzd., Worship consisted in the recitation of prayers and hymns; the offering of soma-juice, which was not allowed to ferment and become intoxicating, as was the case in India, but was drunk fresh; and finally in sacrifices, that of the horse being looked upon as the most acceptable. The flesh was only shown to the sacred fire as an act of consecration, and was then eaten at a solemn banquet by the priest and his fellow-worshippers.

Finally, the Zoroastrians were devout believers in the immortality of the soul and a conscious future existence. They taught that immediately after death the souls of men, both good and bad, proceed together along an appointed path to "the bridge of the gatherer." Over this, from its extreme narrowness, only the souls of the good can pass, while the wicked fall from it into the gulf of punishment below. Even the good have to be assisted in their passage by the angel Serosh, but when safely over the archangel Barman rises from his throne to greet them severally with the words, "How happy art thou who hast come hither to us from mortality to immortality." After this the pious soul goes joyfully onward to the presence of Ormuzd, to the immortal saints, to the golden throne, and to Paradise. As for the wicked, when they fall into the gulf, they find themselves in outer darkness in Ahriman's kingdom, where they are forced to remain and feed on poisoned banquets. The one dark spot, therefore, in the Zoroastrian religion was this dualism, which placed opposite to the good god Ormuzd a being of nearly equal might and activity, Ahriman, who wages with him constant war. Yet even this appears to have been a corruption of the primitive creed. The earlier portions of the Zend-Avesta are strongly monotheistic, are averse to idolatry under every form, and mark in the strongest way the opposition between good and evil. But as time went on, and men mused upon this mysterious problem of the presence and power of evil in a world made by a good god, the figure of the bad intelligence, Ahriman, began to stand out in stronger colors, till he became a god too, endowed with attributes well-nigh as mighty as those of Ormuzd. Then round, the two there grew up a mythology of angelic beings, towards some of whom at last even a religious reverence was paid verging on idolatry; and so the spirituality of the original creed of the Iranians was lost.

The chief authorities are Spiegel's edition and translation of the *Zend-Avesta*; Haug, *Essays on the Sacred Language, etc., of the Parsees*;



Lenormant, *Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient*, 2:306-324; Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, 2:322-344. See also Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, 2:383 sq.; Muller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, vol. i; Upham, *Wise Men*, p. 7274, 82-85; Hunt, *Pantheism*, p. 32 sq.; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Philosophy*, 1:17 sq.; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrew Literature*, p. 340 sq. (R. P. S.)

### Ornamatuas Tüs

is the name of a spirit worshipped by the South Sea Islanders. There are supposed to be several such spirits, and they are thought to reside in the world of night, and are never invoked by wizards or sorcerers. They are a different order of beings from the gods; and are believed to be the spirits of departed relations. The natives were greatly afraid of them, and endeavored to propitiate them by presenting offerings. "They seem," says Mr. Ellis, in his *Polynesian Researches*, "to have been regarded as a sort of daemons. In the Leeward Islands, the chief *ornamatuas* were spirits of departed warriors who had distinguished themselves by ferocity and murder, attributes of character usually supposed to belong to these evil genii. Each celebrated *tu* was honored with an image, through which it was supposed his influence was exerted. The spirits of the reigning chiefs were united to this class, and the skulls of deceased rulers, kept with the images, were honored with the same worship. Some idea of what was regarded as their ruling passion may be inferred from the fearful apprehensions constantly entertained by all classes. They were supposed to be exceedingly irritable and cruel, avenging with death the slightest insult or neglect, and were kept within the precincts of the temple. In the marae of Tane, at Masva, the ruins of their abode were still standing when I last visited the place. It was a house built upon a number of large, strong poles, which raised the floor ten or twelve feet from the ground. They were thus elevated to keep them out of the way of men, as it was imagined they were constantly strangling or otherwise destroying the chiefs and people. To prevent this, they were also treated with great respect; men were appointed constantly to attend them, and to keep them wrapped in the choicest kinds of cloth; to take them out whenever there was a *pae atua*, or general exhibition of the gods; to anoint them frequently with fragrant oil; and to sleep in the house with them at night. All this was done to keep them pacified. And though the office of calming the angry spirits was honorable, it was regarded as dangerous; for if during the night, or at any other time, these keepers were guilty of the least impropriety, it was supposed the

spirits of the images or the skulls would hurl them headlong from their high abodes, and break their necks in the fall.” The names of the principle ornamatus were Mauri, Bua-rai, Tea-fao. They were considered the most malignant of beings, exceedingly irritable and implacable. They were not confined to the skulls of departed warriors, or the images made for them, but were occasionally supposed to resort to the shells from the sea-shore, especially a beautiful kind of murex, called the *murex ramoses*. These shells were kept by the sorcerers, and the peculiar singing noise perceived on applying the valve to the ear was imagined to proceed from the daemon it contained.

## Ornament

is the usual and proper rendering in the O.T. of the Hebrew  $\text{y}d\text{f}e$  *adi* (Sept. usually  $\text{κόσμος}$ ). The Israelites, like other Oriental nations, have always been remarkable for their love of ornament ( $\text{Gen 24:47}$ ;  $\text{Exod 32:2}$ ;  $\text{33:4}$ , etc.), not only in costly garments and braiding the hair ( $\text{1 Peter 3:3}$  *SEE HAIR*), but also in jewelry and gold ( $\text{Ezekiel 28:13 sq.}$ ). The men were usually content to wear simply seal-rings, *SEE SEAL*, and indulged in expensive attire only on solemn or public occasions; unless their position, as in the case of princes, required more display ( $\text{Psalm 45:5}$ ;  $\text{2 Samuel 12:30}$ ;  $\text{2 Maccabees 4:38}$ , etc.). But the women, especially young damsels and brides, wore many and very valuable ornaments ( $\text{2 Samuel 1:24}$ ;  $\text{Jeremiah 2:32}$ ;  $\text{Isaiah 3:17 sq.}$ ;  $\text{61:10}$ ;  $\text{Judges 10:4}$ ;  $\text{12:16}$ ; comp.  $\text{Esther 2:12}$ ), generally in the form of rings, chains, and bracelets. Sometimes the young women purposely made themselves publicly conspicuous by their adornments (Baruch 6:8; *i.e.* Epist. Jerem. 8). During times of mourning, in obedience to a natural impulse, all ornaments were laid aside ( $\text{Exodus 33:4 sq.}$ ;  $\text{2 Samuel 1:24}$ ;  $\text{Ezekiel 24:17, 22}$ ). Ornaments are enumerated in various passages (see  $\text{Isaiah 3:18 sq.}$ ;  $\text{Hosea 2:12}$ ;  $\text{Ezekiel 16:11}$ ). Among the ornaments peculiar to females was the golden head-dress in the form of the holy city (see Mishna, *Edujoth*, 2:7,  $\text{bj z l ç ry}$ ], so explained by the rabbins). Idols were also adorned with gold and jewels ( $\text{Jeremiah 10:4}$ ; Baruch 6:10, 23;  $\text{2 Maccabees 2:2}$ ), as now the images of the Virgin in the Roman churches. *SEE ATTIRE*; *SEE EPHOD*.

The number, variety, and weight of the ornaments ordinarily worn upon the person form one of the characteristic features of Oriental costume, both in ancient and modern times (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:184 sq.; Van

Lenep, *Bible Lands*, p. 531 sq.). The monuments of ancient Egypt exhibit the hands of ladies loaded with rings, earrings of very great size, anklets, armlets, bracelets of the most varied character and frequently inlaid with precious stones or enamel, handsome and richly ornamented necklaces, either of gold or of beads, and chains of various kinds (Wilkinson, 2:335-341). The modern Egyptians retain to the full the same taste, and vie with their progenitors in the number and beauty of their ornaments (Lane, vol. iii, Appendix A). Nor is the display confined, as with us, to the upper classes; we are told that “even most of the women of the lower orders wear a variety of trumpery ornaments, such as ear-rings, necklaces, bracelets, etc., and sometimes a nose-ring” (Lane, 1:78). There is sufficient evidence in the Bible that the inhabitants of Palestine were equally devoted to finery. In the Old Testament, Isaiah (<sup><2318></sup>Isaiah 3:18-23) supplies us with a detailed description of the articles with which the luxurious women of his day were decorated, and the picture is filled up by incidental notices in other places; in the New Testament the apostles lead us to infer the prevalence of the same habit when they recommend the women to adorn themselves, “not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array, but with good works” (<sup><5419></sup>1 Timothy 2:9, 10), — even with “the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price” (<sup><1104></sup>1 Peter 3:4). Ornaments were most lavishly displayed at festivals, whether of a public (<sup><3213></sup>Hosea 2:13) or a private character, particularly on the occasion of a wedding (<sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 61:10; <sup><2423></sup>Jeremiah 2:32). In times of public mourning they were, on the other hand, laid aside (<sup><1234></sup>Exodus 33:4-6).

With regard to the particular articles noticed in the Old Testament, it is sometimes difficult to explain their form or use, as the name is the only source of information open to us. Much illustration may, however, be gleaned both from the monuments of Egypt and Assyria and from the statements of modern travelers; and we are in all respects in a better position to explain the meaning of the Hebrew terms than were the learned men of the Reformation era. We propose, therefore, to review the passages in which the personal ornaments are described, substituting, where necessary, for the readings of the A. V. the more correct sense in italics, and referring for more detailed descriptions of the articles to the various heads under which they may be found. The notices which occur in the early books of the Bible imply the weight and abundance of the ornaments worn at that period. Eliezer decorated Rebekah with “a golden

*nose-ring* (μζη, *nezem*) of half a shekel weight, and two bracelets (*dymæ tсамid*) for her hands of ten shekels weight of gold" (<sup><022></sup>Genesis 24:22); and he afterwards added "*trinkets* (yl כלי, *keli*, articles in general) of silver and *trinkets* of gold" (verse 53). Earrings (μhynεβB]μzε, "*nezemn* in their ears") were worn by Jacob's wives, apparently as charms, for they are mentioned in connection with idols: "They gave unto Jacob all the strange gods which were in their hand, and their ear-rings which were in their ears" (<sup><034></sup>Genesis 35:4). The ornaments worn by the patriarch Judah were a "signet" (μτωβ, *chotham*), which was suspended by a *string* (l ytε, *pathil*) round the neck, and a "staff" (<sup><078></sup>Genesis 37:18): the staff itself was probably ornamented, and thus the practice of the Israelites would be exactly similar to that of the Babylonians, who, according to Herodotus (1:195), "each carried a seal, and a walking-stick, carved at the top into the form of an apple, a rose, an eagle, or something similar." The first notice of the ring occurs in reference to Joseph: when he was made ruler of Egypt, Pharaoh "took off his *signet-ring* (τ [ Bfi, *tabbdath*; in this, as in other cases [<sup><70></sup>Esther 3:10; 8:2; 1 Maccabees 6:15], not merely an ornament, but the symbol of authority) from his hand and put it upon Joseph's hand, and put a gold chain (*dylbæ rabid*; also a chain worn by a woman [Esther 16:11]) about his neck" (<sup><042></sup>Genesis 41:42), the latter being probably a "simple gold chain in imitation of string, to which a stone scarabæus, set in the same precious metal, was appended" (Wilkinson, 2:339). The number of personal ornaments worn by the Egyptians, particularly by the females, is incidentally noticed in <sup><082></sup>Exodus 3:22: "Every woman shall *ask* (A. V. "borrow") of her neighbor *trinkets* (yl כלי, *keli*, as above) of silver and *trinkets* of gold. and ye shall spoil the Egyptians." In <sup><212></sup>Exodus 11:2, the order is extended to the males, and from this time we may perhaps date the more frequent use of trinkets among men, for while it is said in the former passage, — "Ye shall put them nupon your *sons* and upon your daughters," we find subsequent notices of ear-rings being worn at all events by young men (<sup><322></sup>Exodus 32:2), and again of offerings both from *men* and women of "*nose-rings* (j j ; *chach*, A. V. "bracelets;" some authorities prefer the sense "buckle;" in other passages the same word signifies the ring placed through the nose of an animal, such as a bull, to lead him by) and ear-rings, and rings, and *riicklaes* (zmllK, *kuuma*, A.V. . "tablets;" a necklace formed of perforated gold drops strung together), all articles of gold" (<sup><352></sup>Exodus 35:22). The profusion of these ornaments was

such as to supply sufficient gold for making the sacred utensils for the tabernacle, while the laver of brass was constructed out of the brazen mirrors (*twarḥi maroth*) which the women carried about with them (<sup><0388></sup>Exodus 38:8). The Midianites appear to have been as prodigal as the Egyptians in the use of ornaments; for the Israelites are described as having captured “*trinkets of gold,*” *armlets* (*hd[ xā*, *etsadah*, A. V. “chains;” cognate term, used in <sup><0389></sup>Isaiah 3:20, means “stepchain;” but the word is used both here and in <sup><0110></sup>2 Samuel 1:10 without reference to its etymological sense) and bracelets, rings, ear-rings (*l ygā*, *agil*, a circular ear-ring of a solid character), and *necklaces*” (*zmḥk*, *kumaz*, as above), the value of which amounted to 16,750 shekels (<sup><0453></sup>Numbers 31:50, 52). Equally valuable were the ornaments obtained from the same people after their defeat by Gideon: “The weight of the golden *nose-rings* (*μzn*, *nezem*, as above; the term is here undefined; but, as ear-rings are subsequently noticed in the verse, we think it probable that the nose-ring is intended) was a thousand and seven hundred shekels of gold; besides *collars* (*μynāḇi*, *saharonim*, A. V. “ornaments;” the word specifies *moon-shaped* disks of metal, strung on a cord, and placed around the necks either of men or of camels) and *ear-pendants* (*twpyfā*, *netiphoth*, A. V. “collars” or “sweet-jewels;” the etymological sense of the word is *pendants*, which were no doubt attached to ear-rings) (<sup><0126></sup>Judges 8:26).

The poetical portions of the O.T. contain numerous references to the ornaments worn by the Israelites in the time of their highest prosperity. The appearance of the bride is thus described in the book of the Canticles: “Thy cheeks are comely with *beads* (*μyrā*, *torim*, A. V. “rows;” the term means, according to Gesenius [*The*. p. 1499], *rows* of pearls or beads; but as the etymological sense is connected with *circle*, it may rather mean the individual beads, which might be strung together, and so make a row, encircling the cheeks. In the next verse the same word is rendered in the A. V. “borders.” The sense must, however, be the same in both verses, and the point of contrast may perchance consist in the difference of the material, the beads in ver. 10 being of some ordinary metal, while those in ver. 11 were to be of gold), thy neck with *perforated* [*pearls*] (*μyzāj* } *charuzim*, A. V. “chains;” the word would apply to any perforated articles, such as beads, pearls, coral, etc.); we will make thee *beads*, of gold with studs of silver” (1, 10, 11). Her neck, rising tall and stately “like the tower of David builded for an armory,” was decorated with various ornaments

hanging like the “thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men, on the walls of the armory” (4:4); her hair, falling gracefully over her neck, is described (4:9) figuratively as a “chain” (qnr[ ] anak), and “the roundings” (not as in the A. V. “the joints”) of her thighs are likened to the pendant (pyabē[ ] “jewels;” rather this is the lace-work fringe of the drawers enveloping the lower limbs) of an ear-ring, which tapers gradually downwards (7:1). So again we read of the bridegroom: “his eyes are... fitly set,” as if they were gems filling the sockets of rings (v. 12): “his hands are as gold rings (myl ꝥ ꝥ gelilim) set with the beryl,” i.e. (as explained by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 287) the fingers when curved are like gold rings, and the nails dyed with henna resemble gems (rather the fingers had rings literally). Lastly, the yearning after close affection is expressed thus: “Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm,” whether that the seal itself was the most valuable personal ornament worn by a man, as in <sup>-2024</sup>Jeremiah 22:24; <sup>-3023</sup>Haggai 2:23, or whether perchance the close contiguity of the seal to the wax on which it is impressed may not rather be intended (<sup>-2086</sup>Song of Solomon 8:6). We may further notice the imagery employed in the Proverbs to describe the effects of wisdom in beautifying the character; in reference to the terms used we need only explain that the “ornament” of the A. V. in 1:9; 4:9, is more specifically a wreath (hyw[ ] ativyah), or garland; the “chains” of 1:9, the drops (qnr[ ] anak, as above) of which the necklace was formed; the “jewel of gold in a swine's snout” of 11:22, a nose-ring (mzn, nezem, as above); the “jewel” of 20:15, a trinket, and the “ornament” of 25:12, an ear-pendant (yl ꝥ ꝥ chali, as above).

The passage of Isaiah (<sup>-2085</sup>Isaiah 3:18-23) to which we have already referred may be rendered as follows: (18) “In that day the Lord will take away the bravery of their anklets (mysbē[ ] akasinu), and their lace caps (mysꝥꝥ shebisim; rather, perhaps, disks attached to the necklace), and their necklaces (lunettes); (19) the ear-pendants, and the bracelets, and the light veils; (20) the turbans, and the step-chains, and the girdles, and the scent-bottles, and the amulets; (21) the rings and noserings; (22) the state-dresses, and the cloaks, and the shawls, and the purses; (23) the mirrors, and the fine linen shirts, and the turbans, and the light dresses.”

The following extracts from the Mishna (*Sabb.* cap. vi) illustrate the subject of this article, it being premised that the object of the inquiry was to ascertain what constituted a proper article of dress. and what might be

regarded by rabbinical refinement as a burden “A woman must not go out (on the Sabbath) with linen or woollen laces, nor with the straps on her head; nor with a frontlet and pendants thereto, unless sewn to her cap; nor with a golden tower (i.e. an ornament in the shape of a tower); or with a tight gold chain; nor with nose-rings; nor with finger-rings on which there is no seal; nor with a needle without an eye (§ 1); nor with a needle that has an eye; nor with a finger-ring that has a seal on it; nor with a diadem; nor with a smelling-bottle or balm-flask (§ 3). A man is not to go out... with an amulet, unless it be by a distinguished sage (§ 2): knee-buckles are clean, and a man may go out with them; stepchains are liable to become unclean, and a man must not go out with them “ (§ 4). See each article named in its place.

### Ornaments (Or Decorations), Architectural

are additions made to simple constructive features, or to the form of these features, for the purpose of embellishment or elegance. Thus the Doric shaft, while answering the constructive purposes of a simple square or round pier, is ornamented with fluting; and its capital, with its beautifully proportioned echinus and abacus, supports as a plain slab would do the weight of the entablature. The other classic orders illustrate this in a richer manner. Thus the Corinthian column, with its fluted and elegant shaft, resting on an ornamented base, and crowned by an ornamented capital, takes the place of what might have been, had utility alone been consulted, a plain pier of rubble-work, with a rough stone to rest upon, and another on the top to receive the load.

In classic architecture, as in every good style, the same principle pervades all the ornamental features, viz. *that they are constructive features ornamented in a manner suitable to their use*; for instance, a column being a member for support, should be of such a form as to denote this; the constructive use of a cornice being to protect the top of the wall, and to shield the front of it from the rain and sun, it should be made of such a form as to do this, and also to *look* as if it did it to express its purpose. In classic architecture, the cornice consists of several members, in which the constructive decoration is well seen; the mutules and modillions beautifully indicating in an ornamental manner their original use, while the leaf enrichments of the small moldings give life and animation to the building. In mediaeval art the same principle prevails in a much greater degree, and over a more complex system of construction. The shafts, with their elegant



and purpose-like bases and caps, are arranged so that each supports a separate member of the vaulting. The arch moldings are divided so as to indicate the rings of their constructive formation. The buttresses, so elegant in outline, express the part they serve in supporting the vaulting; the pinnacles, with their ornamental finals, are the decorated dead-weights which steady the buttresses. The foliage and smaller ornaments are also beautifully and suitably applied, as the growth and vigor of the supporting capitals and corbels, and the running foliage of the string-courses, archmoldings, etc., fully illustrate.

There are, no doubt, many styles of art to which these remarks can hardly be said to apply; as, for example, the Assyrian, Egyptian, and Hindu styles, where we find many features applied in a manner meant to be ornamental, although actually contrary to their constructive use. In these styles (and also in Greek architecture), human figures, bulls, and other animals are placed as columns to carry the weight of a superincumbent mass. This is evidently wrong in principle, except when the figure is placed in an attitude to indicate that he is supporting a weight, as the Greek Atlantes do; but in the former cases religious notions seem to have overcome true artistic feeling. There are also many forms of ornament used in all styles the origin of which is obscure and their advantage doubtful; such are the zigzag, chevron, billet, etc., so common in early mediaeval art and the scrolls of Ionic and Indian art, and the complications of the interlacing work of the North in the Middle Ages. Such things may be admissible in colored decoration, such as the confused patterns of Saracenic art, and the shell-patterns of Indian art; but where ornamental *form* is wanted, unless the requirements of the construction are carefully followed as the guide to the decoration, all principle is lost, and the ornament runs wild. This has frequently occurred in the history of art, and in no case more markedly than in the art of the Renaissance.

The material in use must also have an influence on the form and style of the ornament. Thus stone-carving and metal-work must evidently require different treatment. Facsimile leaves might be formed in iron, but could not be so carved in stone. This constructive element should be carefully attended to in designing. All imitative art must be to some extent conventional. Natural objects, such as leaves, flowers, etc., cannot be copied absolutely literally; and in suiting the conventional treatment to the nature of the material used lies the great skill of the artist.



## Ornaments, Ecclesiastical,

a designation of the various minor articles of furniture, utensils, pictures, etc., used in some churches.

Soon after the establishment of the Church as a state institution, i.e. in the time of Constantine, ornaments more or less costly began to be introduced. In addition to the observations on the sacred vessels and utensils of the church, and all gifts which were called *Anathemata* and Ἐκτηπώματα, and which were a sort of symbolical memorial or hieroglyphical representation of the kindness and favor that had been received, sentences of Holy Scripture and other inscriptions were frequently written on the walls. This was the most ancient of all decorations in churches. Gilding and mosaic-work were introduced at an early period. The practice of exhibiting pictures of saints, martyrs, etc., began in the 4th century; it was introduced by Paulinus, bishop of Nola, and his contemporaries, privately and by degrees. Statues and images were a later innovation. The pictures of kings and bishops were brought in about the same time; but no images of God or the Trinity were allowed in churches till after the second Nicene Council; nor, usually, statues or massy images, but only paintings and pictures, and those symbolical rather than any other. The practice of adorning churches with evergreens is mentioned by Augustine. and is probably of high antiquity.

The Roman Catholic Church has continued in a free use of all kinds of church ornamentation. Even in the Greek Church, where the Iconoclastic spirit has done away with much that is held essential to church decorations by Romanists, *SEE ICONOCLASM*, the number of ornaments used is still very great. Of course in the Protestant churches ornaments of a ritualistic character have been largely abandoned. In the Church of England, the Rubric before the Common Prayer directs that such ornaments of the church and the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as they were in this Church of England, by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of king Edward VI. *SEE CONSTITUTIONS* and *SEE CANONS ECCLESIASTICAL*; *SEE RITUALISM*. The Lutheran Church of Germany has retained the use of pictures, tapers, and crucifix; while the Reformed Church and the dissenting bodies have carefully discarded every such ornament from the church.

We embody in this article a concise description of the chief articles used in the ritualistic churches of Christendom, and their supposed significance, taking it largely from a curious little book written in defense of extreme ritualism, and entitled *The Ritual Reason Why*. The *altar-rail* is a rail which separates the altar from the rest of the chancel, because it symbolizes the Holy of Holies in the Temple; the *altar-cloth* veils it as a token of respect, and to mark the different seasons of the Church by a change of colors, which are five in number; the *lights* are emblematic of Christ, the light of the world, and also signs of spiritual light and joy; *flowers* are used for the same purpose; the *credence-table* (q.v.) is used for the preparation of the elements for the communion before they are placed on the altar; the *sedilia* (q.v.) are the seats of the lesser clergy, arranged according to their rank; the *paten* (q.v.) is a thin dish of gold or silver gilt, on which the altar beads are placed for consecration and for communion; the *ciborium* is a kind of shallow cup used for the same purpose the *chalice* (qv.) is the cup for holding the consecrated wine; the *chalice-veil* is a square of embroidered silk for covering it when empty; the *corporal* is a napkin of fine linen spread on the altar at the time of the communion; the *cruets* are vessels of glass or metal for holding the sacred wine, and for water; the *pyx* (q.v.) is a metal canister lined with linen in which the bread is kept till required for use; the *basin* and *napkin* are used for washing the priests' hands; the *piscina* (q.v.) is a small stone basin set in the wall, and used for the same purpose; the *lectern* (q.v.) is the name given to the reading-desk; the *censer* (q.v.), or *thurible*, is a vessel of metal, usually in the shape of a cup, with a perforated cover, in which incense is offered; the *sanctus bell* is a small bell used to give notice of the elevation of the host, or eucharistic bread; the *travelling-cloth* is spread over the altar-rails, or before the communicants, to prevent any of the bread falling to the ground. There are other articles, especially different kinds of candles and candlesticks, used in and about the altar and in processions; but those above mentioned are the most important, except such as are worn upon the person, for which **SEE VESTMENTS**. (See illustrations on following page.)

See Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, bk. viii; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 741 sq., 811 sq.; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity exemplified*, p. 260 sq.; and. for the Church of England especially, Hook, *Church Dict. s.v.*

## Or'nan

(Heb. *Ornan*', אֲרָנָה; Sept. Ὀρνᾶ; Targum usually אֲרָנָה, but also אֲרָנָה, אֲרָנָה, אֲרָנָה; and niM; Vulg. *Ornan*), the form in which the name of the Jebusite king, who in the older record of the book of Samuel is called Araunah, Aranyah, Ha-avarnah, or Haornah, is given in Chronicles (<sup><1215></sup>1 Chronicles 21:15, 18, 20-25, 28; <sup><1401></sup>2 Chronicles 3:1). **SEE ARAINAH**. In some of the Greek versions of Origen's Hexapla collected by Bahrdt, the threshing-floor of Ornan (Ἐρνὰ τοῦ Ἰεβουσαίου) is named for that of Nachon in <sup><1066></sup>2 Samuel 6:6.

## Oro

is (1) the name given in the Yoruba country of West Africa to *Mumbo Jumbo* (q.v.). (2) The principal war-god of the pagan natives of Polynesia. Such was the delight which he was supposed to have in blood that his priest required every victim offered in sacrifice to be covered with its own blood in order to its acceptance. When war was in agitation a human sacrifice was offered to Oro, the ceremony connected with it being called fetching the god to preside over the army. The image of the god was brought out; when the victim was offered, a red feather was taken from his person and given to the party, who bore it to their companions, and considered it as a symbol of Oro's presence and sanction during their subsequent preparations. Oro was, in the Polynesian mythology, the first son of Tauroa, who was the founder and father of the gods; he was the first of the fourth class of beings worshipped in the Leeward Islands, and appears to have been the medium of connection between celestial and terrestrial beings. In Tahiti Oro was worshipped under the representation of a straight log of hard casuarina wood, six feet in length, uncarved, but decorated with feathers. This was the great national idol of the Polynesians. He was generally supposed to give the response to the priests who sought to know the will of the gods or the issue of events. At Opoa, which was considered the birthplace of the god, was the most celebrated oracle of the people.

## Orobio, Isaac De Castro

a Spanish physician, noted as a philosopher and polemic against Christianity, was born at Braganza about the year 1620. His parents, who were Jews, though outwardly professing Romanism, educated him in

Judaism. *Balthasar Orobio* — this was his name while in the Church — studied

## Picture for Orobio

the scholastic philosophy at the University of Alcala de 'Honores, in which his acquisitions were so considerable that he was appointed lector in metaphysics in the University of Salamanca. He afterwards applied himself to the study of medicine, which he practiced at Seville. Upon suspicion of Judaism he was cast into the prisons of the Inquisition, where during three years he underwent torture worthy of the barbarity of that infamous tribunal, and which often, according to his own declaration, so perplexed his understanding as to make him ask himself, "Am I really Don Balthasar Orobio, who walked about freely in Seville, who lived at ease, and had the blessing of a wife and children?" Sometimes he thought that his past life had been nothing but a dream, and that the frightful dungeon where he was had been his birthplace, as, according to all appearance, it was destined to see him die. At other times, as he had a very metaphysical mind, he formed arguments and then resolved them, thus performing the parts of opponent, respondent, and moderator at the same time. In this way he amused himself, and constantly denied that he was a Jew. After appearing twice or thrice before the inquisitors, he was treated as follows: At the bottom of a sub-terraneous vault, lighted by two or three small lamps, he appeared before two persons. One was the judge, and the other the secretary of the Inquisition, who asked him to confess the truth, declaring that, in case of a criminal's denial, the holy office would not be deemed the cause of his death if he should expire under the torture, but it must be attributed to his own obstinacy. Then the executioner stripped off his clothes, tied his hands and feet with a strong cord, and set him on a low stool, while he passed the cord through some iron rings fixed in the walls; then, drawing away the stool, he remained suspended by the cord, which the executioner drew tighter and tighter to make him confess, until a surgeon assured the court he could not bear more without expiring. These cords put him to exquisite torture by cutting into the flesh, and making the blood burst from under his nails. To prevent the cords tearing off the flesh, of which there was danger, bands were girded about the breast, which were drawn so tight that he would not have been able to breathe if he had not held his breath while the executioners put the bands around him. By this device his lungs were enabled to perform their functions. During the severest, of his sufferings he was told that was but the beginning of his torments, and that he had better

confess before they proceeded to extremities. Orobio adds that the executioner, being on a small ladder, to frighten him, frequently let it fall against his shin-bones. The staves, being sharp, caused him dreadful pain. However, all the tortures of the holy office were insufficient to wrest from him the avowal of his true sentiments, which would have drawn down upon him the most cruel punishment. He was at length set at liberty, left Spain for France, and was appointed by Louis XIV as professor of medicine at Toulouse. But weary, at length, of the necessity under which he lay of concealing the religion which he believed to be the true one, and which, without doubt, the ill-treatment received from Christians had rendered more dear, he went to Amsterdam, where, after having received circumcision, he made an open profession of Judaism taking the name of *Isaac*. He died in the year 1687. It was in the city of Amsterdam that Orobio had his famous conferences with the theologian Philip de Limborch (q.v.), who, persuaded of the force of his own arguments in favor of the Christian religion, published them, together with the objections of Orobio: *De veritate religionis Judicae cum confutatione religionis Christianae*, in three treatises, under the title of *Philippi a Limborch amica collatio cum erudito Judaeo* (Tergow, 1687; Basle, 1740). Orobio wrote, *Certamen philosophicum propugnatae veritatis divince ac naturalis adversus Joh. Bredenburgii principia* (Latin and Dutch, Amsterd. 1684, 1703, and 1731): — *Respuesta a un Predicante sobre lt perpetua observancia de la divina Ley: — Explicacion del capitulo liii d' Ysaías: — Explicacion paraphrastica de has lxx Semanas de Daniel: — Una epistola invectiva contra un Judio philosopho medico, que aegava la ley de Mose y siendo Atheista afectava la ley de Naturaleza: -Israel venge, ou exposition naturelle des propheties Hebraiquesu ls ues Chretiens appliquent a Jesus leur pretendu Messie* (translated from the Spanish into French by Henriquez, Lond. 1770). With regard to the last work, it has been supposed by De Rossi that it was not written by Orobio himself, but only compiled from his works by Henriquez, who is mentioned as the translator; and it is remarkable that neither Basnage nor Wolf, who appear to have had his works as published in Spanish before them, enumerates any treatise with this title. The work *Israel Venge* has been translated into English by Miss Anna Maria Goldsmid (Lond. 1839), and also in the same year by the late Dr. A. M'Caul (q.v.), under the title *Israel Avenged*, to which edition is appended a reply from the pen of this able British apologist of Christianity. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:54 sq.; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:646 sq.; 3:551 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 253 sq. (Germ. transl. by

Hamburger); *Bibliotheca Judaica antichristiana*, No. 122, etc. (Parma, 1800); Basnage, *Histoire des Juifs*, p. 743 sq. (Taylor's transl.); Schudt, *Judische Denkwürdigkeiten*, 1:124, 159 sq.; Kalkar, *Israel u. die Kirche*, p. 36; Limborch, *Historia Inquisitionis*, vol. ii, ch. 18; vol. iv, ch. 29; Joh. Clericus, *Bibliotheca universalis*, 7:289 sq.; Lindo, *History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal*, p. 370; Adams, *History of the Jews* (Bost. 1812), 2:91) Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 430 sq.; Finn, *Sepharitidim'* (Lond. 1841), p. 443 sq.; Frankel, *Monatsschrift* (1867), p. 321-330; Kayserling, *Gesch. d. Juden in Portugal* (Leips. 1867), p. 302 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 3:233; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:202 sq., note 1, p. x sq.; Rodriguez de Castro, *Bibliotheca Espanola*, 1:606; Fabricius, *Delectus Argumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum*, etc. (Hamb. 1725), p. 359, 614; Huie, *History of the Jews* (Edinb. 1841), p. 198 sq. (B. P.)

### Orosius, Paulus

a noted writer of the early Christian Church in Spain, was born in the latter part of the 4th century at Tarragona, in Catalonia. He was educated in Spain, and, after entering the service of the Church, was made presbyter in his native place. About A.D. 414 he proceeded, by direction of the Spanish bishops Eutropius and Paul, to Africa, for the purpose, as it seems, of consulting St. Augustine (whom he appears; from the introduction to his *History*, to have been in communication with some years before) on several controverted points of belief, which were then discussed by the Priscillianists and the Origenists, especially concerning the doctrine of the nature and origin of the soul. (See *Consultatio sive Commonitorium Orosii ad Augustinum de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum*, together with Augustine's answer, *Ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas*, both in the collection of the works of St. Augustine.) By advice of Augustine, Orosius proceeded thence to Palestine with a recommendation from Augustine to Jerome, who was then living at Bethlehem to consult with this learned Church father too. While in Palestine, Orosius wrote a treatise against Pelagius, who was at that time spreading his opinions concerning original sin and grace — *Liber apologeticus contra Pelagium de Arbitrii Libertate* which is annexed to the *History* of Orosius. He was also called upon to oppose Pelagius and his disciple' Celestius in a synod held at Jerusalem July 30, 415. From Palestine Orosius returned to Hippo Regius, to his friend Augustine, and thence to Spain. He now employed himself in writing, in accordance with Augustine's

advice, the historical work which gained him his reputation, viz. the *Historiarum lib. vii, adv. paganos*; also known under the different titles of *De cladibus et miseriis munzdi*, *De totius mundi calamitatibus*, *Hormeta*, and *Ormsesta* (the origin and signification of these latter appellations are uncertain). This work was commenced in 416, and completed in 417; its object is to refute the accusations of the heathen, who stated that the calamities which had befallen the Roman empire, and, above all, the capture and pillage of Rome by Alaric, A.D. 410, and the subsequent misfortunes of the people, arose from the neglect of the ancient gods and the introduction of Christianity. Augustine had already treated the same subject in his great apologetic work, *De civitate Dei*, in another manner. Orosius set himself to prove historically that this world had always been a place of suffering and sorrow, governed by errors and superstitions, but that it would be still worse were it not for Christianity. This historical work, which comes down to the year 417, consists of seven books, divided into chapters. It begins with a geographical description of the world, then treats of the origin of the human race according to the book of Genesis, and afterwards relates the various accounts of the mythologists and poets concerning the heroic ages. Then follows the history of the early monarchies, the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian; the conquests of Alexander, and the wars of his successors; as well as the early history of Rome, the contents being chiefly taken from Trogus Pompeius and Justinus. The fourth book contains the history of Rome from the wars of Pyrrhus to the fall of Carthage. The fifth book comprises the period from the taking of Corinth to the war of Spartacus. Orosius quotes his authorities, several of which are from works which are now lost. The narrative in the sixth book begins with the war of Sulla against Mithridates, and ends with the birth of our Savior. The seventh book contains the history of the empire till A.D. 416, including a narrative of the taking and sacking of Rome by Alaric, which was the great event of the age. Orosius intermixes with his narrative moral reflections, and sometimes whole chapters of advice and consolation, addressed to his Christian brethren, and intended to confirm their faith amid the calamities of the times, which, however heavy, were not, as he asserts, unprecedented. The Romans, he says, in their conquests had inflicted equal if not greater wrongs on other countries. His tone is that of a Christian moralist impressed with the notions of justice, retribution, and humanity, in which most of the heathen historians show themselves deficient. He deprecates ambition, conquest, and glory gained at the expense of human blood and human happiness. As

a historian, Orosius shows considerable critical judgment in general, though in particular passages he appears too credulous, as in ch. 10 of the first book, where he relates from report that the marks of the chariot-wheels of Pharaoh's host are still visible at the bottom of the Red Sea. (As an instance of the incidental value of the passages taken by Orosius from older writers, see Savigny, *Das Recht des Besitzes* p. 176.) In the main, however, the work is not strictly original, but is largely taken from Justin and Eutropius. That it was highly prized in the Middle Ages is proved by the fact that there are a great many manuscript copies extant. The *Historiae* has often been published (Augsburg, 1471; Vicenza, 1475; Cologne, 1526, etc.; Leydel, by Haverkamp, 1738 and 1767). King Alfred made a free translation of it into the Anglo-Saxon language, which was published by Daines Barrington, with an English version of it (Lond. 1773, 8vo), but of which a much more accurate edition, with a literal translation into English, and valuable notes, was published by Dr. Bosworth in 1855. The very remarkable additions of Alfred are especially valuable, as containing "the only geography of Europe written by a contemporary, and giving the position and the political state of the Germanic nations so early as the 9th century." A translation of Alfred's version forms a volume of "Bohn's Antiquarian Library" (1847). One of the best editions of Orosius is that with Haverkamp's notes, published at Leyden. Orosius died in Africa. Several other works, such as *Quaestiones de Trinitate et aliis S.S. locis* (Paris, 1533), have been erroneously attributed to him. See Mohler, *De Orosii Vita ejusque Historiarum Libris Septem adversus Paganos* (Bal. 1844); Gennadius, *De Viris Illustribus*, p. 39, 46; Schonenmann, *Bibl. Patr. Lat.* vol. ii, § 10; Moller, *Dissertatio de Paulo Orosio* (Altorf, 1689, 4to); Smith, *Diet. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* 3:58, 59; Alzog, *Kirchengesch.* vol. i; Moshelm, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. i; Lardner, *Works* (see Index); *English Cyclop.* s.v.

## Oroth

SEE HERB.

## Or'pah

(Heb. *Orpah'*, **hPrI**; supposed to be transposed for **hrpI**; a gazelle; Sept. **Ὠρφα**), a Moabitish woman, wife of Chilion, son of Naomi, and thereby sister-in-law to Ruth. B.C. cir. 1360. On the death of their husbands Orpah accompanied her sister-in-law and her mother-in-law on



the road to Bethlehem. But here her resolution failed her. The offer which Naomi made to the two younger women that they should return “each to her own mother’s house,” after a slight hesitation, she embraced. “Orpah kissed her mother-in-law,” and went back “to her people and to her gods,” leaving to the unconscious Ruth the glory, which she might have rivalled, of being the mother of the most illustrious house of that or any nation (<sup><RB04></sup>Ruth 1:4, 14). *SEE RUTH.*

## Orphan

The customary acceptation of the word orphans is well known to be that of “children deprived of their parents;” but the force of the Greek word ὀρφάνους (rendered *comfortless* in the king James version, <sup><GB48></sup>John 14:18) implies the case of those who have lost some dear protecting friend; some patron, though not strictly a father: and in this sense it is used, <sup><SB17></sup>1 Thessalonians 2:17: “We also, brethren, being taken away from our care over you,” ἄπορφανισθεντες. Corresponding to this import of the word it may be used by Christ in the passage of John’s Gospel.

## Orphanages Or Orphan Asylums

a term applied to those philanthropic institutions which provide a home for orphaned children until their education or training has fitted them for safe contact with the world at large.

The history of the origin of orphan asylums is very uncertain. What the Romans understood *bypueri* (or *puellce*) *alinentarii* cannot properly be compared to our institutions called orphanages. Trajan, who did much to protect orphans, both the Antonines, and Alexander Severus, established foundations for them; but such institutions do not seem to have been frequent till the introduction of Christianity, which gave encouragement for the founding of so many institutions beneficial to mankind. *SEE ASYLUMS; SEE HOSPITALS.* In the Middle Ages orphan asylums became quite frequent, especially in thriving and opulent cities of the Continent, and enactments were secured in the Church to take proper care of children bereft of their parents (comp. Lea, *Studies in Church History*, p. 74). In Germany and Italy many orphanages date from the 16th and 17th centuries, but by far the most famous of the institutions which originated in that period is the Orphan House at Halle founded by A. H. Francke (q.v.) in 1698. In many respects it is the most noted of all orphanages. The Orphan House founded at Ashley Down, near Bristol, England, by George Muller

(see his *Life of Trust*), stands perhaps second on the list. Both these institutions are noted not only for their extensive orphan labors, but also for their missionary enterprise at home and abroad. But while the former has largely devoted itself also to educational and business enterprises (see Hurst's Hagenbach, *Church History of the 18th and 19th Centuries*, 1:130, 140, 306), Muller's single and small Orphan House, founded in 1836, on his own premises, has grown to five orphanages, each one of extensive proportions, and each filled to its utmost capacity with indigent beneficiaries, and all these supported, not, as in the former, by endowment and traffic, but by unasked-for contributions to Muller; "all," as he believes "in answer to prayer and faith." The five orphanage buildings have cost over \$500,000; the balance of the receipts has gone to meet the current expenses during the thirty-seven years of the history of the enterprise. Whatever has been received beyond what has been needed for present use has not been funded for possible future need for no future lack has been apprehended but has been immediately applied in missionary work in various parts of the country. As many as 150 missionaries have been aided by the "surplus" funds. During the year ending May 26 1874, Muller received £37.855 15s. 6d., with which 189 missionaries and 122 schools were supported in whole or in part, 2261 orphans maintained, and 47,413 Bibles or parts of the Bible, and 3,775,971 tracts and books distributed. From the beginning up to May, 1874, he had instructed in all 38,800 children in the various schools entirely supported by the institution (as Mr. Muller is pleased to designate it), besides tens of thousands benefited in other schools assisted by its funds, not only in Great Britain, but in Spain, Italy, India, and British Guiana. Added to this, more than 467,000 Bibles and Testaments in various languages, and 50,000,000 religious tracts, have been issued and distributed through its agency, 190 missionaries supported year by year, and 4408 orphans brought up. In most of the institutions the care of the orphan is relinquished only to a competent person, usually one following a trade. The boy or girl, however, is more or less under the eye of the orphanage until the apprenticeship is satisfactorily completed. The Jews, noted for their philanthropic labors, have adopted this Christian institution, and have founded several large orphanages. One of their most noted is at Berlin, called the 'Auerbachsche Waisenanstalt.'

The question of most consequence in relation to the public support of orphans is, whether it is best, in a moral, physical, and economical point of view, to bring up large numbers of orphans in great establishments where

they live together, or to put them out singly in trustworthy families paid by the community (see *Brit. Qu. Rev.* Oct. 1875, art. v). In Germany this question was long and thoroughly discussed. and for a time the majority favored home-training; the asylum advocates have finally got the control, and orphanages are fast multiplying. Most of the governments of Europe now support orphanages. Institutions founded by private charity in many cases receive aid also from the government if they stand in need of it. In the United States orphans have received great consideration. We here distinguish three classes: (1) those supported by the national government; (2) those supported by single states; and (3) those supported by private (especially Church) charity. One of the most successful of the last named is the *Howard Mission* of New York City. A model orphanage on British soil is that at Erdington, founded by Josiah Mason at an expense of \$1,500,000, and supporting over 300 orphans.

## Orphans

*SEE HUSSITES.*

## Orpheotelists

a set of mystagogues in the early ages of ancient Greece, who were wont to appear at the doors of the wealthy, and promise to release them from their own sins and those of their fore-fathers by sacrifices and expiatory songs; and they produced on such occasions a collection of books of Orpheus and Musaeus, on which they formed their promises.

## Orpheus

### Picture for Orpheus

(supposed to be the Vedic *Ribhu* or *Arbhu*, an epithet both of Indra and the sun), a semi-mythic name of frequent occurrence in ancient Greek lore. The early legends call him a son of Apollo and the muse Calliope, or of Oleagrus and Clio, or Polymnia. His native country is Thrace, where many different localities were pointed out as his birthplace — such as the mounts of Olympus and Pangaeus, the river Enipeus, the promontory of Serrhium, and several cities. Apollo bestows upon him the lyre, which Hermes invented, and by its aid Orpheus moves men and beasts, the birds in the air, the fishes in the deep, the trees, and the rocks. He accompanies the Argonauts in their expedition, and the power of his music wards off all

mishaps and disasters, rocking monsters to sleep and stopping cliffs in their downward rush. His wife Eurydice (?- Sanscrit Uru, the Dawn) is bitten by a serpent (? =Night), and dies. Orpheus follows her into the infernal regions; and so powerful are his "golden tones" that even stern Pluto and Proserpina are moved to pity; while Tantalus forgets his thirst, Ixion's wheel ceases to revolve, and the Danaides stop in their wearisome task. He is allowed to take her back into the "light of heaven," but he must not look around while they ascend. Love or doubt, however, draw his eye, towards her, and she is lost to him forever (? — first rays of the sun gleaming at the dawn make it disappear or melt into day). His death is sudden and violent. According to some accounts, it is the thunderbolt of Zeus that cuts him off, because he reveals the divine mysteries; according to others, it is Dionysus, who, angry at his refusing to worship him, causes the Menades to tear him to pieces, which pieces are collected and buried by the Muses in tearful piety at Leibethra, at the foot of Olympus, where a nightingale sings over his grave. Others, again, make the Thracian women divide his limbs between them, either from excessive madness of unrequited love, or from anger at his drawing their husbands away from them. Thus far legend and art, in manifold hues and varieties and shapes, treat of Orpheus the fabulous. The faint glimmer of historical truth hidden beneath these myths becomes clearer in those records which speak of Orpheus as a divine bard or priest in the service of Zagreus. the Thracian Dionysus, and founder of the Mysteries (q.v.); as the first musician, the first inaugurator of the rites of expiation and of the mantic art, the inventor of letters and the heroic meter; of everything, in fact, that was supposed to have contributed to the civilization and initiation into a more humane worship of the deity among the primitive inhabitants of Thracia and all Greece. Orpheus was one of the Argonauts, of which celebrated expedition he wrote a poetical account still extant. This is doubted by Aristotle, who says, according to Cicero, that there never existed an Orpheus, but that the poems which pass under his name are the compositions of a Pythagorean philosopher named Cecrops. According to some of the moderns, the *Argonautica*, and the other poems attributed to Orpheus, are the production of the pen of Onomacritus, a poet who lived in the age of Pisistratus, tyrant of Athens. Pausanias, however, and Diodorus Siculus speak of Orpheus as a great poet and musician, who rendered himself equally celebrated by his knowledge of the art of war, by the extent of his understanding, and by the laws which he enacted. He was buried at Pieria in Macedonia, according to Apollodorus. The inhabitants of Dion boasted that his tomb was in their city. Orpheus, as

some report, after death received divine honors, the Muses gave an honorable burial to his remains, and his lyre became one of the constellations in the heavens (Diod. i, etc.; Pausan. i, etc.; Apollod. 1:9, etc.; Cicero, *De Nat. Deo.* 1:38; Apollon. i; Virgil, *AEn.* 6:645; *Georg.* 4:457, etc.; Hygin. *Fab.* xiv, etc.; *Ovid, Mletam.* 10:1, etc.; Plato, *Polit.* x; Horace, *Odes,* 1:13, 35). The best edition of the Orphic fragments is that of G. Herrmann (Leipsic, 1805). The hymns have repeatedly been translated into English by T. Taylor and others. The chief authority on the Orphic literature still remains Lobeck's *Aglaophamus*, p. 244. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog. and Mythol.* — s.v.; Menzel, *Christliche Symbolik*, 2:174-575; Westrop, *Handbook of Archaeol.* p. 199; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiquits Chretiennes*, s.v. Orphee.

### Orphic Mysteries

a class of mystical ceremonies performed at a very early period in the history of Greece. The followers of Orpheus (q.v.) devoted themselves to the worship of Dionysus, not, however, by practicing the licentious rites which usually characterized the Dionysia or Bacchanalia, but by the maintenance of a pure and austere mode of life. These devotees were dressed in white linen garments, and partook of no animal food, except that which was taken from the ox offered in sacrifice to Dionysus.

### Orphrey

(*Aurum Phrygmatum*, gold or Phrygia), the name of an ornamental border of a cope or alb, because it is an imitation of the famous Phrygian embroidery. England was famous for this work, and M. Paris relates that the pope, struck with its beauty, directed the Cistercian abbots to buy up all the specimens they could, saying, "England is our garden of pleasure and delight; its treasure is inexhaustible: where much is then, thence much maybe taken." His order was obeyed, and his choir was vested in copes thus ornamented. In some English inventories the rich apparels (apparatus) of the alb for the neck and hands are called *spatularia* and *manicularia*.

### Orr, James M.

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Fairhaven, Preble County, Ohio, March 31, 1838. He was educated at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; studied theology in the Alleghany Seminary, Pa.; was licensed by the Ohio First Presbytery, April 1, 1862; and ordained by the Argyle Presbytery,

March 10, 1864. as the pastor of East Greenwich Church, N. Y. He died near Fairhaven, Ohio, April 18, 1865. Mr. Orr's ministry was short, but he gave evidence of being a most acceptable and useful minister. His style of writing and his delivery were exceedingly chaste. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 278.

### Orr, Robert

a Presbyterian minister, who flourished in this country during the colonial period, was either a native of Scotland or Ireland, probably of the latter country. He came to America in 1715, and accepted in that year a call to Maidenhead and Hopewell, and thus became a member of the first American presbytery (organized in 1705 or 1706 at what is now supposed to be Freehold, N. J.). Orr died about the year 1725. See Gillett, *Hist. of the Presb. Ch.* 1:29, 34.

### Orrente, Pedro

a Spanish painter, was born at Montealegre, in Murcia, in 1560. It is not known under whom he studied in his own country. Afterwards he went to Italy, and became the pupil of Giacomo da Ponte (Bassano), whose manner of coloring he adopted, though his own style of coloring and design was very different. Some authors say that he was not a pupil of Bassano, and that he never went to Italy, supposing that he was a pupil of El Greco, and afterwards imitated the manner of Bassano, from seeing his work in Spain; but Lanzi conclusively shows that he visited Italy, where he painted some works which Conca pronounced superior to those of Bassano. On his return to Spain he was favored with the protection of the duke of Olivarez, who employed him to paint several pictures for the palace Bueno Retiro. He painted many works for the churches and convents at Valencia, Cordova, and Toledo. His works are numerous, and are to be found in most of the principal cities of Spain, where they are held in high estimation. In the cathedral at Toledo is an admired picture by him representing Santa Leocadia coming out of the sepulcher, and in the chapel of Los Reyes Nuevos, in the same church, was a picture of the *Nativity*, since removed to the royal collection at Madrid; it is a grand composition, admirably executed. In the same church are some superb landscapes, and a picture of Orpheus charming the brute creation, one of his most celebrated works. He died at Toledo in 1644, and was interred in the same church as El Greco.

## Or-Sarua, Isaac Ben-Moses

of Vienna, by way of abbreviation also called **zay8r** , i.e. *Rabbi Isaac Or-Sarua*, and by his contemporaries styled **l wdgh wnybr** , i.e. “our great Master,” while others called him **tpwm rwdh** , i.e. “the wonder of the age,” or **çwdqh wnybr** , i.e. “our holy Master,” is one of the greatest Talmudical authorities of the 13th century. Or-Sarua witnessed the awful treatment of his coreligionists in France, who were obliged to wear some kind of mark on their clothes. He witnessed the persecutions against the Jews of Germany, which seem to have been the order of the day, and speaks of the horrible massacres that took place at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1241, where many suffered martyrdom. Or-Sarua attained to a great age, for he flourished about 1200-1270. To satisfy his thirst for learning, he undertook great journeys, in order to hear the greatest teachers of the German and French academies. He was probably before 1217 at Regensburg, where he attended the lectures of the famous R. Jehuda the Pious, the author of the ethical work entitled **8s µydysejē** About 1216-17 Or-Sarua was at Paris, where the Jewish academy was in a very flourishing condition under the presidency of the famous R. Jehuda ben-Isaac Sir Leon. Or-Sarua was one of the most prominent of Leon's pupils, in whose spirit he lived and labored. From France Or-Sarua returned to Germany, living and laboring at different places, especially at Vienna; hence he is called Isaac ben-Moses of Vienna. He is the author of a great Talmudical work entitled **[wrz rwa**, a ritual codex and commentary. He is also said to have written a commentary on the Pentateuch, which is still extant. The works of Or-Sarua were published for the first time at Scytomir (1862, 2 vols. fol.). See De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 332 (German transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:654 sq; 3:561, No. 1167; Dr. H. Gross, *R. Isaak ben-Mose OrSarua aus Wien*, in Frankel-Gratz, *Monatsschrift*, 1-871, p. 248-264. (B. P.)

## Orsi, Benedetto

an Italian painter, was a native of Pescia, and flourished about 1660. Lanzi says he was an eminent pupil of Baldassare Franceschini, called Il Volterrano. There is a fine picture of *St. John* attributed to him in the church of St. Stefano, at Pescia. He also painted the *Seven Works of Mercy* for La Campagna le Nobili. There still exists a large circular picture in the church of St. Maria del Letto, at Pistoia, which was enumerated by good

judges among the finest works of Volterrano, till an authentic document proved the real painter to be Benedetto Orsi.

### Orsi, Bernardino

an Italian painter, flourished at Reggio in the early part of the 15th century. According to Tiraboschi he was an eminent artist in his time. Most of his works have perished. Lanzi says Reggio still boasts a Madonna of Loretto painted by him in the cathedral in 1501.

### Orsi, Giuseppe Agostino

an Italian Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Florence May 9, 1692. He received his education from the Jesuits, and in 1708 he entered the monastery of the Dominicans at Fiesole. Having been teacher of theology and philosophy in the monastery of St. Mark, at Florence, he was in 1732 called to Rome, and appointed secretary in the Congregation of the Index; in 1749 he became magister palatii; in 1759 cardinal, and died in 1761. Besides his work *De irreformabili Roman. Pontific. in defin. ideï controvers. judicio* (Romoe, 1739), which was written for the purpose of defending papal infallibility, he also wrote a *Church History* (21 vols.), reaching as far down as the year 600 (Rome, 1747- sq., and 1754 sq.); a continuation of which, in 29 vols., reaching down to the Council of Trent, was written by the Dominican Becchetti (Rome, 1770 and 1788). See *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:885-886.

### Orsi, Lelio

(called LELIO DA NOVELLARA), an Italian painter, was born at Reggio in 1511. Banished from his native city for some unknown reason, he established himself at Novellara, where he gained such great distinction as to acquire the surname. Notwithstanding he was one of the ablest artists of his time — and his works have been the admiration of succeeding times, — very little is known of his life with any certainty, and his history is mostly founded on supposition. The cardinal Tiraboschi wrote his life, compiled from a variety of sources. The Italian writers say that he was “in pittura grande, in architettura ottimo, e in disegno massimo” (in painting grand, in architecture excellent, and in design pre-eminent). Tiraboschi conjectures, on the authority of a MS., that he imbibed his taste of design at Rome; others suppose that he was a pupil of Michael Angelo, or that he studied



the designs and models of that master; and others, again, that he was a pupil of Giulio Romano. There is great similarity in his style to that of Correggio, though his are of a far more robust character; his works having the same grace in his chiaroscuro, in the spreading of his colors, and in the beauty and delicacy of his youthful heads; hence some suppose, with great probability, that he was a pupil of that master. At all events it is certain that he was on friendly terms with Correggio, that civilities passed between them, and that Orsi attentively studied his works, and copied some of them, as is evident from his fine copy of the celebrated Nolle, now in the possession of the noble house of Gazzolo at Verona. Tiraboschi says he painted several works for the churches at Rome. It would therefore seem probable, as Tiraboschi asserts, that he first studied at Rome, and afterwards improved his style by contemplating the works of Correggio; for Lanzi says "his design is evidently not of the Lombard school, and hence the difficulty of supposing him one of the scholars of Correggio, in which his earlier works, at least, would have partaken of a less robust character." He painted many noble frescos in the churches at Reggio and Novellara, most of which have perished. Lanzi says, "for such of his works as are now to be seen at Modena we are indebted to Francesco III, of glorious memory, who had them transferred from the fortress of Novellara to the ducal palace for their preservation. Few of his altar-pieces now remain in public at either Novellara or Reggio, the most having perished or been removed, one of which last, representing Sts. Rocco and Sebastiano along with S. Giobbe, I happened to meet in the studio of Signor Armanno at Bologna." There are a few others of doubtful authenticity, claimed to be genuine, by him at Parma, Ancona, and Mantua. Orsi died in 1587.

### Orsi, Prospero

a Roman painter, was born in 1560. According to Baglioni, he was employed by pope Sixtus V in the palace of St. John of Lateran, where he painted two ceilings, one representing the *Children of Israel passing through the Red Sea*, and the other *Isaac blessing Jacob*. He was the particular friend of the Cav. Giuseppe Cesari d'Arpino, whose manner he imitated. He afterwards abandoned historical subjects for grotesques, for which he had extraordinary talents, and for this reason was called *Prosperino dalle Grottesche*. He died in 1635, in the pontificate of Urban VIII.

## Orsini

*SEE BENEDICT XIII; SEE URSINUS.*

## Ortega

(ST.), Juan de, a Spanish architect, flourished during the 11th century. According to Miliza, he was the son of Vela Velasquez, and a native of Fontana d'Ortunno, dear Burgos. He is said to have made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and to have erected at Montesdosa a church, a monastery, and a hospital, still existing.

## Ortega, Raymundo

a Spanish theologian noted for his antiquarian labors, was born at Beja in the 9th century. Nothing further is known of his personal history. His work, *De Antiquitatibus Lusitaniae*, which is reputed to have been written about 878, is a valuable treatise, and will perpetuate the memory of this scholar. He died towards the close of the 9th century.

## Orthodox

(ὀρθόξος, from ὀρθός, *right*, and δόξα, *an opinion*) are those whose doctrine is right-whose religious opinion is in accordance with an assumed or generally prevalent standard. This last is with Roman Catholics the dogmas of their Church, with Protestants it is the Bible. The doctrines which are generally considered as orthodox among us are such as were generally professed at the time of the Reformation, viz. the fall of man, regeneration, atonement, repentance, justification by free grace, etc. The national standard of orthodoxy is not the same in all countries; for those opinions and observances which are received by the majority of any nation, or are patronized by the ruling power, are recognized as the standard faith; hence the Greek Church is orthodox in Russia; the Roman Catholic in Spain, Portugal, France, etc. the Anglican Church in England; the Presbyterian in Scotland; but in Ireland, while the religion of the majority is Roman Catholic, the state Church is on the Anglican model; so that it is a disputed point which set of religious opinions and customs should be acknowledged as orthodox. Again, in Upper Canada the orthodox faith is the Protestant Episcopal; while in Lower Canada the established religion, which is also the opinion of the majority is Roman Catholic. In New England the term is employed to distinguish those Congregational churches

which hold the evangelical creed from the Unitarian and Universalist churches. *SEE ORTHODOXY.*

Some have thought that, in order to keep error out of the Church, there should be some human form as a standard of orthodoxy, wherein certain disputed doctrines shall be expressed in determinate phrases directly leveled against such errors as shall prevail from time to time, requiring those especially who are to be public teachers in the Church to subscribe or virtually to declare their assent to such formularies. But, as Dr. Doddridge observes,

- 1.** Had this been requisite, it is probable that the Scriptures would have given us some such formularies as these, or some directions as to the manner in which they should be drawn up, proposed, and received.
- 2.** It is impossible that weak and passionate men, who have perhaps been heated in the very controversy thus decided, should express themselves with greater propriety than the apostles did.
- 3.** It is plain, in fact, that this practice has been the cause of great contention in the Christian Church, and such formularies have been the grand engine of dividing it, in proportion to the degree in which they have been multiplied and urged.
- 4.** This is laying a great temptation in the way of such as desire to undertake the office of teachers in the Church, and will be most likely to deter and afflict those who have the greatest tenderness of conscience, and therefore (being equal in other respects) best deserve encouragement.
- 5.** It is not likely to answer the end proposed, viz. the preservation of uniformity of opinion; since persons of little integrity may satisfy their consciences in subscribing what they do not at all believe as articles of peace, or in putting the most unnatural sense on the words. And whereas, in answer to all these inconveniences, his pleaded that such forms are necessary to keep the Church from heresy, and it is better there should be some hypocrites under such forms of orthodoxy than that a freedom of debate and opinion should be allowed to all teachers; the answer is plain that when anyone begins to preach doctrines which appear to those who attend upon him dangerous and subversive of Christianity, it will be time enough to proceed to such animadversion as the nature of his error in their apprehension will require, and his relation to them will admit. These

remarks however are not applicable to the use of simple confessions or declarations of faith, the object of which is to ascertain and promote Christian fellowship. The design of these is of course only to state the sense in which we interpret and understand the Word of God. Thus, e.g., the *Evangelical Alliance* (q.v.) has adopted an orthodox standard for common confession of its members. See Doddridge, *Lectures*, lect. 174; Watts, *Orthodoxy and Charity United*; Fuller, *Works*; Robert Hall, *Works*; Duncan and Miller, *On the Utility of Creeds*; Donaldson, *Christian Orthodoxy* (Lond. 1857, 8vo), especially ch. v. **SEE ESTABLISHMENT**; **SEE SUBSCRIPTION**.

### Orthodoxy And Heterodoxy.

The use of these two words implies the possession of a standard of truth, so that what agrees with it is right, and what disagrees with it is wrong. In the general domain of truth, where there are no positive stipulations, and in philosophy, this distinction cannot be made. Yet as Christianity started with the consciousness of possessing the truth, it was from the first led to establish principles — though less clearly defined than they were afterwards. Indeed we find heresy mentioned already in the N.T., as a departure from the absolute truth in religious doctrines and religious life. Christ came into the world to disclose the truth, as ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ (<sup><3146></sup>John 14:6); every one who is of the truth hears his voice (<sup><3137></sup>John 18:37). Hence any one who follows his teachings is ὀρθοτομῶν τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας (<sup><3125></sup>2 Timothy 2:15), and the true doctrine is ἀποστολικὴ ὀρθοτομία (Euseb. *Church History*, 4:3), little different from what was later designated as ὀρθοδοξία (G. Major, *De voc. ὀρθ.* *sign. if*: Vit. 1545). Thus there arose in the apostolical times a κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, a *regula veritatis*; every departure from it was soon stamped as heresy, and afterwards more correctly called ἑτεροδοξία, by which we are to understand only οὐκ ὀρθοποδεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (<sup><3124></sup>Galatians 2:14; comp. <sup><3112></sup>2 Corinthians 11:2 sq.), διδασχὴ ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε (<sup><3117></sup>Romans 16:17)? He who teaches differently, ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰ. Χρ. καὶ τῆ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ (<sup><3113></sup>1 Timothy 6:3). Plato considered heterodoxy as error, not as a simple departure from orthodoxy. Yet the ancient Church did not particularly attach itself to these denominations of orthodoxy and heterodoxy as designating the contrast between the Christian truth and its

opposite, for its doctrines were not yet firmly enough established. But as they gradually came to be more strictly defined, that which agreed with the decisions of the Church was called orthodox, and whatever differed from them heterodox. The notion of orthodoxy commenced only to acquire real power when the Church attained a secure footing in the state. We find the expression often used by Eusebius, Athanasius (whom Epiphanius: calls the father of orthodoxy, *Haer.* lxi, c. 2), etc., and also among the Latins, e.g. in the writings of Jerome. Isidore of Hispalis says in the *Origines.*(7:14). “Orthodoxus est recte credens et ut credit recte vivens.” The Church as the embodiment of religion in the community needs a firmly established doctrine as its basis; it no longer leaves the individual free to believe as he chooses. Unity of doctrine with the Church, or at least the acceptance of its fundamental principles, constitutes orthodoxy, departure from them is heterodoxy. A tendency to the use of these words was already apparent in the ancient Church, for we find Ignatius in the beginning of the 2d century designates. those who depart from the general faith, as taught and supported by the bishops, as ἑτεροδοξοῦτες (*A d Smyrn.* c. 6), and warns his readers against being led into error ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις (*Ad Magn.* c. 8). But he uses them more in the etymological than in the ecclesiastical sense. The ecclesiastical use of them did not become general before the 4th century, when the *regula veritatis* gradually acquired a more objective form in the canon of Scripture, in the confessions of the Church, the decrees of the synods, and the assertion of the Church possessing the standard of truth. In cases of uncertainty, the Church or the synods decided as to what was conformed to, the doctrine of the Church (orthodox), and what contrary to, it (heterodox). Thus it gradually proclaimed more and more loudly, especially in the East, that the doctrine it taught constituted orthodoxy, and that every doctrine differing from it was heterodoxy.

This question of orthodoxy twice attained paramount importance in the Church. First in the difficulties concerning the dogma and ecclesiastical usages which more from an outward impulse than from inner reasons led to a separation between the Eastern and the Western churches. In these discussions, and particularly on that concerning images, the Greek Church always based itself on its antiquity and its orthodoxy, till in the course of the dispute the ἑορτὴ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας was established in 842, which led to the Greek Church assuming specifically the name of orthodox, which it still maintains. The first formal exposition of its dogmas by Joii of Damascus (732) had already borne the title of ἕκθεσις τῆς ὀρθοδόξου

πίστεως, which was also the case with other distinguished dogmatic works afterwards, such as Euthymius Zigadenus's *πανοπλία δογματικῆ τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως*, and Nicetas Acominatus's *θησαυρὸς ὀρθοδοξίας*. The Greek Church consequently claims to possess the absolute truth, which she preserves without attempting to develop it, like a miser his treasure, while she considers all other Christian churches as heterodox, schismatic, and heretical. This is evinced in all official acts and documents of the Greek Church, as also from the generally received confession of the archbishop of Kief, Peter Mogilas, which bears the inscription *Ὁρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησιαίς ἀνατολικῆς*. See Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 17:466 sq.; Marheineke, *Ueb. d. Ursprung u.d. Entwicklung d. Orthodoxie u. Heterodoxie*, etc. in Daub u. Creutzer, *Studienui.* 1807.

The second occasion when the question of orthodoxy acquired such importance was at the time of Luther's Reformation. The whole body of doctrine was revised and determined down to the most minute dogmatic definitions. The adherents of the Reformation in the 16th century were from the first obliged to defend themselves against the accusation of heresy and neologism. They were thus obliged to prove their conformity with the ancient Church, and therefore their orthodoxy. But as on this point there was no ecclesiastical authority to refer to, every member of the Protestant Church was obliged all the more diligently to prove his unity of doctrine with the true Church of Christ by the only valid standard, Scripture, and to reject from his association those who did not conform to that standard. The disputes which preceded the drawing up of the Formula of Concord greatly strengthened this feeling, and soon those alone were considered orthodox who accepted every article of that formula. The zeal of the contest magnified the importance of the mooted points until it led almost to a separation. The orthodox party considered that the possession of the absolute truth was sufficient, without absolute purity of life; it was a time of *dead* orthodoxy. There were certainly men of active and living piety in the party, but the paramount consideration was that of conformity to the doctrine of the Church, so that thoroughly worldly men who accepted fully every article of the formula were in high honor in the Church; while such men as John Arnd, Spener, Gottfried Arnold, could not atone by their piety for their want of conformity on some points, and were violently attacked by distinguished orthodox teachers. All heterodoxy was then considered as heresy, i.e. regarded as attacking the very foundation of

religious truth. This tendency was strenuously opposed by the gentle and learned. G. Calixtus, and the pious and active Spener. Pietism, which arose about that time, aided in the work — although opposed also by the followers of Spener, and the orthodox party became but a shadow of its former self. Soon, however, under the influence of Kant, philosophy also entered into the strife. As it prevailed, orthodoxy became but a name to be mocked at (Nicolai Elias Hartknoch), and all the views which were formerly denounced as heterodox. nay even heretical, were now looked upon as orthodox. The Rationalists — when they retained Christ and the Bible — based their Christianity on reason; and every one was considered orthodox who still adhered to positive Christianity. As for definite Church doctrines, they seemed to be forever consigned to oblivion. The reaction, however, came from the same side from whence the attack had proceeded. In Kant himself there were already signs of this. Fichte, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Baader, Hegel, etc., threw discredit on the so-called revelations of the philosophic school, and led the way to a more thorough conception of the Biblical, and in consequence of the ecclesiastical doctrines. Theology now receiver a fresh impulse from such men as Schleiermacher, Neander, etc. The issue of the controversies thus raised will be found treated under *SEE PROTESTANTISM; SEE RATIONALISM; SEE RITUALISM*, and similar heads. *SEE ORTHODOX*.

### Orthodoxy, Feast of

The Council of Constantinople, held under Photius, in the year 879, and reckoned by the Greeks as the eighth general council, fortified image-worship by new and firm decisions, approving and renewing all the decrees of the Nicene Council. The Greeks, a superstitious people, and controlled by monks, regarded this as so great a blessing conferred on them by heaven that they resolved to consecrate an anniversary in remembrance of it, which they called the *Feast of Orthodoxy*.

### Orthosias

(Ὄρθωσιὰς v. r. Ὄρθωσία, Vulg. *Orthosias*), a place on the shore of Palestine, to which Tryphon, when besieged by Antiochus Sidetes in Dora, fled by ship (1 Maccabees 15:37). Orthosia is described by Pliny (v. 17) as north of Tripolis, and south of the river Eleutherus, near which it was situated (Strabo, xvi, p. 753). It was the northern boundary of Phoenicia, and distant 1130 stadia from the Orontes (id. p. 760). Shaw (*Trav.* p. 270-



1, 2d ed.) identifies the Eleutherus with the modern Nahr el-Bridle, on the north bank of which, corresponding to the description of Strabo (p. 753), he found “ruins of a considerable city, whose adjacent district pays yearly to the bashaws of Tripoli a tax of fifty dollars by the name of *Or-tosa*. In the *Peutinger Tables*, also, Orthosia is placed thirty miles to the south of Antaradus, and twelve miles to the north of Tripoli. The situation of it likewise is further illustrated by a medal of Antoninus Pius, struck at Orthosia; upon the reverse of which we have the goddess Astarte treading upon a river. For this city was built upon a rising ground on the northern banks of the river, within half a furlong of the sea, and, as the rugged eminences of Mount Libanus lie at a small distance in a parallel with the shore, Orthosia must have been a place of the greatest importance, as it would have hereby the entire command of the road (the only one there is) betwixt Phoenice and the maritime parts of Syria.” (See also Thomson, in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1848, p. 14.) On the other hand, Mr. Porter, who identifies the Eleutherus with the modern Nahr el-Kebtr, describes the ruins of Orthosia as on the south bank of the Nahr el-Barid, “the cold river” (*Handb.* p. 542, 553, ed. 1875), thus agreeing with the accounts of Ptolemy and Pliny. The statement of Strabo is not sufficiently precise to allow the inference that he considered Orthosia north of the Eleutherus. But if the ruins on the south bank of the Nahr el-Barid be really those of Orthosia, it seems an objection to the identification of the Eleutherus with the Nahr el-Kebir; for Strabo at one time makes Orthosia (xiv, p. 670), and at another the neighboring river Eleutherus (ὁ πλησίον ποταμός), the boundary of Phoenicia on the north. This could hardly have been the case if the Eleutherus were 38 hours, or nearly twelve miles, from Orthosia. Kiepert (*Map*) locates Orthosia at *Nahr Arka*, midway between these two points (Robinson, *Later Bib. Res.* p. 582).

According to Josephus (*Anf.* 10:7, 2), Tryphon fled to Apamea, while in a fragment of Charax, quoted by Grimm (*Kurzgef. Handb.*) from Muller's *Frag. Graec. Hist.* 3:644, fr. 14, he is said to have taken refuge at Ptolemais. Grimm reconciles these statements by supposing that Tryphon fled first to Orthosia, then to Ptolemais, and lastly to Apamea, where he was slain.

### Ortiz, Alonso

a noted Spanish theologian and historian, was a native of Toledo, and flourished in the early part of the 16th century. He held for some time the



canonry of Toledo, and while in this position he was employed by cardinal Ximenes to revise the Mozarabic Liturgy. At his death Ortiz bequeathed his library to the University of Salamanca. He left six:essays, which were collected and published in one volume under the title of *De la herida del rey Don Fernando el Catdolco, consolatorio a la princesa de, Portugal; Una oracion a los reyes catolicos* (in Spanish and Latin); *Dos cartas mensageras a los reyes, una que escribio la ciudad, la otra el cabildo de la iglesia de Toledo; Contra la carta del protonotario' Loena* (Seville, 1493, fol.). The most important among them are a treatise, in twenty-seven chapters, addressed to the princess of Portugal, daughter of Isabella, on the death of her husband, and a discourse addressed to Ferdinand and Isabella after the taking of Granada in 1492, in which he rejoices over the event, and expresses also his satisfaction at the cruel expulsion of the Jews and heretics. "These two discourses," says Ticknor, "are written in a pompous style; vet they are not wanting in merit, and the second contains one or two really fine and even touching passages on the peace enjoyed by Spain since its hated enemy had been expelled, heartfelt expressions of the author which found an echo in all the Spaniards." Besides these two treatises, this volume contains an account of an attempt at assassination committed against Ferdinand the Catholic at Barcelona Dec. 7, 1472; two letters from the city and cathedral of Toledo, asking that Granada may not take precedence before Toledo; and an attack against the prothonotary Juan de Lucena, who had ventured to blame the severity of the Inquisition. He wrote also *Missale mixtum, secundum regulam beati Isidori, dictum Mozarabes* (Toledo, 1500, fol., with a preface): — *Breviariumn mixtum secundum regulam beati Isidori, dictum Mozarabes* (Toledo, 1502, fol.); these two works are of great value on account of the learned preface and of their scarcity. See Nicolas Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana nova*; Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, 1:383; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:891; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1868, 3:537; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* July, 1867, p. 437. (J. N. P.)

## Ortlibenses

is the name of a Christian sect, sometimes spoken of as a branch of the ancient *Vaudois*, or *Waldenses* (q. y.). They were afterwards identified with the *Brethren of the Free Spirit*. The Ortlibenses are mentioned in the treatise of Reinerius against the Waldenses (*Bibl. Max.* 25:266), where also they are called, but apparently by a false reading, *Ordibarii*. The Ortlibenses appear to have been a party of the disciples of *A malric of*

*Bena*, who formed themselves into a sect under the influence of a leader named Ortlieb, at Strasburg, early in the 13th century (Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 3:467). Reiner describes them as repudiators of nearly all the articles of Christian faith. Thus they denied that there was a Trinity before the nativity of Jesus Christ, who, according to them, only then became the Son of God. To these two persons of the Godhead they added a third, during the preaching of Jesus Christ, namely, the apostle Peter, whom they acknowledged as being the Holy Ghost. They held the eternity of the world; but had no notion of the resurrection of the body or the immortality of the soul. Notwithstanding this they maintained (perhaps by way of irony) that there would be a final judgment, at which time the pope and the emperor would become proselytes to their sect. They denied the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. His cross, they pretended, was penance and their own abstemious way of life; this, they said, was the cross Jesus Christ bore. They ascribed all the virtue of baptism to the merit of him who administered it. They were of opinion that Jews might be saved without baptism, provided they joined their ranks. They boldly asserted that they themselves were the only true mystical body, that is to say; the Church of Christ. The Ortlieb'sian heresy seems to have been closely associated with the pantheism of Amalric, and with his theory as to the incarnation of the Holy Spirit. See, besides the works by Reiner and Gieseler above referred to, Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4:570, 571.

### Orton, Azariah G. D.D,

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Tyringham, Berkshire County, Mass., Aug. 6, 1789. He graduated at Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., in 1813; studied theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J.; was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery, and ordained at Cranberry, N. J., in 1822. He labored successfully at Seneca Falls, N. Y., Lisle, Greene, and Lisle a second time. He died, at the latter place Dec. 28, 1864. Dr. Orton wrote largely for the press, especially on capital punishment, episcopacy, and slavery. He was a man of profound investigation; his powers of abstraction were seldom equaled. Infidelity in all its phases found in him an unbending opponent. Never for one moment did he seem to doubt the divinity of Christ, the inspiration of the Bible, or the sacredness of the ministry. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1866, p. 220. (J. L. S.)

## Orton, Job, S.T.P.,

an eminent English divine of the Independent body, noted as an expositor of sacred writ and as a pulpit laborer, was born at Shrewsbury Sept. 4, 1717. To his parents, who were the patrons of piety and good men, he was indebted for early instruction in the Christian faith, and he imbibed from them the principles of pure religion. In his native town he acquired a considerable portion of classical learning. In his sixteenth year he was put under the tuition of Dr. Charles Owen, of Warrington, who had usually with him a few young men designed for the work of the ministry. In 1734 he was sent to Dr. Doddridge's academy at Northampton; and, after going through the ordinary course of studies, he was in 1739 appointed assistant to the doctor in his academical labors. Young Orton discharged the duties of this office with singular ability, prudence, and success. In 1741 he was taken from this situation to his native town by the united voices of the Presbyterian and Independent congregations, which joined to receive him as their pastor. On Dr. Doddridge's decease, he was pressingly invited to succeed him in the academy and congregation; but this, as well as a call to succeed Dr. Hughes in London, he declined, and continued his labors at Shrewsbury till compelled by ill-health to resign the pastoral office. After this he devoted himself to literary pursuits, so far as his health would allow till his death, which occurred at Kidderminster July 19, 1783. "Few men were more diligent than Mr. Orton, or more conscientious in performing the various duties of his office. To the end of his life his heart was set on doing good; and when he had ceased to preach, conversation, letters, plans of sermons, were sent to his friends, and every private method in his power was resorted to. With the same view he published books: viz. *Discourses on Eternity* (1764, several editions), *On Zeal* (1774, 12mo), *On Christian Worship* (1775, 12mo): — *Meditations for the Sacrament* (1777, 12mo): — several volumes of *Sermons*, etc. His *Life of Dr. Doddridge* (Salop, 1766, 8vo, and often) is one of the most useful books to a student and a minister." But the principal work from the pen of Dr. Orton was published after his decease, and is entitled *A Short and Plain Exposition of the Old Testament, with Devotional and Practical Reflections, for the Use of Families* (edited by Robert Gentleman, from the author's MSS., 6 vols. 8vo, 1798; 2d ed. 6 vols. 1822). "It is composed on the plan of Doddridge's *Expositor*, with which it forms a complete commentary on the entire Bible. It is well adapted to the object for which it was intended, and exhibits good sense and much sound exposition. In its own department it

has not been superseded” (Kitto). See Jones, *Christian Biog.* s.v.; Kippis, *Biog. Brit.* v. 308; Alibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1462, 1463; Lowndes, *Brit. Lib.* p. 640, 821.

## Orus

*SEE HORUS.*

## Orvis, Samuel

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Denmark, Lewis County, N. Y., Dec. 5, 1813; was converted in 1829; commenced preaching in 1839; joined the Black River Conference in 1842, and died at Carthage, N. Y., Sept. 14, 1850. Mr. Orvis was one of the brightest ornaments of his conference. His sermons were digested, symmetrical, and powerful, his scholarship respectable and sound, and his ardor for study intense. His pastoral labors were full of affection and success, and all his efforts were by his fervent piety made very acceptable and useful. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 4:616; *Black River Conf. Memorial*, p. 280. (G. L. T.)

## Oryx

a species of antelope held in high estimation among the ancient Egyptians. Sir John G. Wilkinson says: “Among the Egyptians the oryx was the only one of the antelope tribe chosen as an emblem, but it was not sacred; and the same city on whose monuments it was represented in sacred subjects was in the habit of killing it for the table. The head of this animal formed the prow of the mysterious boat of Pthah-Sokari-Osiris, who was worshipped with peculiar honors at Memphis, and who held a conspicuous place among contemporary gods of all the temples of Upper and Lower Egypt. This did not, however, prevent their sacrificing the oryx to the gods, or slaughtering it for their own use, large herds of them being kept by the wealthy Egyptians for this purpose, and the sculptures of Memphis and its vicinity abound, no less than those of the Thebaid, with proofs of this fact. But a particular one may have been set apart and consecrated to the deity, being distinguished by certain marks which the priests fancied they could discern, as in the case of oxen exempted from sacrifice. And if the laws permitted the oryx to be killed without the mark of the pontiffs seal (which was indispensable for oxen previous to their being taken to the altar), the privilege of exemption might be secured to a single animal when

kept apart within the inaccessible precincts of the temple. In the zodiacs the oryx was chosen to represent the sign Capricornus. M. Champollion considers it the representative of Seth, and Horapolla gives it an unenviable character as the emblem of impurity. It was even thought to foreknow the rising of the moon, and to be indignant at her presence. Pliny is disposed to give it credit for better behavior towards the dog-star, which, when rising, it looked upon with the appearance of adoration. But the naturalist was misinformed respecting the growth of its hair in imitation of the bull Basis. Such were the fables of old writers; and judging from the important post it held in the boat of Sokari, I am disposed to consider it the emblem of a good rather than of an evil deity, contrary to the opinion of the learned Champollion." *SEE ANTELOPE.*

### Orzechowski, Stanislaus

(better known to learned Europe under his Latinized name of *Orzichorius*), is one of the most noted of Polish theologians of the Reformation period. He was born in Galicia in 1513. pursued his elementary studies at Przemyśl, and then went to the universities of Vienna and Wittenberg. At the latter place he became intimately acquainted with Luther and Melancthon, and adopted their opinions; not, however, from a sense of piety and love of truth, but because his reckless character craved novelty. "Having been sent to Germany," he says himself, "I became enamoured of innovation. I considered that it would be very honorable to me if, by introducing some German doctrines, I should be distinguished from my equals in age, as, for instance, such principles as to disobey the pope; to have no respect for laws; to revel always, and never to fast; to seize the Church property; to know nothing about God; to exterminate the monks. After three years of study I arrived at the truth that all which is old, which is paternal, is not just. I wished to advance further, and I passed to Carlstadt, of whom it was said that all that he has taken from Luther he has made still worse. To the guidance of such leaders I intrusted myself, and whoever made more and bolder innovations, him I considered better and more learned." This description of the particular tenets which he confessed, expressed in the most coarse and abusive language, was written at a time when he had joined the Romanists and attacked the Protestants; and although the account which he gives of his connection with the Reformers was written in order to throw odium on the Protestant doctrines, he gave at the same time a true picture of his passionate character, which rendered him through all his life equally dangerous as a friend or as an enemy. After

having finished his studies at the German universities, Orzechowski visited Rome, and returned to his native land in 1543, thoroughly imbued with the opinions of the Reformers. He began openly to broach them in his country; but he soon perceived that they could not afford him any worldly advantages, while the Roman Catholic Church could dispose of wealth and honors in favor of its defenders. He therefore entered into orders, and was, after some time, promoted to the canonry of Przemysl. But, although a member of the Roman Catholic clergy, he could not entirely conceal his real opinions, being continually excited by his relative, Rey, of Naglowice, one of the first Protestant writers of his country. Afraid of losing, by an overt attack on the Roman Catholic Church, the advantages he derived as one of her dignitaries, he did it in an indirect manner. Thus he opened a discussion in several writings on the councils of Ferrara and Florence, questioning the supremacy of the pope over the Eastern Church, although ostensibly professing a great respect for those councils, and thereby provoking an inquiry into the relation of the Polish Church, which was of Eastern origin, to the Church of Rome as its *supreme* (?) head. He also openly defended the matrimony of the priests. Having been cited before the ecclesiastical authorities for attempting innovations dangerous to the repose of the Church and the purity of its doctrines, Orzechowski made a recantation of his opinions, and the book which contained them was condemned to be burned. This submission of Orzechowski to the authority of his Church was not, however, of long duration; and when the rector of Kryczonow married a wife, Orzechowski took his part violently against the clergy. Soon afterwards he himself publicly married Magdaline Chelnicki; and when the bishop of Przemysl cited him on that account before the tribunal, he arrived in company with such numerous and powerful friends that the bishop dared not open the court, but, affecting to judge him by default, signed a decree of excommunication, inflicting upon him the penalty of infamy and confiscation of property. Orzechowski, not in the least intimidated by these proceedings, gave a public justification of his conduct before his congregation. He complained at the same time before the tribunal of the province of the violent and cruel proceedings, and made an appeal from the episcopal sentence to the archbishop. Public sentiment favored Orzechowski, and, though the highest governmental authority had, approved the episcopal verdict, no officer dared to execute the Church decree. The delay only encouraged the opposition; and when in 1550 a diet was convened to further consider the case general opinion was so outspokenly arrayed against the Church that Orzechowski found it an easy

task to fan the popular indignation into a terrible flame, and thus unconsciously became a most valuable servant to the Reformation cause, though he had himself turned the cold shoulder to it. His bitter attack of Romanism opened the eyes of the people, and soon the bishops who had been so eager to condemn Orzechowski sought for an opportunity to reconcile this able and violent antagonist. On Feb. 17, 1552, absolution was granted him, and he thereupon presented to a Roman Catholic synod a declaration of his entire adherence to its tenets, and at the same time resigned his ecclesiastical dignities. But as the pope of Rome refused to approve the action of the synod and bishops, Orzechowski broke out anew in invectives against Rome. This time, however, his opposition proved no longer as formidable as heretofore, the golden opportunity for leadership having been lost by him. Those who favored the Reformation cause dared not to trust him after his sudden desertion. The Romanists put his writings into the *Index Expurgatorius*, and he was declared a servant of Satan. In 1557 he was excommunicated anew, but when, soon after, his wife died — the principal obstacle to reconciliation with Rome, as the pope refused to endorse the marriage contract — Orzechowski was approached kindly, and in 1559 was finally reconciled to the Church which he had so long and violently and ably attacked. He now directed his hostility to the Protestants, and for many years was Rome's ablest champion in Poland. His writings of this period abound in the same virulence and scurrility which characterize his works against Rome. He died in the second half of the 16th century. The life of this extraordinary individual is one of the most striking proofs that the highest talent, destitute of principle, is unable to produce anything that is really great or good. The principal cause of popular discontent with Rome in Poland, and the principal promoter of Protestant liberty, he betrayed by the fickleness of his character and the versatility of his opinions the high vocation to which his great talents and bold character seemed to entitle him. He might have been the founder of Protestantism in Poland. He died an abject slave to popish error and superstition, and left his country in darkness and slavery, instead of securing for it religious and civil freedom. See Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*, 1:179-198.

### Osai'as

᾽(Ὠσαΐας, *Vulg.* omits), a Graecized form (1 Esdras 8:48) of the name JESHAIAS (<sup><15789></sup>Ezra 8:19).

## O Sapientia!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Osbaldistan, Richard

an English prelate of note, was born near the opening of the 18th century. He was educated at Oxford, and, even after entering the Church, taught for a while. He was at one time master of Westminster School. While in this position he was found to entertain contempt for high ecclesiastical



authorities (see Perry, *Ch. Hist.* 1:536, 537), and he was obliged to flee from the country. Later we find Osbaldistan in the deanery of York, and in 1747 he was elevated to the bishopric of Carlisle, from which he was transferred to London in 1762. He died in 1764. He published several *Sermons* (Lond. 1723, 1748, 1752).

### Osband, Gideon

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near the opening of this century. Of his early history we have but little at our command. He entered the Genesee Conference in 1842 or 1843, and for twelve years successfully labored for the Christian cause. "He accomplished," says the record, "more for his sin-periled race and the glory of God than some men have in half a century." He died at Macedon Centre, N. Y., June 7, 1855. See Conable, *Hist. of the Genesee Conference* (N.Y. 1876, 8vo), p. 550, 551.

### Osbern(e) Of Canterbury,

an English divine of the-Anglo-Norman period, flourished near the close of the 11th century. He died in 1100. He is the author of a life of St. Dunstan, published in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra* (1691, fol.), and is supposed to have left other writings. See Wright, *Biog. Brit. Literaria* (Anglo-Norman period), p. 26 sq.

### Osbern(e) Of Gloucester,

another English divine of the Anglo-Norman period, flourished near the middle of the 12th century. He was the author of a *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, in the form of dialogues; also a *Commentary on the Book of Judges*, and four treatises *On the Incarnation, Nativity, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ*, but none of these works have ever been printed. See Wright, *Biog. Brit. Literaria* (Anglo-Norman period), p. 158 sq.

### Osborn, Chauncey

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Berkshire, Tioga County, N. Y., Aug. 1, 1811. He was educated in Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio; studied divinity in the theological seminary of Hudson, Ohio; was licensed by Portage Presbytery, and ordained pastor of the Church in Farmington, Ohio, in 1842. He labored successively at Grand Blanc Brighton, Byron, Livonia, and Dearbornsville — all in the state of Michigan. He died Nov.

30, 1866. Mr. Osborn was a diligent and faithful home missionary, singularly punctual and systematic in his studies and habits, and never wearying in his labor of love. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 222. (J. L. S.)

### Osborn, Jeremiah

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lenox, Mass., in 1779. He studied theology under Dr. Perkins, and was one of the pioneer ministers of Tioga County, N. Y. He was ordained and installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Berkshire, N. Y., in 1806; preached in that place until 1820, when he removed to Candor, in the same county. Here his labors were indefatigable. Oftentimes he was known to start out on a pastoral visitation in the morning, visit from house to house through the day, conduct an evening meeting, and return to his home, not having taken any meal since he left in the morning. He became prematurely old, and was obliged to retire from the active ministry. In 1836 he removed to Ohio, and in 1839, while on a journey to Massachusetts to visit his mother, he died suddenly. Mr. Osborn was a man of grave and dignified deportment, his manner in the pulpit being of this type, and his sermons being always impressed with solemnity. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 222. (J. L. S.)

### Osborn, Samuel

a Congregational minister, of Irish birth, came to this country near the opening of last century, and was minister at Eastham, Mass., from 1718 to 1736, when he was obliged to retire because of his leaning to Arminianism. He then taught school for some ten years in the city of Boston, and died about 1785, aged about ninety-five years. He published his case and complaint in 1743.

### Osborn, Theron

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Amenia, N. Y.; in 1796; was converted about 1814, joined the New York Conference in 1826, and died at Marlborough, N. Y., Aug. 12, 1852. He was a faithful and useful minister, of deep piety, beautiful virtue, moderate gifts, and considerable usefulness. See *Minutes of Conferences*, v. 190; Smith, *Sacred Memories*, p. 46 sq.

## Osborne, Ethan

an American Presbyterian minister, was born at Litchfield, Conn., Aug. 21, 1758. When just ready for school the Revolutionary War broke out, and he entered the army in defense of the American cause. After the war he studied for the ministry, and was licensed when twenty-seven years old; and from December, 1798, to 1844 was settled as pastor over the Old Sione Church at Fairfield, N. J. He died there May 1, 1858.

## Osborne, Michael

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Essex County, N.J., March 21, 1796. His early educational advantages were limited; he studied theology in the Princeton Seminary, N.J.; was licensed to preach Oct. 10, 1822, and ordained in 1825. He labored successively in Savannah, Ga.; Woodbridge, N. J.; Charlotte C. H., Va.; Newbern and Raleigh, N. C.; Brierv and Cub Creek, Va., and Farmville, Va., at which latter place he died, July 3, 1863. Mr. Osborne was a man of excellent understanding, sound and logical judgment, quick and accurate perception. His preaching was of the highest order of excellence, being characterized by deep feeling and enthusiasm. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 361. (J. L. S.)

## Osborne, Lord Sydney Godolphin

an English divine and philanthropist, was born Feb. 5, 1808, and graduated at Oxford in 1830. He became rector of Stoke Pogis, and in 1841 at Durweston, Dorsetshire. He died in 1873. Lord Osborne published *Scutari and its Hospitals* (1855), which he visited and aided in improving, and many brief essays for the promotion of various charities, as well as work of a strictly secular character.

## Oscar I, King Of Sweden And Norway

deserves a place here on account of his varied philanthropic labors. He was born at Paris. July 4, 1799, and was the son of the French general Bernadotte. He came to the throne in 1844, and was then already noted as an author and a man of rare culture. He had renounced Romanism, and became an adherent to the Lutheran creed. As a monarch, he exerted himself in favor of religious and temperance reforms, and the improvement of the social condition of women. He resigned the royal authority in 1857,

and died in 1859. Among his publications is a work *On Penal Laws and Establishments* (1851).

## Oschophoria

(ὄσχοφόρια, *branch-bearing*), a festival among the ancient Greeks, celebrated, as some writers allege, in honor of Athene and Dionysus, while others maintain it to have been kept in honor of Dionysus and Ariadne. It was instituted by Theseus, or, according to some, by the Phoenicians. On the occasion of this festival, which was evidently connected with the vintage, two boys, carrying vine branches in their hands, went in ranks, playing, from the temple of Dionysus to the sanctuary of Pallas. See Gardner. *Faiths of the World*, vol. ii, s.v.

## Osculatorium

(*object to be kissed*), viz. *pacis ad Missam* (of peace for the Mass); the “*pax*” for the holy kiss, as used in the ancient Church. It was a piece of wood or metal, with a picture of our Savior, the blessed Virgin, or the like, painted or embossed upon it. This was kissed by the priest during the celebration of mass, and afterwards handed to the people for the same purpose; a custom which probably originated in the ancient kiss of charity, which was practiced by the Christians at the service of the Eucharist. *SEE PAX*.

## Ose'a

(*Osee*, 2 Esdras 12:40), Ose'as (*Osee*, 2 Esdras 1:39), Osee' (Ὠσηέ ~~4125~~ Romans 9:25), less correct modes of Anglicizing the name of the prophet HOSEA *SEE HOSEA* (q.v.).

## Osgood, David D.D.,

a noted Congregational minister, was born at Andover, Mass., Oct. 14, 1747, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1771. He studied theology at Andover, of which one of his ancestors was a founder, and was ordained to the ministry Sept. 14, 1774. He settled as pastor of Medford, where he continued nearly fifty years, and became a distinguished preacher. He was a zealous Federalist, and one of his sermons in 1794, upon Genet's appeal to the people against the government, attracted great attention, and rapidly passed through many editions. His election sermon in 1809 was the most celebrated of his discourses. He was a thorough Calvinist, “a truly

good and great man, and an earnest and fearless preacher.” A volume of his *Sermons* was published at Boston in 1824. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*; Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biogr.* s.v.

## Osgood, Thaddeus

an American minister, noted as a philanthropist, was born at Methuen, Mass., Oct. 24, 1775, and was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1803. He studied divinity with Drs. Lothrop and Emmons, and was ordained about 1806; was stated supply in Southbury, Conn.; and was a missionary in New York and Canada. He organized the first Church in Buffalo, N. Y., and many others; in 1812 he collected \$9000 in England for a school in Quebec, and gathered there 200 boys in a Sabbath-school; went again to England in 1825, and collected \$5000 for a society to promote education and industry in 1837 formed another society in Canada to supply Bibles for seamen and emigrants; was many years a distributor of tracts and founder of Sabbath-schools; went a third time to England for benevolent objects; and closed his useful life at Glasgow, in Scotland, Jan. 19, 1852. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biogr.* s.v.

## Oshe'a

(Heb. *Hoshe'a*, [יֹשֻׁעַ]; Sept. Αὐσῆ; Vulg. *Osee*), another form (<sup>(4113)</sup>Numbers 13:8) of the name of JOSHUA *SEE JOSHUA* (q.v.), the son of Nun.

## Oshima

(i.e. *big island*) is a Japanese island, sometimes called *Vries*, or *Barneveld's Island*. It is about eight miles long and five wide, and there are many villages with considerable population on it. But as the inhabitants of Oshima are principally Japanese, we refer to the article JAPAN *SEE JAPAN*

## Osiander, Andreas (1),

a distinguished German theologian of the Reformation period, and a disciple of Luther, was born at Gunzenhausen, in Bavaria, Dec. 19, 1498. His father was a blacksmith, called *Hosemann*, out of which name his son, after the fashion of his time, manufactured the classic-sounding name *Osiander*. Andreas studied successively at Leipsic, Altenburg, and Ingolstadt, and acquired great proficiency in the dead languages,

particularly in Hebrew, as also in theology, mathematics, and even in medicine. After completing his studies, he was made teacher of theology in an Augustinian convent at Nuremberg, but in 1522 accepted the principles of the Reformation, and became an evangelical preacher in one of the churches of that city. He labored with marked success for the Reformation, frequently defending it in public conferences against the Roman Catholic clergy. His eloquence gained him great reputation, and he was soon looked upon as one of the principal followers of Luther. Gieseler speaks of Osiander as at this time “the highly endowed Reformer of Nuremberg” (*Eccles. Hist.* 4:469 sq.). In 1529 he was sent to the Conference of Marburg, whose object was to reconcile the Lutheran and Swiss theologians, principally on the doctrine of the Eucharist. Osiander seems to have sided on that point most consistently with Luther against Zwingli, but on the doctrine of justification he held some peculiar views, yet they did not differ enough from those of the Lutherans to make him break from them. In 1539 he was one of the Protestant theologians who appeared before the Diet of Augsburg to advocate the cause of the Reformation. He took an active part in the proceedings which resulted in the drawing up of the Confession of Augsburg. In 1546 he attended at the conference in Smalcald (q.v.). But upon the publication of the Interim (May 15, 1548) Osiander felt that he could no longer stay at Nuremberg, and he retired, after twenty-seven years of successful Reformatory labors there, in 1549, to the court of duke Albert of Prussia, who had formerly been much pleased with his preaching. It is said that he expected to be called to England, but that Cranmer refrained from inviting him on account of his combative tendencies. Albert, however, offered him the professorship of theology in the newly organized University of Konigsberg. Osiander accepted this position, as it allowed him full scope for the spread of his doctrinal views. These were somewhat peculiar, and differed from those of the other Reformers, particularly on the question of justification. In opposition to the external view of justification by faith alone, as they taught it, Osiander insisted that “faith is the medium of the indwelling of Christ in the human soul.” This form of statement he proved from Luther's writings was authorized, but he used it, in distinction from Luther, to describe living faith as appropriating Christ, and thus developed the view in a mode akin to that of the German mystics of the 14th century. The principal fault in Osiander's doctrine was, especially, the unwarrantable stress he laid upon his peculiar shape of the dogma, constituting justification and redemption

as only *one act*. His doctrine seems to have amounted to the following propositions:

1. That Christ, considered in his human nature only, could not by his obedience to the divine law obtain justification and pardon for sinners; neither can we be justified before God by embracing and applying to ourselves, through faith, the righteousness and obedience of the man Christ. It is only through that eternal and essential righteousness which dwells in Christ considered as God, and which resides in his divine nature united to the human, that mankind can obtain complete justification.
2. That a man becomes partaker of this divine righteousness by faith, since it is in consequence of this uniting principle that Christ dwells in the heart of man with his divine righteousness. Now, wherever this divine righteousness dwells, there God can behold no sin; therefore, when it is present with Christ in the hearts of the regenerate, they are, on its own account, considered by the Deity as righteous, although they be sinners. Moreover, this divine and justifying righteousness of Christ excites the faithful to the pursuit of holiness and to the practice of virtue. Osiander indeed maintained that what was called justification by orthodox theologians should be more properly designated *redemption* (illustrated by the case of a Moor ransomed from slavery). In his opinion the signification of δικαιοῦν is to “make just;” it is only by metonymy that it can mean “to pronounce a person just” (comp. Planck, 4:249 sq.; Tholuck's *Anzeiger*, 1833, No. 54, 55; Schenkel, 2:355). He was opposed by Francis Staphylus. Morlin, and others. (On Osiander's doctrine in its earliest form [after 1524], see Heberle in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1844; it is further developed in the two disputations which he held, A.D. 1549 and 1550, in his treatise *De unico Mediatore*, 1551, and in various sermons.) Says Baur, in his *Dogmengesch.* p. 332: “Justification, according to Osiander, is the mystical union of man with Christ as the absolute principle of righteousness. The believer is so embodied in Christ that in this living concrete unity he is flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone.... The *Formula Concordiae* is incorrect in representing his doctrine as excluding the human nature of Christ from the work of redemption.” As Osiander considered justification, it is evidently not to be understood as a judicial act of God, as it was held by the Reformers, who all adopted on this point the theory of Anselm, but as something subjective, as a communication of an inner justice operating directly upon conscience. This doctrine was never violently attacked by the Lutherans, though they were opposed to it so long as Luther's

magnanimous spirit was able to restrain in the new Church all controversies which did not seem to him to be indispensable for preserving the purity of truths leading to salvation. While at Nuremberg Osiander therefore escaped violent opposition, but when established at Königsberg, so much farther removed from the personal influence of his own devoted friends, and the great Reformer himself no longer on earth to stay the strife, the jealousy of competitors, the newness of Osiander's views, joined to a certain freedom — much removed, however, from immorality — of manners, created many enemies, and involved him in bitter controversies, which commenced with his first disputations, *De lege et Evangelio* (1549), *De Justificatione* (1550). The strife was for a while subdued by the authorities, who favored Osiander and exiled his opponents, but broke out with renewed violence when he published in Latin and in German his Confession, entitled in the former *De unico mediatore Jes. Chr. et justificatione fidei Confessio n. Osiandri* (Regiom. Oct. 1551, 4to), or in German *Bekennniss v. d. einigen Mittler Jes. Christ. u. v. d. Rechtfertigung* (1551; 2d ed. 1552). Osiander by this publication simply inflamed the strife, because he here treated his opponents with arrogance and harshness. Morlin (q.v.), who had been made pastor at Königsberg in September of this year, tried in vain to adjust the controversy; and when all seemed lost for Osiander, his devoted friend the duke called for a judgment from the theologians of all the German estates of the Augsburg Confession. The Wurtemberg judgment alone tried to vindicate the essential agreement of Osiander with Lutheranism, and this only the duke presented, but failed, nevertheless, to bring about a peaceful settlement. Osiander was finally, on account of his heretical views, called before the Synod of Wittenberg, but it declined to inderdict him; and before he could be the subject of further controversy he died, at Königsberg, Oct. 17, 1552. His faithful adherents, who continued the controversy after his death, are called *Osiandrians* (see below).

Osiander was well versed in mathematics, astronomy, and physics. He was very eloquent, but he had all the coarseness of his age; he overwhelmed his adversaries with insults, unbecoming jokes, and cynical jests. His works were numerous, but are now altogether forgotten; the most important are, *Conjecture de ultimis temporibus ac de fine mundi* (Nuremb. 1544, 4to): — *Harmoniae evangelicae, libri iv, Greece et Latine* (Basle. 1537, fol.; ibid. 1561, Greek and Latin; Paris. Robert Estienne, 1545, Latin only; translated into German by J. Schweinzer, Frankfort, 1540, 8vo). This is the first Protestant *Harmony*, but it is worthless because Osiander labored



under the new and erroneous opinion that the four Gospels, instead of being a narration of the same events, were an account of four different periods, chronologically following each other, and that the similitude of events was the result of a similarity of circumstances: — *Biblia sacra, quæ præter antiquæ Latince versionis necessariam emendationem, et difficiliorum locorum succinctam explicationem, multas insuper utilissimas observationes, continet* (Tibing. 1600, fol.; four times reprinted). Osiander was the first to publish Copernicus's *Astronomy*, to which he wrote a preface (Nuremb. 1543. 4to). See, besides the works already referred to, Adam, *Vitæ theologorum Germanorum*; Teissier, *Eloges des hommes savants*, 1:110, 111; Jocher, *Allg. Gelehrten-Lexikon*; *Musee des Protestants celebres*; Moerlinos, *Historia Osiandris*; Wigandus, *De Osiandrismo* (1583, 4to); Wilken, *And. Osiander's Leben, Lehre u. Schriften* (Strasburg, 1844, 8vo); Lehnerdt, *De Andr. Osiandro* (Kinigsb. 1837, 8vo); *Leben und ausgewählte Schriften 'der Voter und Begründer der Lutherischen Kirche*, by Hartmann, Moller, Schmidt, etc., vol. v; Moller, *Andreas Osiander, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften* (Elberfeld, 1869, 8vo); Baur, *Lehre v. d. Versöhnung*, p. 329; *A cta Osiandristica* (Regiom. 1553. 4to); Joach. Morlin, *Historia* (1554); Arnold, *Unpart. Kirchengesch. Ketzerhistorie*, II, vol. xvi, c. 24; Walch, *Religionsstreit. . . Evang.* — *Luth. Kirchen* (1733, 1739); Schrockh, *Kirchengesch. seit d. Reform.* 4:572 sq.; Planck, *Gesch. d. protestantischen Lehmbegriiffs*, vol. iv, v, vi; Baur, *Disquisitio in A. Osiandri de justificatione docti inam* (Tubingen, 1831); Dorner, *Entwickelungsgesch. v. d. Person Christi* (2d ed. 1854, p. 576-591); Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*; Buchanan, *Doct. of Justification*; Gass, *Gesch. der protest. Dogmatik*, 1:61 sq.; Held, *De opere Jesu Christi salutari, quid M. Lutherus senserit demonstratur* (Gott. 1860); Frank, *Ad eccles. de satisf. Christi doctrinam, quid redimaverit ex lite Osiandrian.* (Erl. 1858); Grau, *De A ndr. Osiandri Doctrina Commentatio* (1860); Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas*; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 2:469-481; Hardwick, *Hist. of Doctrines*, 2:286 sq.; *Bullet. Theol.* Jan. 1867, p. 23; *Jahrb. Deutscher Theol.* 1857.

### Osiander, Andreas (2),

called THE YOUNGER, son of Lucas the Elder, was born at Blaubeuern, Wurtemberg, May 6, 1562. He became, in 1587, pastor at Guglingen; preacher to the duke of Wurtemberg in 1590; general superintendent in 1588; and, finally, chancellor of the University of Tubingen in 1605. Osiander died in 1617. He left sermons, essays, and theological treatises,

the best-known of which is *Papa non papa, hoc est, papae et papicolarum de praecipuis Christiane fidei partibus Lutherana confessio* (Tubing. 1599, 8vo; Frankf. 1610, 12mo).

### Osiander, Johann Adam (1),

a distinguished German Protestant writer, was born at Vaihingen, in Wurtemberg, Dec. 3, 1626. He became, in 1680, chancellor of the University of Tubingen, and died there Oct. 26, 1697. Among his theological works we note, *Commentarius in Pentateuchum* (Tubing. 1676-78, 5 vols. fol.), which was until the close of the last century considered One of the best commentaries on the Pentateuch: — *In Josuem* (ibid. 1681, fol.): — *In Judices* (ibid. 1682, fol.): — *In librum Ruth* (ibid. 1682, fol.): — *In primum et secundum librum Samuelis* (Stuttg. 1687, fol.): — *Tractatus theologicus de nmagia* (Tiibing. 1687, 8vo): — *Primitioe evangelicce, seu dispositiones in Evangelia dominicalia efestivalia* (ibid. 1665-1691, 14 pts. 4to): — *De azyliis Hebrceorum, Gentilium et Christianorum* (ibid. 1673, 4to). Gronovius inserted in the fourth volume of his *Thesaurus antiquitatum Graecarunz* the part of this treatise which refers to the places of refuge among the Greeks and Romans. See Jocher, *Allg. Gelehrten-Lex.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:905. (J. N. P.),

### Osiander, Johann Adam (2),

a German philologist and theologian, son of the preceding, was born at Tubingen in 1701. He became professor of Greek in the university of that city, and died there Nov. 20, 1756. He wrote a number of essays on questions of philology, literature, and philosophy. The best-known among them is entitled *De immortalitate animne rationalis, ex lumine rationis probabili* (Tubing. 1732, 4to). See J. G. Walchius, *Bibl. theol. selecta*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:906. (J. N. P.)

### Osiander, Lucas (1),

called THE ELDER, son of Andreas Osiander (1), was born at Nuremburg Dec. 16 1534. He accompanied his father to Konigsberg, and was educated at that high school. Upon the completion of his studies he went to Suabia, and was made deacon at Goppingen in 1555, and two years later special superintendent at Blaubeuern; in 1560 he passed with the same title to Stuttgart, where he was appointed court preacher in 1567; and finally in

1593 he was appointed prelate of Adelberg. Here his violent denunciation of the Jews, who were protected by the duke from motives of policy, caused him to be ejected about 1596, and he withdrew to Esslingen; in this city he preached for about a year without any salary; but he finally returned to Stuttgart, and there was made general superintendent of the churches of Wurtemberg. He died Sept. 7, 1604. His activity was as remarkable as his erudition. He had taken part in the conferences of Maulbronn in 1564, and also in 1576, when he assisted in framing the so-called Formula of Maulbronn; also in the conferences of Mompelgard in 1586, and of Regensburg in 1594. In 1584 he had taken an active part in opposing the persecutions directed against the Anabaptists. He wrote against Sturm in defense of the Formula of Concord; against Mentzer on the human nature of Christ; against Huber on the doctrine of election; against the Reformed theologians on the controverted points; against the Jesuits, etc. He even published a treatise against Mohammedanism. Osiander's principal works are, *Epitomes historiae ecclesiasticae centuriarum xv* (ex Historia Magdeburgica) (Tilb. 1607, 3 Vols. 4to): — *Enchiridion controversiarum, quae Augustance Confessionis theologia cum Anabaptistis intercedunt* (Witeb. 1614, sm. 8vo): — *Enchiridion controversiarum, quas Augustance Confessionis theologi habent cume Calvinianis* (ibid. 1614, sm. 8vo): — *Enchiridion controversiarum religionis, puce hodie inter Augustance Confessionis theologos et pontificios habentur* (ibid. 1615, sm. 8vo): — *Biblia Lat. ad fontes Hebraici textus eenedata, cum brevi et perspicua expositione Lucas Osiandri inversis locis theologict* (1574-1586, 7 vols. 4to; 13th ed. 1635; it was also translated into German by David Forster [Stuttg. 1609], and passed through many editions): — *Institutiones Christianae Religionis; Postella Evangeliorum; De ratione concionandi* (Tilb. 1582, 8vo; twice reprinted): — *Adndonitio de studiis Verbi divini ministrorum privatis recte instituendis* (ibid. 1691, 8vo). See Jocher, *Allg. Gelehr.* — *Lexikon*; J. G. Walch, *Biblioth. theologica selecta*; Neander, *Hist. Christian Dogmas*; Frischlinus, *Memoria Theol. Wurtemb.* 1:146 sq.; Schrockh. *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* 4:428, 468, 671; Fuhrmann, *Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch.* s.'v.

### Osiander, Lucas (2),

called THE YOUNGER, son of the preceding and brother of Andreas the Yoanger, was born at Stuttgart, May 6, 1571. He became professor of theology at Tübingen in 1619, and died there Aug. 10, 1638. He was much given to controversy, and wrote against the Jesuits, the Reformed Church,

the Anabaptists, the Schwenckfeldians, etc., and was accused of having started the difficulties which divided the theologians of Tübingen and those of Giessen on the doctrine of the self-abasement of Christ. His immoderate attacks against J. Arnd's *Wahre Christenthum*, in 1623, led him into very disagreeable disputes. He wrote sermons and numerous theological works, mostly polemical. See Jocher, *Allg. Gelehr.* — *Lexikon*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:905. (J. N. P.)

## Osiandrians

is the name of a body of Lutheran theologians who adhered to the doctrines of Andreas Osiander (q.v.) concerning the redemptive character of Christ by virtue of his divine nature alone. Osiander was opposed by Melancthon and others, but principally by Stancarus (q.v.), professor of Hebrew at Königsberg, who adopted the opposite extreme, that Christ's divine nature had no concern in the satisfaction he made, and that the mediation between God and man belonged to Jesus, considered in his human nature only. After the death of Osiander the strife was continued by his disciples. They were at first upheld by Osiander's former protector, the duke; but in 1554 a council condemned their doctrines, and demanded that all Osiandrians should abjure their heresies. They protested, and were for the greater part obliged to leave the country. Osiander's son-in-law, the court preacher Johann Funck, was compelled to recant by the synod of 1556, but afterwards returned to his errors; he became also connected with political troubles, and paid the penalty of his heresy with his life. **SEE FUNCK**. After this the party soon lost all importance, and the troubles ended. Morlin, the leader of the orthodox party, who had been exiled from Königsberg, was recalled and made bishop, and framed a new confession of faith denouncing the Osiandrian heresy. The confession, in order that it should not be considered a new formula, but only a reassertion of the old, was called *Repetitio coaporis doctrine Christiane*; this name was afterwards changed, however, to *Corpus Doctrinae Prutenicum* (in 1567), and all the Osiandrians were banished from Prussia, after which they soon became extinct. See references in the article OSIANDER. In recent times the Osiandrian view of justification has been espoused by Dr. John Forbes in his *Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinb. 1868, 8vo). See *British and Foreign Evang. Rev.* Oct. 1868, art. ii.

## Osiris

according to others, AIRIS or HYSIRIS (*Many-eyed*), a celebrated Egyptian deity, whose worship was universal throughout Egypt. This name appears in the hieroglyphic texts as early as the 4th dynasty, and is expressed by a throne and an eye; at a later period, that of the 19th, a palanquin is substituted for a throne; and under the Romans, the pupil of the eye for the eye itself. Osiris does not indeed appear to have been universally honored till the time of the 11th and 12th dynasties, or about 1800 B.C., when Abydos, which was reputed to be his burial-place, rose into importance. In the monuments of this age he is called “great god, eternal ruler, dwelling in the west, and lord of Abut” or Abydos. Even at the most remote period individuals after death were supposed to become an Osiris; and all the prayers and ceremonies performed or addressed to them were, in this character, referring to their future life and resurrection. At the time of the 18th dynasty this title of Osiris was prefixed to their names, and continued to be so till the time of the Romans and the fall of paganism.

The Greek and Roman writers greatly differ in their opinions concerning this celebrated god, but they all agree that, as king of Egypt, he took particular care to civilize his subjects, to polish their morals, to give them good and salutary laws, and to teach them agriculture. After he had accomplished a reform at home, Osiris resolved to go and spread cultivation in the other parts of the earth. He left his kingdom to the care of his wife His, and of her faithful minister Hermes or Mercury. The command of his troops at home was left to the trust of Hercules, a warlike officer. In this expedition Osiris was accompanied by his brother Apollo, and by Anubis, Macedo, and Pan. His march was through Ethiopia, where his army was increased by the addition of the Satyrs, a hairy race of monsters, who made dancing and playing on musical instruments their chief study. He afterwards passed through Arabia, and visited the greatest part of the kingdoms of Asia and Europe, where he enlightened the minds of men by introducing among them the worship of the gods, and a reverence for the wisdom of a supreme being. At his return home Osiris found the minds of his subjects roused and agitated. His brother Typhon had raised seditions, and endeavored to make himself popular. Osiris, whose sentiments were always of the most pacific nature, endeavored to convince his brother of his ill conduct, but he fell a sacrifice to the attempt. Typhon murdered him in a secret apartment, and cut his body to pieces, which were divided among the associates of his guilt. This cruelty incensed His; she

revenge her husband's death, and, with her son Orus, she defeated Typhon and the partisans of his conspiracy. She recovered the mangled pieces of her husband's body, the genitals excepted, which the murderer had thrown into the sea; and to render him all the honor which his humanity deserved, she made as many statues of wax as there were mangled pieces of his body. Each statue contained a piece of the flesh of the dead monarch; and His, after she had summoned to her presence one by one the priests of all the different deities in her dominions, gave them each a statue, intimating that in doing so she had preferred them to all the other communities of Egypt, and she bound them by a solemn oath that they would keep secret that mark of her favor, and endeavor to show their sense of it by establishing a form of worship and paying divine homage to their prince. They were further directed to choose whatever animals they pleased to represent the person and the divinity of Osiris, and they were enjoined to pay the greatest reverence to that representative of divinity, and to bury it when dead with the greatest solemnity. To render their establishment more popular, each sacerdotal body had a certain portion of land allotted to them to maintain them, and to defray the expenses which necessarily attended their sacrifices and ceremonial rites. That part of the body of Osiris which had not been recovered was treated with more particular attention by His, and she ordered that it should receive honors more solemn, and at the same time more mysterious than the other members. As Osiris had particularly instructed his subjects in cultivating the ground, the priests chose the ox to represent him, and paid the most superstitious veneration to that animal. Osiris, according to the opinion of some mythologists, is the same as the sun, and the adoration which is paid by different nations to an Anubis, a Bacchus, a Dionysus, a Jupiter, a Pan, etc., is the same as that which Osiris received in the Egyptian temples. His also after death received divine honors as well as her husband; and as the ox was the symbol of the sun, or Osiris, so the cow was the emblem of the moon, or Isis. Nothing can give a clearer idea of the power and greatness of Osiris than this inscription, which has been found on some ancient monuments: "*Saturn, the youngest of all the gods, was my father; I am Osiris, who conducted a large and numerous army as far as the deserts of India, and traveled over the greatest part of the world, and visited the streams of the Ister, and the remote shores of the ocean, diffusing benevolence to all the inhabitants of the earth.*" Osiris was generally represented with a cap on his head like a mitre, with two horns; he held a stick in his left hand, and in his right a whip with three thongs. Sometimes he appears with the head of a hawk, as

that bird, by its quick and piercing eyes, is a proper emblem of the sun (Plutarch, *In Isid. and Os.*; Herodotus, 2:144; Diodorus, i; Homer, *Od.* 12:323; Aelian, *De Anim.* iii; Lucian, *De Dea. Syr.*; Pliny, viii).

In the Egyptian Ritual, or "*Book of the Dead*," and other inscriptions, Osiris is said to be the son of Seb or Saturn, and born of Nu or Rhea; to be the father of Horus by Isis, of Anubis, and of the four genii of the dead. Many mystic notions were connected with Osiris; he was sometimes thought to be the son of Ra, the Sun, or of Atum, the setting Sun, and the Bennu or Phoenix; also to be uncreate, or self-engendered, and he is identified in some instances with the Sun or the Creator, and the Pluto or Judge of Hades. Osiris was born on the first of the Epagomenae, or five additional days of the year. When born, Chronos or Saturn is said to have given him in charge to Pamylen; having become king of Egypt, he is stated to have civilized the Egyptians, and especially to have taught them agriculture, the culture of the vine, and the art of making beer; he afterwards traveled over the earth, and conquered the people everywhere by his persuasion. During his absence, his kingdom was confided to His, who guarded it strictly, and Set or Typhon, the brother of Osiris (who was born in the third of the Epagomenae), was unable to revolt against him. Typhon had, however, persuaded seventy-two other persons, and Aso, the queen of Ethiopia, to join him in a conspiracy; and, having taken the measure of Osiris, he had a chest made of the same dimensions, richly ornamented and carved, and produced it at a banquet, where he promised to give it to whomsoever it should fit; and when all had lain down and tried it, and it suited none, Osiris at last laid himself down in it, and was immediately covered over by the conspirators, who placed the lid upon it, and fastened it with nails and molten lead. The chest was then hurled into the Nile, and floated down the Tanaitic mouth into the sea. This happened on the seventeenth of the month Athyr, in the twenty-eighth year of the reign or age of Osiris. Khem or Pan, and his attendant deities, discovered the loss of the god; His immediately cut off a lock of hair and went into mourning, and proceeded in search of Anubis, the child of her sister Nephthys by Osiris; and, having found him, brought him up. The chest meanwhile floated to Byblos, and, lodging in a tamarisk became enclosed in the tree, which was cut down by the king, and the trunk, containing the chest and the body of the god, was converted into a pillar to support the roof of the palace. The goddess proceeded to Byblos, and ingratiated herself with the queen's women by plaiting their hair and imparting to it an

ambrosial smell, so that the monarch, whose name was Melcarthus, and his wife, Saosis or Nemanoun, invited her to court to take care of their own child. She endeavored to confer immortality upon him by placing him on a fire, and changing herself into a swallow, flew around the pillar and bemoaned her fate. The queen became alarmed at the danger of her child; His revealed herself, and asked for the pillar of tamarisk wood, which was given her. She then cut it open, and took out the chest, making great lamentations, and subsequently sailed for Egypt, with the eldest of the king's sons. The goddess, intending to visit Horns, her son, at Buto, deposited the chest in an unfrequented spot; but Typhon discovered it by the light of the moon, tore it into fourteen pieces, and distributed each to a home or district. His recovered all by passing the marshes in a boat of papyrus; all except the phallus, which had been eaten by the lepidotus, the phagrus, and oxyrhynchus fish. Subsequently a battle took place between Horus and Typhon or Set, which lasted three days, and ended by Typhon having fetters placed upon him. His, however, liberated Typhon, which so enraged Horus that he tore off her diadem, but Teti or Thoth placed on her the head of a cow instead. Typhon finally accused Horus of illegitimacy; but the question was decided between them by Teti or Thoth and the gods. From Osiris, after his death, and His sprung Harpocrates. Osiris seems to have been finally revived, and to have become the judge of the Karneter or Hades, presiding at the final judgment of souls in the hall of the two Truths, with the forty-two daemons who presided over the capital sins. and awarding to the soul its final destiny. Thoth or Hermes recorded the judgment, and justified the deceased against his accusers, as he had formerly done for Osiris.

Considerable diversity of opinion existed among the ancients themselves as to the meaning of the myth of Osiris. He represented, according to Plutarch, the inundation of the Nile; His, the irrigated land; Horus, the vapors; Buto, the marshes; Nephthys. the edge of the desert; Anubis, the barren soil; Typhon was the sea; the conspirators, the drought; the chest, the river's banks. The Tanaitic branch was the one which overflowed unprofitably; the twenty-eight years, the number of cubits which the Nile rose at Elephantine; Harpocrates, the first shootings of the corn. Such are the naturalistic interpretations of Plutarch; but there appears in the myth the dualistic principle of good and evil, represented by Osiris and Set or Typhon, or again paralleled by the contest of Ra or the Sun, and Apophis or Darkness. The difficulty of interpretation was increased from the form



of Osiris having become blended or identified with that of other deities, especially PtahSocharis, the pigmy of Memphis, and the bull Hapis or Apis, the avatar of Ptah. Osiris was the head of a tetrad of deities, whose local worship was at Abydos, but who were the last repetition of the gods of the other nomes of Egypt, and who had assumed a heroic or mortal type. In form, Osiris is always represented swathed or mummied, in allusion to his embalment; a network, suggestive of the net by which his remains were fished out of the Nile, covers this dress; on his head he wears the cap *atf*; having at each side the feather of truth, of which he was the lord. This is placed on the horns of a goat. His hands hold the crook and whip, to indicate his governing and directing power; and his feet are based on the cubit of truth; a panther's skin on a pole is often placed before him, and festoons of grapes hang over his shrine, connecting him with Dionysus. As the "good being," or Onnophris the meek-hearted, the celestial or king of heaven, he wears the white or upper crown. Another and rarer type of him represents him as the *Tat*, or emblem of stability, wearing the crown of the two Truths upon his head. His worship, at a later time, was extended over Asia Minor, Greece, and Rome, and at an early age had penetrated into Phoenicia, traces of it being found on the coins of Malta and other places. He became introduced along with the Isiac worship into Rome, and had votaries under the Roman empire. But the attacks of the philosophers, and the rise of Christianity, overthrew these exotic deities, who were never popular with the more cultivated portion of the Roman world. See Prichard, *Mythology*, p. 208; Willinson, *Man. and Cust.* 4:314; Bunsen, *Egypt's Place*, 1:414.

## Oski, Reuben

(also called *Hoschke*), a rabbi at Prague, where he died in 1673, is the author of **FWql jynb̄ar**] a manual for preachers, containing in alphabetical order certain *loci communes*, compiled from different authors, of which only the first part has been published (Prague, 1660; Hamburg, 1712), while the second part is yet in MS. in the Oppenheimeriana: **l wdGhi yn̄b̄ar**] **FWql j̄i**] a Cabalistic *Midrash* on the Pentateuch, with large extracts from the Mekiltha, Pesikta, Zohar, and other Cabalistic works (Wilmersdorf, 1681; Amsterd. 1700; Lemberg, 1860; Amsterd. 1870, fol.); which however must be distinguished from the **FWql j̄iofR**. Simeon Cara (q.v.): — **hvWd2aq̄b̄ær b̄D**; an introduction to the subject of asceticism (Sulzbach, 1684): — and **tByign**] **o** Cabalistic observations on the ritual

for the Sabbath. — See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:412 sq.; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei*, p. 254 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Etheridge, *Introduction to Heb. Literatur e*, p. 419; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur*, p. 402; Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 223. (B. P.)

### Osmond Or Osmund St.,

an English prelate of the 11th century, was son of the count of Seez, in Normandy. He succeeded his father, and gave most of his goods to the clergy. In 1066 he followed William the Conqueror to England, and received from him the county of Dorset and the charge of lord chancellor. The king, judging him better fitted for the Church than for the management of temporal affairs, made him bishop of Salisbury about 1078. He died Dec. 3, 1099, and was canonized by pope Calixtus III in 1458. In order to render the manner in which divine service was conducted more uniform, he wrote a treatise of ecclesiastical forms, named sometimes *Liber ordinalis*, sometimes *Consuetudinariun ecclesice*, or again *Horariae preces*. This work, with some slight alterations, remained in use until the time of Henry VIII; was one of the most popular manuals for public devotion with the English clergy, and has principally contributed to hand down Osmond's name to posterity. See *Hist. litter. de la France*; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*; Inett, *Hist. Engl. Ch. I*, 15:4, n. 4; Churton, *Early Engl. Ch.* p. 291; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:907; Hook, *Eccles. Biogr. s.v.*; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Lit.* (AngloNorman period); Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index in vol. viii); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors.*v.

### Osorio, Francisco Meneses

a Spanish painter, was born at Seville in the latter part of the 17th century. He studied under Murillo, and became one of the most successful imitators of that artist. In concert with Juan Garzon, one of his fellow-disciples, he painted several pictures in the churches and convents of Seville. In 1688 Osorio was chosen major-domo of the academy of that city, to which he presented his picture of the *Conception*, which was greatly admired. At the death of Murillo, in 1685, he was employed to finish the works at Cadiz left incomplete by that master. He copied the works of Murillo to perfection, particularly his pictures of children. Among his own works are, *Elijah Fed in the Desert*, in the church of San Martino at Madrid, and the picture of *St. Catharine*, in the Capuchin monastery at Cadiz his finest production. Osorio died at Seville about 1700.

## Osorio (Or Osorius), Geronimo (1),

a learned Roman Catholic Portuguese divine, and an excellent writer, the descendant of an illustrious family, was born at Lisbon in 1506. Showing an extraordinary inclination for literature, he was sent, at thirteen, to the University of Salamanca, and there learned Greek and Latin, and studied the law. At nineteen he removed to Paris, to be instructed in Aristotle's philosophy. From Paris he went to Bologna, where he devoted himself to theology, learned Hebrew, and studied the Bible, in which he became so great a master that, on his return home, John III, king of Portugal, appointed him professor of divinity at Coimbra. Taking priest's orders, he was given the care of the church of Tayora by Dom Lewis, infante of Portugal, and soon after the archdeaconry of Evora by cardinal Henry, archbishop of that province, and brother to king John; and at last he was nominated to the bishopric of Sylves by Catharine of Austria, that king's widow, who was regent of the kingdom during the minority of her grandson Sebastian. When this prince became of the proper age for the personal administration of his kingdom, he resolved upon an expedition against the Moors in Africa, much against the persuasions of Osorio, who thereupon, to avoid being an eye-witness of the calamities he dreaded, made various pretenses to go to Rome. Here pope Gregory XIII gave Osorio many testimonies of his esteem; but he had not been absent above a twelvemonth when the king called him home. Not long after this Sebastian was slain in a battle against the Moors, Aug. 4, 1578. During the tumults in Portugal which succeeded this fatal event Osorio labored incessantly to prevent the people of his diocese from joining in them; and failing in this effort, he laid it so deeply to heart that he died of grief, August, 1580. He is much commended for his piety and charity. He maintained several learned men in his palace, and at meals had some portion out of St. Bernard's works read, after which all present were at liberty to propose any difficulties that occurred upon it. As a writer, Du Pin observes that his diction is easy and elegant. for which reason he is called the Cicero of Portugal, as being a great imitator of Cicero, both in style, choice of subjects, and manner of treating them. His compositions are not intermixed with quotations, but consist of connected reasonings. He does not endeavor in his *Commentaries* and *Paraphrases* to explain the terms of the text, but to extend the sense of it, and show its order and series fully. These were collected and published at Rome (1592, in 4 vols. fol.) by Jerome Osorio, his nephew, who prefixed his uncle's life to the edition. The

titles of his works are: *De nobilitate civili, et de nobilitate Christiana*: — *De gloria* (printed with the foregoing; some have thought this last to have been written by Cicero, and that Osorio found it and published it as his own): — *De regis institutione et disciplina*: — *De rebus Emanuelis regis invictissimi virtute et auspicio gestis*: — *Item, cum præfatione Joannis Metelli, de reperta India*: — *De justitia cælesti, lib. x, ad Reginaldum Polum Cardinalem*: — *De vera sapientia, lib. v, ad Gregorium XII, P. M.* — besides paraphrases and commentaries upon several parts of Scripture. He wrote to queen Elizabeth of England and exhorted her to turn papist. He was answered by Walter Haddon, master of the requests to that queen. See *Genesis Biog. Diet.* s.v.; *Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.; *Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.; *Hallam, Introd. to the Liter. of Europe*, 1:258.

### Osorio, Geronimo (2),

nephew of the preceding, was canon of Evora, and, having been educated by his uncle, endeavored to imitate his style; but he was not so fine a writer, though he seems to have had more learning. He wrote, besides a life of his uncle, *Notationes in Hieronymi Osorii Paraphrasin Psalmorum*, subjoined to his uncle's *Paraphrase* in the third volume of his works. Du Pin says these "Remarks" are valuable, and filled with critical observations on the Hebrew language: — *Paraphrasis et Commentaria ad Ecclesiasten nunc primum edita*: — *Paraphrasis in Canticum Canticorum* (Lugd. 1611, 4to).

### Ospray

#### Picture for Ospray 1

(by ornithologists, *Osprey*) is the rendering in the A. V. of the Hebrew **חַיָּנִיָּה**; *ozniyah*' (Sept. **ἀλιαίετος**, or *sea-eagle*; which Jerome follows, *halyetus* and *halecetus*, some copies translating it *aquila marina*; but the Veneto-Greek MS. has **γύψ**, *the vulture*, from mere conjecture); the name of some unclean bird which the law of Moses disallowed as food to the Israelites (<sup><OR113></sup>Leviticus 11:13; <sup><OR142></sup>Deuteronomy 14:12). The Hebrew etymology, from the root **זָצַח**; *to strengthen*, would seem to point to some bird remarkably *powerful, fierce, or impudent*. Bochart supposes the *black eagle* to be meant, but reasons upon the mere conjecture that by the word **ἀλιαίετος** is intended **μελαναίετος** (*Hieroz.* 3:188, etc.). The traditional

interpretation favors the English rendering, the name and description of this bird having been copied and preserved from hand to hand, at least from Aristotle's time to our own. Thus, Gesner and Aldrovandus copied from Aristotle (Ray, *Preface to Willoughby's Ornithology*); from them Willoughby took the names of his birds; and on this system Linnaeus based his classification (Neville Wood, *Ornithologists' Text-book*, p. 3). Aristotle, about B.C. 300 (probably contemporary with the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek; see above), describes the *ἀλκίαιετος* as "a species of eagle dwelling near seas and lakes; and remarks it sometimes happens to it that, having seized its prey, and not being able to carry it, it is drowned in the deep" (*Hist. Animal.* 9, c. 32). — The same word is found in the writings of Pliny (A.D. 70) with the following description: "There remains (to be mentioned) the *halicetos*, having the most penetrating vision of all (eagles); soaring (or balancing itself) on high, and upon perceiving a fish in the sea, rushing down headlong, and with its breast dashing aside the waters, seizing its prey" (*Hist. Nat.* 10:3). The *halicetus* is described in the very words of Aristotle and Pliny by Aldrovandus (lib. 12, Bonon. 1594, p. 194). For the transference of names into the Linnaean system, see *Systema Naturae*, 1:129 (Holmiae, 1767). The word, according to its etymology, signifies *sea-eagle*, and the traditional English word is osprey. The following accounts, from modern naturalists are strikingly in accordance with the ancient descriptions: Species of the halietus, or sea-eagle, occur in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia (Selby's *British Ornithology*). Mr. Macgillivray describes "its savage scream of anger when any one approaches the neighborhood of its nest, its intimidating gestures, and even its attempts to molest individuals who have ventured among its native crags." Mr. Selby (*Illustrations of British Ornithology*, 1825), respecting the osprey, observes, "It is strictly piscivorous, and is found only in the vicinity of lakes, rivers, or such pools as abound with fish. It is a powerful bird, often weighing five pounds; the limbs are very muscular in proportion to its general dimensions; its feet are admirably adapted for retaining firm hold of its slippery prey." Mr. Montagu (*Ornithological Dictionary*, 1802, s.v. Ospray) remarks, "Its principal food is fish, which it often catches with great dexterity, by pouncing upon them with vast rapidity, and carrying them off in its talons." See also Grandsagne's edition of Pliny, with Notes and Excursus by Cuvier (Parisii, 1828), p. 215. This fine and powerful bird of prey has a wide geographical distribution. It is spread over the whole of Europe and Asia from Norway to Kamtchatka, from Ireland and Portugal to India and Japan. On all the coasts of the Mediterranean it is

common, and in Africa it reaches from Egypt to the Cape. In America Dr. Richardson found it in the arctic regions; Wilson and Audubon describe it as abundant throughout the United States; and it is seen fishing in the West Indies. Its prey is fish, and to obtain this it selects its eyryon some bold headland jutting out into the sea, or a tall cliff overlooking the broad reach of a river, or a blasted pine that springs out of the rifted rock where a cataract plunges down the steep. The manners of this bold seaking have been eloquently described by Wilson:

“In leaving the nest, he usually flies direct till he comes to the sea, then sails around in easy curving lines, turning sometimes in the air as on a pivot, apparently without the least exertion, rarely moving the wings, his legs extended in a straight line behind, and his remarkable length and curvature of wing distinguishing him from all other hawks. The height at which he thus elegantly glides is various, from one hundred to one hundred and fifty and two hundred feet, sometimes much higher, all the while calmly reconnoitring the face of the deep below. Suddenly he is seen to check his course, as if struck by a particular object, which he seems to survey for a few moments with such steadiness that he appears fixed in the air, flapping his wings. This object, however, he abandons, or rather the fish he had in his eye has disappeared, and he is again seen sailing around as before. Now his attention is again arrested, and he descends with great rapidity; but ere he reaches the surface shoots off on another course, as if ashamed that a second victim had escaped him. He now sails at a short height above the surface, and by a zigzag descent, and without seeming to dip his feet in the water, seizes a fish, which, after carrying a short distance, he probably drops, or yields up to the bald-eagle, and again ascends by easy spiral circles to the higher regions of the air, where he glides about in all the ease and majesty of his species. At once, from this sublime aerial height, he descends like a perpendicular torrent, plunging into the sea with a loud rushing sound, and with the certainty of a rifle. In a few moments he emerges, bearing in his claws his struggling prey, which he always carries head foremost, and having risen a few feet above the surface, shakes himself as a water spaniel would do, and directs his heavy and laborious course directly for the land. The hawk, however, in his fishing pursuits, sometimes mistakes his mark, or

overrates his strength by striking fish too large and powerful for him to manage, by whom he is suddenly dragged under; and though he sometimes succeeds in extricating himself, after being taken down three or four times, yet oftener both parties perish. The bodies of sturgeon, and of several other large fish, with a fish-hawk fast grappled in them, have at different sites been found dead on the shore, cast up by the waves” (*Amer. Ornith.* s.v. Fishhawk).

## Picture for Ospray 2

With this may be compared the description of another modern naturalist, Dr. Richardson: “When looking out for its prey it sails with great ease and elegance, in undulating lines at a considerable altitude above the water, from whence it precipitates itself upon its quarry, and bears it off in its claws.” The osprey belongs to the family *Falconide*, order *Raptores*. It has a wide geographical range, and is occasionally seen in Egypt; but as it is rather a northern bird, the Hebrew word may refer, as Mr. Tristram suggests to us, either to the *Aquila noevia* or *Aquila noevioides*, or more probably still to the very abundant *Circaetus gallicus* which feeds upon reptilia (*Nat. Hist. of Bible*, p. 185).

## Ossa

a Homeric female deity, the messenger of Zeus. She was worshipped at Athens, and seems to have corresponded to the Latin goddess *Fama*.

## Ossat Arnaud D'

a French cardinal and diplomatist, was born of very humble origin Aug. 23, 1536, at Larroque. He lost both his parents when but nine years of age, and entered the service of Thomas de Marca, who gave him as a servant to his nephew and ward, John de Marca, lord of Castelnaud-Magnoac. Being present while his master was taking his lessons, D'Ossat soon learned enough of Latin to teach it to the less capable nobleman. Receiving the tonsure Dec. 26, 1556, he entered the Church, and afterwards accompanied his former master and two other young gentlemen to Paris as their tutor. These returned to Gascony in 1562, and D'Ossat remained in Paris, where he continued his studies under Ramus, whose intimate friend he soon became. He was for a while professor of rhetoric and philosophy at the University of Paris, but soon after went to Bourges to study law under Cujas, and became counselor to the Parliament. In 1574 he went to

Rome as secretary to the French ambassador, Paul de Foix, and now remained most of the time in that city, first in a subordinate position, then as ambassador of Henry III and Henry IV. In that capacity he rendered his employers great service. It was D'Ossat who reconciled the Church of Rome and Henry IV. He was made cardinal in 1599, and died at Rome March 13, 1604. Cardinal D'Ossat is a remarkable instance of elevation to Church dignity by the force of personal merit. He wrote, *Expositio Arnaldi Ossati in disputationem Jacobi Carpentarii de methodo* (Paris, 1654, 8vo), in defense of Ramus; and a collection of *Lettres* addressed to the minister of state, Villeroy, which are models of diplomatic correspondence (1st ed. Paris, 1624, fol. best by A. de la Houssaye, Paris, 1697, 2 vols. 4to, with notes; reprinted, with more notes, Amst. 1707, 1714, 1732, 5 vols. 12mo). This work was translated into Italian by Jerome Canini (Venice, 1729, 4to). He is also considered the author of the *Lettres* published under the name of cardinal Joyeuse, and of a remarkable *Memoir* on the League, written in Italian in 1590, and published in the *Vie du Cardinal D'Ossat*, Anon. (by Madame d'Arconville). See *Gallia Christiana*, vol. xi, xiv; Frizon, *Gallia purpurata*; Alby, *Hist. des Cardin. illustres*; Moreri, *Dict. hist.*; *France pontificale*; Nicéron, *Memoires*, 34:31-40; Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, 1:224 sq.

## Ossenians

a name sometimes given to the followers of Elxai, in the 1st century, who taught that faith may and ought to be dissembled. — Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

## Ossifrage

### Picture for Ossifrage

occurs in the A. V. at <sup><68113></sup>Leviticus 11:13; <sup><68412></sup>Deuteronomy 14:12 (where it is classed among unclean birds), as the rendering of the **srP**, (*pe'res*; Sept. **γρῦψ**, *Vuulg. gryps*), which is supposed to be derived from the root *pairas'*, **srP**; *to break*, from the power of its beak to crush the bones of its victims. Hence the Latin compound *ossifrage*, or *bone-breaker*, is simply a translation of the Hebrew name. There has been much difference of opinion as to the bird intended by this term, but it is evidently a large bird of the eagle kind, and is very possibly called in these passages by a general name, bestowed indefinitely by the Jews. with no accurate



discrimination of species. The Targum of Onkelos, and the Sept. and Vulg., understand the “vulture,” and many modern versions concur in this reading. Others think the word denotes the black eagle, and some the falcon. It is perhaps the great sea-eagle, which, as it differs in its colors during the several stages of its growth, has obtained three distinct systematic names: *Falco ossifragus*, *Falco albicilla*, *Falco albicandus*. When it has attained its fifth year, it puts on its last suit, which is a dusky brown, intermixed with gray, with a white tail. It is about the size of the golden eagle, and inhabits the cliffs along the sea-shore. It is found in the northern parts of Europe and in Asia. But most prefer to identify the Hebrew bird in question with the species commonly known as the *Vulture of the Alps*, which was the ossifrage of the Romans. It was called by the Hellenic nations *phene* (φήνη), and is known as the *Lammergeyer* in Switzerland. This is the largest flying bird of the Old World, and inhabits the highest ranges of mountains in Europe, Western Asia, and Africa. Not only does he push kids and lambs, and even men, off the rocks, but he takes the bones of animals that other birds of prey have denuded of the flesh high up into the air, and lets them fall upon a stone in order to crack them and render them more digestible even for his enormous powers of deglutition. (See. Mr. Simpson's very interesting account of the *Lammergeyer* in *Ibis*, 2:282.) The *Lammergeyer*, or bearded vulture, as it is sometimes called, is one of the largest of the birds of prey. It is not uncommon in the East; and Mr. Tristram several times observed this bird “sailing over the high mountain-passes west of the Jordan” (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 171). The species in Europe is little if at all inferior in size to the *Condor* of South America, measuring from the point of the bill to the end of the tail four feet two or three inches, and sometimes ten feet in the expanse of wing; the head and neck are not, like those of vultures, naked, but covered with whitish narrow feathers; and there is a beard of bristly hair under the lower mandible; the rest of the plumage is nearly black and brown, with some whitish streaks on the shoulders, and an abundance of pale rust color on the back of the neck, the thighs, vent, and legs; the toes are short and bluish, and the claws strong. In the young the head and neck are black, and the species or variety of Abyssinia appears to be rusty and yellowish on the neck and stomach. It is the *griffon* of Cuvier, *Gypaetos barbatus* of nomenclators, and γρύψ, of the Sept. The Arabs, according to Bruce, use the names *Abu-Duch'n* and *Nisser-Werk*, which is a proof that they consider it a kind of eagle, and perhaps confound this species with the great sea-eagle, which has likewise a few bristles under the throat; and

commentators who have often represented *Peres* to be the black vulture, or a great vulture, were only viewing the *Gypaetos* as forming one of the order *Accipitres*, according to the Linnoean arrangement, where *Vultur barbatus* (*Syst. Nat.*) is the last of that genus, although in the thirteenth edition (by Gmelin) we find the name changed to *Falco barbatus*, and located immediately before *F. albicilla*, or the sea-eagle, showing that until a still more accurate classification placed the species in a separate genus, ornithologists had no determined idea of the true place it should occupy, and consequently by what generical appellation it was to be distinguished.

### Ossilago

(*bone-hardening*). *SEE OSSIPAGA*.

### Ossilegium

(*os*, “a bone,” and *legere*, “to gather”), the act of collecting the bones of the dead. It was customary among the ancient Greeks, when the funeral pyre was burned down, to quench the dying embers with wine, after which the relatives and friends collected the bones of the deceased. This last practice received the name of the Ossilegium. The bones, when collected, were washed with wine and oil, and deposited in urns, which were made of different materials, sometimes even of gold.

### Ossipaga

(*bone-fastener*), an ancient Roman deity, whose office it was to harden and consolidate the bones of infants. — Gardner, *Faiths of the World*, s.v.

### Ossuarium

the vase or urn in which the ashes of the departed are deposited. *SEE TURNS*.

### Oster, P. J.

a missionary among the Jews in France, was born h at Strasburg March 5, 1804, where he also studied for the ministry. In November, 1828, he was engaged as a missionary by the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews, and was stationed at Marseilles, visiting and also preaching to the Jews in Paris, Metz, Colmar, Montbeliard, Besan-on-Lyons, Avignon, etc. In 1835 he was stationed at Metz, whence he

undertook extensive journeys through the south of France. After fourteen years' labor in the missionary cause, Mr. Oster resigned his office in 1843, and was during the last four years the minister of the Lutheran congregation in Posen. Too great exertion in the duties of his office had, however, an injurious effect on his health, for the restoration of which he was advised to undertake a voyage to South Australia. He died, however, Oct. 24, 1847, having been eight weeks on the sea. Besides his French translation of Dr. A. M'Caul's *מלך תבנית* (the Old Path), under the title *Les Sentiers d'Israel*, he published also a brochure, *Les Conjectures d'un Israelite Frangais sur l'Origine du Culte Mosaique, examinees* (Metz, 1840), against a certain Tsarphati, who denied the inspiration and divine authority of the laws of Moses., See the proceedings of the London Society in the *Jewish Expositor* (London, 1829-31); the *Monthly Intelligencer* (1830-34); *Jewish Intelligencer* (1835-43), where Mr. Oster's interesting missionary journals are found. (B. P.)

### Ostertag, Paul Albert, Dr.

a noted German missionary worker, was born at Stuttgart April 18, 1810. Having received the necessary education, he entered the University of Tubingen for the study of theology. In 1837 he became tutor and leader of the missionary institution at Basle in which position he for a long time edited the *Basler Missionsmagazin* (the Missionary Magazine), which up to this day is very extensively circulated in Europe as well as in this country. Failing health obliged him to retire from active work, and after some years of retirement he finished his course at Basle, Feb. 17, 1871. He is the author of some hymns, which are found in Knapp's *Evangelischer Liederschatz*. See Knapp, *Evangelischer Liederschatz*, p. 1340; Schutze, *Deutschland's Dichter u. Schriftsteller* s.v. (B. P.)

### Osterwald, Jean Frederic

an eminent FrenchSwiss Reformed theologian, was born at Neuchatel, where his father was pastor, in 1663. In 1676 he went to Zurich to study under Prof. Ott, and in 1678 went to the University of Saumur, where he graduated in 1679. He then completed his studies at Orleans under the renowned Claude Pajon; at Paris under Pierre Alli, Jean Claude, etc.; and at Geneva under Louis Tronchin. He was ordained at Neuchatel in 1683, appointed deacon in 1686, pastor in 1699, and was repeatedly chosen dean by the clergy. He died at Neuchatel April 14, 1747. Osterwald wrote, *Traite*

*des sources de la corruption, qui irgne aujourd'hui parmi les Chretiens* (Neuch. and Amst. 1700, anon.; often reprinted, and translated into English under the title of *A Treatise. concerning the Causes of the present Corruption of Christians, and the Remedies thereof*, 3d ed. Lond. 1711, 8vo; and in Watson's *Tracts*, No. 6; it was also translated into Dutch in 1703, and twice into German in 1713 and 1716). By this work Osterwald, who during his long and active life had, with Winnfels (q.v.) and Turretin (q.v.) — together called the Swiss triumvirate — labored zealously for the promotion of *practical* piety, sought a departure from that phase of orthodoxy which, recognizing profession as a principal obligation, had dwelt upon it so prominently as to lose sight of the holy living required of the Christian professor. Osterwald attributed the corruption of Christians to the tendency to dispute concerning certain dogmas, and considered the bad state of morals as arising from the people seeking to derive comfort, but not improvement, from Scripture. He accused them of attaching more importance to the knowledge of the word of Scripture than to a life of practical piety. To insist on morals as of paramount importance was considered a heresy. This corruption was further authorized by the doctrine that good works are unnecessary, and also that it is impossible to fulfill all the requirements of the law, as if the regenerate man remained as impotent as the natural man. Osterwald also asserted that the Reformation was not a complete work, and that the reformation of morals was yet to take place. There was also a want of unity, the Church being divided into numerous parties excommunicating each other. It was therefore necessary to lay aside all these vexatious minor points, and to adhere firmly to the essential doctrine, for fear lest religion should be still more dishonored. The teachings even of the catechisms were more doctrinal than practical. Pastoral care was deficient. This works exhibiting in bold relief the failings of the orthodox party, had great success, but awakened also considerable opposition. In 1702 Osterwald published a Catechism, which was translated into Dutch, German, and into English, under the title of *The Grounds and Principles of the Christian Religion explained in a Catechetical Discourse for the Instruction of Young People*, rendered into English, and revised by George Stanhope, D.D. (Lond. 1704, '8vo). Among his other works we notice *Douze Sermons sur divers Textes de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Geneva, 1722, 8vo): — *The Arguments of the Books and Chapters of the O. and N.T., with Practical Observations*, translated by John Chamberlayne, Esq. (5th ed. Lond. 1779); the arguments and reflections with which this was accompanied have been translated into

most of the European languages, and are much-esteemed: — The *Preliminary Discourse to the Arguments on the Books*, etc. (ibid. 1722, 8vo): — The *Nature of Uncleanness Considered, etc.; to which is added a Discourse concerning the Nature of Chastity, and the Means of obtaining it* (ibid. 1708, 8vo): — *Lectures on the Exercise of the Sacred Ministry*, translated and enlarged by Thomas Stevens, M.A. (ibid. 1781, 8vo): — The *Necessity and Usefulness of Reading the Holy Scriptures, and the Disposition with which they ought to be Read*; translated by John Moore, A.B. (ibid. 1750, 18mo): — *An Abridgment of the History of the Bible* (ibid. 1750, 18mo). See Schweizer, *Gesch. der ref. Centraldogmen*, 2:759; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index in vol. ii); Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7:481 sq.; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*, 1:113 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 10:730 sq.; Darling, *Cycl. Bibliographica*, 2:2256. (J. N. P.)

## Ostiarri

(*door-keepers*), the lowest of the minor orders in the Western Church. They are spoken of by Church writers of the 3d or 4th century. The fourth Council of Carthage prescribed as the form for their admission to office the delivery of the church-key to them by the bishop, with the words: "Behave thyself as one who must render account to God of the things locked under these keys." They arranged catechumens in their places, announced the hours of service, and had charge of the church. From this word *ostiarus* are derived the words *huissier* and *usher*. The second master of Winchester is called *hostiarius*. The Greek Church only partially adopted the institution of porters, and soon let it die out. In the West they always lived near the church. See Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, p. 418; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index); Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* vol. iii; Westrop, *Handb. of Archaeology*, p. 72; Coleman, *Anc. Christianity*, p. 127, 185. **SEE DOOR-KEEPERS.**

## Ostrich

### Picture for Ostrich

(**hn**[**y**] *yaanah*’, always with **tBj** *daughter of the ostrich*, i.e. *the female ostrich*. See also the cognate **^**[**y**] *yaen*, <sup><2013></sup>Lamentations 4:3. In <sup><18913></sup>Job 39:13, the word **hx/n**, *notsah*, *feathers*, is wrongly rendered *ostrich*; while **μynæ**] *female ostriches*, is translated *peacocks*, in the A.V.; Sept.

στρουθός, <sup><15415></sup>Deuteronomy 14:15, but in Isaiah and in <sup><3101></sup>Micah 1:8, Sept. **σειρήνες**; see Schleusner, *Lex.* s.v.). In Arabic the bird is called *nea-mah*, also *thareds jammel*, i.e. *camel-bird*; like the Persian *sutur morph*; comp. Greek **στρουθοκάμηλος** (Diod. Sic. 2:50), and Lat. *Struthiocamelus*, in Pliny.

### 1. Names. —

(1.) It is now generally admitted that the word *yaansh* should be rendered ostrich; as the passages in which it occurs require us to understand some inhabitant of the remote desert, and seem thus to exclude *the owl*, the usual rendering in the English Version (<sup><1819></sup>Job 30:29; 39:13; <sup><2121></sup>Isaiah 13:21; 34:13). **SEE OWL**. The etymology of the word also accords better with the former rendering. The wordn **הנִיִּי**, *yaanah'*, like **μυνη** *renanim'*, appears to refer to the habit of uttering loud-sounding cries; and the third name, *bath-hayaanah*, “the daughter of vociferation,” or “loud moaning,” is in conformity with the others, and an Oriental figurative mode of expressing the same faculty (which exists not, we think, in the females alone, but in the whole species); for the ostrich has an awful voice, which, when heard on the desert, is sometimes mistaken in the night, even by natives, for the sound of a beast. This, too, is the almost unanimous rendering of the old translators (Ges. *Thes.* 2:609), while the reference of the word to *the owl*, supported by Oedmann (*Samml.* 3:35 sq.), rests on no 'early testimony. Bochart (2:830 sq.) would understand the male ostrich by **סמך תי** in <sup><11116></sup>Leviticus 11:16; <sup><15415></sup>Deuteronomy 14:15; but no ancient version supports this rendering. **SEE NIGHT-HAWK**. Gesenius (*Thes.* s.v. **הנִיִּי**) refers the word to the root **נִי**; which signifies “to be greedy or voracious;” and demurs to the explanation given by Michaelis (*Suppl. ad Lex. Heb.* p. 1127) and by Rosenmüller (*Not. ad Hieroz.* 2:829, and *Schol. ad* <sup><11116></sup>Leviticus 11:16), who trace the Hebrew word *yaanah* to one which 'in Arabic denotes “hard and sterile land:” *bath-hayaanah* accordingly would mean “daughter of the desert.” Without entering into the merits of these various explanations, it will be enough to mention that any one of them is well suited to the habits of the ostrich. This bird, as is well known, will swallow almost any substance, pieces of iron, large stones, etc.; this it does probably in order to assist the triturating action of the gizzard: so that the Oriental expression of “daughter of voracity” is eminently characteristic of the ostrich. With regard to the two other derivations of the Hebrew word, we may add that the cry of the ostrich is said sometimes to resemble

that of the lion, so that the Hottentots of South Africa are deceived by it; and that its particular haunts are the parched and desolate tracts of sandy deserts.

(2.) *Ya'en* (  $\hat{\text{[y]}}$  ) occurs only in the plural number  $\mu\upsilon\eta\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$  *ye'enim* (Sept.  $\sigma\tau\rho\upsilon\theta\iota\omicron\nu$ , Vulg. *struthio*), in  $\langle\text{LXX}\rangle$  Lamentations 4:3, where the context shows that the ostrich is intended: "The daughter of my people is become cruel like the ostriches in the wilderness." This is important, as showing that the above word, which is merely the feminine form of this one, with the addition of *bath*, "daughter," clearly points to the ostrich as its correct translation, even if all the old versions were not agreed upon the matter.

(3.) *Ranan*,  $\hat{\text{[r]}}$ ; in the plural form  $\mu\upsilon\eta\eta\tau\iota$ , *renanim*; Sept.  $\tau\epsilon\rho\pi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ ; Vulg. *struthio*), alone occurs in  $\langle\text{LXX}\rangle$  Job 39:13; where, however, it is clear from the whole passage (13-18) that ostriches are intended by the word. The A. V. renders *rehanim* by "peacocks," a translation which has not found favor with commentators; as "peacocks," for which there is a different Hebrew name ( $\mu\upsilon\eta\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ ), were probably not known to the people of Arabia or Syria before the time of Solomon. **SEE PEACOCK.** The Hebrew *renanins* appears to be derived from the root  $\hat{\text{[r]}}$ ; *randan*, "to wail," or to "utter a stridulous sound," in allusion to this bird's nocturnal cries. Gesenius compares the Arabic *zimar*, "a female ostrich," from the root *zamar*, "to sing."

**2. Description.** — The head of the ostrich is small, and not composed of strong bones; the bill, in form somewhat like that of a duck, is flat, with a nail at the apex, and broad at the gape; the eyes, hazel-colored, have a clear and distinct vision of objects to a great distance, although when seen obliquely they have an opalescent appearance; the auditory apparatus is large and open, notwithstanding that in the pairing season ostriches are said to be very deaf; the neck, long and slender, is, together with the head, but scantily clothed with whitish shining hairs, and in the pairing season becomes for a time pink or rosy red; towards the base it assumes the general color of the plumage, which, with the quill and tail plumes, is entirely composed of loose downy-webbed feathers, only differing in size and color; the wings, each from three to four feet long, exclusive of feathers, are entirely naked on the inner side, and are supplied towards the end of the pinion bone on each side with two sharp-pointed quills resembling those of a porcupine, and no doubt serving for defense; the

thighs, nearly bare of plumage, and of a deep flesh-color, are as full and muscular as those of a strong man, and the tarsi or legs, of corresponding length with the proportions of the neck, are covered with broad horny scales, and terminate in two toes; the inner, being the longest, is armed with a broad, strong claw; and that on the outside, only half the length of the other, is without any. The great feathers, so much prized in commerce, are twenty in each wing, those of the tail being nearly always useless, broken, and worn. The cloven feet, long neck, and vaulted back of these birds are in themselves quite sufficient to suggest to the imagination an animal of the camel kind: but these external appearances are not the only points of resemblance; the stomach is so formed as to appear possessed of a third ventricle, and there are other structural particulars, such as a sternum not keel-shaped, as in birds, but in the form of a round buckler, to protect the chest, which, with the fact that they are without the muscular conformation to render them capable of flying, altogether approximate these birds to quadrupeds, and particularly to the order of Ruminantia.

**3. Habits.** — Ostriches are gregarious — from families consisting of a male with one or several female birds, and perhaps a brood or two of young, up to troops of near a hundred. They keep aloof from: the presence of water in the wild and desert, mixing without hesitation among herds of gnu, wild asses, quaggas, and other striped Equidae, and the larger species of Antilopidae. From the nature of their food, which consists of seeds and vegetables, although seldom or never in want of drink, it is evident that they must often approach more productive regions, which, by means of the great rapidity of motion they possess, is easily accomplished; and they are consequently known to be very destructive to cultivated fields. As the organ of taste is very obtuse in these birds, they swallow with little or no discrimination all kinds of substances, and among these stones; it is also probable that, like poultry, they devour lizards, snakes, and the young of birds that fail in their way. One has even been known to snap a traveler's sketch-book from his hand, attracted to it by the sight of the white paper. It is not yet finally decided whether the two species are polygamous, though concurrent testimony seems to leave no doubt of the fact: there is, however, no uncertainty respecting the nest, which is merely a circular basin scraped out of the soil, with a slight elevation at the border, and sufficiently large to contain a great number of eggs; from twelve to about sixty have been found in them, exclusive of a certain number always observed to be outlying, or placed beyond the raised border of the nest,



and amounting apparently to nearly one third of the whole. These are supposed to feed the young brood when first hatched, either in their fresh state, or in a corrupted form, when the substance in them has produced worms. These eggs are of different periods of laying, like those within, and the birds hatched form only a part of the contents of a nest, until the breeding season closes. The eggs are of different sizes, some attaining to seven inches in their longer diameter, and others less, having a dirty white shell, finely speckled with rust color; their weight borders on three pounds. Within the tropics they are kept sufficiently warm in the day-time not to require incubation, but beyond one or more females sit constantly, and the male bird takes that duty himself after the sun has set. It is then that the short roar may be heard during darkness; and at other times different sounds are uttered, likened to the cooing of pigeons, the cry of a hoarse child, and the hissing of a goose — no doubt expressive of different emotions; but that the roar is expressive of the feeling of anger may be inferred from the assertion that jackals and foxes (*Canis Megalotis Caama?*) have been found close to the nests of these birds, kicked to death. This fact is the more credible, as the last-mentioned animal is a dexterous purloiner of their eggs; and it may be here added, in proof of the organ of smelling not being quite so obtuse in the ostrich as is asserted, that Caffres and Hottentots, when they daily rob a nest for their own convenience, always withdraw the eggs by means of a stick, in order to prevent the female finding out the larceny by means of the scent which human hands would leave behind; for then they will not continue to lay, but forsake the abode altogether. This circumstance may account for the small number of eggs often found in their nests. Tristram states (*Ibis*, 2:74): “Two Arabs began to dig with their hands, and presently brought up four fine fresh eggs from the depth of about a foot under the warm sand.”

**4. Locality.** — The ostrich roams over the whole of Africa from the Sahara to the Cape; but principally affects vast desert plains, over which its lofty stature gives it a great command of sight. It is still abundant in the Arabian peninsula, and extends into the waste and and regions that bound it on the north. It was predicted both by <sup>2321</sup>Isaiah 13:21 and by Jeremiah 1, 39 that ostriches should dwell at Babylon, than which there could scarcely have been devised a feature more strongly fitted to mark the silence and desolation, not merely of the city itself, but of the whole region in which it stood, and the utter contrast of this condition with that in which it sat the lady of kingdoms, and the center to which converged all the traffic of a

plain that swarmed with towns and cities. The bird of the desert still strides over the Euphratean plains. Herbert says he saw it between Lar and Shiraz. Mr. Ainsworth also implies that it still exists in the and wastes of Mesopotamia and Assyria, though it has become rare. Dr. Kitto informs us that it “inhabits the great Syrian desert, especially the plains extending from the Hauran towards Jebel Shammar and Nejed. Some are found in the Hauran, and a few are taken almost every year, even within two days' journey of Damascus” (*Phys. Hist. of Palestine*, p. 407). Prophecy assigns it to Idumaea (<sup>23413</sup>Isaiah 34:13). Ostriches exist, not only in Africa, but in the region of Arabia, east and south of Palestine beyond the Euphrates; but it may be a question whether they extend so far to the eastward as Goa, although that limit is assigned them by late French ornithologists.

The two species appear promiscuously in Asia and Africa, but the troops or coveys of each are always separate. The gray is more common in the south, while the black, which grows largest in Caffraria, predominates to the north of the equator. One of the last mentioned, taken on board a French prize, and wounded in the capture, was brought to London, where it was able to peck its food from a cross-beam eleven feet from the ground. The enormous bird afterwards shown in Bullock's museum was said to be the same. The common-sized ostrich weighs about eighty pounds; whence it may be judged that the individual here mentioned may have been at least forty pounds heavier.

**5. Scripture Notices, etc.** — The ostrich is mentioned in the Old Testament among unclean birds (<sup>8116</sup>Leviticus 11:16; <sup>5445</sup>Deuteronomy 14:15), less, perhaps, because of the voracity with which it swallows glass, metals, etc. (Aelian, *Anim.* 14:7; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 389), than because it appeared to the Hebrews as a kind of hybrid, half bird and half beast (comp. Sommer, *Bibl. Abhdl.* 1:257), or because the ideas of desolation and terror were naturally associated with its home in the desert. Indeed, the Arabians and Ethiopians eat the flesh of the ostrich with delight (see Diod. Sic. 3:28; Strabo, 16:772), and in India, and even in Rome, it was considered a delicacy (Aelian, *Anim.* 14:13; Lamprid. *Vit. Heliogab.* p. 27). But it is only when young that it could be palatable to a modern taste; and it is always dry and hard (see Aben-Ezra, on <sup>4239</sup>Exodus 23:29; Galen, *De Aliment. Facult.* 3:20). African Arabs, says Mr. Tristram, eat its flesh, which is good and sweet. Ostrich's brains were among the dainties that were, placed on the supper-tables of the ancient Romans. The fat of the ostrich is sometimes used in medicine for the cure of palsy and rheumatism (Pococke, *Trav.*

1:209). It is mentioned as living in the desert in <sup><21321></sup>Isaiah 13:21; 34:13; 43:20; Jeremiah 1, 39; <sup><2148></sup>Lamentations 4:3; comp. Theophrast. *Plant.* 4:4, p. 322; Jerome on Isaiah 14. This is so notorious of the ostrich that the Arabian zoologists suppose that it never drinks. It is said to be hardened against its young (<sup><2148></sup>Lamentations 4:3). This is confirmed of the ostrich by travelers (comp. Shaw, *Trav.* p. 388). Yet the common statement that the ostrich deposits and leaves its eggs in the nests of other birds cannot be supported. Elian even speaks of the ostrich as peculiarly fond of its young (*Anim.* 14:7). “As a further proof of the affection of the ostrich for its young” (we quote from Shaw's *Zoology*, 11:426), “it is related by Thunberg that he once rode past a place where a female was sitting on her nest, when the bird sprang up and pursued him, evidently with a view to prevent his noticing her eggs or young.” A mournful cry or scream is attributed to it (<sup><3100></sup>Micah 1:8; <sup><4819></sup>Job 30:29; comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:811 sq.). Shaw testifies to the lugubrious voice of this bird: “During the lonesome part of the night they often make a doleful and hideous noise, which would sometimes be like the roaring of a lion; at other times it would bear resemblance to the hoarser voices of other quadrupeds, particularly of the bull and the ox. I have often heard them groan, as if they were in the greatest agonies” (2:349). Dr. Livingstone refers to the loudness and lion-like character of the sound: “The silly ostrich makes a noise as loud [as the lion] . I have been careful to inquire the opinions of Europeans who have heard both, if they could detect any difference between the roar of a lion and that of an ostrich; the invariable answer was that they could not when the animal was at any distance. . . To this day I can distinguish between them with certainty only by knowing that the ostrich roars by day, and the lion by night” (*South Africa*, p. 141). The name **μυνάε** (<sup><48913></sup>Job 39:13) is given in allusion to this cry, as is sufficiently clear from the context. The following is a close translation of the poetical description of this bird in the passage just cited (<sup><48913></sup>Job 39:13-18), which aptly delineates its chief characteristics

“The wing of the ostrich [is] flaunted:  
 [Is her] pinion perchance [like that of the] pious [stork, or [her] feather?  
 [Nay], for she will leave to the earth her eggs,  
 Even upon [the] dust will she warm them;  
 While she has forgotten that a foot may crush it,  
 Even the living [thing] of the field trample it.  
 She has harshly taken her young for [those] not [be longing] to her.  
 In vain her labor [of parturition, since as to hatching she is] without dread.  
 For God has made her oblivious of wisdom

Nor apportioned to her [a share] in Understanding.  
 [Yet] whenever aloft she may lash [herself for flight]  
 She will laugh at the horse and at his rider.”

The waving of the wing is well illustrated by the description of Leo Africanus (*Descr. Afr.* 9:55) and of Elian (*Anim.* 2:27), while the fact that the plumage is dark (gray or black) on the back, shoulders, and wings, and elsewhere white, is a striking resemblance to the stork. The statement in the 14th verse, that the ostrich leaves her eggs in the sand carelessly, arises probably from the fact that a few eggs are often found at a short distance from the nest, supposed to be placed there as food for the young when hatched (comp. Leo Afric. *ut sup.*; Vaillant, *Reis. nach. Africa*, 2:210; Bochart, p. 863). As to the folly spoken of in ver. 17, it is a general belief among the Arabs that the ostrich is a very stupid bird; indeed they have a proverb, “Stupid as an ostrich;” and Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2:865) has given us five points on which this bird is supposed to deserve its character. They may be briefly stated thus:

- (1) Because it will swallow iron, stones, etc.;
- (2) Because when it is hunted it thrusts its head into a bush, and imagines the hunter does not see it;
- (3) Because it allows itself to be deceived and captured in the manner described by Strabo (16:772. ed. Kramer);
- (4) Because it neglects its eggs;
- (5) Because it has a small head and few brains. Such is the opinion the Arabs have expressed with regard to the ostrich; a bird, however, which by no means deserves such a character, as travelers have frequently testified.

“So wary is the bird,” says Mr. Tristram (*Ibis*, 2:73), “and so open are the vast plains over which it roams, that no ambuscades or artifices can be employed, and the vulgar resource of dogged perseverance is the only mode of pursuit.” Dr. Shaw (*Travels*, 2:345) relates as an instance of want of sagacity in the ostrich, that he “saw one swallow several leaden bullets, scorching hot from the mould.” We may add that not unfrequently the stones and other substances which ostriches swallow prove fatal to them. In this one respect, perhaps, there is some foundation for the character of stupidity attributed to them (Pliny, 10:1; comp. Diod. Sic. 2:50). Mr.

Tristram, however, remarks, "The necessity for swallowing stones, etc., may be understood from the favorite food of the tame ostriches I have seen being the date-stone, the hardest of vegetable substances" (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 239). The statement that when erect "she scorneth the horse and his rider," may be referred both to the height and the swiftness of the bird. The ostrich is the largest of all known birds, and perhaps the swiftest of all cursorial animals. The capture of an ostrich is often made at the sacrifice of the lives of two horses (*Ibis*, 2:73). Its strength is enormous. The wings are useless for flight, but when the bird is pursued they are extended and act as sails before the wind. The ostrich's feathers so much prized are the long white plumes of the wings. The best come to us from Barbary and the west coast of Africa. The ostrich belongs to the family *Struthionidae*, order *Cursorses*.

### Oswald, St.,

an English saint, was king of Bernicia, in Northumbria, England, from 634 to 642. He was a son of Ethelfrith, who was born in 604, and who became one of the most powerful S. Rxon monarchs. Oswald was noted for his piety and charitable nature. As a youth, while living in banishment among the Scots in Ireland, he had been instructed in Christianity and baptized by pious monks, and through their influence he was filled with an ardent zeal for the Christian faith. He sought to re-establish in England the Christian religion, which had been well-nigh abolished by Penda, the warlike pagan monarch of Mercia, and his equally warlike ally Cadwallon. Oswald defeated and slew Cadwallon, and having restored to Northumbria its independence in 636, it was now his firm resolution to do his utmost to make the worship of his God universal among his people. In order to carry out this object, he applied to the monks of Iona to send him one of their number. They consecrated the excellent and amiable monk Aidan as bishop, and sent him to Northumbria. Until he had gained a complete knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, Oswald himself acted as his interpreter. By this joint activity of the zealous king and Aidan, a firm foundation was laid for the Church in that district, and the success of their labor was truly unparalleled. Oswald founded an episcopal see in the island of Lindisfarne; and, aided by other missionaries from Iona, bishop Aidan converted in a few years the whole north of England to Christianity. Oswald, after a reign of eight years, met his death in battle with the pagan tribe of the Mercians, Aug. 5, 642. He fell by the sword of Penda, "in who worshipped Odin, and never left the altars of his grim war-god dry for want

of a victim.” As an illustration of Oswald's piety, we read in Miller's *History of the Anglo-Saxons* that “previous to his battle with the Welsh king (Cadwallon), which occurred soon after he was seated upon the throne of Bernicia, he planted the image of the cross upon the field, holding it with his own hands while his soldiers filled up the hollow which they had made in the earth to receive it. When the cross was firmly secured he exclaimed, 'Let us all bend our knees, and with one heart and voice pray to the true and the living God that he in his mercy will defend us from a proud and cruel enemy; for to him it is known that we have commenced this war for the salvation and safety of our people.' All knelt, as he had commanded, around the cross, and when the last murmur of the solemn prayer had died away, they marched onward with stouter hearts to meet the terrible enemy.” Of the battle we have no other record than that Cadwallon fell, and that his army was destroyed. The spot where the cross was planted was afterwards called Heaven-field, and was for ages held in great reverence by the people. “Penda hated not the Christians who adhered rigidly to the tenets of their new creed,” but if they halted between Christianity and Odinism he abhorred them. The reason why he attacked Oswald is not known. It may have been to revenge the fall and defeat of Cadwallon, or it may have been simply love of conquest. Nor has it ever been charged that he attacked the Bernician king because the latter was a zealous Christian. All that is known is that Penda attacked and slew him at Maserfelth on Aug. 5, 642. In the above-mentioned work by Miller we read that “while the barbed javelin which caused his death was still fixed in his breast, he never for a moment ceased to pray, and that for centuries after his death his name was ever linked with the following pious sentence: 'May the Lord have mercy on their souls! as Oswald said when he fell on the battle-field.’” Of his charitable nature it is related that “one day, as he was about to partake of the refreshments which were placed before him in a silver dish, the almoner, whose office it was to relieve the poor, stepped in and informed him that a number of beggars were waiting without soliciting alms. When his eye alighted upon the rich vessel in which the dainties were piled, the thought of their wants and his own unnecessary luxuries rose before him with so striking a contrast that he ordered the untouched food to be distributed among the beggars, and the silver dish to be broken up and given to them.” But Penda, after the battle of Maserfelth, ordered the head and limbs of this pious and charitable king to be severed from the body, and, transfixed on stakes, to be exposed to public gaze. Oswald was canonized. The fifth of March became Oswald's day, and: the

legend of Oswald is the theme of many old German poems and of the Icelandic *Oswaldo Saga*. See Miller, *History of the Anglo-Saxons; Oswaldo Saga* (Edinb. 1854). His name was cherished in the affection and respect of his nation, and hence soon began to be honored as that of a saint. Miracles were said to be wrought at his tomb and by his relics; and indeed the faith in them prevailed through the whole of these islands. Oswald's remains were carried to Bardney, in Lincolnshire, by Osthrida, and afterwards to St. Oswald's, in Gloucestershire, by Elfieda, the daughter of king Alfred. But more yet than the English legend, German myth has embellished Oswald's name. See Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschich.* 1:234 (Mitau, 1874; Engl. trans. Phila. 1875, 1:301); Clement, *Handb. of Legendary and Mythological Art*, p. 243 (New York, 1872); Neander, *Ch. History* (Torrey's transl.), 3:20 sq.; *Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.*; *Die beiden Oswaldgedichte*, ed. in Haupt's *Zeitschrift fur deutsches Alterthum*, vol. ii, and by Etmiller (Zurich, 1845); Zingerle, *Die Oswaldlegende* (Stuttg. 1856); Wright, *Biog. of Brit. Lit.* (see Index); Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* (see Index in vol. viii); Churton, *Hist. of the Early Engl. Church*, p. 238, 244. (R. B. A.)

### Oswald Of Worcester,

an English prelate who flourished in the second half of the 10th century, is noted as one of the principal advocates on English soil of the monastic associations. He was a nephew of Odo of Canterbury (q.v.), and was, like him, of Danish parentage, but of English birth. In his childhood he was placed under Fridegode (q.v.), and made great progress in profane as well as theological learning. His uncle then called him to Canterbury, and made him canon of the old minister. Oswald was, however, very restless in this position, having conceived a great preference for the monastic state, and finally passed over to France and joined the monks of Fleury. On the approach of Odo's death Oswald was sent for, but he reached England too late to see his uncle again. Oswald was, however, induced to remain in his native country, after he had returned to the Continent for a short stay with his kinsman Oskitel, and was honored by the English clergy with several rich benefices, and in 960 with the see of Worcester. In 972 he was still further recognized by being elevated to the archbishopric of York, retaining at the same time the bishopric of Worcester. Together with Dunstan and Ethelwald, Oswald now labored for the triumph of English monasticism. and at the different English councils advocated the abolition of a married clergy (see Lea, *Hist. of Celibacy*, p. 174; Hill, *English*



*Monasticism*, p. 162 sq.). Oswald died Feb. 28, 992. Four books have been attributed to Oswald, none of which are known to exist at present: a book of letters to his uncle Odo; a letter or treatise addressed to Abbo, beginning with the words "Praescientia Die monachus;" a book, *Ad sanctos dum esset Floriaci*, beginning with the words "Oswaldus supplex monachus;" and *Statuta synodalia*. The only ground for the first of these titles appears to be the statement of his biographers that, in answer to Odo's letter begging him to return to England, 'he wrote excuses for staying at Fleury. It is difficult to judge of the authenticity of the other three, since they rest on the simple statement of the old bibliographers. See Inett, *Hist. of the English Church*, vol. i; Wright, *Biog. Brit. Literaria* (Anglo-Saxon period), p. 462-467.

### Oswald, Heinrich Siegmund

a German divine of note, was born at Nimmerseet, in Silesia, June 30, 1751. After receiving his education at the school at Schmiedeberg, in Silesia, he went, in 1765 or 1766, into the office of his elder brother, who at that time held a public appointment. Seven years afterwards Oswald engaged himself as secretary to the landgrave of Glatz, but failing health obliged him to resign this position. He established himself in business at Breslau, but not meeting with success, he became a merchant's clerk. In 1790 Oswald became personally acquainted with king Frederick William II, who appointed him a court counselor, and afterwards a lector, and in 1791 a privy counselor. After the death of the king he retired with his family to Hirschberg, and later to Breslau, receiving a pension until his death, which occurred Sept. 8, 1834. His latter years Oswald had devoted to the production of musical, poetical, and religious works, and published in 1793 *Gedichte und Lieder fu' s Herz*. One of his best-known hymns, which is to be found in the *Schwanengesdng*e (Swan's Songs), is the one commencing "Wem in Leidenstagen" (English transl. by E. Cox in *Hymns from the German*, "Oh! let him whose sorrow"). Others of his hymns may be found in some of the modern hymn-books. See Koch *Gesch. d. Kirchenliedes*, 6:395 sq.; Sack, in Niedner's *Zeitschrift fur histor. Theologie* (1863), pt. iii; Miller, *Singers and Songs of the Church*, p. 303; Cox, *Hymns from the German*, p. 248; Knapp, *-Evangelischer Liederschatz*, p. 1340; Sch tz, *Deutschlands Dichter undSchhriftsteller*, v. (B. P.)



## Otfried

(Lat. *Otfridus*) OF WEISSENBURG, one of the most noted of mediaeval characters is celebrated especially as the author of a popular version of the Gospels, and for his efforts to familiarize the German people with the sacred Scriptures. He was probably of Alemannic race, and was born some time in the 9th century. He was at first educated at Fulda, under Rabanus Maurus (q.v.), the pupil of Alcuin (q.v.); next he lived many years in St. Gall, and finally removed to Weissenburg, in Alsace, one of those numerous monasteries scattered along the borders of Switzerland where the mountains break down to the lakes. While at Weissenburg Otfried wrote his *Liber evangeliorum*, a poetical paraphrase of the Gospels, in four-lined verses, with rhyme. Otfried's aim was to make the people familiar with God's Word in the German tongue. It was his wish, he said, that the praise of Christ might be sung in German ("thaz wir Christus sungun in unsera zungun"); that the Franks might learn to sing by heart what the Bible taught, and also be constantly reminded to reduce it to practice. He thought it "a shame that the Franks, a people not inferior in other respects to the Greeks and Romans, a people who had conquered so many nations, should not possess God's Word in their own language." Otfried's work is the first rhymed poem we possess of the 9th century, and has always marked an important epoch in modern literature. True, there are very frequently introduced episodes, sometimes similes or allegories from ecclesiastical works, sometimes mystical and moral reflections of his own, which make Otfried's work less poetical; but, on the other hand, there are passages where the poet rises to warmth and true poetry, as where, in describing the journey of the Magi, he speaks of the longing of the soul for its heavenly fatherland. The poem, which was probably written before 868, was first published by M. Flacius (Basle, 1571); an edition with a Latin translation was published by Schilter, *Thesaurus antiquitatum Teutonicarum* (Ulm, 1726); a critical edition was published by Graff, *Krist, das lateste hochdeutsche Gedicht* (Konigsb. 1831), and by Kelle (Regensb. 1856); a German translation was published by Rapp (Stuttg. 1856). See Grandidier, *Sur la Vie et les Ouvrages d'Otffrid* (Strasb. 1778); Lechler, in *Stu(lien u. Kritiken* (1849), 1:54-90; 2:303-332; Lachmann, in Ersch u. Gruber's *Encyklop.* iii, § 7:228-282; Neander, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, 3:425 (Torrey's transl.); Winkworth, *Christian Singers of Germany*, p. 15 sq.; Koch, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes*, 1:171 sq. (Stuttg. 1866); Schutze, *Deutschlands Dichter u. Schriftsteller*,

s.v.; Vilmar, *Gesch. d. deutschen Nationalliteratur*, p. 36 sq.; Grimm, in the Introduction to his *Deutsche Grammatik*; -Gostwick and Harrison, *Outlines of German Literature*, p. 11; Miiller, *Chips from a: German Workshop*, 3:6; Hoffmann v. Flallersleben, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes bis auf Lutherszeit* (Hanover, 1851), p. 23 sq.; id. *Fundgruben fii deutsche Sprache und Literatur*, i. 38-47; Wackernagel, *Literaturgesch.* § 31,32. (J. H.W.)

## Othlo

a Benedictine monk who flourished near the middle of the 11th century, is noted for his mystico-theological writings, and for several biographies of German saints. He was born at Freisingen of respectable parents; was educated at the convent in Tegernsee, and at Hersfeld. After a short stay at Wurzburg he entered the convent of Emmeram at Regensburg, and remained within its walls for over thirty years; then spent four years in hard literary labors at Fulda; and again went to Regensburg to die in the convent, some time near the close of the century. A list of all his works is given by Waitz in Pertz, *Monum. German. Hist.* 6:521. Among Othlo's theological writings are, *Liber visionum spiritualis doctrine scientie*: — *Dialogus de tribus aucestionibus*: — *De cursu spirituali*. His opus *De tentationibus (ipsius) variafortuna et scriptis*, Mabillon published in his *Analect.* (Par. 1685), vol. 4. Among his biographies of German saints are lives of St. Boniface and St. Wolfgang. See Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 4:401; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 196.

## Othman, Ibn-Affan,

the third caliph of the Moslems after the Prophet, is noted in Mohammedan history not only on account of the importance of his own reign, but also as the life-companion of the founder of Islam. He was a direct descendant from Abd el-menaf, one of the ancestors of, the Prophet. Having early adopted Islam by the persuasion of Mohammed, he became one of his most zealous *ashab* (companions), followed him in his flight from Mecca to Medina, and was made, on his return, one of his most confidential friends and secretaries. Upon the death of the caliph Omar, it was found that Othman was one of the six individuals whom he had by his will designated for his place. After mature deliberation, the majority chose Othman, on condition that he would govern the people according to the rules of the Koran, which Othman solemnly promised to do; and he was accordingly

invested with the supreme power towards the end of Dhi-l-hajjah A.H. 32 (Nov. or Dec., A.D. 644), three days after the death of Omar. His first public act was to send a body of troops under El-mugheyrh Ibn-Shaabah to complete the reduction of the province of Hamadan (A.D. 645), while another army expelled Jezdegerd from Persia (A.D. 646). *SEE OMAR.* Another body of Arabs (A.D. 647) reduced all that part of Khorassan which had escaped former invasions. In the mean while Abdullab Ibn-Said invaded Eastern Africa, and, after defeating and killing at Yakfbiyah the patrician Gregorius, who commanded in the Grecian emperor's name, subdued its principal cities. Four years afterwards (A.D. 651) the same commander made an incursion into Nubia, and obliged the Christian sovereign of that country to sue for peace and pay him tribute. The islands of Cyprus and Rhodes were at, tacked and plundered by Muawivah Ibn-Abi-SufyAn (A.D. 648): these two maritime expeditions being the first which the Arabs ever made. But while the *temporal* power of Islam was thus extending its hold on all sides, Othman himself was rapidly losing his influence over his subjects, alienating their affections by the weakness of his internal administration and his partiality towards the members of his family. Othman began his reign by removing the celebrated Amru Ibn-el-lass from the government of Egypt — a country which he had conquered — and appointing in his place his own foster-brother, Abdullah Ibn-Said. This measure was as disagreeable to the Arabs as to the Egyptians. The people of Alexandria, who bore impatiently the Mohammedan yoke, and were only kept in obedience by the mildness and the justice of their governor, seeing a favorable opportunity, entered into a correspondence with the Greek emperor, and surrendered to him the city; and although Othman immediately reinstated Amru, who recovered Alexandria and demolished its fortifications, this was not accomplished without great difficulty and considerable bloodshed (A.D. 646). Saad Ibn-Abi Wakkas and Abu Musa el-ashaari, two of Mohammed's companions, were also deprived by him of their command. Othman rendered himself further obnoxious by occupying the “minbar” (pulpit), and while at prayers in the mosque the same place which the Prophet had used, instead of placing himself, as his predecessors Omar and Abu-Bekr had done, a few steps lower down. He had also lost from off his finger a silver signet-ring which had once belonged to the Prophet, and with which the caliphs his predecessors had sealed their dispatches an ominous circumstance, which was regarded by all zealous Moslems as the greatest blow that could be inflicted on their rising empire; and he had recalled from his exile Hakem

Ibn-Aass, whom the Prophet himself had banished from Mecca. Othman was further accused of excessive prodigality towards his favorites. Finally public discontent ran so high that the elders of the Arabian tribes and the most illustrious of Mohammed's own companions met at Medina, and threatened Othman with deposition unless he could justify his public acts. Othman resented this daring action of his subjects as an outrage upon his authority, and he not only ignored the message, but even severely abused the messenger. The people continued their protestations, and loudly clamored for his abdication, and they would even have done violence to his person: had not Ali, who had considerable influence with the rebellious subjects, promised immediate remedy in the caliph's name. Quiet was only maintained for a short time, however; for Ayesha, the Prophet's widow, sorely hated Othman, and she fanned an insurrection which resulted in the murder of Othman in his own palace, his soldiers having previously deserted him. His mutilated body lay unnoticed for three days; but was finally buried in a hole, without any ceremony, according to Abulfeda and Atabari, on June 18, 656 (18th day of Dhi-l-hajjah, A.H. 35). Othman was a pious Mohammedan, and was not only well versed in the Koran, but was the first to make an authentic copy of this sacred book of Islam, thus furnishing the basis for all future copies of the Koran. The transcription was done under his own supervision by Zeyd Ibn-Thabit, Abdullah Ibn-Zobeyr, and other companions of the Prophet. Othman himself transcribed the Koran several times, and while in the palace awaiting his assassination he was found to enjoy the companionship of the Koran. See Abulfaraj, *Hist. Dynast.* (transl. by Pococke), p. 31 sq.; Ockley, *Hist. of the Saracens*, vol. i; Price, *Mohammedan History*, vol. i; *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v., and the authorities there quoted.

### Othman I And III

sultans. *SEE TURKEY.*

### Othmar, St.

(AUDEMAR, AUTOMARUS), is the name of one of the most celebrated monastics of the Middle Ages. He was the first real abbot of the convent of St. Gall, one of the most noted of ascetic asylums in Europe. As has been seen in the article ST. GALL *SEE ST. GALL*, the disciples of Gallus remained together after his decease, and appointed one of their own number as *custos*, or *pastor Galli*. Our Othmar was one of those whom his

brethren delighted to honor, and he occasionally held that post. He was well fitted for places of distinction. He had been as thoroughly trained as was the custom of his times in Courland, and enjoyed the favors and protection of duke Waldram, whose family took great interest in the county of St. Gall. As this establishment was hindered in its progress by the Franks, duke Waldram concluded to make them take an interest in it by surrendering it to them in 720, and Othmar was appointed abbot. He now exerted himself greatly in establishing the convent on a permanent basis. By Pepin's orders the rule was changed from Columban's to Benedict's, in order to harmonize with the other Frankish convents. This change, however, did not prove quite successful, as the French wished to place the convent under the immediate dependence of the diocesan bishop, in order to have greater control over it — a step which the monks themselves strenuously resisted. The chronicles of St. Gall give very full accounts of these disputes. Othmar took a journey to the court of the Franks, and there obtained some advantage; but while on his way to it a second time he was arrested, accused of lewdness and, judged by enemies, was of course condemned. He was taken to the village of Bodman, on the lake of Constance, where he was subjected to severe fasting. He was afterwards transferred to the island of Stein, on the Rhine, where he died, Nov. 16, 759. He had filled his office during forty years, and his death proved a severe loss to the convent, as his successor was a willing instrument in the hands of its enemies. Othmar's remains were brought to St. Gall in 769, and are said to have worked miracles there. He was canonized in the 9th century by Salomo I, bishop of Constance (839-871), which canonization was afterwards confirmed by the Church of Rome. Othmar's biography was written almost a century after his death by Gozbertus Diaconus. It is exclusively based on tradition. It was afterwards revised by abbot Walafrid Strabo of Reichenau, and continued by Iso of St. Gall. We have the latter work complete, but that of Gozbert only with the interpolations of Walafrid. See Walafridi Strabi *Liber de vita S. Otmari*, in Pertz, *Mon. Germ. SS.* 2:41-47; Isonis Magistri *De miraculis eiusdem libri ii*, p. 47-54 (ibid.); Ekkehardi *Rhythmi de S. Otmaro*, p. 54-58 (ibid.); Ratperti *Casus S. Galli*, cap. ii, p. 62-63 (ibid.); *A bbatum S. Galli catalogs*, ed. D. Ildefons. ab Arx, p. 35 (ibid.); Gozberti Diaconi *Continuatio libri ii de miraculis S. Galli-per Walafridum emendata*, cap. 11-15, p. 23-24 (ibid.); *Aunn. Sangall. maior.* in Pertz, *Mon. Germ.* 1:73, note d, and p. 74; Trudp. Neugart, *Cod. dipl. A lam.* etc. (1791, 4to); *Traditiones monast. S. Galli*; Ildephons. von Arx, *Gesch. d. Kantons St. Gallen* (1810, 2 vols.);

Rettberg, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, 2:107 sq.; Heber, *Lebensbilder aus der altdeutschen Kirche vor Bonifacius*, in Marriott, *Wahrem Protestanten* (1855, vol. iv, pt. 2-3); Nagel, *Gesch. d.'KI. St. Gallen*, etc., in the *Programm des Pädagogiums zu Halle*, 1852; Heber, *Die vorkarolingischen christlichen Glaubenshelden am Rhein u. deren Zeit* (Frankf. ad M. 1858, p. 248 sq.); Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 7:802, 803; Herzog, — *Real-Encyklop.* 10:736.

## Oth'ni

(Heb. *Othni'*, *יֹנָתַי*; *my lion*; Sept. *Ὅθνί* v. r. *Γοθνί*), the first named of six sons of Shemaiah; a mighty man of valor, made a porter in the tabernacle service (<sup><1317></sup>1 Chronicles 26:7). B.C. cir. 1013.

## Oth'niel

(Heb. *Othniel'*, *יֹנָתַי*; *lion of God*; Sept. *Γοθονιήλ*), the first judge or regent of the Hebrews after the death of Joshua. He was the son of Kenaz, the brother of Caleb (but see Rosenmüller, *Schol. in Jos.* p. 295 sq.), of the tribe of Judah. *SEE CALEB*; *SEE KENAZ*. Othniel displayed extraordinary valor in seizing the city of Debir, or Kirjath-sepher, for which exploit he was rewarded by the gift of Achsah, the daughter of Caleb, in marriage. Afterwards he was made the instrument of delivering the Hebrews from the severe bondage in which they had been held for eight years by the Mesopotamians. During the forty years of his administration (B.C. 1567-1527) the Hebrews remained faithful to Jehovah their God and king, and consequently prospered (<sup><6516></sup>Joshua 15:16-19; <sup><7011></sup>Judges 1:11-15. 3:8-11; <sup><1313></sup>1 Chronicles 4:13; 27:15). *SEE JUDGES*.

## Otho Or Otto St., Of Bamberg,

a noted Pomeranian prelate, and the evangelist of that now Prussian province, was born about 1062, and was descended of a noble but not wealthy Suabian family. He received a learned education, according to the fashion of those times. Providence brought him to Poland, where he became private tutor of the sons of some of the noblest families. Thus he became known to the duke Wladislay Herman who invited him to his court, and made him his chaplain (1082-1103). Having the confidence of the duke, he was soon employed on political missions, and in this way became known to the emperor Henry IV. This monarch finally drew Otho to his own court, and made him one of his chaplains, and also employed him as

secretary. Otho got into great favor with the emperor. He was appointed imperial chancellor; and when the bishopric of Bamberg, in the year 1102, fell vacant, was placed over that diocese. In the year 1103, Feb. 2, Otho entered upon his duties. He did not receive the papal consecration until the year 1106, by Pascal II (q.v.). “As a bishop, Otho was distinguished for the zeal and interest which he took in promoting the religious instruction of the people in their own spoken language, and for his gift of clear and intelligible preaching. He was accustomed to moderate, with the severity of a monk, his bodily wants, and by this course, as well as by his frugality generally, was able to save so much the more out of the ample revenues of the bishopric for carrying forward the great enterprises which he undertook in the service of the Church and of religion. He loved to take from himself to give to the poor; and all the presents he received from princes and noblemen, far and near, he devoted to the same object. He caused many churches and edifices to be constructed for the embellishment or the greater security of his diocese, and especially took pleasure in founding new monasteries, for, in common with many of the more seriously disposed in his times, he cherished a strong predilection for the monastic life” (Neander). In the contest about ecclesiastical investitures, *SEE INVESTITURE*, between Henry V and Gregory VII (q.v.), Otho was inclined to favor the principles of the Gregorian Church government, but finally got tired of the quarrel, and accepted an invitation from the duke Boleslay of Poland to go to Pomerania in order to carry on a Christian mission there. Having obtained the sanction and blessing of pope Honorius II on this work, Otho began his journey on April 24, 1124. “Fondly attached as he was to monkish ways, the experience of his predecessor in this missionary field taught him to avoid every appearance of that sort, and rather to present himself in the full splendor of his episcopal dignity. He not only provided himself in the most ample manner with everything that was necessary for his own support and that of his attendants in Pomerania, but also took with him costly raiment and other articles to be used as presents to the chiefs of the people; likewise all the necessary church utensils, by which he could make it visibly manifest to the Pomeranians that he did not visit them from interested motives, but was ready to devote his own property to the object of imparting to them a blessing which he regarded as the very highest.” On his first missionary journey he baptized in Pyritz, near Stargard, 7000 pagans; was favorably received in Kammin; where the first Church for the Pomeranians was founded by him. After having remained there for forty days, during which time he instructed and baptized the

people, he determined to push his missionary journey onwards, and directed his steps to Wollin, where he found the people strongly attached to their ancient customs, and where he had every reason to expect a more determined opposition. Otho came near suffering martyrdom at this place, and, without having effected his purpose, he had to repair to Stettin, the capital town. Here the reception he met with was at first unfavorable, but finally, after a patient waiting of some months. Christianity triumphed, and the downfall of paganism could be made known to the duke. Otho then returned to Wollin. The inhabitants of this town having agreed with the bishop that they would follow the example of the capital city, had already sent persons to Stettin for the purpose of obtaining exact information respecting the manner in which the Gospel was there received. The news they obtained could not fail to make the most favorable impression, and Otho was received in Julin, or Wollin, with demonstrations of joy and respect. The activity of the clergy during the two months which they spent in this place scarcely sufficed to baptize all who offered themselves. After having laid the foundation of the Christian Church in many other places, Otho felt bound to make a visitation-tour to the communities already founded by him. and bestow confirmation on those who had before been baptized. Julin, or Wollin, was made the first bishopric of Pomeiania, to which post Boleslay nominated Adalbert, one of his chaplains, who by his direction had accompanied bishop Otho as an assistant. By way of Poland Otho returned to Bamberg, where he was received with great joy, March 28, 1125. In the year 1128 he undertook a second missionary journey by way of Germany over Halle, Magdeburg, and Havelberg. The result of this second journey was that at the diet held at Usedom a decree was issued which permitted the free preaching of the Gospel in all places. The bishop now commenced sending his clergy two by two into all the towns and villages, intending to follow them. In Wolgast and Gutzkov the temples were destroyed, and Stettin, which had relapsed into paganism, was brought over again to Christianity. Otho then returned to his episcopal see at Bamberg, keeping however a lively correspondence with the mission in Pomerania. He died June 30, 1139. Whether Otho introduced the seven sacraments among the Pomeranians whom he had converted to Christianity is a point which remains to be investigated. See *Vitae Ottonis Bamb.* ed. Koepke (*Monum. Germ.* vol. xiv); Sulzbeck, *Leben des heiligen Otto von Bamberg* (Regensburg, 1866); Kannegiesser, *Bekehrungsgeschichte der Pommern* (Greifswalde, 1824); Meiller, *Otto, episcopatus Bambergensis Pomeraniae apostolus et exempti monasterii Ensdersensis pncepiuus*



*dotator* (Amb. 1730); *Otto von- Bamberg*.(Stettin, 1792); Buch, *Memoria Ottonis Episcopi Basnberg* (Jenae, 1828); Barthold, *Geschichte von Rigen und Pomnern* (Hamburg, 1839); Milman, *Mitslav, or the Conversion of Pomerania* (1854); Maclear, *Hist. Christian Missions in the M. A.* p. 303 sq.; Hardwick, *Ch. Rist. M. A.* p. 208, 209; Engelhardt, *Dog mengeschichte*, 2:196; Munscher, *Dogmengeschichte* (ed. by Von Coln), p. 189, 190; Piperj *Evangelischer Kalender*, 1852, p. 149 sq.; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's transl.), 4:23-30, 130; Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 1:296; Gieseler, *Text-book of Church History*, 2:596 sq.; Niedner, *Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchezngeschichte*, p. 384. (B. P.)

### Otho And Otto Of Freising(en),

a noted German monastic who; attained to high ecclesiastical offices, and was one of the crusaders, was a nobleman by descent. The date of his birth is not exactly known; it is supposed to be Dec. 5, 1109; some, however, put it in 1108. He was the third son of duke Leopold of Austria, and of Agnes, daughter of emperor Henry IV. In 1130 (or 1126) he joined the Cistercians, studied in Paris under Abelard, and became an adherent of Gilbert. In 1131 he was made abbot of Morimund, in Champagne, and bishop of Freising(en) in 1136. He did much towards raising the bishopric, which was at the time in a very bad condition, and was looked upon as its second founder. He had also great influence in the general affairs of the country. In 1147 he took part in the crusade with his half-brother, emperor Conrad III; was afterwards chosen by his nephew, emperor Frederick I, to negotiate between him and Henry Jasomirgott, duke of Bavaria; went as far as the Alps with the emperor in his second journey to Rome in 1158, then finally settled at Morimund, where he died, Sept. 22, 1158. He was much esteemed for his knowledge and his piety. Otho wrote, *De duabus civitatibus*, or *De mutatione rerum* (a history extending from the creation down to his own times): *De gestis Friderici imperatoris* (dictated to his secretary, canon Radewick of Freising, who afterwards added two sections to it). Both works were first publisher by Cuspinian, under the title *Ottonis Episcopi Freysingensis Rerum ab origine mundi ad ipsius usque tempora* (Strasb. 1515), and afterwards in Urstisus, *Germanice hist. illustr.* (Frankf. 1585 and 1670, fol.); in Tissier, *Bibl. patr. Cisterc.* (Par. 1669), and Radewick's continuation in Muratori, *Scriptores rerum Ital.* The history of Frederick I is found in Schiller, *Ahg. Samnmlunng-historischer Memoiren*. The first four books of this Chronicle are a mere compilation from Orosius, Eusebius, Isidore of Seville, and other previous writers; but

the last three books contain much original information, especially concerning the affairs of Germany in the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries. Otho is an impartial and trustworthy historian, and judicious for the times in which he lived. His Chronicle was continued down to the year 1210 by another Otho, *Appendix Ottonis a S. Blazio a fine libri septimi Ottonis usque ad annum Salutis* 1210. Another work of Otho of Freysingen is a treatise concerning the end of the world, according to the book of Revelations, which is generally appended to his Chronicle. See Huber, *O. von Freisingen* (Munich, 1847); Wiedemann, *O. von Freising, sein Leben it. Wirken* (Passau, 1849); Lang, *Psychologischer Charakter' Otto's von Freising* (Augsb. 1853); *Zeitschr. f. Gesch. Wissenschaft*, vol. ii (1844); *Lit. Central Blatt* (1856). — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 12:521; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.'x*. 738. (J. H.W.)

## Otho I

(or *the Great*) OF GERMANY, next to Charlemagne the greatest European prince of the Middle Ages, noted alike in secular and ecclesiastical history in the former for his valuable service to German unity and influence, and in the latter for the support he gave to the papacy, and for the independence which he maintained towards the popes— was the son of the emperor Henry I, and was born in 912. He was carefully trained for successorship to the throne, and enjoyed the esteem of his associates and of the people. On the death of his father in A.D. 936 he was crowned king of the Germans. He immediately engaged in a series of eventful and generally triumphant wars, in the course of which he reduced the power of the dukes, -and conquered and converted the heathen Danes, Weinds. Bohemians, and Hungarians. He also interfered in the French dissensions, and thus acquired influence among that people, while at home he strengthened his individual power by gathering around him the leaders of the nation, and especially the best of the clergy. When his throne had been secured beyond venture, he turned his attention to Italy for the purpose of making his power felt over the entire domain of Charlemagne. Otho appeared first as the champion of Adelaide, the young widow of king Lothaire, who had been imprisoned and otherwise ill-used by Berengar, the poisoner of Lothaire, and the usurper of the Italian crown. Otho liberated Adelaide, whom he married at Pavia in the year 951, and forgave Berengar. and allowed him to retain the sovereignty of Italy, but as his vassal. Otho then returned to Germany. After some years, fresh complaints from pope John XII (q.v.) of the tyranny of Berengar, who was then waging war against the papal throne,

induced Otho to recross the Alps, and to go to the rescue of the pope in his extreme hour of need. Otho defeated Berengar and his son and colleague Adalbert. He was thereupon himself acknowledged by a diet held at Milan as king of Italy, and crowned by the archbishop with the iron crown of the Longobards in the church of St. Ambrose at the close of 961. In the following year Otho repaired to Rome, where pope John XII crowned him emperor of the West. as being the successor of Charlemagne, Feb. 2, 962. "Never did a more important event in history take place, making less impression on those who witnessed it, and being less commemorated by subsequent historians, than the coronation of Otho I at Rome in the year 962. By the coronation of Charles 162 years earlier, the first foundations had been laid for the empire; by the coronation of Otho that empire itself was founded afresh, and from that time forward it had an uninterrupted existence (Reichel, *The Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 124). For a short period the spiritual and temporal heads of Christendom seemed to be happily united, but the fickle pope, influenced either by mistrust or jealousy, soon again interrupted that happy concord by concocting anew intrigues with Alberia, the son of Berengar. Otho, who heard complaints from many quarters against the pope's licentiousness and tyranny, first remonstrated with him by means of an envoy. John pleaded his youth as an excuse, and promised amendment, which, however, never took place. Invited by the Romans themselves, the emperor now returned to Rome with an army, and the pope fled. The Romans having sworn that they would never elect another pope without the concurrence of the emperor and his son, he held a synod, in the year 963, in the church of St. Peter, and here many grave charges were variously preferred against the absent pontiff, who was deposed Dec. 4, and Leo VIII (q.v.) declared his successor. Fresh wars were the result of this step. Popes and antipopes contested the possession of Rome. No sooner had Otho departed from Rome than John re-entered the city and drove away Leo, and as papal incumbent once more practiced many acts of cruelty, this time seeking revenge upon those who had favored the exaltation of his rival. The struggle for the possession of Rome lasted for three years, and was ended only by the death of John and Berengar. The election of John's successor was held without the emperor's consultation, though it had been especially stipulated that Otho's wishes should be heeded. This brought Otho again to Rome, which he besieged and took. He banished the pope elect, Benedict V (q.v.), and reinstated Leo VIII. The year after, when this pope died, Otho instituted John XIII (q.v.). The Romans revolted against this action

as soon as the emperor had turned his back on their city, and Otho was again obliged to return in 966 and put down this insurrection. He hanged thirteen leaders, and many others he condemned to severe punishment. His presence at Rome he turned into service to himself by causing his son Otho, then a child of six years, to be anointed and crowned as his colleague and emperor by the pope, in order—that the claims of his house, to the throne might have the sanction of the Church. He also in 972 married his son to the princess Theophania, under whose powerful influence Eastern manners and luxury were introduced at the German court. Otho died at Minsleben, in Thuringia, May 7, 973, and was buried at Miagdeburg. He left the character of a great and just ruler, who had extended the limits of the empire, and restored the prestige of the imperial power more nearly to the rank which it occupied under Charlemagne than any other emperor. He appointed counts-palatine, founded cities, bishoprics, and monasteries, and did good service to the empire in reorganizing the shaken foundations of its power in Europe. Otho's policy towards the see of Rome is worthy of notice, for while he showed himself zealous for the interests of the Church, endowed abbeys and convents, and honored deserving men among the clergy, yet he always asserted his sovereign right in temporal matters, and in the elections of the popes, a right of choice which his successors continued to exercise for a long time afterwards (until the pontificate of Gregory VII). See Vehse. *Lebens Kaiser Otto's dero Grossen* (Dresden, 1827); Luitprand, *Historia Othonziz in Afonumz. Ger2mss. Script.* vol. iii; Ranke, in *Jahrbiicher des deutschen Reichs*, vol. i, pt. i; Luden, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Volkes*, vol. iii, vii; Baxmann, *Gesch. der Politik der Pdpste* (see Index in vol. ii); *Ch. Histories* by Neander, Gieseler, Kurtz. Niedner (Indices); Reichel, *The See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 121 sq.; Milman, *Latin Christianzity*, 3:175 sq.; Piper, *Evangelisches Jcahrbuch*, 1852, p. 111 sq.; Gibbon, *Declize and Fall* (Milman's ed.), v. 55, 59, 419; Lewis, *Hist. of Germany* (N. Y. 1874), p. 126 sq.; Zeller, *Hist. de Allgemaine* (Paris, 1873). — **SEE PAPACY.**

## Otho II

OF GERMANY, son of the preceding, and ruler from 973 to 983, deserves no special notice at our hand. He was largely engaged in suppressing sedition at Rome, and in settling the interminable strife of the Italian princes. He was intent in the latter part of his reign in collecting a large army against the Saracens, whom he wished to expel from Sicily; but he

died before the plan had reached execution. See Giesebrecht, *Jahrbucher des deutschen Reichs* (Berlin, 1840).

### Otho III

OF GERMANY, son of the preceding, was emperor from 983 to 1002. He was born in 980, and was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle first and at Rome in 996, whither he had been called by pope John XV to quell the insurrection of Crescentius, a remarkable character of the Middle Ages, who aspired to re-establish the Roman republic under a nominal allegiance to the Eastern emperors. Pope John XV dying in the mean time, Gregory V assumed the pontificate, and it was this pope who crowned Otho III. After the restoration of peace the emperor returned to Germany; but the renewed rebellion of Crescentius, who drove Gregory from the papal throne, and instituted a Calabrian Greek as antipope under the title of John XVI, compelled Otho to return to Italy, where success, as usual, attended his measures. Crescentius, who had thrown himself into St. Angelo, was seized and beheaded, together with twelve of his chief adherents; the antipope imprisoned, Gregory restored; and on the speedy death of the latter, Otho's old tutor, Gherbert, archbishop of Ravenna, was raised to the papacy under the title of Sylvester II. Otho, elated with his success, took up his residence at Rome, where he organized the government, erected new buildings, and showed every disposition, notwithstanding the ill-concealed dissatisfaction of the Romans, to convert their city into the capital of the Western empire. The near approach of the year 1000, to which so many alarming prophecies were then believed to point as the end of the world, induced Otho to undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, where he founded an archbishopric. On his return, after visiting Charlemagne's grave at Aix-la-Chapelle, and removing the consecrated cross suspended from the emperor's neck, he again repaired to Rome to consolidate his schemes of establishing a Roman empire. The insurrection of the Romans frustrated his plans, and, escaping from Rome at the risk of his life, he withdrew to Ravenna to await the arrival of powerful reinforcements from Germany; but before they had crossed the Alps he died, in 1002, apparently from poison, said to have been administered to him by the widow of Crescentius, who, it is believed, had deliberately set herself to win his affections that she might have an opportunity of avenging the death of her husband. With Otho III the male branch of the Saxon imperial house became extinct. See Wilman, *Jahrbucher des deutschen Reichs unter*

*Kaiser Otto III* (Berl. 1840). and the histories referred to in the article *SEE OTHO I.*

## Otho IV

OF GERMANY ruled from 1198 to 1218. but he played no part worthy of special mention here. He was crowned by Innocent III in 1209, but on account of the occupation of the papal territory was visited with the ban by this same pope, and thus crippled in his power he found it impossible to contend with the rival ruler, Frederick II, and retired to Brunswick, where he died, Nov. 19, 1218.

## Otho, Georg

a distinguished German Orientalist, was born at Sattenhausen, near Cassel, in 1634. He became professor and librarian at the University of Marburg, and died in that city May 28, 1713. Besides a large number of academical discourses, and Latin essays on various points of philosophy and of Biblical exegesis, he wrote, *Oratio funebris inl obiturn Justi Jungmannii* (Cassel, 1668, 4to): — *De accentuatione textus Hebraici* (Marburg, 1698, 4to): — *Synopsis institutionum Samaritanarum, Rabbinicarum, Arabicarum, Ethiopicarum, et Persicarum, ex optimis autoribus excerpta* Francf. 1701, 8vo). Otho, in his grammars, adopted the plan and system of James Alting (q.v.); they were therefore looked upon as a continuation of Alting's works, and reprinted with the latter's grammars in 1717 and 1730: — *Fundamenta punctuationis lingue sazncte*, and *Institutiones Chald. et Syr.*; *Palestra linguarum Orientalium* (ibid. 1702, 4to), destined to facilitate the comparative study of Oriental languages. It contains the first four chapters of Genesis, in the Hebrew text, accompanied by the Latin version of Arius Montanus, in the Targums of Onkelos, of Jonathan, and of Jerusalem, and the Syriac, Samaritan, Arabic, Ethiopian, and Persian translations, each with a literal Latin translation. It gives also all that part of both the smaller and the larger Masorah which relates to these four chapters, and the notes of R. Solomon, Aben-Ezra, etc. The whole is preceded by a model of parsing in each of these languages, and followed by glossaries for all the words contained in the book: — *Virga Aharonis polyglottos* (Marb. 1692, 4to); a work of the same kind as the preceding, more elaborate, but less extensive; it embraces only the first eleven verses of Numbers 17. A letter of Otho is inserted in Lacroze, *Thesaurus epistol*,

1:311. See Jocher, *Allg. Gel.-Lex.*, Supplement; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:929. (J. N. P.)

### Otho, Johannes Heinrich

a noted Swiss Hebraist, was born April 15, 1651, at Berne, in Switzerland. He received his education in his native place, went in 1669 to Lausanne, thence to Saumur, Orleans, Paris, and Oxford. In 1673 he returned to his native country, was appointed public teacher of philosophy at Lausanne, where he died, July 16, 1719, after having occupied some pastorates in different places. Otho published several works on the Hebrew, which to this day are used with great advantage, viz. *Lexicon Rabbini cophilologicum in quo ordine alphabetico notantur et referuntur principue quae circa patrum hebreorum dogmata, ritus et statuta in utroque Talmude, laimonidis et aliorum scriptis occurrunt* (Basle, 1675); enlarged edition by Zacharias (Altona, 1757). In a later edition, which was published at Geneva in 1675, the Talmudical treatise *Shekalim*, with notes and a Latin translation by the same author, is also given: — **ym&hi t l v l yi hnyM&ai**. i.e. *Historia doctorum Mischnicorum quo opere etiam Synedrii magni Hierosolymitani presides et vicepresides recensentur* (Oxf. 1672; later ed. by Reland, Amst. 1698). See Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.*; Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:59 sq.; Jocher, *Allgenzeines Gelehrten-Lexikon*, 3:1142; Supplement by Rotermond, v. 1273 sq.; *Bibl. Brenensi Class.* vol. vi, fasc. ii, p. 291 sq. (B. P.)

### Otho, Julius Conrad

(originally *Naphtali Margalita*), a distinguished German Orientalist, belonged to a very ancient Jewish family, distinguished for its great learning and Talmudic lore, of which five members have united with the Christian Church. Naphtali Margalita was born at Vienna Sept. 12 1562, and joined the Church in 1603 at Altona, where he was appointed professor of Oriental languages, and died at the same place in 1607. He wrote, *Usus linguae Hebraicae, h. e. expositio mystica document. Hlebr. Vet. Test.* (Nurnberg, 1604): — *Grammatica Ebraica* (ibid. 1605): - **al & ayzr**; i.e. *Occultorum detectio seu monstratio dogmatum, quae omnes Rabbini. recte sentientes ante et post Christi nativitatem de unitate essentiae divinae Trinitate personarum, et de Messia posteritati reliquerunt*, etc. (ibid. 1605; Stettin, 1613); a work consisting of extracts from the Talmud and the Sohar to prove the validity of the Christian



doctrine: — *Lexicon radicale s. thesaurus coronam Sacrae Scriptorum complectens, in quo juxta ordinem alphabeticum ponuntur nomina, verba, serviles et radicales literae et voces inde derivatae* (Nürnberg, 16.). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:60; Wolf, *Bibl. Itebr.* 1:480; Steinschneider, *Bibliographisches Handbuch*, p. 105; Same, *Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana*, p. 2080; Jocher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon*, 3:1142; Supplement by Rotermund, v. 1300; Fabricius, *Delectus Argumentorum et syllabus scriptorum*, etc. (Hamburg, 1725), p. 583 sq.; Loscher, *De causis linguae Hebr.* (Leips. 1706), p. 169; Delitzsch, *Saat auf Hoffnung* (Erlangen, 1869), 7:146 sq. (B. P.)

### Othobon, Synod of

was held in London, A.D. 1268, under cardinal Othobon, and claims attention, not only as representing the united churches of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, but as displaying a commendable zeal for discipline, and embodying its decrees in constitutions. many of which are still law. It directs that the laity be carefully instructed in the baptismal formula, in order that in cases of emergency they might be qualified to administer the rite; and it enjoins, for the first time, the indicative form of absolution after confession, still retained in the office for the visitation of the sick. Several of its canons are directed against simoniacal contracts for benefices, non-residence and pluralities, commutations of penance. appropriations of tithes to monastic houses, and commendams, which, originating in early times when interruptions were perpetually occurring to regular ministerial appointments, were afterwards grievously perverted.

### Otho'nias

(**Ὄθονίας**, Vulg. *Zochias*), a corrupt form (1 Esdras 9:28) of the name MATTANIAH (<sup><S&OZ></sup>Ezra 10:27).

### Otolengo, Samuel Ben-David Ben-Jechiel, Of Casale,

a noted Italian rabbi, flourished for a while at Venice, and died at Padua Aug. 22, 1718. He distinguished himself as a poet and grammarian, and published **ly[m] awmç**, “the Mantle of Samuel,” being extracts from the **tyrbh twj wl ynç** of Isaiah Horwitz (q.v.), to which he also wrote an Index (Venice, 1705): — **hyrq hnman**, extracts from the **qby rb[m]** of Aaron Berechja befi-Moses ben-Nechemia of Modena, important for



ascetic literature (ibid. 1701): —  $\mu\upsilon\beta\beta\omega\zeta\hat{\omega}q\tau$  *Correctio seu institutio ponitentium*, a ritual containing precepts, prayers, hymns, etc. (2d ed. Venice, 1719). See First, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:58; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* 1:1094; 3:1080; Jocher, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon*, 3:1134. (B. P.)

### O'Toole (Or Tuathal), Laurence,

an eminent Irish prelate, belonged to the princely sept of the Hy Murrays of Leinster, in which province he was born in 1134. He was educated in the monastery of Glendolough, one of whose seven ancient churches still remains. He was very pious in early youth, and at the age of twenty-five was chosen a bishop; the duties of the office were almost literally forced upon him. Afterwards he became the abbot of the above monastery, and in 1162 he was elected archbishop of Dublin, a position which he readily accepted, that he might the more easily distribute the available funds of the diocese to the poor. He was consecrated by Gelasius, the Irish bishop of Armagh, who Leland says refused to attend the Roman Catholic council in Cashel. Grienne, his predecessor, and three other Dano-Irish bishops before him, had been ordained by the archbishops of Canterbury, to whom they had severally promised "canonical. obedience." With O'Toole the foreign consecrations of the Dublin bishops ceased. He was the first archbishop ever consecrated in Ireland (comp. Usher, *Religion of the Early Irish*, vol. 4; Ware, *Irish Antiq.* 1:312). O'Toole was a prominent member in the national council at Clane, called by Roderick, the last Irish king. At this meeting the school or monastery of Armagh was raised to the rank of a university, and a rule was passed that no one should be received as a lector or theological professor unless he had graduated in this university. In this and several other instances we perceive the-efforts which were then made to introduce Romish doctrines into the Irish Church, and to bring the "diverse and schismatical usages," of which Guillebertus, the pope's legate, had spoken, to "the one Catholic and Roman office." O'Toole was a true patriot. When the treachery of MacMorrough was developed, and the English invasion had become evident, he took a decided stand for his country. After several fruitless efforts to adjust matters, he risked his life between the conflicting parties to prevent the massacres of the people. In 1171, during a serious division among the English, he conceived the idea of arousing the whole nation, and of driving all the foreigners at once out of the island. For this purpose he went from province to province, addressing the nobles and common people, and urging them to arise simultaneously,

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

The same destruction seems to have been continued down to the time of James II of England, for it appears to have been the policy of the first English invaders of Ireland, as a means of preserving their own authority, to efface as far as possible from the memory of the people every trace of their former nationality and the independence of their Church. See Todd, *Ancient Irish Church*, p. 133 sq.; De Vinne, *History of the Irish Primitive Church*. (D. D.)

### Ott, Johann Baptist

SEE OTT, JOHANN HEINRICH. (below)

### Ott, Johann Heinrich

a noted Swiss Protestant divine and Orientalist, was born in the canton of Zurich in 1617. His father, also a minister in the country, placed him at Zurich under the care of the distinguished Breitingger. In 1636 he went to:study at Lausanne; sometime after at Geneva and Grossingen, in the company of Hottinger; after rapid advancement under professors Gomar and Alting, he went to Leyden and Amsterdam. Here for five years he applied himself to the study of rabbinical learning and the Oriental languages. He then returned to Switzerland, making the tour of England and France. After his arrival home he became minister of the Church of Dietlickon, where he remained twenty-five years. In 1651 he was appointed professor of eloquence at Zurich, of Hebrew in 1655, and of ecclesiastical history in 1668. He died in 1682. Ott maintained an extensive literary correspondence. He wrote principally on theology. The following is a complete list of his works: *Franco Gallia: — Oratio de causa Jan senitica: — Queastio, an et quando Petrus fuit Ronzoe: The Grandeur of the Roman Church* (in Latin, with Remarks): — *Ovouca Trooyitu, seu nomiina hominnum pr pria: — A nnales Anabaptistici: — Exzaminis perpetui in annales Ccesaris Baronii, centurieu tres: — Vindicice hujus tractatus adversus Abbatem Reding: — Oratio in commendationem studii Hebraici: — De resurrectione: — aronii examinis continuatio ad xiii saculunz usque: — De magia licita et illicita: — De' alphabetis et ratione scribendi onnium nationunm: — Universa poesis philologice tractata, etc.*

His son, JOHANN BAPTIST, an Orientalist and antiquarian, was born in 1661. He became professor of Hebrew at Zurich about 1702, and wrote several antiquarian treatises. He died shortly after his appointment to the professorship at Zurich.

### Ottaviani, Carlo

an Italian engraver, was born about the 18th century. He engraved ten of the thirty-three plates published under the following title: *Le pitture della capella pontificia Quirinade, opera di Guido Reni, disegnatte da Pietro Angelletti ed incise da Giove Carlo fratelli Ottaviani.*

### Ottaviani, Giovanni

an Italian engraver, was born at Rome in 1735. He visited Venice, where he studied under Wagner, and engraved several prints. On returning to Rome he soon gained reputation, and became highly esteemed. His principal work was his collection of engravings after the pictures by Raphael in the Loggia of the Vatican, of which, the first part appeared in twelve numbers (Rome, 1769-1770, fol.); the second in thirteen numbers (1776). Among his other prints the following are most noted, *St. Jerome with a Crucifix, after Guercino, St. Cecilia;* and *Angelica and Medora;* and twenty-three plates from the paintings by Raphael in the Vatican.

### Ottensosser, David,

of Firth, distinguished as a translator and interpreter of Biblical books as well as of other Hebrew works, died May 22, 1858, at an age of 74 years. Of his many publications we mention: the Book of Job, translated into German, with a Hebrew commentary *rwabw yznkça μwgrt μ[æwya* (Offenbach, 1807): — Isaiah, with a German translation and a Hebrew commentary (Firth, 1807): — the Lamentations of Jeremiah, with a Hebrew commentary (ibid. 1811): — a German translation of the Chaldee paraphrase of the Book of Esther, *a8l b rtsa l [ μwgrt* (Sulzbach, 1820): — a Hebrew commentary to the *Bechinat-Olam* of Jedid Penini (q.v.) (Vienna, 1830): — a German translation of and a Hebrew commentary on Petachja's (q.v.) *Travels* (Firth, 1844): — a History of the Jews according to Josephus, in Hebrew letters (ibid. 1821, 3 vols.): *Ërd, hrw*, a Commentary on the Pentateuch, excerpted from Maimonides's (q.v.) *More Nebuchim* (ibid. 1804): — *l aecjæt [WVT]* i.e. a refutation of the charge that the Jews use the blood of Christians, and the groundlessness of this charge (ibid.): — *rslm yrWpsam* Moral Tales of the Past (ibid. 1846): - *t [diyr]æor t/rçæarwthi* letters on the *More Nebuchim* of Maimonides, translated into German, with notes and

annotations (ibid. 1846, 1848, and 1856). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:58 sq.; *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, 1856, p. 357 473; Dessauer, *Geschichte der Israeliten* (Bresla., 1870) p. 545. (B. P.)

### Otterbein, Philip William,

a noted divine, was born June 4, 1726, at Dillenburg, Germany, and is commonly acknowledged as the founder of the *United Brethren in Christ* (q.v.). His father was rector of a classical school at Herborn, and gave his son a thorough classical and theological education. He early felt a strong desire to labor in some foreign land. This wish was gratified in 1752, when, at the instance of Rev. Michael Schlatter (q.v.), he received a call as minister of the German Reformed Church in America. Having, with five other young ministers, been ordained at the Hague, he sailed with them to New York, where they arrived July 27 of the same year. Otterbein was first settled at Lancaster, Pa., in August, 1752. At the urgent solicitation of the Church he remained until the close of 1758, although he was much dissatisfied with the lack of discipline which prevailed: From 1758 to 1760 he labored at Tulpehocken, Pa.; from 1760 to 1765, at Frederick, Md.; from 1765 to 1770, at York, Pa. He visited Germany in 1770, and returning to York in 1771, remained there until 1774. In that year he accepted a call from the new congregation in Baltimore, which, in 1770, had separated from the old Church. There he remained for the rest of his days. He died Nov. 17, 1813. A man of ardent piety and apostolical spirit, endowed with extraordinary power as a preacher, he exerted a great influence among his brethren, and extended his work beyond the limits of his own Church. He proclaimed the necessity of regeneration and of a holy life with great force and directness. He took part in union meetings, held often in the woods and kept up for several days. He instituted prayer-meetings, and trained pious laymen to lead them; and he maintained a close fellowship with men of like mind in other religious denominations, especially with Martin Bohm, a Mennonite, and with Asbury and Wright, whom John Wesley sent to labor in America. In 1784 he assisted Dr. Coke in ordaining Asbury as the first bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. On Sept. 25, 1800, in conjunction with Bohm, he convened a conference at Baltimore. It was attended by thirteen ministers, and resulted in the organization of the society of the *United Brethren in Christ*. Otterbein is said to have been elected their first bishop or superintendent. This, however, is denied by Dr. Harbaugh, in his *Fathers of the German Reformed Church* (2:53-76), who says that no bishop was elected until

1813, and proves by substantial evidence that Otterbein never left the communion of the German Reformed Church. Otterbein worked for a revival in the Church, and not for an organization out of it. When he saw that the movement was tending to this result, "he held on to it, not to organize it, but to prevent its organization; not to carry it forward, but to restrain and control it. Only when the case became hopeless did he withdraw. In the quietude of old age, he silently mourned over the evil" (*Fath. of the Ger. Ref. Church*, 2:71). It would therefore appear that while Otterbein was practically the founder of the United Brethren in Christ, he did not intend to establish a new religious denomination; and, like John Wesley, never really severed his connection with his own Church. See, besides Harbaugh, Corwin, *Manual of the Ref. Church in Amer.* p. 173 sq.; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v. (E. de S.)

### Otterson, James

a Presbyterian minister, was born in New York City Oct. 11, 1791. He graduated at Columbia College, New York; studied theology with Dr. J. M. Mason; was ordained by the Associate Presbytery of New York, and installed as the successor to Dr. Proudfit, pastor of the Church of Broadalbin, Fulton County, N. Y., in 1821. About the year 1827 he was called to the united pastorate of the Reformed Dutch churches of Hempstead and Oyster Bay, on Long Island, N. Y.; in 1834 he succeeded Dr. Van Vranken as pastor of the Church in Freehold, N. J.; he next took charge of the Church at the White House, in Hunterdon County, N. J.; in 1845 he was called to the Church in Johnstown, N. J.; his last charge was in Wilmington, Del., which he relinquished in 1863, and retired to the house of his son, a prominent member of the bar at Philadelphia, Pa. He died Sept. 17, 1867. Mr. Otterson possessed a clear, analytical mind, which showed the effect of early culture. He was a good scholar, a sound and able theologian, and a very instructive and edifying preacher. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, p. 133. (J. L. S.)

### Ottilia, St.,

*SEE ODILIA, ST.*

### Ottini, Felice

a Roman painter, who, according to Pascoli, was a pupil of Giacinto Brandi. He possessed excellent talents, a fine taste, and was employed

almost in his youth to decorate the chapel of P. P. di Gesu e Maria at Rome. He died young, in 1695.

### Ottini, Pasquale

(sometimes called *Pasqualotte*), an Italian painter of note, was born at Verona in 1570. He studied with Felice Riccio, called Brusasorci, whose manner he imitated so happily that he was employed to finish some works left incomplete by his master at his death. Lanzi says "he was a good artist in regard to forms, and of no common expression, particularly in the works he conducted after having seen Raphael's. Of this we have a striking example in his *Murder of the Innocents*, at S. Stefano, and his picture of *St. Nicolo*, with other saints, at S. Giorgio, in the best style of Venetian coloring. In other instances his coloring is somewhat languid—a defect most probably from time and unfavorable situation." He was in high repute in his native city, and the learned Alessandro Carli, in his history of Verona, says that he approached nearer to Paul Veronese than any other artist of that city. He died of the great plague in 1630. He is said to have executed some beautiful etchings. Bartsch has given a description of only one known print by him, which he commends in the highest terms. It represents the burial of Christ, and is signed *Pasq. Ottii, Vers. ino*.

### Otto Of Bamberg.

SEE *OTHO OF BAMBERG*.

### Otto Of Freising.

SEE *OTHO OF FREISING*.

### Otto Of Passau

(some have it OF NASSAU), for a time teacher in the Franciscan convent of Basle, was there connected with the Pietistic sect of the *Friends of God* (q.v.). He is principally known as the author of a book of edification for the use of the laity, entitled *Die Vierundzwanzig Alten u. der Goldene Thion* (1386). It consists of directions for leading a Christian life, and insists particularly on its subjective aspects. It was first printed at Augsburg in 1480, and lately under the title of *Die Krone der Aeltesten* (Regensb. 1836). It was translated into Dutch (Utrecht, 1480, and often reprinted). See Pfeiffer, *Deutsche Mystiker des 14ten Jahrh.* (Stuttg. 1845);

Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 4:408,409; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop* 10:741. (J. N. P.)

## Ouch

(only in the plur. *t/xByjæmishbetsoth*, textures, e.g. *brocade*, as <sup><9514></sup>Psalm 45:14; hence *settings*), *bezels*, in which gems are set; hence the sockets for fastening the precious stones in the shoulder-pieces of the high-priest's ephod (<sup><12811></sup>Exodus 28:11, 14, 25; 39:13, 16). *SEE EPHOD*.

## Oude Or Oudh

(Sanskrit, *Ayodha*, i.e. "invincible"), a province of British India, separated on the north from Nepaul by the lower ranges of the Himalayas, whence it gradually slopes to the Ganges, which forms its boundary on the south and south-west, is situated in lat. 25° 34'-29° 6' N., long. 79° 45'-83° 11' E., and has an area of 27,890 square miles, or rather less than that of Scotland, with a population in 1872 of 11,220,747. It is one great plain, the slope of which from north-west to south-east indicates also the direction of the principal rivers. These are the Gumti, the Ghagra (Ghogra), and the Rapti, which swarm with alligators. The northern part, on the edge of the Himalayas, is not very well known. It forms a portion of the Terai, a vast unhealthy tract stretching along the borders of Nepaul, and covered with impassable forests. The climate is cool and pleasant from November to March; during the next four months it is hot and sultry, after, which follows the long rainy season, but in general it is considered the healthiest along the whole valley of the Ganges. The soil is light, and, except small nodules of chalk and oolite called *kankars*, there is hardly a loose stone to be seen. Formerly it was more copiously watered than it is now, the clearing of the jungles having greatly decreased the moisture of the land. The chief crops are wheat, barley, gram, masure, mustard, rice (of the finest quality), millet, maize, joar, bajra, various kinds of pulse and oil-seeds, sugar-cane, tobacco, indigo, hemp, and cotton. In 1872 there were 12,673 square miles of cultivated lands in Oude, and 5588 additional capable of cultivation. The manufacturing industry is not much developed; soda, saltpetre, and salt are the only articles of which more is produced than is requisite for home consumption. Gunpowder, and all kinds of military weapons, guns, swords, spears, shields, and bows of bamboo, or Lucknow steel, are, however, also made, besides some woolen goods,



paper, etc. The principal towns are Lucknow, Fyzabad, Oude, or Ayodha, Roy Bareilly, and Shahabad.

The people are of a decidedly warlike disposition. The bulk of the inhabitants are Hindus, though the dominant race for centuries, until the British annexation, was Mohammedan. The Brahmans are now the most numerous class, but there are twenty-nine different Rajput tribes. It is these two classes that mainly supplied the famous (or infamous) sepoy of the Bengal army. In 1869 Oude contained 7767 Christians, 9,713,730 Hinduls, 1,011,110 Mohammedans, 56 Buddhists, and 487.884 persons of all other creeds. Hindostanee is the language most in use, with a greater admixture of Persian and Arabic and less of Hindu than in the more easterly provinces. The houses of the people are generally of mud or unburnt brick, and the walls are carried up six or seven feet above the roof, to form a sort of enclosed court for the women, which is covered during the rains by a light temporary roofing of bamboo and grass. The rooms have no ceilings, and the floors are of earth, well packed and smooth.

The most characteristic feature in the social economy of Oude is that of the village communities, each of which constitutes a little republic of itself. The payment of a land-tax is one of the oldest institutions of the country. At the time of the British annexation it was supposed that the chiefs known as *talukdars*, who received this tax from the immediate cultivators of the soil, and paid a fixed sum on account thereof to the native government, were merely middlemen, who exacted from the villagers as much as possible, but themselves possessed no proprietary rights whatever. Acting on the assumption that they were only collectors of revenue, the first land settlement made under British rule, in 1856-57, dispossessed the talukdars of nearly all their villages, and provided for the payment of the land-tax by the actual occupants of the soil directly to the government. The injustice of this settlement led to great dissatisfaction, and was ultimately admitted by the British authorities. The talukdars were in fact an ancient landed nobility, with well-established rights of property in the soil, which were entitled to recognition, notwithstanding the frequent extortion which had been practiced upon the subordinate proprietors. The present land settlement, completed in 1859, recognizes the rights of both classes, confirming to each their possessions as they existed at the time of the annexation in 1856. According to the parliamentary accounts for 1871-72, it is so framed as to secure village occupants from extortion, and to exact certain duties and responsibilities from the talukdars. Half the gross rental

is paid to the government. The net land revenue in 1871-72 amounted to £1,207,902. In the same year the licenses for the sale of spirits and drugs, and the excise on opium, yielded £78,106. The total revenue in 1872-73 amounted to £1,656,602; expenditures, £626,519. The total number of educational institutions in 1871-72 was 1548, with an average daily attendance of 37,720 pupils. They comprise the Canning College at Lucknow, with 720 students, of whom 56 were in the college department; 11 high schools and 747 village schools; 81 schools for girls, with 1908 pupils. The expenditure for the support of schools amounted to £47,420. In each school district a library is maintained for the use of the schoolmaster; and there is said to be a school within four antia half miles of every child in Oude. There is a museum at Lucknow. Seven newspapers, four English and three native, are published in the province.

Oude is believed by Sanscrit scholars to be the ancient *Kosala*, the oldest seat of civilization in India. The country was conquered by a Mohammedan army in 1195, and made a province of the Mogul empire. In 1753 the vizier of Oude, Saffdar-Jung, rebelled against his imperial master, Ahmed Shah, and forced the latter to make the governorship hereditary in his family. His son, Sujah-ud-Dowlah, became entirely independent, and founded a dynasty which ruled the country, generally in a most deplorable manner, until the East India Company found itself forced to adopt the extreme measure of annexation, Feb. 7, 1856. The necessity for this highhanded but most beneficent act is claimed by the British to be interpreted by the statistics of crime in Oude during the last years of its independence. One item will suffice: from 1848 to 1854, there were, on an average, no fewer than 78 villages burned and plundered every year, while murders, robberies, abductions, and extortions were every-day occurrences. A feeble king, a blackguard soldiery, and a lawless peasantry had brought about a most helpless and ruinous anarchy. Many British residents in India, however, disclaimed this state of affairs, and regretted the step as unjust towards the people of Oude, and as impolitic for Britain. When the mutiny of 1857 broke out, Oude became one of the great centers of rebellion. Upon this the confiscation of all the estates of the talukdars was proclaimed by lord Canning; but when the country was subdued by force of British arms the estates of all such as laid down their arms and swore fealty to the British government were restored. The forts of the petty chiefs, however, were dismantled and the inhabitants disarmed. The province is now administered by a chief commissioner. The principal feature of the

present condition of affairs in Oude is the preservation in their integrity of the estates of the talukdars.

Missionary labors have been extensively carried on in Oude, and have been crowned with great success. Thus the Methodist Episcopal Church, which has by far the most flourishing mission, has its headquarters at Lucknow, and supports an English and native church; a press, which sent out 3,000,000 pages in 1875; a religious newspaper called the *Witness*, with 656 subscribers; a boarding-school, and 1000 Sunday-school-scholars. We have not room here to "give further details, but refer the reader to the article INDIA *SEE INDIA* and the books mentioned below.

One of the principal towns of Oude, of like name, is noted on account of a temple erected there in honor of Hanumat, the fabled monkey-ally of Rama, an incarnation of the god Vishnu. The ancient city of that name was situated opposite the modern Oude, where its ruins may still be seen. Ayodhya was one of the oldest seats of civilization in India; it was the residence of the solar dynasty, or one of the two oldest dynasties of India, deriving its descent from the sun; but it obtained special renown through Rama, the son of Dasaratha, a king of that dynasty. Its great beauty and immense size are dwelt upon in several of the Puranas and modern poems; but more especially in the *Ramayana*, the first and last books of which contain a description of it. According to some Puranas, Ayodhya was one of the seven sacred cities, the living at which was supposed to free man from all sin, and the dying at which to secure eternal bliss. It was also called Saketa, Kosala, and Uttara-kosala. See Goldstucker's *Sanscrit Dictionary*, s.v. Ayodhya; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; *The American Cyclop.* s.v.; Bishop Thomson, *Our Oriental Missions*, 1:104 sq.; Bohn's *India*, p. 236 sq., 360 sq.; Butler, *Land of the Veda*, s.v.

### Oudin, Casimir,

a distinguished French writer, was born at Mezieres-sur-Meuse, Feb. 14, 1638. He was the son of a weaver. After studying at Charleville, he joined the Premonstrants in 1655, chiefly with a view to devoting himself entirely to study. The history of ecclesiastical writers first attracted his attention. In 1669 he was appointed professor of theology in the abbey of Moreau, and the next year grand-prior. Finally, after taking charge for a while of the Church of Epinay-sous-Gamaches, in the diocese of Rouen, he retired into a convent in 1677 to resume his former scientific labors. After visiting the divers establishments of the order in Lorraine, Burgundy, and the

Netherlands, he obtained permission to settle at Paris in 1683, and soon became intimate with the learned Benedictines of St. Maur, who placed their rich historical materials at his disposal, in order that he might write for them a history of their order — a task which, however, he never attempted. He enjoyed great reputation for learning, and was even considered a model of piety and regularity. But his superiors, frightened at an intimacy which sprung up between him and the renowned Jurieu, confined him to the abbey of Ressons near Beauvais, in 1692. The severe penances to which he was subjected contributed also to disgust him with monastic life; and having finally succeeded in escaping to Holland in 1692; he made an open profession of Protestantism at Leyden. He was subsequently appointed under-librarian of the university of that place, and died there in Sept., 1717. Abbe Boulliot, in his *Biogr. Ardennaise* (vol. ii), says of Oudin: “Contrary to what usually happens to such deserters, he always preserved the general esteem of his co-religionists. This was owing mainly to the purity of his life. To those who advised him to marry, he answered that he had become a Calvinist for the sake of truth, and not to free himself from celibacy.” Oudin's principal works are: — *Supplementum de scriptoribus vel de scriptis ecclesiasticis a Bellarmino omissis ad ann. 1460* (Paris, 1686, 8vo). This work which is far from supplying all the authors omitted by Bellarmine, contains, according to Cave, a large number of errors: — *Le Premontre defroque* (Leyden, 1692, 12mo): — *Veterum aliquot Gallice et Belgii scriptorum opuscula sacra numquam edita* (ibid. 1692, 8vo): — *Historia abbatis Caivi-Montis*, in *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. iii (1701): — *De Collectanea*, in Mason, *Hist. de la republique des Lettres*, vol. ii, viii: — *Tias dissert. criticarum* (Leyden, 1717, 8vo). In this work he claims that the *Codex Alexandrinus* dates only from the 10th century, and that the questions *Ad Antiochum principem* were attributed by mistake to St. Athanasius; — *De scriptoribus Ecclesie antiquis* (Leips. 1722, 3 vols. fol.). See Nicéron, *Memoires*, vol. i, x; Moreri, *Dict. hist.*; Paquot, *Melmoires*; Hugo, *Annales ord. Præm.* 1:55; Haag, *La France Protestante*.

### Ouen, St.

(Lat. *Audenus*), a French prelate, noted for his civil ministrations to king Dagobert, and highly esteemed by that monarch, was born at Sancy, near Soissons, in 609. He was brought up at Ussy-sur-Marne, of which his parents were lords. After studying in the monastery of St. Medard, he received an office at the court of king Clothaire II. Under Dagobert. I, St.

Ouen and St. Eloi, afterwards bishop of Noyon, became the principal ministers of the nation, St. Ouen holding the position of chancellor. But notwithstanding the onerous civil duties thus imposed upon these excellent men, they labored zealously for the spiritual welfare of the people. St. Ouen in particular greatly profited by his intimate association with St. Eloi, and by his advice founded, in 634, the abbey of Rebais, in the diocese of Meaux. Some time after St. Ouen entered the Church himself, and was ordained priest by Dieudonné, bishop of Macon. On his return from a mission to Spain he was made archbishop of Rouen. He is generally believed to have been installed May 21, 640, the same day on which St. Eloi was made bishop of Noyon and of Tournai. The diocese of Rouen, which yet contained many very uncivilized districts, gained greatly under the government of Ouen. He took part in the council of Chalons-sur-Saone, Oct. 25, 644. Pope Martin I having in 651 requested of king Clovis II some of his most learned bishops to be sent as legates to Constantinople to inquire into the question of monothelism, St. Ouen and St. Eloi were designated for that purpose, but, for reasons unknown at present, they did not go on that journey. After the death of Ebroin, king Thierry I, at the suggestion of the new mayor of the palace, Warato, sent St. Ouen to Cologne to negotiate peace with Pepin, duke of Austrasia. The bishop proved successful in this undertaking, but died soon after his return at Clichy-la-Garenne, Aug. 24, 683. His body was transported to Rouen, and buried in the church which now bears his name. Ouen wrote a *Vita Eligii*, which may be considered as one of the most valuable documents we possess for the history of the 7th century. MS. copies of it were preserved in many churches and monasteries. It was first published by Surius, but with many omissions. D'Achery having found two MS. copies — one in the library of the abbey of Corbie, the other in that of Conches, in Normandy — carefully compared them, and published the complete work of Ouen in the fifth volume of his *Spicileg* in 1661. Ghesquiere also published the *Vita Eligii*, revised by means of MSS. from the collections of the Bollandists at Antwerp, in the *Acta Sanct. Belgii*, 3:294-331. It was translated into French, from these various editions, by Louis de Montigny, archdeacon of Noyon (Paris, 1626, 8vo); also anonymously (by Levesque, a priest) — (ibid. 1693, 8vo); by Charles de Barthelemy (ibid. 1847, 8vo); and by abbot Parenty, canon of Arras (Arras, 1851, 12mo). These two latter translations are accompanied with very instructive and learned notes. A life of St. Remy, in MS., preserved in the abbey of St. Gall, is also attributed to Ouen. See *Gallia Christiana*, vol. xi; *Hist. litt<sup>r</sup>. de la France*, 3:623-628;

Pommeraye, *Hist. de 'abbaye de St. Ouen; Hist. des archives de Rouen; France pontificale; Le Cointe, Ann. eccl. de France; Student's History of France*, p. 47; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:978.

### Oughtred, William,

an eminent English divine, noted especially as a mathematician, was born at Eton, Buckinghamshire, in 1573. Being educated at Eton as a foundation-scholar, or "colleger," he was elected thence, in 1592, to King's College, Cambridge, of which in regular course he was admitted perpetual-fellow. He largely cultivated classical learning, as the elegant Latinity of some of his works indicates; but he applied himself chiefly to the study of mathematics. While yet an undergraduate he invented *An Easy Method of Geometrical Dialling*, which, though not given to the public until 1647, was then immediately translated from English into Latin by Christopher Wren, at that time a gentleman-commoner of Wadham College, Oxford. Oughtred took his degree of B.A. in 1596, and that of M.A. in 1599. In 1600 he projected a horizontal instrument delineating dials upon any kind of plane, and for working most questions which could be performed by the globe. In 1603, or thereabout, Oughtred was ordained priest, and presented to the living of Aldbury, near Guildford, in Surrey, upon which appointment he left the university and resided upon his living. He continued his mathematical pursuits, but at the same time distinguished himself by the faithful discharge of his pastoral duties. The mathematical sciences were to him "the more than Elysian fields," and his house was continually filled with young gentlemen who came thither for instruction. He probably wrote his *Treatise of Trigonometry* about 1614; and in pursuing the same subject he invented, not many years afterwards, an instrument called *The Circles of Proportion*. 'All such problems in arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and navigation as depended upon simple and compound proportion might be solved by its aid; and it was the first sliding rule that was projected for those uses, as well as that of gauging. In 1628 he was engaged by the earl of Arundel as tutor to his son, lord William Howard whose patronage of science has much to do with the history of its progress during the 17th century. For the use of his pupil Oughtred published, in 1631, *Arithmetices in numeris et speciebus inzstitutio, quae turn logisticae tum analytiae, atque totius mathematicae clavis est*. This manual contained so many new and excellent theorems, both in algebra and geometry, that it was universally esteemed; and the general plan of it has since been followed by the best authors on the subject. Oughtred was, in 1646, in danger of

sequestration by the committee for plundering ministers, and several articles sufficient to have sequestered him were sworn against him. But William Lilly, the celebrated astrologer, appealed to Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke and all his old friends, and they appeared in such numbers in his behalf on the day of hearing that he was cleared by the majority, though the chairman and many other Presbyterian ministers were active against him. He sometimes amused himself with physical sports, and was sprightly at the age of eighty. Fuller (*Worthies*, 1:145) says that “this aged Simeon had a strong persuasion that before his death he should behold Christ's anointed restored to the throne, which he did to his incredible joy, and then had his 'dimittis' out of this mortal life Jan. 30, 1660.” According to Collier (*Dictionary*), Oughtred died about the beginning of May, 1660, having expired in an ecstasy of joy upon hearing the news of the vote at Westminster which passed for the restoration of Charles II. David Lloyd says that “Oughtred was as facetious in Greek and Latin as solid in arithmetic, geometry, and the sphere of all measures, music, etc.; exact in his style as in his judgment, handling his tube and other instruments at eighty as steadily as others did at thirty — owing this, as he said, to temperance and archery; principling his people with plain and solid truths, as he did the world with great and useful arts; advancing new inventions in all things but religion, which, in its old order and decency, he maintained secure in his privacy, prudence, meekness, simplicity, resolution, patience, and contentment.” He had one son, whom he put an apprentice to a watchmaker, and for whose use he wrote a book of instructions in that art. He left besides a great number of papers upon mathematical subjects; and in most of his Greek and Latin mathematical books were found notes in his own handwriting, with an abridgment of almost all the propositions and demonstrations. These books came into the museum of William Jones, F.R.S., and with the manuscripts passed into the hands of Sir Charles Scarborough. Such of the latter as were found suitable for publication were printed at Oxford in 1676, under the title *Opuscula Mathematica hactenus inedita*. Many of Oughtred's MSS. are in the library of the earl of Macclesfield. See *Biog. Dict.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*; *Engl. Cyclop.*

### Oulih, Gerson Ashkenazi,

a rabbi of the 17th century, studied at Nikolsburg under Menachem Mendel Krochmal, or Krochman. In 1644 he was called to the rabbiship at Prossnitz, then to Hanau, Nikolsburg, and Vienna. When, however, in the

year 1670, the Jews were expelled from the last-named place, he went to Metz, where he died in 1694. He wrote: *ynçrgh tdwb[ t8wç*, *One hundred and twenty-four legal decisions*, which were afterwards published by his son (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1699): — *ynçygh trapt*, *Homiletical discourses on the Pentateuch* (ibid. 1699): — *ynçrg yçwdj*, *Discussive novellas*, published by his grandson (ibid. 1710). See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:60; Jost, *Annalen*, 1840, p. 80. (B.P.)

### Our Lady of Mercy, Sisters of

is the name of a modern Roman Catholic religious order founded in Dublin by Miss Catharine McAuley in 1830. Miss McAuley was born in Gormanstown Castle, near Dublin, Sept. 29, 1787, and died Nov. 13, 1841. Her parents, who were Roman Catholics, died when she was a child, and she was brought up without any definite religious faith. But she became a Roman Catholic, and devoted herself and her large fortune to the service of the poor. She induced several ladies to join her, purchased a house in Dublin, and there, in 1827, opened an asylum for destitute young women and a free school for poor children. Soon afterwards she and her companions underwent a regular novitiate in a convent of Presentation nuns, and in 1831 assumed there the habit and took the vows of the new order. The rules received the sanction of the archbishop of Dublin Jan. 23, 1834; but subsequently in the rule of St. Augustine, modified to suit the active duties of the sisterhood, was adopted by them, approved by Gregory XVI in 1835, and formally confirmed by him in 1840. As thus organized the Sisters of Mercy have in view, besides other charities, the visitation of the sick and prisoners, the instruction of poor girls, and the protection of virtuous women in distress. Wherever their means permit, they founda "houses of mercy," in which destitute girls of good character are cared for until employment can be found for them. The sisterhood is divided into two classes, choir sisters and lay sisters. The former are employed about the ordinary objects of the order, and the latter about the domestic avocations of the convent, and such other duties as may be assigned to them. Candidates for membership of either class undergo a preliminary "postulancy" for six months; at the end of that time they assume the white veil and become novices. The novitiate lasts two years. The vows, which are taken for life, bind the members to poverty, chastity, obedience, and the service of the poor, sick, and ignorant. The sisters are subject to the bishops, and have no general superior. In the United States the



communities of each diocese form one body, governed by a common superior, who is elected by the professed choir sisters and confirmed by the bishop. The habit of the order is a black robe with long loose sleeves, a white coif, and a white or black veil. In the streets a bonnet of black crape is worn instead of the coif and veil.

The Sisters of Mercy have spread considerably over Great Britain and her colonies. The first American house was established at St. John's, Newfoundland, in 1842, and the first in the United States at Pittsburgh in 1843, where they now have their mother-house and novitiate for that diocese, also a hospital, house of mercy, and orphan asylum. Their academies in Pennsylvania are at Latrobe, Loretto, Harrisburg, Lebanon (?), and Philadelphia; they number about 200 sisters, novices, and postulants in their thirteen or fourteen convents and houses in that state; and teach in the diocese of Pittsburgh alone 5000 children. In the diocese of Hartford, which embraces Connecticut and Rhode Island, they have 128 sisters, novices, postulants, and lay-sisters in nine convents and houses (Providence, two, South Providence, Newport, Pawtucket, and Woonsocket, R. I.; Hartford, New Haven, Conn., two), with seven academies under their charge, besides free and parochial schools, two orphan asylums at Hartford and one at South Providence, the whole containing apparently 6395 pupils. Since Feb. 17, 1868, the Hamilton School, one of the public schools in New Haven, has been conducted entirely by them, eleven now teaching nearly 500 children (probably included in the above number of pupils), at a cost to the city of \$5600, according to the report for the year ending Sept. 1, 1870 (see chap. xxiv). The Sisters of Mercy now number probably over 900 in their eighty or more convents and houses in twenty-one different states (Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Kentucky, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, California), with thirty-nine academies (some of them on a large scale, as at Manchester, N. H., Providence, R. I., Vicksburg, Miss., etc.), twelve orphan asylums, and over fifty other schools (free, parish, or industrial), under their charge, containing in all probably from 20,000 to 25,000 pupils. They have hospitals at Worcester, Albany, Pittsburgh (had 2680 patients in one year), Chicago (cost \$75,000), Louisville, Omaha, and San Francisco; houses of mercy in New York, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco; a house of providence in Chicago; a Magdalen asylum

apparently near San Francisco. Those in Georgia are said in the Catholic "Directory" to be a branch of an order founded (in 1829) by the late bishop England of Charleston, "where the nuns renew the vows of religion every year, and live under a rule approved by the bishop." There are five convents in the state, at Savannah, Augusta, Macon, Columbus, and Atlanta, containing somewhat over thirty sisters., Whether the thirty or forty sisters in North and South Carolina belong to the same branch or not is not stated. See Barnum, *Hist. of Romanism*, p. 304, 305.

### Ouseley, Gideon,

a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in Ireland, noted as a missionary, was born at Dunmore, Galway, in 1762. He was the eldest son of his house, the brother of General Sir Ralph Ouseley, and cousin of Sir William and Sir Gore Ouseley, the Orientalists; and his family is distinguished in British military, diplomatic, and literary history. He was designed for the government service, and received a classical education. Married while not yet of age, his recklessness speedily brought him towards financial and moral ruin; but a peculiar episode in his history, closing with an almost fatal gunshot, led him to consider most seriously his spiritual condition. Thus solemnized in his thoughts, he was in 1789 converted by some Methodist soldiers quartered at Dunmore, where Ouseley then resided. He at once began to preach with the same vigor and zeal which he had before displayed in his career of vice and folly, and soon became a most ardent Gospel evangelist. The people heard him with wonder. Attacking at the same time Romish superstition and Protestant indifference, he preached in season and out of season, exhorted in the streets and churchyards, fairs and markets, and was accustomed to attend the wake-houses, or places where the dead lay, there to mingle with the crowds that were collected for the purpose of "hearing mass;" and while the priest read the prayers in Latin, he would translate every part that was good into Irish, and then address the whole assembly, in the presence of the priest, on their eternal interests. He rode on horseback from town to town, generally addressed the crowd without dismounting, and preached from three to five times a day. For seven years he traveled in this manner throughout the province of Connaught, and as far as Leinster, before his name appeared in the minutes. He was then received into the Wesleyan Conference, and in 1799 was appointed missionary to Ireland. It was just at the close of the rebellion, and the Catholic Irish often treated him rudely; but being a master of the Irish language, and thoroughly acquainted with

the Irish character, he succeeded in converting thousands. Charles Graham traveled with him. Together they went into the worst fields of the country, to the darkest and strongest holds of popery and of Satan. On entering a town, the Bible in hand and their hats off, processions of the people followed them to some convenient place, where they worshipped in the following manner: First they sang a translation of one of Charles Wesley's hymns. Next a brief but fervent prayer was so uttered that all heard it, some standing and crossing themselves, some on their knees smiting their breasts. Then one of the missionaries proclaimed a text in both English and Irish, and preached a short but powerful sermon, the other following with an exhortation. Their discourses were mostly in Irish, but were often interspersed with English passages. These brave itinerants thus boldly grappling with the monster evil of the land, Protestants generally, who comprehended that there was no alternative if popery was ever to be conquered, as well as many of the clergy of the Establishment, took sides with them, and welcomed them to their homes and their parishes; and in the occasional mobs, Protestants of all denominations stood faithfully around them. Moreover, Ouseley was an Irish gentleman, his family was influential, and his father, having been converted, sided with him. The wonderful missionary had thus a prestige which commanded respect among his countrymen. His sincere reverence for "the blessed Virgin" procured him, it is said, many a respectful hearing. Allusions in his sermons to her and the Scripture saints often secured reverent attention, without compromising his Protestantism. His popish hearers were seldom scandalized at anything in his services except the omission of the "Hail Mary" after the final prayer. Without provoking the prejudices of his hearers, he treated them with a courage and frankness which challenged their admiration and secured their good-humor. Thus in a town filled with Romanists he hired the bellman, as was his custom, to announce through the streets preaching for the evening. The man, afraid of opposition, uttered the announcement timidly and indistinctly. Ouseley, passing in the street, heard him, and, taking the bell, rang it himself, proclaiming aloud: "This is to give you notice that Gideon Ouseley, the Irish missionary, is to preach this evening in such a place and at such an hour; *and I am the man myself!*" When Coke applied to the Irish Conference for the first official approval of his Asiatic project, and that body, looking upon him with almost idolatrous affection as its own chief apostle, not only sanctioned his plan, but voted him several of its ministers as missionaries, Ouseley stood forth on the Conference floor and begged, with tears, to be permitted to

accompany them. His services, however, could not be dispensed with at home, and he was thus continued in his warfare to the last. When seventy-four years old, and after nearly half a century of devoted labor, he was still abroad on the highways and in the market-places as actively as ever, preaching fourteen, sixteen, and sometimes twenty sermons a week. In the last year of his life he was several times prostrated by sickness, but rallying his remaining energies, he went forth again and again to his missionary labors. On April 8, 1839, he finished his ministry at Mountmellick, where he that day preached three times, once in the street. He returned to Dublin to lie down on his death-bed. "I have no fear of death; the Spirit of God sustains me; God's Spirit is my support," was his dying exclamation. He died May 14, 1839, in the hundredth year of Methodism. "Gideon Ouseley," says Stevens, will be forever recognized as the Protestant apostle of Ireland; it is hardly too much to affirm that no one man has, directly and indirectly, done so much for her deliverance from the stupendous burden of superstition under which popery has crushed her." Besides his incessant missionary labors, Ouseley was the author of several polemical publications, the most important of which was *Old Christianity and Papal Novelties*. The priests could not refute the conclusive arguments of this work; for its educated author was an adept in the controversy. Many popish laymen, popish schoolmasters, and even candidates for the priesthood, were converted by it, and not a few of these converts became: preachers of the Wesleyan body or of the Established Church. See Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, vol. iii (see Index); Riley, *Life of Ouseley* (Lond. and New York, 1848); Arthur, *Life of the Rev. Gideon Ouseley* (Lond. 1876).

### Outram (Or Owtram), William, D.D.,

an English divine, was born in Derbyshire in 1625. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1641, and upon the completion of his university course became rector of St Mary Woolnoth, London, which position he resigned in 1666; was appointed archdeacon of Leicester in 1669; became prebendary of Westminster in 1670, and was also, for some time rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster. He was much esteemed by his contemporaries. Both the Churchmen and the Dissenters had great confidence in his piety and his judgment (see Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. [Church of the Restoration]*, 1:439). He was well versed in rabbinical learning, and in the writings of the fathers. He died in 1679. His works are: *De Sacrisfciis Libri duo, quorum altero explicantur omnia Judceorum nonnulla Gentium Profanorum Sacrificia; altero Sacrificium Christi*

*contra F. Socinum* (Lond. 1677, 4to; Amster. 1688, 12mo); this was translated into English, with additional notes and indexes, by John Allen, under the title of *Two Dissertations on Sacrifices; the first on all the Sacrifices of the Jews, with Remarks on some of those of the Heathens; the second on the Sacrifice of Christ; in both which the General Doctrine of the Christian Church on these Subjects is defended against the Socinians* (1817, 8vo; 1828, 8vo; 1833, 8vo). “Some of the best discussions on the subject of sacrifice,” says Orme, “are to be found in this work; and in no work is the typical relation of the ancient sacrifices to the nature and design of the death of Christ more satisfactorily explained. The English translation is respectably executed, and has made the work accessible to all.” “This work,” says Horne, “is of singular use to the divinity student, as affording, in a comparatively small compass — one of the most masterly vindications of the vicarious atonement of Christ: — *Twenty Sermons preached on several Occasions* (1652, 8vo, posth.; 2d ed. 1679, 8vo). These were edited by Dr. J. Gardiner, bishop of Lincoln, who commends them highly in his preface. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.; Orme, *Bibl. Bibl.* s.v.; Home, *Introd.* vol. ii.

### Ouvrard, Rene

a French ecclesiastic, was born at Chinon about 1620. He was intimate with Arnauld and other writers of Port-Royal. He died in 1694. He published treatises on music, theology, and mathematics.

### Ovalle

(sometimes written Ovaglie), ALFONSO DE, a Jesuit of Spanish extraction, was born in Chili in 1601. He died in 1651. He published in 1646 a *Historical Account of the Kingdom of Chili and the Jesuit Missions in that country*. See Backer, *Biblioth. des ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jesus* (1854), 2d series, p. 451.

### Ovampoland

SEE OVAMPOS. (below)

### Ovampos

or, as they are sometimes called, Otjiherero, are Africans, seemingly the connecting link between the *Kaffre* (q.v.) and *Negro* (q.v.). The country they live in is called Ovampoland, and is situated in the region north of the

great Namaqualand (q.v.), in South Africa, extending north to the Cuanene River, and south to the parallel of 23° S. lat. The land of the Ovamos is a much more fertile region than Namaqualand, from which it is separated by a wide belt of densely bushed country. It has but few rivers, and these not of a perennial nature. About fifty miles from the coast the country rises to a table-land about 6000 feet above the sea-level, and then declines to the south and east into the deserts of the Kalihari and the region of Lake Ngami. Many strong indications of copper-ore are found in various places. The principal rivers, or, rather, water-courses, are the Swakop, Kusip, and their branches, which enter the Atlantic a few miles north of Walfish Bay. The other rivers in the interior seem to lose themselves in the sands. The climate is healthy, except near the coast, where fever in some seasons prevails. It seldom rains in the coast region, which is a very desolate one, and almost devoid of water. Thunder-storms are very violent in the summer season. All the large mammalia are more or less plentiful, according as water may be found at the different drinking-places. Elephants, rhinoceroses, elands, and other large animals driven from the south by the march of civilization, take refuge in the desert lying east of Ovampoland, where sportsmen like Green and Andersson have been known to kill as many as twelve elephants in a day. The country was first described by Sir J. Alexander, who visited its south border. Mr. Galton afterwards penetrated much farther north; and Mr. C.J. Andersson has since fully explored it nearly as far north as Cuanene. Large numbers of horned cattle are annually collected by traders from the Cape in these regions, and whales abound on the coast. The trade in ostrich-feathers and ivory is of increasing importance, and several trading-stations are established for the collection of native products. The Ovamos are described by Andersson as of a very dark complexion, tall and robust, but remarkably ugly. He found them, however, honest, industrious, and hospitable. They are not entirely pastoral, but cultivate much corn. Living in the same country are the Cattle Damaras, with still more of the Negro type, a stout, athletic people, very dirty in their habits, and generally armed with the bow and arrow. They live in a state of constant warfare with the Ghondannup, or Hill Damaras, a nearly pure Negro race, on the one hand, and the Namaqua Hottentots, who live south of them, on the other.

“Little or nothing,” says the *Missionary World* (N. Y. 1874), “has as yet been done for the benefit of the wandering tribes which inhabit the dreary regions of Ovampoland.” German missionaries, employed by the Rhenish

Society, have labored here as well as in Namaqualand, but thus far no marked results have crowned their efforts for the Christianizing of the Ovampos. The missionaries have, however, succeeded in systematizing the Ovampo dialects, and they have even printed some elementary works in the Otjihehero dialect. Two of these appear in Sir G. Grey's catalogue.

## Ovation

a lesser triumph among the ancient Romans. The name seems to have been derived from the animal sacrificed on the occasion, which was not a bull, but a sheep (ovis). In an ovation the general entered the city on foot, clothed not in gorgeous robes, but simply in the toga praetexta of a magistrate. The wreath with which his brow was girt was composed not of laurel, but of myrtle. He carried no scepter in his hand. The procession by which he was attended consisted not of senators. and a victorious army, but of knights and plebeians. No trumpets heralded the general's entry into the city in the case of an ovation, but simply a band of flute-players.

## Oven

### Picture for Oven 1

(Heb. **רַנְנִי**, *tannur*', from the same root with the Chaldee **נְנִי** *to smoke*, Gr. **κλίβανος**), originally any receptacle for fire, as a furnace or kiln (comp. **גֵּנִי** Genesis 15:17; **נְנִי** Isaiah 31:9); but usually an oven for baking bread and cakes (see **נְנִי** Exodus 7:28; **נְנִי** Leviticus 2:4), not only that used by the baker (**נְנִי** Hosea 7:4, 6, 7), but also that in which the mistress of a house baked her bread (**נְנִי** Leviticus 26:26; and see Jahn. *Bibl. Archaeol.* 1:213; 2,182). This oven was built of brick, and was smeared within and without with clay. A fire. was kindled within it, and the dough was placed upon the side, where it baked, and was called **רַנְנִי הַפָּנִי**, *maapheh tannur* (**נְנִי** Leviticus 2:4). The **κλίβανος** of the Greeks appears to have been of a similar construction. Each household possessed such an article (**נְנִי** Exodus 8:3), and it was only in times of extreme dearth that the same oven sufficed for several families (**נְנִי** Leviticus 26:26). It was heated with dry twigs and grass (**נְנִי** Matthew 6:30), and the loaves were placed both inside and outside of it. It was also used for roasting meat (Mishna, *Taan.* 3:8). The heat of the oven furnished Hebrew writers with an image of rapid and violent destruction (**נְנִי** Psalm 21:9; **נְנִי** Hosea 7:7; **נְנִי** Malachi 4:1). But the Hebrews did not always possess such an oven, and often seem to

have baked their bread on the ground, which was first heated by a fire, or on thin plates of metal, and sometimes to have made an excavation in the earth, which answered the purpose (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v. **רִנְנָת**).

*SEE BAKE.*

## Picture for Oven 2

Among the modern Orientals the dough, when prepared, is not always baked at home. In towns there are public ovens and bakers by trade; and although the general rule in large and respectable families is to bake the bread at home, much bread is bought of the bakers by unsettled individuals and poor persons; and many small households send their dough to be baked at the public oven, the baker receiving for his trouble a portion of the baked bread, which he adds to his day's stock of bread for sale. Such public ovens and bakers by trade must have existed anciently in Palestine, and in the East generally, as is evident from <sup>28706</sup>Hosea 7:4 and <sup>28721</sup>Jeremiah 37:21. The latter text mentions the bakers' street (or, rather, bakers' place or market), and this would suggest that, as is the case at present, the bakers, as well as other trades, had a particular part of the bazaar or market entirely appropriated to their business, instead of being dispersed in different parts of the towns where they lived. *SEE CRACKNEL.*

For their larger operations the bakers have ovens of brick, not altogether unlike our own; and in large houses there are similar ovens. The ovens used in domestic baking are, however, usually of a portable description, and are large vessels of stone, earthenware, or copper, inside of which, when properly heated, small loaves and cakes are baked, and on the outer surface of which thin flaps of bread, or else a large wafer-like biscuit, may be prepared. This is adapted to the nomad state, and is the article generally intended by the Hebrew term *tannur*. It usually consists of a large jar made of clay, about three feet high, and widening towards the bottom, with a hole for the extraction of the ashes (Niebuhr, *Desc. de l'Arab.* p. 46). Occasionally, however, it is not an actual jar, but an erection of clay in the form of a jar, built on the floor of the house (Wellsted, *Travels*, 1:350). The oven is frequently covered with a chimney made of mud, to create a draught.

Another mode of making bread is much used, especially in the villages. A pit is sunk in the middle of the floor of the principal room, about four or five feet deep by three in diameter, well lined with compost or cement.



When sufficiently heated by a fire kindled at the bottom, the bread is made by the thin pancake-like flaps of dough being, by a peculiar knack of hand in the women, stuck against the oven, to which they adhere for a few moments, till they are sufficiently dressed. As this oven requires considerable fuel, it is seldom used except in those parts where that article is somewhat abundant, and where the winter cold is severe enough to render the warmth of the oven desirable, not only for baking bread, but for warming the apartment. *SEE FURNACE.*

Another sort of oven, or rather mode of baking, is much in use among the pastoral tribes. A shallow hole, about six inches deep by three or four feet in diameter, is made in the ground; this is filled up with dry brushwood, upon which, when kindled, pebbles are thrown to concentrate and retain the heat. Meanwhile the dough is prepared, and when the oven is sufficiently heated the ashes and pebbles are removed, and the spot well cleaned out. The dough is then deposited in the hollow, and is left there over night. The cakes thus baked are about two fingers thick, and are very palatable. There can be little doubt that this kind of oven and mode of baking bread were common among the Jews. Hence Hezel very ingeniously, if not truly, conjectures (*Real-Lexikon*, s. Vo Brod) comes the *γρᾶβ* *γλσι* (*salley choriy*, Sept. *κανᾶ χονδριτῶν*, Vulg. *canistra Jarin(e)*, *hole-bread baskets*, of <sup><0406></sup>Genesis 40:16, which he renders, or rather paraphrases, “baskets full of bread baked in holes,” not “white baskets”, *SEE BASKET*, as in the A.V., nor baskets full of holes,” as in our margin; nor “white bread,” as in most of the Continental versions, seeing that all bread is white in the East. As the process is slower and the bread more savory than any other, this kind of bread might certainly be entitled to the distinction implied in its being prepared for the table of the Egyptian king.

There is a baking utensil called in Arabic *tajen*, which is the same word (*τηγάνον*) by which the Sept. renders the Heb. *t bj ni* (*miachabhadth*), “pan” in <sup><0405></sup>Leviticus 2:5, etc. This leaves little doubt that the ancient Hebrews had this *tajen*. It is a sort of pan of earthenware or iron (usually the latter), flat, or slightly convex, which is put over a slow fire, and on which the thin flaps of dough are laid and baked with considerable expedition, although only one cake can be baked in this way at a time. This is not a household mode of preparing bread, but is one of the simple and primitive processes employed by the wandering and semi-wandering tribes,

shepherds, husbandmen, and others, who have occasion to prepare a small quantity of daily bread in an easy, off-hand manner. Bread is also baked in a manner which, although apparently very different, is but a modification of the principle of the *tajen*, and is used chiefly in the houses of the peasantry. There is a cavity in the fire-hearth, in which, when required for baking, a fire is kindled and burned down to hot embers. A plate of iron, or sometimes copper, is placed over the hole, and on this the bread is baked.

*SEE BREAD.*

Another mode of baking is in use chiefly among the pastoral tribes, and by travelers in the open country, but is not unknown in the villages. A smooth, clear spot is chosen in the loose ground, a sandy soil — so common in the Eastern deserts and harder lands — being preferred. On this a fire is kindled, and when the ground is sufficiently heated the embers and ashes are raked aside, and the dough is laid on the heated spot, and then covered over with the glowing embers and ashes which had just been removed. The bread is several times turned, and in less than half an hour is sufficiently baked. Bread thus baked is called in Scripture **חֻגַּח** (*uggah*), “cake” (<sup>-0186</sup>Genesis 18:6; <sup>-1173</sup>1 Kings 17:13; <sup>-2042</sup>Ezekiel 4:12, etc.), and the indication <sup>-1196</sup>1 Kings 19:6 is very clear, “cake baked on the coals” (*coal-cakes*), i.e. cakes baked under the coals. The Sept. expresses this word very fairly by **ἐγκρυφία**, *panis subcinericius* (<sup>-0186</sup>Genesis 18:6; <sup>-0123</sup>Exodus 12:39). According to Busbequius (*Itin.* p. 36), the name of *Ilugath*, which he interprets ash-cakes, or ash-bread, was in his time still applied in Bulgaria to cakes prepared in this fashion; and as soon as a stranger arrived in the village the women baked such bread in all haste, in order to sell it to him. This conveys an interesting illustration of <sup>-0186</sup>Genesis 16:6, where Sarah, on the arrival of three strangers, was required to bake “quickly” such ash-bread though not for sale, but for the hospitable entertainment of the unknown travelers. The bread thus prepared is good and palatable, although the outer rind, or crust, is apt to smell and taste of the smoke and ashes. The necessity of turning these cakes gives a satisfactory explanation of <sup>-2008</sup>Hosea 7:8, where Ephraim is compared to a cake not turned, i.e. only baked on one side, while the other is raw and adhesive. *SEE ASH-CAKE.*

### Overall, John

an English prelate, was born in 1559, and, after a proper preliminary training, was educated successively at St. John's College, Cambridge and at

Trinity College, of which he was chosen fellow. In 1596 he was appointed regius professor of divinity, when he took the degree of D.D., and about the same time was elected master of Catherine Hall in the same university. In 1601 he was preferred to the deanery of St. Paul's, London, by the recommendation of his patron, Sir Fulk Greville, and queen Elizabeth; and in the beginning of James's reign was chosen prolocutor of the lower house of convocation. In 1612 he was appointed one of the first governors of the Charterhouse Hospital, then just founded by Thomas Sutton. In April, 1614, he was made bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; and in 1618 was transferred to Norwich. where he died in May, 1619. He was buried in that cathedral, where he lay unnoticed till some time after the restoration of Charles II, when Cosin, bishop of Durham, who had been his secretary, erected a monument in 1669 to his memory. Overall is characterized by Wood as being the best scholastic divine in the English nation; and Cosin, who perhaps may be thought to rival him in that learning, calls himself his scholar, and expressly declares that he derived all his knowledge from him. Bishop Overall is also extolled by Smith for his distinguished wisdom, erudition, and piety. In the controversy which in his time divided the Reformed churches about predestination and grace, he held ground inclining rather to Arminianism; and seems to have paved the way for the reception of that doctrine in England, where it was generally embraced a few years afterwards, chiefly by the authority and influence of archbishop Laud. Overall had a particular friendship for Gerard Vossius and Grotius; and was much grieved to see the love of peace, and the projects of this last great man to obtain it, so ill requited. He labored heartily himself to accord the differences in Holland, upon what is known by the name of the Quinquarticular controversy. Overall's chief work was the *Convocation Book concerning the Government of God's Catholick Church and the Kingdoms of the Whole World* (London, 1690). This treatise was adopted by the convocations of Canterbury and York, but was left unpublished by request of king James I. Overall's object in its compilation was to advocate the superior claims of the throne, and to dispute the claim of those who would place the episcopal office, as by divine right, superior to the throne. He also denies the Presbyterian claim of the superiority of the πρεσβύτερος over the king by divine right. He also teaches that "there is no more necessity of one visible head over the Catholic Church than of one visible monarch over all the world," and that "a government, which had originated in rebellion, ought, when thoroughly settled, to be considered as ordained by God, and as such to be obeyed by clergy and laity." Not having received

the royal confirmation, the book is held as possessing no legal authority, yet there is no room to doubt that it was designed to be received as an authentic exposition of the mind of the Anglican Church on the subjects of which it treats. This work, preserved in manuscript for eighty-four years, was first given to the world by archbishop Sancroft in 1690, with the design of injuring the new government; but an important passage in it which had been overlooked reconciled William Sherlock to the oaths, and he no longer refused to take them. A new edition of the work was published in the "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology" (1844). — Bishop Overall also wrote *Sententia de Predestinatione* (London, 1651). He is besides named among the translators of the Bible, and as a writer of that portion of the Catechism of the Church of England which concerns the sacraments. For Overall's *Notes on the Common Prayer*, see Nichols, *Commentary*; for his remarks on *The Necessity of One Visible Head*, see Wordsworth, *Christian Institutes*, 4:135 and for his remarks *On a Middle State*, see Campbell, *Doctrines of a Middle State*. See also *Biographical Dictionary*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, s.v.; Adolphus, *Manual for Students in Theology* (see Index); M'Elhinney, *The Doctrine of the Church*, p. 260; Hallam, *Literature*, 2:358; Stoughton, *Ecclesiastical History of England (Church of the Restoration)*, 1:219; Wordsworth, *Ecclesiastical Biography*, 1:128 sq.; 4:297 sq.

### Overbakh, Peter A.

a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in 1779. He studied theology under Livingston, and was licensed to preach in 1803. From 1805 to 1806 he was stationed at Bethlehem and Corymans, N. Y.; from 1806 to 1809, at Woodstock; from 1809 to 1817, at Woodstock and Flatbush (Ulster Co.). After 1834 he also preached at Plattekill station. He died in 1843. Through his influence the character of the community in which he spent his ministry was greatly changed. He organized a Church in Flatbush with a dozen members, and left it with three hundred, besides having formed a new organization near by. Overbakh's labors, though mostly obscure, resulted in many conversions, and he was regarded as an eminently useful and faithful man. See Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church in America*, p. 174, 175.

## Overbeck, Friedrich,

a distinguished German painter, to whom is justly awarded a large share of the merit for the movement in the early part of this century from which arose the modern German school of art, was born at Lubeck July 3, 1789. He began his studies as an artist at Vienna in 1806 but having adopted and continued to persist in carrying out certain notions of art, and the mode of studying it, essentially different from those inculcated in the academy, he was expelled along with certain other students who entertained the same views, and in 1809 set out for Rome. There he was soon afterwards joined by the now world-wide renowned painters Cornelius and Schadow; and these three, animated with similar ideas, and mutually encouraging one another, laid the foundation of a school that in no small degree influences the taste for art in Europe at the present time. The old German school of painting, partly under the influence of the dominant French taste, and partly guided by the maxims and practice of Mengs (q.v.), had been seeking inspiration almost exclusively from classic sources, and drawing its technical principles from the study of the later painters of Italy. But coincident with the casting off of the trammels of modern French criticism and ancient forms in literature, there had been growing up a desire for a return to a less academic or eclectic system in art; and Friedrich Schlegel, a leading critical advocate of the Romantic school in literature, was the herald and prophet of the new school of national German art. Overbeck was well prepared to become one of the advocates and propagators of these new ideas and, together with his two celebrated friends and a host of followers, the new school rapidly developed. He paid entire devotion to the style of the Italian artists prior to the period of the Renaissance, particularly Fra Angelico (b. 1387; d. 1455), and manifested a strong aversion to a dependence on the form of drawing in the style of Greek or classic art in works embodying religious subjects; although many of his compatriots — Cornelius, for instance — modified or perhaps enlarged these ideas, and studied the works of Michael Angelo and those of Raphael's later style executed under the influence of classic art. Overbeck first became noted by a picture of the *Madonna*, which he painted at Rome in 1811. He was next employed, along with Cornelius and others, by the Prussian consul, general Bartholdi. to execute certain frescos illustrating the history of Joseph; the *Selling of Joseph*; and the *Seven lean Years* being the subjects assigned to him. After completing these, he painted in fresco, in the villa of the marchese Massimi, five large compositions from

*Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered.* In 1814 he and several of his artistic brethren abjured Lutheranism, and embraced the Roman Catholic religion. In 1815 he completed *Christ at the house of Martha and Mary*, which went far to secure his great reputation; but his grand picture, *Christ entering Jerusalem* — (about eight feet by five and a half), finished in the following year for the Marienkirche at Lubeck, was that which may be said to have established his fame: there can be little hesitation in saying that, despite its crudenesses, it was in many respects one of the grandest scriptural pictures which had been painted since the decay of art initially. Though a slow worker — his design being first elaborately thought out, and then laboriously corrected — the productions of a man who had been for nearly half a century constantly working are far too numerous to be mentioned here, even if we had the materials for completing the list. Overbeck's chief work is a fresco at Assisi, *The Miracle of Roses of St. Francis*. His oil-pictures are inferior to his frescos, being dry and weak in color. His great picture, *The Influence of Religion on Art*, preserved in the Stadel Institute at Frankfort, and well known from the engraving, is an admirable composition, and is indeed the most favorable specimen of his powers as a painter in oil-colors. In this vast production he has sought to symbolize in a single design the development of art — including music, architecture, sculpture, and painting — under the influence of Christianity. Christ in the act of blessing, and the Virgin recording the Magnificat, occupy the middle of the upper compartment of the picture, while the saints and prophets of the Old and the apostles of the *New Testament* are assembled around, and the representatives of the several arts fill the different stages or compartments into which the picture is divided. It is a work full of learning, thought, and fine feeling, but one which to understand, much less to do full justice to, it is necessary to study from the artist's own point of view, and with a clear conception of his central idea—to an ordinary spectator by no means an easy matter; He executed a great many drawings remarkable for high feeling, most of which have been engraved. One of his last undertakings, a series of designs from the Evangelists, delicately engraved in the line manner, is a work of high excellence. He died at Rome Nov. 12, 1869, and was buried in one of the churches of the Eternal City in tribute to his eminent services to sacred art. "The works of Overbeck are marked by unflinching invention, great refinement and delicacy of expression, considerable power of drawing, and a style of composition which presents his design with the greatest conceivable perspicuity. Where there is obscurity, as there sometimes is, it

rests in the idea and not in the manner of its presentation. But his treatment of his themes is essentially subjective: in other words, he seems to have always sought to carry out Schlegel's principle that in all Christian themes the treatment must be spiritual and symbolic rather than human and dramatic. Hence his works display a calm devotional beauty and simplicity rather than energy or brilliancy of style. This spirituality and symbolism of style and thought rise in the works of Overbeck not infrequently into grandeur, and are always impressive; but often, even in his hands, they run into coldness, obscurity, and mannerism. But the nobleness and purity of aim, the great artistic knowledge and power, the fine poetic genius which pervades almost every production of his pencil, and his singleness of purpose, must always secure for the name of Friedrich Overbeck a high place in the history of art, and one of the very highest among the painters of the 19th century" (*Enyl. Cyclop.*). See Nagler, *Kinstler-Lexikon*, s.v.; Raczynski, *Histoire de l'Art Allemand modern*, Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Overberg, Bernhard

a distinguished German theologian and writer, was born at Hoeckel, near Osnabruck, about 1757. In 1774 he went to study theology at Munster, was ordained priest in 1780, and appointed professor in the normal school of Munster in 1783. In 1789 he became intimate with princess Amelie Gallitzine (q.v.), and this friendship lasted until death. In 1809 he was appointed regent of the episcopal seminary, and counselor of the Consistory in 1816. He died Nov. 9, 1826. He was very active in promoting the cause of education in the diocese of Munster. His principal works are, *Anweisung zum Schulunterrichte* (1795): — *Biblische Geschichte* (1796): — *Religionshandbuch nebst den beiden Katechismen* (1804, several eds.). His biography was written by J. Neinermann (Munster, 1829) and by Krabbe (*ibid.* 1832; 2d ed. 1846). See Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 12:529; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 10:743 sq. (J. N.P.)

### Overbury Sir Thomas,

an English author who flourished in the second half of the 17th century, but of whose personal history we know scarcely anything, is noted as the author of *A true and perfect Account of the Examination, Trial, Condemnation, and Execution of Joan Perry and her two Sons for the supposed Murder of William Harrison, written by way of Letter to Thomas*

*Shirley, M.D., in London (1676): — Queries proposed to the serious Consideration of those who impose upon others in things of divine and supernatural Revelation, and prosecute any upon the Account of Religion; with a Desire of their candid and Christian Resolution thereof (1677): — in answer to criticisms on the above, Ratiocinium Vernaculum, or a Reply to Ataxice Obstaculum, etc.*

## Overseer

(usually **dyqβē**, *pakid'*, visitor, <sup><0304></sup>Genesis 39:4; 41:34; but Piel of **j xñ**; to *preside*, in <sup><4102></sup>2 Chronicles 2:2, 18; 34:13; **rfáv**, in <sup><1007></sup>Proverbs 6:7; **ἐπίσκοπος**, a bishop, in <sup><4018></sup>Acts 20:28), not only an officer who had the superintendence of the household, as Joseph had in that of Pontiphar, but also an overlooker of work-men, as those appointed by Solomon (<sup><4428></sup>2 Chronicles 2:18) **SEE OFFICER**. We read that Pharaoh set taskmasters or overseers, over the children of Israel, who “made their lives bitter with hard bondage” (<sup><0114></sup>Exodus 1:14), a statement fully confirmed by the monuments, where the taskmasters are uniformly represented armed with cudgels. **SEE BASTINADO**. In the margins of many of the Psalms, the Hebrew word **j Xēm** is properly rendered *overseer*, meaning probably the *chief musician*, as the text has it. (See Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v.) **SEE CHIEF MUSICIAN**.

## Overseer

**SEE BISHOP; SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE PRELACY.**

## Overton, Samuel

an English minister of the Society of Friends, was born in the county of Warwick in 1668. He entered the ministry in 1694, and labored therein forty-three years. He is noted as one of the first of those concerned in establishing meetings for Church discipline in Warwickshire. He died July 23, 1737. See Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, 3:225.

## Oviedo, Council Of

(*Concilium Ovetense*), was held about 877, according to Pagi (Mansi says the date is altogether uncertain). King Alphonso, his queen, and sons were present, and eighteen bishops. Several useful regulations were drawn up. The Church of Oviedo was erected into a metropolitan see, and



Hermenegilde, who presided over it, was recognized as head over the other bishops, to labor with them for the re-establishment of discipline in the Church, which had been impaired by the rule of the infidels. See Labbe, *Conc.* 9:501.

### Ovington, John

an English ecclesiastical writer and traveler, was born in the 17th century. He was chaplain to king James II. In 1689 he sailed to the East Indies, and spent several years in Surat. He published in 1698 his *Voyage to Surat in the years 1689-1693*, etc., which was translated into French. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Thomas, *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology*, s.v.

### Owen, Anning

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the State of New York in 1751. He is said to have been a member of the Congregational Church in early life; but he dated his conversion from the Indian battle in Wyoming in 1778. His account of this event was as follows: When the retreat commenced on the battle-field he expected to be killed, and determined that, should he be shot, his last breath should be spent in calling upon God for mercy. Having secreted himself under a grape-vine on the margin of the river, he there gave his heart to God, and found peace to his soul. He united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was soon licensed to preach; was ordained deacon in 1791; joined the traveling connection in 1795; and in 1797 received elder's orders. He was three years presiding elder on the Susquehanna District; continued in the itinerancy nineteen or twenty years; traveled extensively in the north-western part of New York, and was one of the first Methodist laborers in many parts: of the old Genesee Conference. In 1813, in consequence of bodily infirmities. he received a superannuated relation. He died at Ulysses, Cayuga County, N. Y., in April, 1814. He is described as a zealous, good man, very eccentric, and at times quite eloquent. Possessed of little learning, he nevertheless was ready in thought, shrewd and witty, and never at a loss for adequate means of communication with the people. He labored with all his might, and when he was convinced that he was right nothing could turn him aside. Of great religious sympathy, of mighty faith, and tremendous power, the labors of Anning Owen were eminently successful. See Connable, *Hist. of the Genesee Conference* (N. Y. 1876), chap. i.

## Owen, Griffith

a minister of the Society of Friends, flourished towards the close of the 17th century. He died in 1717. As a minister of the Gospele was lively and pathetic; as a member of religious society, he was active and exemplary. William Penn, in one of his letters, mentions him as “tender Griffith Owen, who sees and feels.” For some years he was an active member of the governor's council. He was not only a minister, but practiced medicine, and was eminently useful in the newly settled province. He was universally beloved through life, and lamented at death. See Janney, *Hist. of the Friends*, 3:67, 187.

## Owen, Henry M.D.,

a learned divine of the Church of England, was born in 1716, near Dolgelly, in Merionethshire. He was educated at the grammar school of Ruthin, in Wales, whence he was removed to Jesus College, Oxford. His attention was primarily directed towards the medical profession; but, changing his purpose, he took orders, and, after various preferments, became in 1760 rector of St. Olave, Hart Street, and vicar of Edmonton, in Middlesex. In 1775 he also obtained the living of Edmonton. He died in 1795. He published, *The Intent and Propriety of the Scripture Miracles*, a most valuable work: — *Observations on the Four Gospels: — Directions to Students in Divinity: — Inquiry into the State of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: — Critica Sacra, or a Short Introduction to Hebrew Criticism: — Collatio Codicis Cottoniani Geneseos, cum editione Romana a viro clarissimo. Johanne Ernesto Grabe*, deemed the most ancient manuscript in Europe: — *Critical Disquisitions: — The Modes of Quotation used by the Evangelical Writers*. “All of Dr. Henry Owen's works,” says Orme, are characterized by sound criticism and laborious research. Bishop Marsh, who says that he is an excellent critic, observes that his *Historical and Critical Account of the Septuagint Version* should be read by every man who wishes to be acquainted with the history of that version” (*Bibl. Bibl.* [1839] p. 187). See Nichols; *Lit. Anecdotes*; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.; Jones, *Christian Biog.* s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.

## Owen, James

a minister of the Society of Friends, was born Feb. 18, 1822, near Caesar's Creek. Ohio, and was religiously trained. In 1826 his family removed to

Hendricks County, Indiana, where he learned something of the difficulties and privations incident to frontier life. He was recorded as a minister Sept. 8, 1849. He labored in Iowa in 1849, visited the yearly meetings of Philadelphia, New York, and New England in 1850. and soon after went again to Indiana and Ohio. In 1854 he again visited Iowa, and, in view of the rapid emigration of Friends to that state, left his home, then in Howard County, Indiana, and settled at Bangor, Iowa, in 1855. Here he was subjected again to many privations. Afterwards he visited the Friends of Indiana, Ohio, Maryland, and North Carolina, and labored among the freedmen in Kentucky, Tennessee, and Arkansas. March 16, 1869, he went on a visit to the Society of Friends and others in England, Ireland, and some parts of the Continent. He returned to America, and visited in course Baltimore and North Carolina yearly meetings, and appointed meetings within the limits of Randolph and other counties, as many as seventeen per week. The climate of this latitude proved detrimental to his health, and an attack of typhoid pneumonia obliged him to seek a northern climate. He died Jan. 2, 1871, and was interred in the Friends' cemetery at New Providence, Iowa. James Owen was eminently successful in his unusually abundant ministerial labors. The weightiness of his spirit, the edifying manner in which he preached, and the solemnity of his appeals, together with his sincere kindness and genial ways, gave him a place in the hearts of all, both old and young, within the scope of his acquaintance. See *Friends' Review* (Philadelphia), Nov. 2, 1872.

### Owen, John (1),

an English divine of the Puritan age, and most conspicuous among the English Congregationalists of his day. Descended from an ancient and honored family in Wales, he was born (1616) at Stadham, near Oxford. His father, Henry Owen, was an earnest and laborious minister in the Church of England, but a Nonconformist. At the age of twelve he was entered a student at Queen's College, Oxford, where, while he was still a boy, his diligence in study and his progress in all the departments of learning were such as are not often equaled by maturer minds. From the first he seems to have had in view the clerical profession; but in the early years of his university life he was impelled (as he afterwards believed and confessed) by no better motive than ambition for eminence and power in the Church of England. In the progress of his studies he was awakened by the Spirit of God to higher thoughts and aspirations; and he began to work with religious conscientiousness, seeking to do God's will, though he had not

yet attained the full freedom of the sons of God. The Puritan habit of thinking and the Puritan spirit, which Owen had inherited from his father, brought him into collision with certain ritualisms which Laud, then chancellor of the university, was forcing upon Oxford, and which to the evangelical party of those days seemed to be "popish superstitions." Compelled to choose between a compliance with the new regulations and a relinquishment of his place and hopes in the university, he chose the latter. He was then twenty-one years of age, having commenced master of arts two years before, and having been more recently ordained to the ministry of the Church of England. That confession of Puritanism cost him (as he knew it must) the favor of an uncle in Wales who had chiefly supported him, and whose estate he was expected to inherit. At that time the conflict between king Charles I and the English people as represented in Parliament was impending, and men everywhere, young and old, were taking sides. Owen had taken the side of reformation in the Church and of chartered liberty in the state; and all who knew him knew where he would be found. To such a man, so long as Laud might remain at the helm of the ecclesiastical establishment, there was no prospect of preferment. Many a Puritan clergyman in those days found refuge and employment as chaplain or tutor, or both, in the family of some nobleman or gentleman favorable to that party. Such was the beginning of Owen's ministry. But at the outbreak of the civil war the nobleman in whose family he was then employed took arms for the king, while he himself declared for the Parliament, and not only lost his place, but was disinherited by his Welsh uncle. Being thus thrown upon the world, he removed to London, which had become the metropolis of Puritanism. His religious life at the university and in the country had been earnest and resolute, but had not been enriched with the joy of salvation. He had not found in his own experience an assured peace with God through Christ. But it happened to him, not long after his removal to London, that having gone on a Sabbath morning to hear a celebrated preacher, he was disappointed by seeing a stranger in the pulpit. The unknown preacher's text, "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" was so appropriate to Owen's habit of mind that it commanded his most earnest attention, and the sermon that followed led him into the light. Thenceforward he knew how to rest upon the Gospel with a cheerful and sustaining confidence. His removal to London seems to have been with a view to the publication of a work on the chief theological controversy of that age. His *Display of Arminianism*, published in 1642, was an elaborate confutation of the doctrines which Laud and his abettors were introducing

into the originally Calvinistic Church of England, and which were regarded on all sides as having more than an accidental connection with the party of absolutism in the state, as well as with tendencies Rome-ward in the Church. The learning and ability of that book, written by a young man of twenty-six years, commended its author to the Parliamentary committee for purging the Church of scandalous ministers, and thus it was the occasion of his being introduced to a pastoral charge. The incumbent of the parish church at Fordham, in Essex, having been found scandalous, the living was "sequestered," and Owen was commissioned to supply the vacancy. In that retired parish his ability as a preacher, and his diligence in visiting the families and catechizing the children of his flock, gave character and success to his ministry, so that in 1646 (when he was thirty years of age) he was called to preach before the House of Commons at one of their monthly fasts. Not far from that time the incumbent of Fordham, whose place he was occupying, having died, the right of presentation to the living was exercised by the patron, and Owen was displaced. Immediately the people of Coggeshall, in the same county, invited him to become their minister; and by the Puritan earl of Warwick, patron of that parish, he was presented to the living. The invitation came from a people who had been trained in Christian knowledge and duty by faithful ministers, and who called him because they knew him. It was by the patron's judicious use of his right of presentation that the parish had become so competent to choose; and his confirmation of the people's choice, when they chose so wisely, was a matter of course. Till this time Owen had accepted, in a general way, the Presbyterian theory of a National Church, governed by classical and synodical courts; but in connection with his removal to Coggeshall he began to act more definitely upon those principles of ecclesiastical polity which, in that age and country, more than now and here, distinguished the Independents or Congregationalists from the Puritans of the Presbyterian party. Long afterwards, reviewing what he had asserted and practiced in the administration of his parish at Fordham, and describing the change in his position, he said, "I found that my principles were far more suited to what is the judgment and practice of the Congregational men than to those of the Presbyterian." Yet he had considered himself a Presbyterian, for he had not consciously advanced beyond the position of his Puritan friends. His acquaintance was not with any of the ministers or of the people who held "the Congregational way," but wholly with those of "the Presbyterian way." When the question between those two parties was becoming the great question in England, he set himself "seriously to inquire into the

controversy.” After reading much of what had been written on both sides, he proceeded in his study of the question as his manner had been in other controversies. He “took under peculiar consideration and examination” the work — “which seemed most methodically and strongly to maintain that which was contrary,” as he thought, to what was then his own persuasion. The book thus selected was from New England — John Cotton's book of *The Keys*; and to “the examination and confutation” of that book he addressed himself “for his own particular satisfaction.” His own account of the result is, “Quite beside and contrary to my expectation, at a time and season when I could expect nothing on that account but ruin in this world, without the knowledge or advice of or conference with any one person of that judgment, I was prevailed upon to receive those principles which I had thought to have set myself in opposition unto.” He had published, while at Fordham, a tract entitled *The Duty of Pastor and People Distinguished*. His first publication after coming to his new charge was *Eshcol, or Rules of Church Fellowship*; and thenceforward he found himself among the champions of Congregationalism, or Church independency against the theory of a National Church under a National Church government. Yet his mind and heart were always set much more upon great questions in theology, and upon the theines of Christian experience and Christian living, than upon questions of Church polity. His *Eshcol* was a simple tract for use in his own parish; but the more arduous labor of his mind and of his pen, while he ministered to that congregation of two thousand souls, appears in another publication. *Saclus Electorum, Sanguis Jesu, or the Death of Death in the Death of Christ*, a volume of more than 300 pages, quarto. was another of his battles against Arminianism. About that time, Essex having become a principal seat of the war, Fairfax, the chief commander of the Parliamentary forces, had his headquarters for a while at Coggeshall during the siege of Colchester, and Owen, who seems to have served temporarily as his chaplain, became one of his friends. After the fall of Colchester and the deliverance of the Parliament committee who had been held captive there (which virtually ended the war in England), he preached a Thanksgiving sermon to the victorious army, and another, at another place, to the committee in celebration of their deliverance — the two sermons from the same text, and so connected that they were published as one discourse. At the age of thirty-two years he had attained the highest rank among the preachers as well as among the controversial theologians of his generation. A few months later he was required, at very short notice, to preach before Parliament on an occasion unique in history. It was the

day after that 30th of January, 1649, which saw the king beheaded in the name of justice for crimes against the people. The sermon on that occasion is remarkable for its abstinence from any explicit reference to the great event of the preceding day; but a careful reading of it will show that while the preacher did not find himself called to sit in judgment on the High Court of Justice, or to pronounce a sentence of approval or disapproval on what that court had done, he did not fear to teach that inasmuch as kings have their power from the formal or informal consent of the people, and inasmuch as the people are therefore held responsible in God's providence for the crimes of those whom they permit to rule them, kings are of right responsible to the people whom they rule. To the sermon, as published by request of Parliament, he appended a most timely *Discourse on Toleration*, maintaining that religion, as such, does not come within the province of the magistrate, and that, therefore; the state ought not to concern itself with the suppression of any religious error which does not directly assail the foundations of society or the public peace. At the moment when the party with which his interests were identified, and of which as a religious party he had become a leader, was wielding the supreme power, he demanded of Parliament liberty for all to worship God according to their own convictions. Less than three months elapsed before he was again called to preach before Parliament, the principal officers of the army being also present, among whom was Cromwell, then lately appointed lord-lieutenant of Ireland. That was his sermon on the shaking of heaven and earth, from ~~8127~~ Hebrews 12:27. The next day Cromwell met Owen for the first time, and, immediately taking him aside, announced his intention with regard to Ireland, and invited him to go as chaplain, and to aid in reforming and restoring the University of Dublin. Yielding to the advice of brethren in the ministry, and to the urgency of the great chief, whose earnest invitation was equivalent to a command, he left his parish for the time. While preparations for the expected campaigns were in progress he had the opportunity of preaching on another memorable occasion before Parliament, the council of state, and the council of the army, the occasion being a national thanksgiving when the attempt at military revolution by the Levellers had been suppressed. Going to Ireland, he remained in Dublin preaching to attentive multitudes, investigating the affairs of the university, and devising measures for its benefit. Returning with Cromwell to England, he was again summoned to preach before Parliament on a day of national fasting. In consequence of his representations and appeals on that occasion, seconded as they were by Cromwell, the Parliament passed an ordinance

for the encouragement of religion and learning in Ireland. Certain lands were appropriated to the support of Trinity College, to the founding of another college in that university with maintenance for teachers, and to the establishment of a free school with support for masters and scholars. At the same time six of the most acceptable preachers in England were sent over to give reputation to the restored university, and they, till the provided endowments should become productive, were to be supported from the public revenue. So conspicuous had Owen become in connection with public affairs that he was soon required to leave his flock again, and to go with the lord-general into Scotland, where Presbyterianism had anointed the second Charles for king, and was in arms against the commonwealth of England. Accordingly he was with Cromwell through that strange campaign in which sermons and theological disputations alternated with sieges and cannonadings. Returning once more to his home and his parochial work, he was soon appointed dean of Christ Church College at Oxford, his great friend Cromwell having been already made chancellor of the university. The next year he became by Cromwell's appointment vicechancellor, and the chief responsibility for the welfare of the university came upon him. Owen's administration at Oxford was perhaps the most active — certainly not the least useful period of his life. The university had been brought almost to ruin by the long war, Oxford having been for a time the royal residence, and its colleges having exhausted their resources in the vain attempt to sustain the divine right of Charles Stuart to govern England according to his absolute will. When the victories achieved for Parliament had ended the conflict, some of the colleges had been closed, others had been converted into barracks and military storehouses; the university was overwhelmed with debt; and the students, diminished in number, were characterized more by insubordination and licentious behavior than by diligence in study or by generous aspirations. To Owen was committed the public work of raising the university from its low estate, and of making it, more than it had ever been before, the seat of learning and of religion. He restored order and salutary discipline. He gathered around him men conspicuous by their ability, such as John Howe, Charnock, Thomas Goodwin, Theophilus Gale, Pocock the Orientalist, and Ward the astronomer — men not of the Independent party only, but of various party connections or of none. His government, severe towards licentious practices, was tolerant of honest differences; he conciliated the Presbyterians by bestowing upon eminent preachers of that party some of the livings of which he was officially the patron; and, at a time when the



use of the old Book of Common Prayer was regarded by law as proof of hostility to the existing government, he silently permitted a meeting of Episcopalians every Lord's day hard by his own lodgings. So manifest was the revival and prosperity of learning there that, after the restoration of Charles II, even the enemies of Puritanism were compelled to acknowledge the fact. Clarendon's reluctant testimony for the university as governed by Owen is, "It yielded a harvest of extraordinary good and sound knowledge in all parts of learning; and many who were wickedly introduced applied themselves to the study of learning and the practice of virtue; so that when it pleased God to bring king Charles II back to his throne, he found the university abounding in excellent learning, and little inferior to what it was before its desolation." While thus presiding over the university, Owen never intermitted his work as a preacher, nor was he relieved from the responsibility of often advising those in whose hands were the interests of the commonwealth. It is difficult to see how even he, under such burdens, could find time for the labors of authorship. But during that period many of his most elaborate and learned treatises were published — some in Latin, others in English. Owen's retirement from the vice-chancellorship followed soon after the crisis at which Cromwell found himself constrained to decline the title of king, offered to him by the Parliament as a means of restoring the ancient forms of government under a new dynasty. Owen opposed that movement, and was the author of the petition which was presented to the protector in the name of his early and best friends, and which overruled in his mind his own judgment, convincing him that, though governing with more than kingly power, he could not assume the kingly name without the ruin of "the good old cause." Cromwell, invested with new dignity in the state, transferred the chancellorship of Oxford to his son Richard, who appointed a new vice-chancellor. Owen remained in the deanery of Christ Church College till a few months before the restoration of the Stuart monarchy. From Oxford he retired to his native place, where a Congregational Church, previously gathered by his ministry, received him as its pastor. But the suppression of such congregations, by an Act of Parliament forbidding more than five persons to meet for worship in any unauthorized place, was an early consequence of the restoration; and thenceforward his preaching to little secret assemblies, or sometimes more publicly, when persecution grew less violent, was always in violation of law. In 1663 he received, but for some unrecorded reason did not accept, an invitation to New England. The First Church in Boston called him to become the successor of John Cotton and John Norton, and the colleague

of John Wilson; and for several years his coming was confidently expected. When Charles II, in 1671, proclaimed his "declaration of indulgence," virtually abrogating those acts of Parliament which inflicted penalties on Roman Catholic recusants and Protestant dissenters, there was a measure of liberty which Owen did not hesitate to use. He began to preach openly in London. Under his ministry a Church was constituted—the same which, in another generation, enjoyed the pastoral ministrations of Isaac Watts. He was still recognized as the leading man of the Independents; and, though under the ban of the law for his nonconformity, he was widely honored, and had powerful friends even in the House of Lords. On one occasion, being at Tunbridge Wells, when the king and the duke of York (afterwards James II) were there, he was invited to the royal tent; and Charles talked freely with him about the laws against dissenters. Afterwards, at London, the king invited him to repeated interviews on the same subject, and even entrusted him with a thousand guineas for the relief of suffering Nonconformists. Of course it was well understood, all the while, that the king's sympathy was not with nonconforming Protestants, but with recusant Romanists. Those latest years of Owen's life were in one respect the most productive. Persecuted or tolerated, worshipping in secret conventicles or openly preaching the Word, he seems to have been always writing, and the demand for his books seems to have been constant. His greatest and best-remembered works (of which the most voluminous is his *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*) are the product of those years. His last work (destined to be posthumous) was *Meditations on the Glory of Christ*, and the first sheet of it only had been printed when he departed, rejoicing that he was to see that "Glory" face to face. His death took place at Ealing, near London, Aug. 24, 1683. Eleven days afterwards a procession of more than sixty noblemen in carriages drawn by six horses each, and of many others in mourning coaches and on horseback," followed his remains along the streets of London to their burial in Bunhill-fields.

Many of Owen's works have been often reprinted, and are among the classics of English religious literature. A collected edition of all his works in twenty-three volumes, the first being *Memoirs of his Life*, by the Rev. William Orme, was published at London in 1820. Another edition, in twenty-four volumes, carefully edited by the Rev. William H. Goold, and including a *Memoir* by the Rev. Andrew Thomson, was published at Edinburgh in 1850, and republished at Philadelphia in 1860. The last-

named memoir has been used (but not exclusively) in the preparation of this article. See also Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of the Dissenters*, 1:444; Nea., *Hist. of the Puritans*; *Princeton Rev.* 1852, p. 165 sq.; *Presbyt. Rev.* Oct. 1862; *North Brit. Rev.* Nov. 1851; *Kitto's Jour. Sac. Lit.* July, 1854, p. 466. (L. B.)

### Owen, John (2),

a divine of the Church of England, was born in London in 1765, and received his education at St. Paul's School and at Cambridge. Having taken orders, he became a popular preacher at Fulham, and obtained from bishop Porteus the living of Paglesham, in Essex. Dr. Randolph, the successor of the bishop in the see of London, insisting upon Mr. Owen's residence at his rectory, he was obliged to relinquish the curacy of Fulham. whereupon the inhabitants of the parish presented him with a purse of near £700. On the institution of the British and Foreign Bible Society he became one of the secretaries, and for eighteen years was the most active of its members. He died Sept. 26, 1822. Besides various tracts and sermons, he was the author of *The Retrospect, or Reflections on the State of Religion and Politics in France and Great Britain: — The Christian Monitor for the Last Days: The Fashionable World Displayed: — Vindication of the Bible Society, its History*, etc.; and works of travel in different parts of Europe. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.

### Owen, John Jason D.D., LL.D.,

a noted American Biblical scholar and educator, was born at Colbrook, Conn., August, 1803. While very young, although surrounded by unfavorable circumstances he devoted himself earnestly to study, more particularly with a view to the mastery of the ancient languages. His early life, especially, was characterized by remarkable perseverance. Without aid, except that furnished by his own mind, he undertook the study of Greek, and it is noteworthy that difficulties which seem as if they could not be successfully encountered even with the aid of an instructor he met and conquered solely by the power of his will. His preparations for the academical course he began under the tutorship of the Rev. Dr. Elisha Yale, of Kingsborough, N. Y., to which place his parents removed about that time. Shortly afterwards he went to Middlebury College, and graduated in 1831. He then entered the theological seminary at Andover, Mass. After spending the requisite time in the last-named institution, he

became a minister of the Presbyterian Church, to which body he rendered very efficient and valuable services. Though he never accepted the pastorate of any congregation, he was accustomed to preach from time to time in the different churches throughout New York, in which city he had taken up his residence after graduation, or wherever else he might be spending his time. He was a very prominent member of the New York Educational Society, and also of the Young Men's Educational Society, and under his private and more public instruction many young men have become qualified for the ministry of different religious denominations. At the opening of the Cornelius Institute he became its principal. While there he edited his Xenophon's *Anabasis*, which was the first Greek text-book with English notes that was published in the United States. Under his direction also were published a *Greek Reader*. Xenophon's *Cyropoedia*, the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* of Homer, and Thucydides. These books attracted considerable attention and scrutiny, and were warmly welcomed by all scholars. Prof. L. Schmitz himself a celebrated Greek scholar, wrote to Owen from Edinburgh, in 1850, congratulating him on his success as a translator. It was a frequent regret of Prof. Owen's that the Greek language is too exclusively studied in schools from classical sources; and to remedy this defect he edited the Acts of the Apostles in the original for students, appending a lexicon for the same purpose (N. Y. 1850, 12mo). His most extensive literary undertaking was his Commentaries on the Gospels, the first volume of which appeared in 1857. Two volumes have since been printed, and manuscript for a third was in readiness for the printer at the time of his death, and was afterwards published. The three volumes are entitled *A Commentary, Critical, Expository, and Practical, on the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and the Acts* (N.Y. 1869, and often, 12mo). This work deservedly ranks among the very best for popular use which the scholarship of our country has produced. It is lucid, thorough, and evangelical. It meets fairly and fully every difficulty which arises. There is no parade of learning in it, but the results of extended reading and a careful and thorough independent investigation are given. The critical part of the work is beyond all doubt as ably and satisfactorily performed as in any similar American or English work. In the year 1848 Dr. Owen resigned his position in the Institute in order to take the chair of professor of ancient languages in the New York Free Academy, of which he became vice-principal. In the year 1866, the name of the institution being changed to that of College of the City of New York, he became vicepresident of the faculty; and in this sphere he worked faithfully until about two weeks

before his death, which occurred on Sunday, April 18, 1869. Dr. Adams conducted the funeral services. The presence of a large number of eminent clergymen, the most learned men and prominent citizens of the United States, indicated the position obtained by the deceased. As a scholar he was well known and highly esteemed by the learned men of England, Scotland, and America. He ranked as one of our best Greek scholars and most industrious of commentators. As a Christian, all who came in contact with him felt the influence of his holy life, and could not but recognize in him the love of that Savior he endeavored to persuade others to follow. As an instructor, he was faithful, sympathizing, and kind almost to a fault. As a man, he was genial in his temper, earnest in his endeavors, and won the love of a large circle of New York's most distinguished residents.

### Owen, Lewis,

an English theologian and writer, was born in Merioneth County in 1572. After passing some time with the Jesuits in Spain, he left them to reenter the world, and was ever after a bitter opponent of the society. He wrote *The Running Register, recording a true Relation of the State of the English Colleges, Seminaries, and Cloysters of all foreign Parts* (Lond. 1626); the most curious parts of it are to be found in *Restituta*, 1:141: — *The Unmasking of all Popish Monks, Friars, and Jesuits* (ibid. 1628, 4to); — *Speculum Jesuiticum, or the Jesuit's Looking-glass* (ibid. 1629, 4to); reprinted in Edward Sandys's *Europe Speculum*. See Chalmers, *General Biog. Dict.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38:1005; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v. (J. N. P.)

### Owen (Or Owings)

Richard, was the first native American Methodist preacher, though for many years he acted only as a local preacher. He was converted under the preaching of Robert Strawbridge, in Baltimore Co., Md., and is described as “a man of a respectable family, of good natural parts, and of considerable utterance, plain in his dress, plain in his manners, industrious and frugal.” He was long the most effective co-laborer of Strawbridge, traveling the country in all directions, founding societies in Maryland and Virginia, and opening the way for the coming itinerants. He thus secured the pre-eminence of being the first native standard-bearer of the Methodistic movement in the Western hemisphere. Owen's temperament was congenial with that of Strawbridge, whose missionary activity he

emulated, and whose funeral sermon he preached. Though burdened with the cares of a large family, he often left wife and children and a comfortable living, and went without recompense into distant parts to publish the Gospel. In 1772 he was with Strawbridge stationed in Frederick Co. His name was printed in the Minutes, but it is not said that he was received into the traveling connection until 1785. At the time of his death he had been preaching fifteen or sixteen years, and was stationed in Fairfax Co. He died at Leesburg in 1787. See Bennett, *Memorials of Methodism in Virginia*, p. 240; Stevens, *Hist. of the M. E. Church*, vol. i (see Index in vol. iv).

### Owen, Robert

a noted socialist and philanthropist, was born at Newton, Montgomeryshire, North Wales, in 1771. His parents were poor, but they gave him a good elementary education. Until he was fourteen he was employed in drapers' shops in his native town and at Stamford. He then procured a situation in London, where he showed such talents for business that at eighteen he became a partner in a small cotton mill. He was successful in this enterprise, and then removed to the Chorlton Mills, near Manchester, where he was equally prosperous. In 1801 he married the daughter of David Dale, a manufacturer of Glasgow, who had established in 1784 a cotton-factory near Lanark, now New Lanark, on the banks of the Clyde. In this factory not only cotton-spinning, but other connected branches of the manufacture were carried on, and at one time as many as 4000 persons were settled there in connection with it. Shortly after his marriage, Owen sold the Chorlton Mills and undertook the management of New Lanark. The latter establishment had been a center of disorder and immorality; but the incessant labors and the paternal administration of the new proprietor made a rapid change in affairs. The little colony established at Lanark prospered both materially and morally. As a commercial speculation it was in a high degree successful: but the most remarkable feature was the benevolent care with which Mr. Owen attended to the welfare of the persons employed and to the education of their children. He here introduced many improvements, since adopted in other schools, so as to make instruction at once attractive and useful, and founded, if not the first, one of the earliest of the infant schools. Besides the ordinary routine of education, the children of whom there were at one time 600 — were taught various practical arts, and were instructed in singing and dancing, care being also taken of their health by building well ventilated school-rooms and providing for active exercise. The reputation of the

establishment spread rapidly; it was visited by persons of rank and influence, giving to Lanark a European celebrity. In 1812 he published his *New View of Society, or Essays on the Formation of Human Character*, and afterwards a *Book of the New Moral World*, in which he developed a theory of modified *communism*. **SEE SOCIALISM**. The unfavorable reception which his system received among the English clergy induced him in 1823 to relinquish his connection with New Lanark and to betake himself to the United States. About 1824 he purchased from a Pennsylvania German colony, under Frederick Rapp, a tract of land on the Wabash, in Posey Co., Indiana, and founded the settlement of New Harmony, where he endeavored to carry his theory of the co-operative system into effect. Largely composed of vagabonds and adventurers from all nations, this colony proved an utter failure, and Owen returned to England in 1827. In this year an attempt was also made to effect an establishment in consonance with his new view of society at Orbiston, in the parish of Bothwell, Lanarkshire. It was intended to purchase 1200 acres of land, and to erect a parallelogram to accommodate 1200 persons. A large sum of money was raised, but the expenses so greatly exceeded the estimates that not more than a fourth of the purposed parallelogram was built; but it had a theater, lecture-room, and schoolrooms. Less than 200 persons were collected; the laborers were to work on the co-operative system, but were not all paid alike, nor did all fare alike. They took their meals in a common hall, but at four different tables, the charge for the total weekly board varying from 14s. to 10s., 7s., and 5s., 6d. Including English and Irish families, as well as Scotch, it is not strange that their manners and customs gave great offense to their Presbyterian neighbors, and indeed there was much that was objectionable. It terminated in a short time; the society was dissolved; the property was sold at an enormous loss; the buildings were pulled down, and the materials sold; and nothing now remains of New Orbiston. A similar experiment was also made at Tytherley, in Hampshire, and was equally unsuccessful. Mr. Owen's attempts to establish a "Labor Exchange" in London, in connection with a bazaar and a bank, were likewise fruitless; after a short existence the concern became bankrupt. In 1828 he visited Mexico on an invitation from the Mexican government to carry out his scheme there. but nothing was done. In 1829 he held a public debate at Cincinnati, with the Rev. Alexander Campbell, D.D., of Bethany Va., on the "Evidences of Christianity;" of which discussion a newspaper of the day says: "With an acute, vigorous mind, quick perceptions, and rapid powers of combination,

Mr. Campbell sorely puzzled his antagonist by his masterly defense of the truth, divine origin, and inestimable importance of Christianity." In spite of his failures, Owen lost nothing of his wonderful activity. For a long time he resided at London, where he held weekly reunions and a great number of meetings. In these gatherings he delivered more than a thousand discourses. For years he edited the *Millennial Gazette*, a publication designed to show that men might be happier by uniting their interests than by carrying out the present competition system. He wrote more than two thousand articles for the journals. He also undertook numerous journeys, some of which were to France, where his "rational system" did not even succeed in exciting curiosity. An audience which he obtained in 1840 from queen Victoria, by the mediation of lord Melbourne, provoked against him in the House of Lords some most severe remarks. After having failed in 1847 in the parliamentary elections of London, he thought to take advantage of the Revolution of February, 1848, - 60 passing into France and rallying to the support of his system the provisional government, or one of the socialistic parties; but he could not make his voice heard there. He, however, continued for the rest of his life to advocate his views both as a writer and public speaker, and revisited America several times, attempting to found a system of religion and society according to reason alone. During his last years he was a believer in spiritualism, through which he became convinced of the immortality of the soul; and he devoted much effort to the vindication of his claim to hold conversations with the spirits of the dead. He died at Newton, Nov. 19, 1858.

Owen insisted on an absolute equality in all rights and duties, and the abolition of all superiority, including alike that of capital and that of birth. Being desirous of improving the condition of the industrial classes, he speculated on the causes of evil, and approached the subject from the extreme sensational point of view. He regarded the power of circumstances as controlling, and he was led to consider action as simply obedience to the stronger motive. He thus introduced the idea of physical causation into the human will, and made the rule of right to be each one's own pleasures and pains. He believed that man is born a *passive creature* with certain susceptibilities, and that external circumstances acting on these susceptibilities of necessity give rise to our dispositions, and through them form our whole character; in other words, that the character of an individual is formed *for* him, and not *by* him. This doctrine, which is the most extreme development of philosophical necessity that the present age



has known, was doubtless in great part the result of a too exclusive experience with that class of mankind which exists chiefly as the appendages and machinery of commercial life, and which is made up of those whose poverty and ignorance unite to render them to an unusual degree passive instruments. As a philosopher Owen must be condemned; but, whatever may be thought of the opinions he held, there can be little doubt of his extreme benevolence, his moral integrity, and his executive ability, more especially as, displayed in his early life. His publications are, *A New View of Society* (Lond. 1813): — *Observations on the Effects of the Manufacturing System* (1815): — *Address to the Inhabitants of New Lanark* (Lond. 1816): — *Tracts Relative to the New Society* (1817): — *Two Memorials in Behalf of the Working Classes*: — *Discourses on a New System of Society, with an Account of the Society of New Lanark* (Pittsburgh, 1825): — *Robert Owen's Opening Speech, and his Reply to the Rev. Alexander Campbell; the Debate on the Evidences of Christianity, the Social System, and Scepticism, between Mr. Owen and Mr. Campbell* (Bethany, 1829): — *Mr. Owen's Memorial to the Republic of Mexico* (Cincinnati. 1829): — *Book of the New Moral World* (Lond. and N. Y.): — *The Revolution in the Mind and Practice of the Human Race* (Lond. 1849). See Packard, *Life of Robert Owen* (Phila. 1866) Martineau, *Biographical Sketches*; A. J. Booth, *Robert Owen, the Founder of Socialism in England* (1869); Noyes, *Hist. of Socialism*; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; *American Cyclop.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 201 sq.; Morell, *Hist. of Modern Philosophy*, p. 293 sq.; *New-Englander*, 1866, p. 399 *Amer. Presbyt. Rev.* April, 1866, p. 344.

### Owen, William

a Congregational minister, was born in Pembrokeshire, Wales, Oct. 23, 1844, and was educated at the Congregational Memorial College, Brecon, from 1868 to 1870. He was ordained for the ministry at Coalburgh, Ohio, in September, 1870, and became pastor of the Congregational society in that place. Too severe application to his studies in college and overwork in the pastorate broke his constitution, and he died of consumption Jan. 14, 1875, on his first charge.

## Owens, Thomas

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in South Carolina Jan. 8 1787, and was the son of Thomas and Frances Owens. His parents took him to the Natchez country when young, and settled in what is now Jefferson County. Thomas was in early manhood perverted to vicious purposes. In his twenty-fourth year he became an earnest seeker of salvation from sin. As a preliminary step, he united with the Church in 1810, and was soon after converted while kneeling to receive the holy communion. He was soon encouraged by his brethren to take an active part in the social meetings of the Church. where he successfully commenced those extraordinary labors which made him so conspicuous in afterlife. He was admitted into the traveling connection Nov. 1, 1813, as a member of the Tennessee Conference, and was effective seventeen years, during which time he traveled four years in Alabama, four years in Louisiana, west of the Mississippi, and nine years in various parts of Mississippi. He was on the superannuated list thirty-eight years, but most of that time he rendered efficient service as a self-supporting minister. All who have succeeded him in his different fields of ministerial labor know what a deep and lasting impression his preaching and other kindred exercises made on the minds of all classes. He had learned by experience and practical observation all the avenues leading to the human heart, and he knew how to touch every chord of human sympathy. His native wit and genius cropped out everywhere. He said what other men said, and preached the same doctrines his brethren preached, but it was all said and preached in his own peculiar and attractive style. His genial face, the indescribable intonations of his voice, his apt illustrations and gestures, all combined to keep up an interest in his hearers. He died July 1, 1868. But few men of his talents ever accomplished a similar amount of good. See *Minutes of the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, 1868.

## Owings, Richard.

*SEE OWEN, RICHARD.*

## Owl

is the rendering in the English Version of several Hebrew words. In our identifications of them we follow the ancient intimations compared with modern authorities.

## Picture for Owl 1

1. *Yanshuph* (אֵשׁוֹפִי), which is mentioned in <sup><B117></sup>Leviticus 11:17; <sup><B416></sup>Deuteronomy 14:16, among unclean water-fowl; and in <sup><B341></sup>Isaiah 34:11 (here written *yanshoph*, אֵשׁוֹפִי), in the description of desolate Edom. The Sept. and Jerome translate it *ibis*, i.e. *the Egyptian heron*, according to the older commentators; and Oedmann (*Sammlung*, 6:27; comp. Oken, *Lehrb. d. Naturg.* III, 2:583) and others favor this rendering; but it has been shown that the real ibis is a smaller bird, not of the heron species, the *Ibis religiosa* of Cuvier; a rare bird even about Memphis, and unknown in Palestine. This, then, could not be the *yanshuph* of the Pentateuch, nor could the black ibis which appears about Damietta, nor any species strictly tenants of hot and watery regions, be well taken for it. See IBIS. Bochart and others, who refer the name to a species of owl, appear to disregard two other names ascribed to owls in the 16th verse of the same chapter of Leviticus. If, therefore, an owl was here again intended, it would have been placed in the former verse, or near to it. On the whole, as the Sept. refers the word to a wader, and the older commentators to a species of *ardea*, we accept the view already indicated by Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, p. 922), on etymological grounds, that a heron is intended; and the *night-heron* is the only one, perhaps, in all respects suited to the passages. It is a bird smaller than the common heron; distinguished by two or three white plumes hanging out of the black-capped nape of the male. In habit it is partially nocturnal. The Arabian *Abu-onk* (?), if not identical, is a close congener of the species, being found in every portion of the temperate and warmer climates of the earth: it is an inhabitant of Syria, and altogether is free from the principal objections made to the ibis and the owl. The Linnaean single *Ardea nycticorax* is now typical of a genus of that name, and includes several species of night-herons. They fly abroad at dusk, frequent the sea-shore, marshes, and rivers, feeding on mollusca, crustacea, and worms, and have a cry of a most disagreeable nature. This bird has been confounded with the night-hawk, which is a goat-sucker (caprimulgus), not a hawk.

2. *Kos* (ס/ק, <sup><B117></sup>Leviticus 11:17; <sup><B416></sup>Deuteronomy 14:16; <sup><B416></sup>Psalm 102:6), rendered “little owl” and “owl of the desert,” is perhaps most applicable to the white or barn owl, *Strix flammea*. Bochart (*Hieroz.* 2:267) referred this name to the pelican, on account of the assumed signification of *kos*, “cup,” by him fancied to point out the pouch beneath the bill (so Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 695); whereas it is more probably an

indication of the disproportionate bulk and flatness of the head compared with the body, of which it measures to the eve full half of the whole bird, when the feathers are raised in their usual appearance. *Kos* is only a variation of *cup* and *cap*, which, with some inflexions, additional or terminal particles, is common to all the great languages of the old continent. The barn-owl is still sacred in Northern Asia.

## Picture for Owl 2

3. *Kippoz* (z/P22æ), “great owl,” <sup><2345></sup>Isaiah 34:15) has been variously supposed to designate the hedge-hog, otter, osprey, bittern, and owl. Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1226), with Bochart, deriving the word from the root *zpq*; *kaphaz*, to draw together, to contract, thinks it to be a species of serpent, *Serpensjaculus*, i.e. the *arrowsnake*, so called from its darting, springing, in the manner of the rattlesnake. But as the text evidently speaks of the habits of a bird, we may perhaps acquiesce in the translation *owl*. There are noticed in Egypt and Syria three well-known species of the genus *Strix*, or owl: *Strix bubo*, “the great-eared owl;” *Strix flammea*, the common barn-owl; and *Strix passerina*, the little owl. In this list *Strix otus*, the long-eared owl, *Strix brachyotus* or *ulula*, the short-eared owl, known nearly over the whole earth, and *Strix orientaulis* of Hasselquist, are not included, and several other species of these wandering birds, both of African and Asiatic regions, occur in Palestine. The eagle-owl, or great-eared owl, *Strix bubo*, we do not find in ornithological works as an inhabitant of Syria, though no doubt it is an occasional winter visitant; and the smaller species, *Bubo Atheniensis* of Gmelin, which may be a rare but permanent resident, probably also visiting Egypt. It is not, however, we believe, that species, but the *Otus ascalaphus* of Cuvier, which is common in Egypt, and which in all probability is the type of the innumerable representations of an eared owl in hieroglyphical inscriptions. This may be the species noticed under the indefinite name of *kippoz*.

## Picture for Owl 3

4. *Yaanaḥ*’ (hn[ɹ]y) <sup><8116></sup>Leviticus 11:16; <sup><6445></sup>Deuteronomy 14:15; <sup><8319></sup>Job 30:29; <sup><2121></sup>Isaiah 13:21; 34:13; 43:20; <sup><2403></sup>Jeremiah 4:39; <sup><3001></sup>Micah 1:8), the OSTRICH *SEE OSTRICH* (q.v.).

5. *Lilith* (tyl æ æ <sup><2344></sup>Isaiah 34:14), “screech-owl,” but better in the margin NIGHT-MONSTER *SEE NIGHT-MONSTER* (q.v.).

## Ox

(״Ωξ, Vulg. *Ilox*), given (Judith 8:1) as the son of Joseph, and father of Mereri, among the ancestors of Judith (q.v.).

## Ox

## Picture for Ox

the different terms denoting this family, or part of it, in the A.V. are the renderings of the following Hebrew words:

**1.** *Abbir'*, רַבִּיָּאִי is translated “bulls” in <sup><922></sup>Psalm 22:12; 1, 13; 68:30; <sup><347></sup>Isaiah 34:7; <sup><411></sup>Jeremiah 1:11. This word is properly an adjective, derived from רַבִּיָּאִי; *to be strong*, and means *mighty*; hence transferred to the bull in allusion to his strength. But in <sup><683></sup>Psalm 68:30 it should probably be rendered *princes* (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v. רַבִּיָּאִי).

**2.** *E'leph, āl ā*, which occurs only in the plural, *alaphim'*, מִּרְפָּאִי derived from אֵלֶּא; *to learn*, in allusion to the domestic and docile disposition of the animal, and used in the common gender, including the whole family, like the English *beeve* — *an ox or cow*. In <sup><673></sup>Deuteronomy 7:13; 28:4, 18, 51, it is translated *kinze*; in <sup><87></sup>Psalm 8:7; <sup><404></sup>Proverbs 14:4; <sup><314></sup>Isaiah 30:24, *oxen*.

**3.** *Alluph'*, אֵלֶּאִי also written, defectively, אֵלֶּאִי is from the same root, in the same signification, but is used in the masculine gender only, grammatically, while including animals of both genders. It is found in this sense in <sup><419></sup>Jeremiah 11:19, rendered “ox,” and in <sup><144></sup>Psalm 144:14, in the plural, “oxen;” — but in <sup><419></sup>Jeremiah 11:19 the word is properly an adjective, *tame, gentle*, and the rendering should be, “I was like a *tamed lamb*,” not, as in the English Version, “I was like a *lamb or an ox*.” See Gesenius. *Thesaur.* s.v. אֵלֶּאִי;

**4.** *Bakar'*, רַקִּבִּי; in the common gender, a word for all *oxen* or *neat cattle*; generically *a herd*. The word is derived from רַקִּבִּי; *to cleave, to lay open*, in allusion to the use of the blast for plowing (comp. Latin *armentum*, from *arare*). This very general and very common word is usually rendered *head, herds*, as <sup><135></sup>Genesis 13:5; <sup><162></sup>Deuteronomy 16:2; <sup><387></sup>Habakkuk 3:17; or *oxen*, as <sup><126></sup>Genesis 12:16; <sup><107></sup>1 Samuel 11:7; <sup><162></sup>Amos 6:12. But two

phrases deserve especial notice, the *ben-bakar*, **rqBA`B**, *son of the herd*, or *of a bull*, which is translated *calf*; *calves*, in <sup><0187></sup>Genesis 18:7, 8; <sup><0142></sup>1 Samuel 14:32; but *bullock* in <sup><0105></sup>Leviticus 1:5; <sup><0458></sup>Numbers 15:8,9; and again, *par ben-bakal*, **rqBA`B, rPi** literally, *an ox, son of the herd*, which is rendered *bullock*, or *young bullock*, as <sup><0143></sup>Leviticus 4:3; 16:3; <sup><269></sup>Ezekiel 43:19, 23, 25, and often. **SEE CATTLE.**

**5. E'gel, l g[** **e** from an obsolete root, said to signify *to roll* (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v. **l g[**), *a calf* possibly from the idea of the *embryo* as *rolled* or *wrapped together*; and so always translated, as <sup><0234></sup>Exodus 32:4; <sup><2106></sup>Isaiah 11:6; <sup><3042></sup>Malachi 4:2; except in <sup><2418></sup>Jeremiah 31:18; 46:21, where our English Version wrongly has *bullock*, *bullocks*. The feminine form, *eglah*, **hl g[**, is also frequent, and is rightly rendered: *heifer*, as <sup><0159></sup>Genesis 15:9; <sup><2355></sup>Isaiah 15:5; but in <sup><2305></sup>Hosea 10:5 the English Version represents the plural by the word *calves*. **SEE CALF; SEE HEIFER.**

**6. Par, rP;** or **rPi** probably from the root **rrP**; *to be borne*, referring to the bearing of the yoke; but the word usually means *a bull*, *young bullock*, and is hence often referred to the root **rrP**; in its more usual sense, *to break*, in allusion to the fierceness and violence of his anger. It is usually spoken of bullocks for sacrifice only, as <sup><0245></sup>Exodus 24:5; <sup><0105></sup>Leviticus 4:3, 4, 5, 7; <sup><0281></sup>Numbers 28:11, 19, and often; so <sup><2842></sup>Hosea 14:2, where the meaning is, "So will we offer our praise as victims," or sacrificial bullocks. But in <sup><0213></sup>Psalms 22:13 it means *bulls*, without reference to sacrifice. (See also No. 4 above.) **SEE BULLOCK.**

**7. Tse'med, dmX,** from the root **dmX**; *to subject to the yoke*; hence *a pair* or *yoke*, as of asses, <sup><0790></sup>Judges 19:10; <sup><1061></sup>2 Samuel 16:1; even of horsemen, as <sup><2207></sup>Isaiah 21:7, 9; and also of *oxen*, as <sup><0910></sup>1 Samuel 11:7; <sup><8003></sup>Job 1:3; 42:12. **SEE YOKE.**

**8. Shor, r/v,** from a root denoting *to be strong* or *bold*. It is a general term for animals of the beeve kind, without distinction of age or sex, and hence is variously rendered, according to the context: *ox*, *oxen*, as <sup><0315></sup>Genesis 32:5; <sup><0207></sup>Exodus 20:17; 22:1, 4; <sup><0514></sup>Deuteronomy 5:14; <sup><3010></sup>Ezekiel 1:10; *bullock*, <sup><0140></sup>Leviticus 4:10; 9:4; 22:23; <sup><2121></sup>Hosea 12:11; *cow*, <sup><0487></sup>Numbers 18:17. In <sup><0227></sup>Leviticus 22:27, where the English Version has *bullock*, the context requires *calf*; and in <sup><0210></sup>Job 21:10, where it renders *bull*, the *cow* is meant. **SEE BULL.**

**9.** *Teo'*, /aT] only in <sup><545></sup>Deuteronomy 14:5, where our version has *wild ox*, and with transposition of the last letters, t6, a/T, only in <sup><550></sup>Isaiah 51:20 — rendered “wild bull;” probably means a species of *antelope* or *mountain-goat*; so called from its swiftness, from the root haṭ; *to outrun*. Yet the ancient interpreters generally render *wild ox*, and the exact meaning is uncertain (comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:973; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* s.v. haṭ). *SEE ANTELOPE.*

**10.** *Tor*, r/T, the Chaldee term for *ox*, corresponding to the Hebrew r/v, No. 8, above. It is found only in the plural, in <sup><580></sup>Ezra 6:9, 17; 7:17, where it is translated “bullocks,” and in <sup><205></sup>Daniel 4:25, 32, 33; 5:21, where our version has “oxen.”

*Natural History of the Bovidae* (scientifically considered). — The earliest pastoral tribes appear to have had domesticated cattle in the herd; and judging from the manners of South Africa, where we find nations still retaining in many respects primeval usages, it is likely that the patriarchal families, or at least their movables, were transported on the backs of oxen in the manner which the Kaffres still practice, as also the Gwallahs and grain-merchants in India, who come down from the interior with whole droves bearing burdens. But, as the Hebrews did not castrate their bulls, it is plain some other method of enervation (*bistournure?*) was necessary in order to render their violent and brutal indocility sufficiently tractable to permit the use of a, metal ring or twisted rope passed, through the nostrils, and to insure something like safety and command to their owners. In Egypt, emasculation, no doubt, was resorted to, for no ring is observable in the numerous representations of cattle, while many of these indicate even more entire docility in these animals than is now attained.

The breeds of Egypt were various, differing in the length and flexure of the horns. There were some with long horns, others with short, and even none, while a hunched race of Nubia reveals an Indian origin, and indicates that at least one of the nations on the Upper Nile had come from the valleys of the Ganges; for it is to the east of the Indus alone that that species is to be found whose original stock appears to be the mountain yak (*Bos grunniens*). It is born with two teeth ill the mouth, has a groaning voice, and is possessed of other distinctive characteristics. Figures of this species or variety bear the significant lotus flower suspended from the neck, and, as is still practiced in India, they are harnessed to the cars of princesses of

Nubia. These, as well as the straight-backed cattle of Egypt, are all figured with evident indications of beauty in their form, and they are in general painted white, with black or rufous clouds, or entirely red, speckled, or *grandinated*, that is, black, with numerous small white specks; and there are also beeves with white and black occasionally marked in a peculiar manner, seemingly the kind of tokens by which the priesthood pretended to recognize their sacred individuals. The cattle of Egypt continued to be remarkable for beauty for some ages after the Moslem conquest.

The domestic buffalo was unknown to Western Asia and Egypt till after the Arabian conquest: it is now common in the last-mentioned region and far to the south, but not beyond the equator; and from structural differences it may be surmised that there was in early ages a domesticated distinct species of this animal in Africa. The buffalo (*Bos bubalis*) is not uncommon in Palestine; the Arabs call it *jamus*. Robinson (*Bib. Res.* 3:306) notices buffaloes around the lake el-Huleh as being mingled with the neat cattle, and applied in general to the same uses. They are a shy, ill-looking, ill-tempered animal." These animals love to wallow and lie for hours in water or mud, with barely the nostrils above the surface. In Syria and Egypt the present races of domestic cattle are somewhat less than the large breeds of Europe, and those of Palestine appear to be of at least two forms, both with short horns and both used to the plow, one being tall and lank, the other more compact; and we possess figures of the present Egyptian cattle with long horns bent down and forwards. From Egyptian pictures it is to be inferred that large droves of fine cattle were imported from Abyssinia, and that in the valley of the Nile they were in general stall-fed, used exclusively for the plow, and treated with humanity. There are now fine cattle in Egypt; but the Palestine cattle appear to have deteriorated, in size at least, since Biblical times. "Herds of cattle," says Schubert (*Oriental Christian Spectator*, April, 1853), "are seldom to be seen; the bullock of the neighborhood of Jerusalem is small and insignificant; beef and veal are but rare dainties. Yet the bullock thrives better, and is more frequently seen, in the upper valley of the Jordan, also on Mount Tabor and near Nazareth but particularly east of the Jordan on the road from Jacob's-bridge to Damascus." See also Thomson (*Land and Book*, 1, 518), who observes that danger from being gored has not ceased "among the half-wild droves that range over the luxuriant pastures in certain parts of the country." In Palestine the Mosaic law provided with care for the kind treatment of cattle; for in treading out corn — the



Oriental mode of separating the grain from the straw — it was enjoined that the ox should not be muzzled (<sup><6574></sup>Deuteronomy 25:4), and old cattle that had long served in tillage were often suffered to wander at large till their death — a practice still in vogue, though from a different motive, in India. But the Hebrews and other nations of Syria grazed their domestic stock, particularly those tribes which, residing to the east of the Jordan, had fertile districts for that purpose. Here, of course, the droves became shy and wild; and though we are inclined to apply the passage in <sup><4922></sup>Psalm 22:12 to wild species, yet old bulls, roaming at large in a land where the lion still abounded, no doubt became fierce and as they would obtain cows from the pastures, there must have been wild breeds in the woods, as fierce and resolute as real wild Uri which ancient name may be a mere modification of *Reem*. **SEE UNICORN.**

There was no animal in the rural economy of the Israelites, or indeed in that of the ancient Orientals generally, that was held in higher esteem than the ox; and deservedly so, for the ox was *the* animal upon whose patient labors depended all the ordinary operations of farming. Ploughing with horses was a thing never thought of in those days. Asses, indeed, were used for this purpose, **SEE ASS**; but it was the ox upon whom devolved for the most part this important service. The pre-eminent value of the ox to “a nation of husbandmen like the Israelites,” to use an expression of Michaelis in his article on this subject, will be at once evident from the scriptural account of the various uses to which it is applied. Animals of the ox family were used for ploughing (<sup><6220></sup>Deuteronomy 22:10; <sup><0944></sup>1 Samuel 14:14; <sup><1199></sup>1 Kings 19:19; <sup><8014></sup>Job 1:14; <sup><3162></sup>Amos 6:12, etc.); for treading out corn (<sup><6254></sup>Deuteronomy 25:4; <sup><3801></sup>Hosea 10:11; <sup><3343></sup>Micah 4:13; <sup><4100></sup>1 Corinthians 9:9; <sup><4558></sup>1 Timothy 5:18), **SEE AGRICULTURE**; for draught purposes, when they were generally yoked in pairs (<sup><0478></sup>Numbers 7:3; <sup><0867></sup>1 Samuel 6:7; <sup><1066></sup>2 Samuel 6:6); as beasts of burden (<sup><3244></sup>1 Chronicles 12:40); their flesh was eaten (<sup><6144></sup>Deuteronomy 14:4; <sup><1009></sup>1 Kings 1:9; 4:23; 19:21; <sup><3213></sup>Isaiah 22:13; <sup><3157></sup>Proverbs 15:17; <sup><4658></sup>Nehemiah 5:18); they were used in the sacrifices, **SEE SACRIFICE**; they supplied milk, butter, etc. (<sup><6324></sup>Deuteronomy 32:14; <sup><2372></sup>Isaiah 7:22; <sup><1072></sup>2 Samuel 17:29). **SEE BUTTER; SEE MILK.**

The law which prohibited the slaughter of any *clean* animal, excepting as “an offering unto the Lord before the tabernacle,” during the time that the Israelites abode in the wilderness (<sup><0870></sup>Leviticus 17:1-6), although expressly designed to keep the people from idolatry, no doubt contributed to the

preservation of their oxen and sheep, which they were not allowed to kill excepting in public. There can be little doubt that during the forty years' wanderings oxen and sheep were rarely used as food, whence it was *flesh* that they so often lusted after. (See Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, art. 169.)  
*SEE FLESH.*

## Ox.

The ox and the ass are often represented round the cradle of the Nativity, in allusion to <sup><2100B></sup>Isaiah 1:3. Beleth says that the lion and ox in front of doors, and a cock or eagle upon the church, were common representations.

## Ox-Goad

(*rqBhidmi jhi*; Sept. ἀροτρόπος τῶν βοῶν; Vulg. *vomer*, <sup><008B></sup>Judges 3:31). *SEE GOAD.*

## Ox, Wild

(*waT]awḏ*, *teo* or *te*; Sept. ὄρυξ, σευτλίον; Aq., Symm., and Theod., ὄρυξ; Vulg. *oryx*), is mentioned among the beasts that were to be eaten (<sup><614B></sup>Deuteronomy 14:5); again, in Isaiah, "they lie at the head of all the streets like a wild bull in the nets." The most important ancient versions point to the oryx (*Oryx leucoryx*) as the animal denoted by the Hebrew words. Were it not for the fact that another Hebrew name (*yachmur*) seems to stand for this animal, we should have no hesitation in referring the *teo* to the antelope above named. Col. H. Smith suggests that the antelope he calls the Nubian Oryx (*Oryx Tao*) may be the animal intended; this, however, is probably only a variety of the other. Oedmann (*Verm. Samml.* p. 4:23) thinks the Bubule (*Alcephalus bubalis*) may be the *tô*; this is the *Bekker-el-wash* of North Africa mentioned by Shaw (*Trav.* 1, 310, 8vo ed.). *SEE ANTELOPE; SEE FALLOW DEER.*

## Oxenbridge, John

a celebrated English Nonconformist, for some time minister in this country, was born at Daventry, England, Jan. 30, 1609. He was educated at Oxford, and also at Cambridge, and at the last university, he took his degree in 1631. He was tutor of Magdalen Hall, Oxford; but was deprived of this position in 1634, because he refused to give up the practice of persuading his pupils to subscribe to certain religious articles of his own framing. He

spent the next few years as a missionary in the Bermuda Islands. Through the intervention, of the Long Parliament, he was appointed fellow of Eton College in 1642; and was ordained pastor of a church in Beverly in 1644. He afterwards settled at Berwick-on-Tweed, where he was silenced by the Bartholomew act in 1662. Having for some time urged the importance of the new settlements in Dutch Guiana, then under lord Willoughby, as a field of missionary labor, he now himself led the way to Surinam, where he labored for some time diligently and with success. In 1667 he visited Barbadoes, whence in 1669 he proceeded to Boston. He was ordained pastor of the First Church, Boston, in conjunction with the Rev. James Allen, April 10, 1670; and remained there until his death, Dec. 28, 1674. Though Oxenbridge was a very popular preacher, his whole life seems to have been passed in religious controversy. His publications are, *A Double Watchword* (1661): — *A Seasonable Proposition for Propagating the Gospel by Christian Colonies in the Continent of New Guiana* (London). The arguments employed by Oxenbridge in this pamphlet are well chosen and ably pursued; but their influence was much weakened by a spirit of intolerant strife: — *Election Sermon* (1671): — *A Sermon on Seasonable Seeking of God*. See Anderson, *History of the Colonial Church*, 2, 245-249; Brown, *History of the Propagation of Christianity among the Heathen*, 3, 490; Drake, *Dictionary of American Biography*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, s.v.

### Oxendine, Alexander W.,

an American Baptist minister, of Revolutionary fame, was born in South Carolina Aug. 26, 1759. At the outbreak of the colonial struggle he enlisted, and was one of the famous Marion men. After the war he preached for many years, and died at a very advanced age, with sight, hearing, and intellect unimpaired, at Benton's Creek, Phelps County, Mo., Sept. 3, 1869.

### Oxenstiern

(a), AXEL GUSTAVSSON, one of the most illustrious statesmen of the 17th century, especially prominent in upholding the cause of the Reformation at a most critical period, was born June 16, 1583, at Fanoë, in the province of Upland, Sweden. He was descended from an ancient highly aristocratic family, distinguished in Swedish history. Early deprived of his father, he received under the direction of his mother an educational training

becoming his rank. As if in preparation for the ministry in the Lutheran Church, which had already been introduced and established as the state religion by Gustavus Vasa (1523-60), he attended the German universities of Rostock, Wittenberg, and Jena, studying at the same time jurisprudence; but it does not appear that he ever held an ecclesiastical office; yet even in his subsequent career of diplomacy, he always preserved a fondness for theological subjects, and a zealous enthusiasm for the maintenance and propagation of the evangelical doctrines. After having finished his academical course by graduating at Wittenberg, he visited most of the German courts. In 1603 he returned home, and was called into state service by Charles IX (1604-1611). He was sent on several diplomatic missions, in which he showed such tact and skill that the king, verging on the grave, appointed him guardian of the royal family, and placed him with six others at the head of the regency. It was at Oxenstiern's urgent suggestion, after the death of the king, that the crown prince, though only seventeen years old, was declared of age at Nykoeping (1611), and succeeded to the throne as Gustavus Adolphus. Oxenstiern was selected to act as chancellor of the kingdom, and:in this high office he enjoyed and justified the full confidence and friendship of his sovereign, who leaned on him, as did Henry IV of France on Sully, in all the political conflicts and complications in which his reign from beginning to end was involved, his cool insight and prudence tempering the ardent impulses of the king, and contributing thereby not a little to his glory. It was also by Oxenstiern's influence, assisted by the queen-mother, that Gustavus Adolphus gave up contracting what in those days would have been considered a mesalliance with Ebba Brahe, and married the gentle and beautiful Mary Eleonore, a princess of the house of Brandenburg, which proved a mutually happy-union. In 1613 (Jan. 16), as Swedish plenipotentiary, Oxenstiern signed a treaty of peace with Denmark, to give the country an opportunity, in a measure, to recover from internal and external commotions. In 1614 he accompanied the king to Livonia, and soon had the satisfaction (1617) of terminating hostilities between Russia and Sweden by an honorable treaty at Stobowa. In 1621, after the king had departed for a campaign in Poland, he was despatched with several regiments to occupy and govern certain districts of Prussia, then under the suzerainty of Poland, which the Swedish arms had gained, and he filled this post four years to the advantage of the country. When, in 1628, Austria and the Catholic league attempted to secure the Baltic coast, he negotiated with the duke of Pomerania and the king of Denmark to replace or re-enforce the Danish garrison of Stralsund

by Swedish troops, and thus frustrated all efforts to capture that stronghold, so that Wallenstein, the imperial general, who had boasted that he would take that city even if it were bound by chains to the sky, had to beat an inglorious retreat. He succeeded also, supported by the mediation of England and France, in effecting an armistice for six years with Poland. All these proceedings appear as arrangements preparatory to that grander undertaking of his administration—an expedition into Germany. The pious and chivalrous king had long meditated, it, and was prevented only by the cautious remonstrance of his minister; but now the measure was determined on, alike from the policy of self-preservation and the moral motive of succoring the sorely oppressed co-religionists who, since 1618, were waging an unequal struggle against the combined forces of Romanism. It is beyond our design here to delineate the origin and progress of the Thirty-years War (q.v.); we have only to sketch the course pursued by the great chancellor of Sweden. We will state briefly: Gustavus Adolphus landed in July, 1630, on the German coast with 15,000 choice troops, accompanied by his minister. Oxenstiern had put all his energy into the execution of the plan, procuring men, money, and material; and his diplomatic talent had ample scope to overcome the lukewarmness and jealousy of the German Protestant princes. Their united activity restored again the fortunes of Protestantism. Gustavus Adolphus advanced into the heart of Germany as in triumph, defeated Tilly near Leipsic, and fell, Nov. 16, 1632, on the bloody field of Liitzen, Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar finishing the battle victoriously against Wallenstein. The death of the king, well calculated greatly to encourage one and to dismay the other of the contending parties, did not move Oxenstiern to give up the cause as lost, though it added much to his embarrassments and responsibilities. Here may also be remarked, as a proof of the authority and confidence he enjoyed at home, that when he sent what purported to be the testament of the late king, and drawn up by him, but not signed by the royal hand, it was accepted as binding; and its tenor observed by the Swedish *Dict.* Oxenstiern was appointed a delegate to Germany with full powers to make any arrangement which he might deem best for the welfare of his country. He immediately exerted himself to increase the number and strength of the armies in-the-field, and went to Dresden and Berlin to concert measures for the effectual continuation of the war. In March, 1633, he convened a congress of the German princes at Heilbronn, and by that assembly was declared director of the evangelical alliance. Also Holland and France, from which latter Sweden had been subsidized. with money since Jan. 1, 1631,

he tried to interest and stir up to more energetic assistance. At his return to Saxony (1634), finding affairs in the saddest disorder—the confederates vacillating, the soldiers dissatisfied and lost to all discipline, and after the disaster of Noirdlingen almost all despairing, even the elector of Saxony openly gone over to the enemy — his mind, rich in resources even in these perplexing circumstances, discovered ways and means to rescue his party from imminent ruin. This accomplished (1636), he returned to Sweden, whence he had been absent for ten years. Longing for a more quiet sphere of action, he resigned in the first session of the senate he attended his plenipotentiary powers, with the advice never to confide so much power as he had been intrusted with to any one person, lest it might be abused; he retained only his seat as chancellor of the kingdom, and as one of the five guardians of the only child and daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, who was but seven years old at the time of his death. Concerning the latter he proved a faithful Mentor, taking particular pains to give her daily lessons in the science of government and international law, and found in Christina an apt and quickwitted pupil. In this connection may be mentioned the proposal of Richelieu — who wished to render him more pliable for his own ends, and promised him all the French influence — to transfer the crown of Sweden by a marriage of one of Oxenstiern's sons with the royal heiress into his own family. The Swedish chancellor resisted the alluring temptation and declined the offer. Meanwhile the politico-religious contest in Germany was maintained on the part of Sweden by the generals Horn, Baner, and Torstenson with varying success. In 1645 he sent his son John there to watch more closely the interests of Sweden, and assist in bringing about a satisfactory settlement. Neither party gave up until both were nearly exhausted. After protracted negotiations at Munster and Osnabriick, they agreed to what is styled the Peace of Westphalia (q.v.), which, besides other political changes, established the principle of at least partial tolerance in religious matters (signed Oct. 24, 1648). Sweden, universally and uniformly Lutheran, received as indemnity five millions of thalers, a part of Pomerania, Bremen, Verden, and Wismar. In 1643 Oxenstiern secretly organized a war with Denmark, which had subjected Sweden to long-standing humiliations, and by skilful management obtained the advantage of his adversary, In the negotiations necessitated in consequence, Oxepstiern, who attended them personally, extorted in the peace of Bromsebro the most favorable terms, ending with an increase of territory. Christina, who since December, 1644, had become queen of Sweden, acknowledged his services by raising him to the rank of a count

(of Sodermark), and the University of Upsala elected him its chancellor. Engrossed as he was with the business of foreign relations, he was by no means unmindful of domestic affairs and home rule. In 1634 he submitted to the Swedish *Diet* a constitution, which was considered a masterpiece of statesmanship, and was gladly accepted. He abolished many oppressive taxes, urged economy in administration, favored and fostered all kinds of industry, and caused canals to be constructed, in order to facilitate intercourse in the interior and commerce with other nations. Nor was he backward in providing for the moral and intellectual advancement of the people; he was instrumental in founding the universities of Abo and Dorpat, and many new schools and academies, five of which he established out of his own purse. The last years of his life were much embittered by the conduct of the young queen, who, endowed with high intelligence and knowledge, might have shone a star of the first magnitude in the north of Europe; but, disregarding older and wiser counsels, under the influence of unworthy favorites she indulged in passions and caprices that created general discontent. Yet when made aware of the public sentiment she decided to resign, and nominated her cousin her successor (1649). Oxenstiern, averse to a foreigner as sovereign, remonstrated most strenuously against such a step as unworthy of her talents, and fraught with evils for the country. She for the time desisted, underwent in 1650 coronation, and for a while manifested more proper attention to governmental affairs, but soon relapsed into her former ways, and, impatient of the restraint imposed upon her as the head of a moral and sensitive nation, carried out her resolution, and in 1654, in a diet purposely convoked, laid down the royal insignia to confer them on her cousin, Charles Gustavus, prince palatine. Oxenstiern, under the pretext of sickness, kept away from the deliberations necessary for the execution of this measure. He died in the same year (Aug. 28, 1654). Christina, not altogether too well affected towards him, bears this testimony to his character: He had great capacity and knowledge of secular affairs and interests; he knew the strong and weak points of all the European states. He was possessed of consummate wisdom and prudence, had a vast capacity and a great heart. State affairs were for him amusement. He was ambitious, but loyal and incorruptible." He was certainly the greatest politician and statesman which Sweden has produced. An extraordinary sagacity and immovable calmness characterized all his decisions, and energy and perseverance their execution. Nothing was deferred to the following day, and still less forgotten, and his activity never tired. His

faculties in this respect border on the marvellous. On all important affairs his activity, his will, his loyalty is impressed. There is not a single branch of the Swedish government which does not owe to him improvements. His vast activity would have been impossible without strict gravity and order; which he exacted of others as well as of himself. His good health and equanimity served to lighten the burden of work and care. He was unusually unselfish and disinterested; he never used his influence, extensive as it was, to amass property by perverse means; on the contrary, he repeatedly advanced considerable sums for public purposes without interest. Frugal in his household, he was for display and luxury where he acted as representative of the state. As a negotiator he ranked with the highest diplomats of the period, even Richelieu not excepted. Cool, reserved, fully acquainted with human character, penetrating to the smallest details of the situation, he conducted affairs with a sure glance; only his haughtiness, which was sometimes excessive, damaged him now and then. His bearing was imposing, though his stature was only a little above middle height. As a diversion and refreshment from his serious practical occupation, he read Greek and Latin classics, in which latter tongue he could fluently converse; and perused the Bible and the fathers of the Church. His letters to Grotius allow us to form an opinion of his vast erudition; often in his despatches to the king he would attach long treatises on the subjects under consideration. There are, however, few of his writings published. He is known as the author of the second volume of Chemnitz's *Historia belli Sueco Germanici*; and his correspondence with his son John (1642-1649) has been edited by Gjorwell; but there remain in the royal archives of Stockholm six vols. fol. of letters written by him from 1626 to 1632; and in Ridderstolpe and Falkenberg a still larger number of documents of his hand are preserved. See Geier, *Svenska Folket's Historia*; Schiller, *Geschichte des dreissigjahrigen Krieges*; Lundblad, *Svensk Plutarch* (Stockholm, 1824, 2 vols.); Coxe, *House of Austria*; Gardner, *Thirty-years War* (N. Y. 1874, 12mo), p. 145-148, 166, 172, 174, 192.

### Oxford, Councils of

(CONCILIA OXONIENSIA), were frequently held in the Middle Ages. Of these the most important are:

(1) Convened in 1160, in which more than thirty Vaudois or Publicani, who had lately come over into England, headed by one Gerard, and who



denied baptism, the Eucharist, and marriage, and who set at naught the authority of the Church, were condemned, and given over to the secular arm, upon which they were sentenced to be branded in the forehead, and publicly flogged out of the city, and were forbidden to remain in that neighborhood. They appear to have made but one convert, a woman, who soon returned into the Church. See Labbe, *Comm.* 10:1404; Wilkins, *Conc.* i, 438.

**(2)** King John, on his return from abroad, assembled a large number of his clergy and barons. first at London, and subsequently at Oxford, demanding a certain portion of the ecclesiastical revenues, but this was unanimously refused (Wilkins, *Conc.* i, 515).

**(3)** Was held at the monastery of Osney, near Oxford, on the 11th of June, by Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury and cardinal legate, who presided. This was a council of all England, and fifty canons were published in conformity with those of the Council of Lateran of 1215:

- 1.** Excommunicates generally all who encroach upon the rights of the Church, disturb the public peace, etc.
- 2.** Directs that bishops shall retain about them wise and charitable almoners, and attend to the petitions of the poor; that they shall also at times themselves hear and make confessions; that they shall reside at their cathedrals, etc.
- 3.** Forbids bishops, archdeacons, and deans to take anything for collations or institutions to benefices.
- 6.** Orders the celebration of the nocturnal and diurnal office, and of all the sacraments, especially those of baptism and of the altar.
- 7.** Forbids priests to say mass more than once in the same day, except at Christmas and Easter, and when there was a corpse to be buried.
- 10.** Orders curates to preach often, and to attend to the sick.
- 11.** Directs that the ornaments and vessels of the church be properly kept, and that in every church there shall be a silver chalice and a clean white linen cloth for, the altar; also that old corporals be burned, etc.
- 12.** Forbids any one to resign his benefice, retaining the vicarage, to prevent suspicion of unlawful bargain.

- 13.** Forbids to divide benefices in order to provide for several persons.
- 15.** Orders churches not worth more than five marks a year to be given to none but such as will reside and minister in them.
- 16.** Assigns to the perpetual vicar a stipend *not less* than five marks, except in Wales, “where vicars are content with less by reason of the poverty of the churches.” Orders that the diocesan shall decide whether the parson or vicar shall bear the charges of the church.
- 17.** Orders that in large parishes there shall be two or three priests.
- 18.** Directs that the bishop shall make the person presented to a living take an oath that he has neither given nor promised anything to the patron.
- 19.** Provides that in each archdeaconry confessors shall be appointed for the rural deans and others of the clergy who may be unwilling to confess to the bishop.
- 20.** Takes from the rural deans the cognizance of matrimonial causes.
- 21.** Forbids, under anathema, to harbor thieves, etc.
- 22** and **23.** Relate to archidiaconal visitations. Forbid those dignitaries to burden the clergy whom they visit with many horses, to invite strangers to the procurations provided for them, or to, extort procurations without reasonable cause.
- 24.** Forbids to let out to farm archdeaconries, deaneries, etc.
- 25.** Orders the archdeacons to take care in their visitations that the canon of the mass be correct; that the priest can rightly pronounce the words of the canon and of baptism; that laymen be taught how to baptize rightly in case of necessity; and that the host, chrism, and holy oil be kept under lock and key, etc.
- 26.** Forbids bishops, archdeacons, and their officers to pass sentence without first giving the canonical monitions.
- 27.** Forbids to exact any fee for burials and the administration of the holy sacraments.

**30.** Orders ecclesiastics to wear decent habits with close copes, to observe the tonsure, to keep their hair cut short, and to abstain from immoderate eating and drinking.

**31.** Forbids clergymen in holy orders publicly to keep concubines.

**34.** Forbids the clergy to spend their ecclesiastical revenues in building houses on lay fees for their sons, nephews, or concubines.

**36.** Forbids the nuns to wear veils of silk, to use pins of silver and gold, and to wear girdles worked and embroidered, and long trains.

**41.** Forbids to give to a person already provided with a benefice, having cure of souls, any revenue out of another church.

**42** and **43.** Order monks to live in common, and forbid them to receive any one into their community under eighteen years of age.

**44.** Orders monks to give away to the poor what remains of their repasts.

**45.** Forbids monks to make wills.

**47.** Forbids monks and canons regular to eat and drink save at the appointed hours; permits them to quench their thirst in the refectory, but not to indulge.

In the Oxford copy of these constitutions two others are added relating to the Jews. See Johnson, *Eccl. Canons*; *Conc.* 11:270; Wilkins, *Conc.* i, 585.

**(4)** Convened in 1322, by Walter Reynolds, archbishop of Canterbury, in which ten constitutions were published:

**1.** Relates to the conferring of holy orders. Directs that all candidates shall be examined previously; enumerates those cases in which holy orders shall be refused. Also forbids to admit clerks ordained in Ireland, Wales, and Scotland to officiate without letters dismissory or commendatory from their ordinaries. Orders that monks shall be ordained by their own diocesan.

**2.** Directs priests to exhort their people to be confirmed, and adults to confess before confirmation. Orders that children on the third day after confirmation be carried to church, that their foreheads may be washed in the baptistery by the priest's hand, in honor of the chrism. Prescribes caution against children receiving confirmation twice.

- 3.** Relates to extreme unction, and appeals to St. James (~~5154~~ James 5:14, 15) in proof of its necessity.
- 4.** Orders rectors and priests to be careful of their altars, to keep the holy Eucharist in a clean pyx of silver or ivory, or other befitting material, to renew the consecrated host weekly, to carry it to the sick with reverence, a light going before, etc.
- 5.** Orders that the linen furniture of the altar be kept whole and clean, that the words of the canon be fully and exactly pronounced, and with the greatest devotion. Forbids a priest to celebrate mass till he has finished 7 matins, prime, and undern. Directs that two candles, or one at least, be lighted at high mass.
- 6.** Relates to the duty of archdeacons in visitation.
- 7.** Relates to marriage.
- 8.** Relates to penance. Orders the priest to consider carefully the particular circumstances of each sin, to receive confessions, especially those of women, in some open place; to consult the bishop, or some discreet men, in doubtful cases, and to be careful not to make the penitents implicate other persons by name in their confessions.
- 9.** Forbids a priest in a state of mortal sin to celebrate before confession. Forbids to reveal confession in any way, directly or indirectly; orders that a priest convicted of doing so shall be degraded without hope of reconciliation.
- 10.** Orders the appointment of a fit priest in every deanery to receive the confession of the clergy.

See Johnson, *Eccl. Canons*; Wilkids, *Conc.* i, 512.

(5) Held in 1408, by Thomas Arundel, archbishop of Canterbury, against the Lollards. Ten constitutions Were published at this council, and sanctioned in one held afterwards in London:

- 1.** Forbids any one to preach without being first examined and allowed by the diocesan. Also forbids men suspended for preaching erroneous doctrine to preach within the province until they be restored by the ordinary who suspended them. Sentences all violators of this statute to excommunication. Declares that any preacher who shall a second time, in

any way, intimate that the Church has not power to make such ordinances by her prelates shall be sentenced to excommunication; and all Christian people forbidden to hold any communication with him under pain of excommunication. Further declares that when lawfully convicted of so doing, such offenders shall be declared heretics by the ordinary, and incur all the penalties of heresy, and their aiders and abettors also, unless they desist within a month from the date of their admonition.

**2.** Forbids the clergy and people of any parish to allow any one to preach unless full assurance be first given of his being authorized, privileged, or sent according to the form specified in Constitution I. Orders that the church, churchyard, or other place where unauthorized preachers have been permitted to hold forth, shall be put under an interdict. Orders, further, that authorized preachers shall suit their discourses to the circumstances-of their hearers.

**3.** Excommunicates, *ipso facto*, all who preach or say anything contrary to the teaching of the Church concerning the sacraments, or any point of faith; declares that such offenders shall not be absolved (except at the point of death), unless they abjure their errors and do penance. Orders that persons who do so a second time shall be formally denounced as heretics, and subject to confiscation of their goods. With regard to the penance to be performed, it is declared that the offender shall expressly recant the things he has preached, taught, or affirmed in the parish church in which he did so, upon some one or more Lord's-days or holy days at high mass.

**4.** Forbids, schoolmasters and other teachers to instruct their pupils in the sacraments and other theological points contrary to the determination of the Church, and enjoins them not to permit their scholars to dispute publicly or privately upon such subjects.

**5.** Forbids to read any book composed by John Wickliffe, or any other in his time or since, in any schools, halls, inns, or other places whatsoever within the province, unless it have been first examined and unanimously approved by the universities of Oxford or Cambridge.

**6.** Declares, upon the authority of St. Jerome, that the translation of the text of holy Scripture is a dangerous thing, because it is not easy to make the sense in all respects the same; enacts that no one shall henceforth, by his own authority, translate any text of Scripture into English; and that no

part of any such book or treatise lately composed in the time of John Wickliffe shall be read in public or private, under pain of excommunication.

**7.** Forbids any one, under pain of being publicly denounced excommunicate, to propose or assert any propositions which carry a sound contrary to the Catholic faith or good morals.

**8.** Forbids all disputing, either in public or private, concerning things determined by the Church, unless it be in order to get at the true meaning. Forbids, also, to call in question the authority of Church decisions, or to preach anything contrary to them, especially concerning the adoration of the cross, the veneration of the images of the saints, and pilgrimages to holy places and relics, or against taking oaths in judicial matters. Orders all preachers to encourage these things, as well as processions, genuflections, bowings, incensings, kissings, oblations, pilgrimages, illuminations, and the making of oaths in a lawful manner by touching God's holy Gospels. Offenders to incur the penalty of heresy.

**9.** Orders that none be admitted to serve as chaplain in any diocese within the province who was not born or ordained there, unless he bring with him letters from his diocesan.

**10.** Declares the University of Oxford to be infected with new unprofitable doctrines, and blemished with the new damnable brand of Lollardy, to the great scandal of the university at home and abroad, and to the seemingly irreparable injury of the Church of England, which used to be defended by her virtue and learning; that therefore, upon the petition of the proctors of the whole clergy of the province, and with the consent of all the prelates present in the convocation, it is enacted that every head of a college or hall in the university shall, at least once a month, make diligent inquiry whether any scholar or inhabitant hath asserted or held any position carrying a sound contrary to the Catholic faith and sound morals; and if he find any such, that he shall effectually admonish him; and that any such person so admonished advancing the same proposition shall be *ipso facto* excommunicated and otherwise punished. Orders that if the offender be a scholar, he shall be disqualified for his degree; if a doctor, M.A., or B.A., he shall be suspended from all scholastic acts, lose all his rights in his college, and be actually expelled, and a Catholic put into his place. Declares that if any head of a house shall neglect, within ten days after the publication of these constitutions, to execute the above regulations against any offender in their college, he shall himself be *ipso facto*

excommunicated and deprived of his office, and the college considered to be void, and a new head appointed. Enacts the same penalties against a head of a college suspected of heresy, who, after admonition from the ordinary, does not reform; and, further, declares him to be for three years incapable of holding any benefice within the province. Lastly, it treats of the manner of proceeding against suspected persons.

See Johnson, *Eccles. Canons*; Labbe, *Conc.* 11, 2089; Wilkins, *Conc.* iii, 314.

## Oxford Tracts

a term applied to certain writings of a clerical party in the Church of England which began to form itself at the University of Oxford in 1833, and which has grown into what is now known as Anglo Catholicism, Sacramentarianism, or. Ritualism.

*History.* — A conference of certain Anglican theologians, held in July, 1833, laid the foundation of this movement. But this conference was occasioned by preceding events. The state of the English Church in the 18th century was deplorable — a proud, lifeless skeleton. The Wesleyan revival, meeting little sympathy within, had to grow up outside of the Church. Only towards the close of that century did the evangelical spirit find place, and form to itself a party, inside of the Church. This party was intent on practical Christian life rather than on guarding the strict formulæ of orthodoxy. Hence it tended to liberalism, both in Church and in state. The political liberalism culminated in reform, particularly in the abolition of the Test Act, in 1828. Parliament was thus opened both to Dissenters and to Catholics. Church reform was now undertaken. The popular voice called for an “adaptation” of the Church to the spirit of the age. Violence occurred at some points. At Bristol the populace burned down the episcopal palace. In 1833 one half of the bishoprics of Ireland were abolished. The very existence of the Church of England seemed to be in danger. It was at this point that the Tractarian party organized itself in order to oppose both the assaults of politics and the inroads of evangelicalism. It was members of the University of Oxford who inaugurated this movement. Oxford, as opposed to Cambridge, the seat of the evangelical party, had remained, to some extent, true to its High-Church reactionary traditions. It was here that the clerical spirit of the past had had its intensest seat. Here the Romanizing tendency of Laud had never entirely died out. Oriel College became the nursery of the new

tendency, notwithstanding that a few years previously it had been the seat of a very liberal scientific spirit. To this college now belonged several very gifted young men; among them, John Keble, after 1831 professor of poetry, and author of the much-admired *Christian Year*; Edward Bouverie Pusey, since 1828 canon of Christ Church and professor of Hebrew; John Henry Newman, fellow and tutor in Oriel; and R. H. Froude. With these co-operated A. P. Perceval, rector at East Horsley. Froude and Perceval first gave form to the movement. Perceval appeared in 1828 in a book — *A Christian Peace Offering* — aiming to allay the prejudices of the Anglicans against the Romanists. He argues that the differences between Anglicans and Romanists are not essential, and that the Roman is a true branch of the one Catholic Church. The debate as to the sacrament is mostly a battle of words. The two churches hold equally to the real presence; but the Roman errs in undertaking to explain the mode of this presence. The mode should be left to private judgment; but the laity should have the communion in both kinds. As to the mass, the English articles only deny that at each celebration of the Eucharist Christ suffers afresh the tortures of the cross; but that is not the real sense of the Romish doctrine. It speaks only of an unbloody offering, and holds that, in some sense, the Eucharist is a sacrifice. Petitions to angels and to saints, and prayer for the dead, as also the veneration of relics, are *per se* harmless, but easily lead to misuse; hence their restriction or prohibition is justifiable. Purgatory, though not based on Scripture nor taught by the early fathers, is not to be condemned. Auricular confession and indulgences are ancient customs, whose loss the Anglican Church regrets. Though not a complete substitute for the strict discipline of the primitive Church, they are much preferable to the lack of discipline which disgraces the English Church. As to justification, the Romish Church teaches not that man is justified by works alone, but only that none is justified by works that are done without grace through Christ. Both the Romish and the Protestant churches teach that the sins of him *who repents* are forgiven through Christ; hence on this point they do not essentially differ. But works of supererogation (they are not mentioned by the Council of Trent) are to be rejected. The Church is infallible thus far, that whatever objective error she may temporarily formulate, yet the people who faithfully follow her decisions infallibly attain to salvation. The significance of this doctrine is as a safeguard against promiscuous rationalism. A limitation of private judgment is to be preferred to such danger. Every branch of the true Church is superior to rulers in spiritual things; but the temporal claims of the pope are illegitimate. As thus viewed



by Perceval, the Romish errors are mere excrescences which can readily be thrown off without seriously affecting the Church. The English Church is simply a branch of this Church in temporary schism. He looks for a reunion. But he is all the more severe against Dissenters. What error of Romanism is half so serious as the breaking up of the unity of the Church by the Independents, the rejection of infant baptism by Baptists? And what are all possible papal errors in comparison with the horrible, godless doctrine of a *Decretum absolutum*! But Froude, an earnest, logical, ascetically pious and very gifted young man, went even farther than Perceval. At first inclined to rationalism, he came finally to the view that while reason is able to judge and compare given ideas, it is dependent on the Church for the ideas themselves. But where is the Church? An examination of the formation of the English Church convinced him that it was far from being the sole true Church. Its founders had been governed too much by arbitrary caprice in their so-called reform of the old Church. The true criterion of the Church is the ancient rule: "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." The Church of the first centuries alone is true to this rule. From it there is no dissent. To it must all modern churches go back, for doctrine, for rites, and for constitution. At first Froude hoped for reconciliation with the Romish Church; but a visit to Rome convinced him that it had fallen far from the primitive pattern. So was it largely also with the actual Anglican Church. The reformers of this Church had given up the divine right of the Church, had substituted preaching in the place of the sacraments as a means of grace, had eliminated the essential sacrificial element from the Eucharist; in a word, had retained only the merest crumbs of the apostolic preaching. But he found comfort in the assumption that the formulae of the Anglican Church are capable of being construed into the sense of the true primitive Church. Accordingly he insisted on celibacy, fasting, retirement from the world, and veneration for sacred things and places. He also looked on the revival of monkish orders as the best means of Christianizing the masses. In one respect he differed from most Ritualists. He insisted on the entire separation of the Church from state control. The friends of Froude at first went not so far as he in their disavowal of the Reformation. The Anglican Church had indeed been badly maimed by the Reformers; but, after all, it was the truest of all the severed branches, and, by proper culture, might yet be made to bear the good fruit of the original stock. But they saw in Froude's ideal primitive Church the sole goal of all their efforts, and in submission to Church discipline the sole remedy for rationalism.

While this little circle of devout ascetics was forming itself and shaping its ideal, the spirit of reform in the political world was moving in the opposite direction. The inherent rights of the bishops were in danger of being undermined. The Tractarians determined to stand in the breach. Their first endeavor was to indoctrinate the laity as to the inalienable rights of the Church as such. Three points were made prominent: The idea of the Church; the importance of the sacraments; the significance of the priestly office. These points were developed in popular catechetical form, and published under the title *The Churchman's Manual* in 1833. While this was in preparation Parliament abolished ten of the Irish bishoprics. This gave impulse to a *conference* at Hadleigh, July 25-29, of Hugh Rose, Froude, Keble, Newman, and Perceval, in view of a revision of the *Manual*. and of concerted action in defence of the Church. The action agreed upon was directed to two points — to develop the significance of apostolical succession, which had been ruthlessly ignored in the abolition of the Irish bishoprics, and to defend the orthodox interpretation of the Prayer-book against the Socinian views which the action of Parliament implied. In September Keble prepared a programme of action for the party, stating the doctrinal reforms they aimed at, and the means agreed upon to effect the end. *The Churchman's Manual* may be regarded as a sort of confession of faith of the party. It was sent to all the Scottish bishops, and was warmly welcomed by them and others. The archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley) refused it his official sanction, but did not object to its publication. This *Manual* is “the first tract put forth to meet the exigencies of the times.” Upon it followed ninety other small treatises, under the general title “Tracts for the Times.” Hence the name of the party — Tractarians.

*The Tracts* (1833-1841). — Though the tracts were the chief missionary agency of the party, their views found also expression in poetry, tales, review articles, and sermons. Keble and Newman wrote the most of the tracts. Pusey wrote several of the most important. The first tract proper appeared Sept. 9 1833; by November, 1835, seventy had appeared, making two volumes. Most of them were original essays, though some were extracts from earlier writers. The later tracts were more lengthy and thorough, the last twenty making four volumes. At first these tracts were almost universally welcomed. They carefully respected the Prayer-book, and defended the rights of the clergy. They were an opportune ally of the establishment in a time of danger. They raised to fresh life the old High Church party, and vigorously assailed evangelicals and dissenters. But the

evangelical Church party soon became alarmed. The *Christian Observer*, in March, 1834, charged the Tractarians with being Romanists. Newman resented the charge in his *Via media* (tracts 38, 41), arguing that not *his* party, but the opposers had fallen away from the idea of the primitive Church, and declaring that the Thirty-nine Articles needed to be supplemented by a protest against Erasmianism and latitudinarianism, and by an additional article on the sacredness of the priesthood. In 1836 the Tractarians involved themselves in a violent personal strife. Dr. Hampden, a Broad Churchman, was nominated by the crown to a professorship of moral philosophy at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. The Tractarians used petitions and all other practicable means to prevent the confirmation. Dr. Thomas Arnold sprang to the help of Hampden in *the Edinburgh Review* (April, 1836). It was the signal to a general attack. The Tractarian movement became the order of the day. Though defeated in the Hampden matter, they lost none of their courage nor zeal. In 1838 they began a series of translations from the fathers, entitled "A Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the Division of the East and West." The Bible is the foundation of the apostolical doctrine, but the fathers are the channel through which it has come down to us — so says the Preface. In 1837, and later, some of the tracts showed a marked advance towards Rome. Rev. Isaac Williams, in tract 80, enjoined "reserve" in the communication of religious truths. It was an effort to revive the Romish *Disciplina arcani*; it discountenanced the preaching of all doctrines to the general public, as also the promiscuous distribution of the Bible. This and similar tracts excited general dismay. It was in vain that Pusey, in a letter to the bishop of Oxford, attempted to deny the Romanizing tendency. Keble wrote tracts in the same vein as Williams. The Tractarians in general had taught their followers to look indulgently on the errors of Rome, and to bewail the Reformation as a blunder. What wonder, then, that certain young enthusiasts were on the point of actually going over to Rome? To prevent this consummation Newman wrote the 90th tract. It was a most ingenious piece of sophistry, the point of which was to make it easy for the conscience to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles, and yet hold firmly all the essentials of Romanism. No other essay from the whole school made such a sensation as this. The Thirty-nine Articles had always been looked upon as a breastwork against all the errors of popery. This breastwork was now riddled through and through, and a free way opened for the influx of the whole host of papal errors. Shortly after the appearance of tract 90 Oxford became alarmed. A session of the university authorities declared

that the tracts were in no wise officially sanctioned by the university, and that a subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles in the sense taught in tract 90 was utterly contrary to the' spirit of subscription. Also the bishop of Oxford (hitherto friendly to the party) sent a message to Newman, censuring the tract in question, and forbidding their further publication. Other prelates joined in the condemnation. Newman yielded; and the tracts ceased to appear. A host of hostile writings was now set afloat. The evangelical party saw all its fears realized: the Tractarians *were* at the threshold of Rome.

*The Perverts.* — It seemed a heavy stroke for the Tractarians that their tracts were now prohibited, and that most of the prelates had turned against them. But this very crisis was a help to their cause; it occasioned a sifting of the party, throwing out the half-hearted elements, and drawing the genuine Anglo-Catholics into closer ranks. The general drift of the school disapproved of Newman's crypto-Romanism. Perceval, in 1842, in a book, *A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement*, etc., divided the Tractarian doctrines into two classes: the common teaching, and the private views of certain individuals. The first class embraced four points: apostolic succession, baptismal regeneration, the eucharistic sacrifice, and the infallibility of councils called according to the canons of 1571. To the second class belonged five opinions: turning towards the east in prayer, the purification of souls in the middle state, Pusey's view of sin after baptism, Williams's *reservatio*, and Keble's notion of mystical interpretation of Scripture. The first four points constituted the golden centre of the Tractarian school. Pusey and Keble diverged slightly towards Rome; and farther still stood Newman, W. G. Ward, and many younger disciples. When, now, the official condemnation of Newman's tract 90 tended to drive the extremists back towards the centre, some had already gone too far to regain their equilibrium. In a sermon in May, 1843, Pusey taught transubstantiation so clearly that the authorities suspended his preaching for two years. Soon thereafter his assistant teacher in Hebrew, Seager, went over to Rome. The next important case was Ward. He had taught in the *British Critic*, a quarterly that went down in 1843, and in the *Ideal of a Christian Church*, 1844, the most offensive Romish views — Mariolatry and mental reservation in subscribing the Thirty-nine Articles. A "convocation" at Oxford degraded him from his university rights, and expelled him. In September, 1845, he went over to Rome. Newman thereupon clearly saw that a mid-position

between Anglicanism and Rome was no longer practicable. lie resigned his position, and followed Ward. Newman's act was the signal for a host. Oakley, fellow of Baliol, and priest of St. Margaret's, London, followed. Other perverts were: Collyns, chief pastor at St. Mary's, Oxford; the poet F. W. Faber, rector of Elton; Thompson, pastor of St. Marylebone; Gordon, priest of Christ Church, Regent's Park. By December, 1846, not less than 150 clergymen and eminent laymen had become Romanists.

It was not merely doctrines, however, but rites also that caused trouble. Several Romish usages were silently and gradually introduced into many churches. These things alarmed the public. The press resounded the cry, "No Popery!" Counteractive societies were formed. An incident gave impulse to a general attack. One Gorham was nominated to a parish in the diocese of Exeter. The High-Church bishop, Dr. Philpotts, opposed his appointment on the ground that he denied baptismal regeneration. After manifold protests and appeals, Gorham's views were justified by the highest tribunal. This spread consternation among the AngloCatholics. The Church, said they, is surrendered to heresy, and that too by a court of laymen. How can she longer be a guardian of orthodoxy! It was now feared that the Sacramentarians would in a body go over to Rome. But the bishops of Exeter and Oxford exhorted to patience and hope. This, however, came too late for some: Palmer, a chief Tractarian, had sought communion with the Greek Church; Maskell, priest in Exeter, had come to the conviction that, with the exception of the Trinity, the English Church had not a single settled doctrine; Dr. Townsend, of Durham, had sought audience with the pope, and prayed for the call of a council. Others, in deeper despair, had set out to colonize New Zealand, in hope of there realizing their Church ideal. While this agitation was in progress, England was awakened and astonished by the news, in October, 1850, that the pope had raised Dr. Wiseman to the dignity of cardinal and archbishop of Westminster, and distributed England into twelve bishoprics. Nothing, however, but regrets and disapproval were possible. The pope had acted uncanonically, said the Tractarians, since England possesses already a sufficiency of Catholic bishops. But this papal action was severely felt by the Tractarian party: it rendered the Romish Church more inviting and aristocratic, and attracted many of their members into its bosom, especially from the higher classes. By Christmas, 1852, no less than 200 clergymen and more than as many laymen had gone over to the Romish communion. The assumptions of Romanism and the political agitation combined to

check the extreme High-Church bishops in their patronage of innovations. The bishops of Exeter, of Oxford, of Bath-Wells, and the archbishop of Canterbury, assumed a more conservative position, protested against the arrogance of Rome, and counselled their clergy to beware of giving deeper offence. But these counsels were poorly heeded. The leaven of sacramentarianism had been too widely sown. It continued to work, and silently to gain ground. Romanizing ritualism more or less pronounced spread far and wide. Auricular confession was introduced in some parishes. In a few cases priests were silenced for indulging in it. This feature is very distasteful to the English sense of personal honor, and has contributed largely to moderate the Tractarian advance. By the end of the year 1862 the whole number of clergymen who had gone over to Rome amounted to about 300.

*Tractarian Doctrine.* — The basal principle of the system is salvation through the sacraments. The formal principle is the exclusive authority of the visible Church. But what of the Protestant principle of justification by faith? Faith, so teaches Pusey, does not justify, but simply brings us to God, who freely justifies us by grace. In this faith lie- other elements, as repentance, hatred of sin, hope of forgiveness. It is the repentant, humble, earnest faith that justifies; and this. faith is wrought in us by God. Justification implies two acts on the part of God: the declaring of the soul just, and the making of it what it is declared to be; The first is an *actus Dei forensis*, the second a *justitia infusa*. This double act is essentially but one. God imputes not to us righteousness, but imparts it. In baptism, righteousness is given in germ. It grows by the use of the means of grace. We are justified before works; but works are germinally involved in faith. God rewards each according to his works; hence works stand in relation to the reward of grace. According to this view justification is essentially a *habitus infusus*, and faith is the grace-life produced by the *justitia infusa*. This is essentially the Romish view, save that works are not regarded as meritorious, but only as a manifestation of the inner faith. Faith, as appropriating God's grace, has no place in this view; all depends upon a mystical infusion of the divine life. Baptism regenerates, that is, the regularly administered rite is the means through which God works regeneration. In the Eucharist the bread and wine become really, but Iwr a spiritual manner, the body and blood of Christ; and Christ, as so present, imparts himself to the believer as spiritual food, unto salvation. The consecrated elements *are* not Christ, but Christ is present in them. The

Tractarians adore not the consecrated bread and wine, but Christ as specially present in them. The Church, as the organic body founded by Christ, and perpetuated by apostolic succession, is the sole mediator of grace, inasmuch as she alone can validly administer the sacraments. The Church is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. But the attributes of unity and sanctity may suffer eclipse in times of schism and misfortune. The Church, as an organism derived by direct succession from Christ, is supreme authority in spiritual matters. Her helps are the Scriptures as interpreted by patristic tradition. But as both Bible and tradition admit of different interpretations, hence it is ultimately to the autonomy of the Church that the believer must look for infallible guidance. The grace and truth that were in Christ passed over to the apostles, and thence to the bishops. The unity of the bishops finds expression in general councils; and the embodiment of the councils lies in the recognised primacy of the successor of Peter. Thus tractarianism, when followed out, leads to Rome. As a school of, theology, tractarianism is a revived scholasticism. It is purely realistic and unspeculative. Truth is to be sought for not by processes of thought, but by consulting authorities. It is objectively existent, and needs only to be looked for. As a form of Church life, tractarianism is esthetic, earnest, active, contemplative, constructive. Regarding itself as the visible manifestation of a divine institution, it lays great stress on the outward form of the Church life upon architecture, ceremonies, manners, and daily conduct. With all its narrowness and errors, it has infused an entirely new spiritual life into what was once the very staid, cold life of the High-Church party in the Church of England. It has also in the same way affected the Protestant Episcopal Church in America.

Quite recently the ritual innovations of the Tractarians have been repeatedly opposed by legal prosecution. The points involved are the eastward posture of the celebrant of the Eucharist, lights on the altar, incense, the mixed chalice, and unleavened bread (wafer). A case in 1867 against Westerton failed. Cases in 1868 and 1869 against Mackonochie and Purchas led to little result. The case against Bennett for the most extreme ritualistic practices resulted in Bennett's favor. This decision of the Court of Arches was appealed by the judicial committee to the Privy Council; but in 1872 the Privy Council dismissed the appeal. Other later attempts of the same nature have also failed of result. So at present the ritualists have pretty nearly' all the liberty of action they could desire.

See *Tracts of the Times* (1834); Froude, *Remains* (1838); Perceval, *Christian Peace Offering* (1828), and his *Collection of Papers* (1842); Wiseman, *High-Church Claims* (1841); Weaver, *View of Puseyism* (1843); *Dublin Review*, Sept. 1843; *Quart. Review*, May, 1843; Palmer, *Narrative* (1843); Newman, *Essay on Miracles* (1843); Ward, *Ideal* (1844); Bishop M'Ilvaine, *Oxford Divinity* (1841); Gladstone, *Church Principles* (1840); Alexander, *Anglo-Catholicism* (1843); Taylor, *Ancient Christianity* (1844); Goode, *Rule of Faith*; many articles in the *Edinburgh Review* after 1843; Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* art. Tractarianismus; *Lond. Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1874, art. 8; Pye-Smith, *Introd. to Theol.* (see Index), Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); *Brit. and For. Rev.* (1844), p. 528 sq. Buchanan, *Justf*; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 424.

### Oxlee, John

a distinguished English divine, was born at Gisborough, in Cleveland, Sept. 25, 1779. In 1802, owing to his knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages, he was selected as second master of Tunbridge Grammar School by the eminent Dr. Vicesimus Knox, its first master. There Oxlee's Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac studies were begun. From 1816 to 1826 he held the rectory of Scawton, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, for the Rev. Thomas Worsley, afterwards master of Downing. In 1836 the archbishop of York presented him to the rectory of Molesworth, Hunts. He died Jan. 30, 1854. Mr. Oxlee, though self-taught, became master of more than 120 languages or dialects, the last being the Yuroba. He wrote *The Christian Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation* (Lond. 1850, 3 vols. 8vo): — *Three Sermons on the Christian Hierarchy, deducing an uninterrupted Triple List of Bishops, etc.*: — *Three Letters to the Archbishop of Cashel on the Apocryphal Books of Enoch, etc.*: — *Three Letters to Mr. C. Wellbeloved: on Unitarian Error*: — *Three Letters to the Rev. F. Nolan, and Two Letters to the Bishop of Salisbury, on the Spurious Text of the Heavenly Witnesses: A Reply to the Rev. R. Towers, the Roman Catholic Head of Ampleforth College, near York*: — *Three Letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the Impropriety of requiring Jews to forsake the Law of Moses. etc.*: — *Three more Letters on the Inutility of any Attempt to Convert the Jews to the Christi in Faith in the Manner hitherto practiced, with a Confutation of the Diabolarchy*. He was also a contributor to Valpy's *Classical Journal*; the *Christian Remembrancer* for 1822; the *Voice of Israel*; the *Voice of Jacob*; *Jewish Chronicle*; but more particularly of seven letters addressed to S. M., the Jew, occupying 110



pages in *The Jewish Repository*. In his work on *The Christian Doctrines*, etc., the mass of learning is astonishing; through more than 1000 pages we are presented with correct extracts from early and late Jewish writers, accompanied with an exact English translation. The *Letters* to archbishop Lawrence are filled with exceedingly rare extracts, and Dr. Nicholls, the late regius professor of Oxford, is said to have expressed his wonder how the works quoted had been obtained, considering that the author's benefice was worth but £228 a year. Nearly up to the day of his death Mr. Oxlee was engaged in literary pursuits. He left behind him many works yet unpublished. — See *Gent. Mag.* Feb. 1855, p. 203 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2, 2268; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.; Kitto, *Journal of Sac. Lit.* April, 1854; Coleridge, *Works*, p. 457. (J. H.W.)

### Ozanam, Antoine Frederic

a distinguished French philosopher and polemic, was born at Milan April 23, 1813. He studied at the college in Lyons, and in 1832 went to Paris to study law. He took the degrees of M.A. and LL.D., and in 1840 was called to the professorship of foreign literature by the Academy of Sciences of Paris., a position which his thorough knowledge of English, German, Italian, and Spanish, besides Hebrew and Sanscrit, enabled him to fill with great success. He died at Marseilles Sept. 8, 1853. Ozanam was a zealous opponent of Protestantism. Among his works, the most important is *Dante et la philosophic Catholique au treizieme siecle* (Paris, 1839 8vo; 2d ed. 1845). Four Italian and one German translation appeared between the first and second editions. It has been very variously judged, according to the standpoint taken by the critics. Ozanam, following the example of Artaud de Montor, attempted to prove the Roman Catholic orthodoxy of Dante against the assertions of Rosetti and Ugo Foscolo. In this Lamennais agreed with him; only the latter maintained that Dante's orthodoxy was but a concession made by him to the prevailing views of his age. Valuable as is Ozanam's work as a sort of commentary or key to Dante's *Divina Commedia*, it might have been much more so had he not entertained such ultramontane views. A more impartial appreciation of his author would have brought him nearer to the evangelical Church, which he condemned without knowing anything of its doctrines. Among his other remarkable works are *Deux chanceliers d'Angleterre Bacon de Verulam et St. Thomas de Canterbury* (Paris, 1836, 8vo and 12mo): — *Les Poetes Franciscains en Italie au treizieme siecle* (ibid. 1852, 8vo), valuable to the theological student who desires an acquaintance with the period of which it treats, for

it gives full portraits of St. Francis, Fra Pacifico, St. Bonaventura, Giacomino di Verona, Thomas de Celano, the author of *Dies Ire* (q.v.), Giacomone da Todi, the author of the famous hymn, *Cur Mundus Militat*, and the famous *Stabat Mater Dolorosa*. There is also a *History of Civilization in the Fifth Century*, which was translated into English by Glynn, and was published at London in 1859, in 2 vols. post 8vo. Besides, Ozanam contributed largely to the *Correspondant*, *L' Universite Catholique*, and *L' Ere Nouvelle*. His complete works were published after his death, under the title *Ouvres completes de A. F. Ozanam* (Paris, 1855, 8 vols. 8vo). Ozanam was one of the eight students who, in 1833, founded the *Societe de St. Vincent de Paul*, which has since become so powerful in France. See Ampere, *Notice*, in the *Journal des Debats*, Oct. 9 and 12, 1858; Legeay, *Etude Biogr. sur Ozanam* (Paris, 1854, 8vo); *Le Correspondant*, Sept. 26, 1853; Collombet; *Biographie de F. Ozanam* (1853); Lacordaire, *Conferences*, 5, 267; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 38, 1018; *Revue Chretienne*, Oct. 1869, p. 579.

### Ozi'as

(Ὠζίας), the Grecized form of the name of three Hebrews.

1. UZZIAH (q.v.), king of Judah (<sup><4008></sup>Matthew 1:8, 9).
2. UZZI (<sup><5101></sup>Ezra 6:4), one of the ancestors of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:2).
3. The son of Micha of the tribe of Simeon, one of the “governors” of Bethulia, in the history of Judith (Judith 6:15, 16, 21; 7:23, 30; 8:10, 28, 35; 15:4). *SEE JUDITH*.

### O'ziel

(Ὠζιήλ, i.e. *Uzziel*), given (Judith 8:1) as the son of Joseph, and father of Elria, in the ancestry of Judith (q.v.).

### Oz'ni

(Heb. *Ozni'*, <sup>ynzā</sup>; *my ear*, or *eared*, i.e. having long ears, or attentive; Sept. Ἄζενί v.r. Ἄζανί), the fourth named of the seven sons of Gad (<sup><0236></sup>Numbers 26:16); called EZBON *SEE EZBON* (q.v.) in <sup><0436></sup>Genesis 46:16.

## Oz'nite

(Heb. same as *Ozni* [q.v.]), a patronic title of one of the families in the tribe of Gad (<sup><0236></sup>Numbers 26:16).

## Ozniyah

*SEE OSPREY.*

## Ozo'ra

(Ὠζωρά v.r. Ἐζωρά), a corrupt form (1 Esdras 9:34) for MACHNADEBAI (q.v.), one of the heads of returned exiles (<sup><1500></sup>Ezra 10:40).