THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

F- Father's Brother

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

F

Faber, Basil

a learned German Protestant divine, was born at Sorau, in Lower Lusatia, about 1520, studied at Wittenberg under Melancthon, was rector of the gymnasium at Nordhausen, 1550-55, and afterwards of Quedlinburg, 1563-70. He opposed Melancthon's *Corpus Doctrinae* and the Crypto-Calvinists, and in 1570 had to leave Quedlinburg on this account. He then taught at Erfurt till his death, 1576. His chief work is the *Thesauerus eruditionis scholasticce* (Lips. 1571; last ed. Francft. 1749, 2 volumes, fol.), a work which still commands consideration for its extensive and exact learning. He was also one of the writers of the Magdeburg Centuries (q.v.).

Faber

(or FABRI), Felix, a Dominican monk and Oriental traveler, was born in Zurich, 1441-2, and was educated by the Dominicans at Basel. He early entered the Dominican order, and was made chief preacher in the cloister at Ulm, 1478. His studies were directed to the illustration of the Bible lands, and he made two journeys to the East, one in 1480 to Jerusalem, and one in 1483-4 to Palestine, Egypt, and Sinai. He died March 14, 1502. His principal writings are *Ecagatorium in Terra Sanctae, Arabiae et Egyptae peregrinationenz* (republished Stuttg. 1843-9, 3 volumes, 8vo): — *Historia Suevorum* (Francft. 1605; Ulm, 1727). — Quotif et Echard, *Script. Ord. Pread.* volume 1; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 4:306.

Faber, George Stanley

D.D., an English divine and voluminous writer, was born October 25, 1773, and was educated at the grammar-school of Heppenholme, and at University College, Oxford, where he passed B.A. in 1792. In 1801, as Bampton lecturer, he preached before the University the discourses which he afterwards published under the title of *Horae Mosaics.* In 1802 he became curate to his father at Calverley, Yorkshire; in 1805 he was made vicar of Stockton-upon-Tees; in 1811 vicar of Long-Newton, where he remained till 1831, when bishop Burgess presented him to a prebend in the cathedral of Salisbury. In 1832 he was made master of Sherburn Hospital,

near Durham. "During his mastership he considerably increased the value of the estates of the hospital. He rebuilt the chapel, the house, and the offices, and greatly improved the grounds; he augmented the incomes of the incumbents of livings under his patronage, restored the chancels of their churches, and erected agricultural buildings on the farms. He died at his residence, Sherburn Hospital, January 27, 1854." Dr. Faber's chief writings are on prophecy, and in them he seeks to show that the prophecies "are not applicable to the destinies of individuals, but to those of governments and nations." His most important writings are *Horce Mosaice, or a Dissertation on the Credibility and Theology of the Pentateuch* (Bampton Lecture, London, 1801, 2 volumes, 8vo; 2d ed. 1818, 2 volumes, 8vo): — A *Dissertation on the Mysteries of the Cabyri, or the great Gods of Phoenicia, Samothrace, Eqypt, Troas, Greece, Italy, and Crete* (Oxford, 1803, 2 volumes, 8vo): — *Dissertation on the Prophecies that have been fulfilled, are now fulfilling, or will hereafter be fulfilled, relative to the great Period of 1260 years* (Lond. 1806, 2 volumes, 8vo; 3d ed. 1814-18. 3 volumes, 8vo): — A *general and connected view of the Prophecies relating to the Conversion, Restoration, Union, and future Glory of Judah and Israel* (Lond. 1808, 2 volumes, *8vo)*: — *The Origin of Pagan Idolatry* (Lond. 1816, 3 volumes, 4to): — *A Treatise on the Genius and Object of the Patriarchal, the Levitical, and the Christian Dispensation* (Lond. 1823, 2 volumes, 8vo): *The sacred Calendar of Prophecy* (Lond. 1828, 3 volumes, 8vo; 1844, 3 volumes, 12mo): — *Eight Dissertations on certain connected prophetical Passages of holy Scriptures bearing more or less upon the Promise of a mighty Deliverer* (Lond. 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo): — *Treatise on the Holy Spirit* (London, 1813, 8vo): — *Diiculties of Infidelity* (Lond. 1824, 8vo; N.Y. 1854, 12mo): — *Difficulties of Romanism* (Lond. 1826, 8vo): — *On expiatory Sacrifice* (Lond. 1827, 8vo): — *Primitive Doctrine of Justification* (London, 1837, 8vo): — *Apostolicity of Trinitarianism* (Lond. 1832, 2 volumes, 8vo): — *Primitive Doctrine of Election* (Lond. 1842, 2d: ed. 8vo; Philad. 1842): — *Provincial Letters from the County Palatine of Durham, exhibiting the Nature and Tdendecy of the Principles put forth by the Writets of "Tracts for the Times," and their various Allies* (1842, 2 volumes, 12mo): — *The many Mansions in the House of the Father scripturally discussed and practically considered* (1851, 8vo): — *Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration* (Lond. 1840 8vo): — *The Waldenses and Albigenses* (London, 1838, 8vo): — *The Revival of the French Emperorship anticipated from the Necessity of Prophecy* (Lond. 1853,

12mo; N.Y. 1859, 12mo). — *English Cyclopaedia; Wesleyan Magazine,* November 1856.

Faber

(FEVRE, DE LA BODERIE), Gui, a French theologian, was born at Boderie, Normandy, August 9, 1541. He became secretary of the duke of Alenqoni, and died in 1598. He was a good linguist, and took part in preparing the Antwerp Polyglot, for which he furnished the Syriac of the N.T. with a Latin translation. He also composed a Chaldaic and a Syriac Grammar, and a Syro-Chaldaic Lexicon, and edited the works of Severus, patriarch of Alexandria, on baptism and the Eucharist, in Syriac, with a Latin translation, and translated Marsil. Ficinus and other writers into French.-Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 4:313; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 30:342.

Faber, Jacobus

(Lefevre Jacques), doctor of the Sorbonne, and grand vicar of Bourges, was born at Coutances, became doctor of the Sorlonne in 1674,, and died at Paris July 1, 1716. He wrote a number of pamphlets against the Protestants, as well as against Arnauld, Maimbourg, and Natalis Alexander; and also a defense of the Sorbonne against the, Jesuits, for which he was for a time imprisoned in the Bastile. — Feller, *Dictionnaire Historique,* 7:79; Hoefer, *Nouv Biog. Generale,* 30:343.

Faber, Jacobus Stapulensis

(Favre, or *Le Fevre d'Etaples Jacques),* an eminent scholar, one of the most zealous of his age for the revival of ancient learning, was born about 1450 (1455?) at Staples, a village of Picardy. He was educated at the University of Paris, in which he studied mathematics, philosophy, and Snally theology. He studied Greek with Hermonymus of Sparta at Paris. In 1492 he traveled into Italy, and studied Aristotle at Florence, Rome, and Venice; and on his return to Paris lectured on Aristotle's writings, and translated a number of them into Latin. In 1507 he took up his abode in the! Benedictine abbey of St. Germain des Pres, with Briconnet, the abbot, who was his pupil and intimate friend. Here he, remained till 1520, engaged chiefly in Biblical studies, the first published fruit of which was his *Psalterium Quintuplex,* in five columns, *Gallium, Romanum, Hebraicum, Vetus, Conciliatum* (Par. 1509, fol). He wrote also *Commentarius in*

Psalmos, etc. (Paris, 1515): — *Commantaries in Epist. Catholicos* (Basil, 1527, *fol.)*: — *Commentarius in Quat. Evang.* (Meld. 1522): — *De Tribus Maydalenis* (Par. 1531). He was suspected of Lutheranism, and the Parliament of Paris was about to proceed against him in 1521; but in 1523, Briconnet, now bishop of Meaux, mande him his general vicar, and he removed to Meaux. He was afterwards deprived of his doctors' degree, and compelled to retire to Guienne. Before this, at the request of the queen of Navarre, he had commenced a translation (from the Vulgate) of the N.T. into French, which appeared in 1523. This work was intended for common readers, and was soon widely scattered. "The effect of the dissemination of this version of the Word of God, which formed the basis for the subsequent translation of Robert Olivetanus, so important in the history of the progress of Protestantism in France, was at once visible. The copies were eagerly sought; the poor received the Gospel gratuitously when they could not even pay the small suan demanded, from the liberality of the good bishop. Briconnet introduced the French Scriptures into the churches of Meaux where the people listened to the lessons in an intelligible language and were delighted. An autograph letter, recently discovered among the rich treasures of the public library of Geneva, frone Lefevre to his absent pupil Farel, pictures to us the immediate results of the publication, and the glowing hopes of the reformer. He writes: 'Good God, with what joy do I exult when I perceive that the grace of the pure knowledge of Christ has already spread over a good part of Europe; and I hope that Christ is at length about to visit our France with this benediction. You can scarcely imagine with what ardor God is maving the minds of the simple in some places to embrace his Word since the books of the New Testament have been published in French; but you will justly lament that they have not been more emidely scattered among the people. Some enemies have endeavored, under cover of the authority of the Parliament, to hinder the work; but our most generous king has become in this matter the defender of the cause of Christ, declaring it to be his will that his kingdom shall hear the word of God without impediment in that; tongue which it understands. Now throughout our entire diocese, on feast-days and especially on Sunday, both the Epistle and thee Gospel are read to the people in their native tongue, and the parish priest adds a word of exhortation to the Epistle or Gospel, or both at his own discretion' (letter of Lefevre, dated Meaux, July 6, 1524, in the *Bulletin de la Societe de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Francais,* t. 11 [1862], pages 212, 213)," cited by Baird, *Methodist Quarterly Review,* 1864, page 442.

Faber was not fitted for the strife and storm of the times, and to secure quiet, he lived for several years as librarian to the palace at Blois, where he prepared a French translation (from the Vulgate) of the O.T., which appeared in Antwerp in 1528 (4 volumes, 8vo). All his affinities, both fromn study and friendship, being emith the Reformation, his last years were embittered by the persecutions suffered by his friends, though be never left the Roaisan Church. But he "well deserved the name of the forerunner of the Reformation; for in 1512, five years before Luther posted his theses on the doors of the cathedral at Wittemberg, he published his Commentary on the Fpistles of St. Paul, which clearly proclaimed the insufficiency of works, and the necessity of faith, as the ground of justification for the sinner An affecting incident is told of his last hours. While sitting at the royal table, a few days before his death, Lefevre was observed to weep, whereupon queen Margaret complained of the sadness of one whose society she had sought for her own diversion, and asked the occasion of his sorrow. 'How can I minister to the joy of others, who am myself the greatest sinner upon earth?' was Lefevre's mournful and unexpected response. Pressed to explain himself, the old man, after admitting that through a long life he had maintained exemplary morality of conduct, exclaimed in words frequently interrupted by sobs: 'How shall I be able to stand at God's tribunal, As I have taught others the purity of the Gospel? Thousands have suffered and died in defense of the doctrine in which I instructed them; and I, unfaithful shepherd that I am, after reaching so advanced an age, when I ought to love nothing less than life, or rather to desire death, have basely avoided the martyr's crown, and betrayed the cause of my God!' The queen and the other persons who were present administered such consolation to the pious Lefevre as they could find, and shortly afterwards he died, relying, on the forgiveness of his Maker, leaving his library to his disciple, Gerard Roussel, and the rest of his scanty property to the poor. The truth of this story, which rests upon the authority of Hubert Thomas, counselor of state and secretary of the elector palatine, has been discredited by Bayle in his Critical Dictionary, and after him by Tabaraud in the *Biographia Universale,* and more lately by Haag, in his great work on French Protestant Biography. All rest their rejection of the story chiefly upon time entire silence of the Reformers, who might well be expected to notice so suggestive an occurrence, were it indeed authentic. But in this instance, as in so many others, it has been proved how unreliable are all such arguments. With singular good fortune, M. Jules Bonnet has recently discovered anmong the unexplored treasures of the

Genevese public library a minute; in the handeriting of the reformer Farel, which demonstrates the truth of the circumstances described by Hubert Thomas. He writes 'Our master, Jacques Lefevre, of Etaples, when suffering from the disease by which he died, was for some days so greatly terrified by the judgment of God that he cried out that his fate was sealed. saying that he was eternally lost because he had not openly professed the truth of God. This complaint he continued to utter days and night. When Gerard Roussel admonished him to be of good courage and trust in Christ, he answered, "I am condemnend; I have concealed the truth which I ought to have professed and openly borne witness to." It was a fearful sight to see so pious an old man so distressed in mind and so overwhelmed by so great a dread of the judgment of God. At length, however, freed from his fears, he began to entertain a good hope in Christ' (published for the first time in the *Bulletin de la Society de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Francais,* t. 9 [1862], pages 214, 215)." — Baird, in *Methodist Quarterly Review,* 1864, page 41. He died at Nearac in 1536 (1507?). A full account of his writings may be found in the *Zeitschrift fur histor. Theol.* (1852), parts 1, 2. — See also Graf, *Essai sur la vie et les ecrits de Lefevre d'Etaples* (Strasb. 1842); Hoefer, *Noun. Biograph. Generale,* 30:334 sq.; Haag, *La France Protestanto;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:310; — Krug, *Handwsrterbuch d, Philos.* 2:2 sq.; Dupin, *Ecclesiastes History.* 16th cent. page 436.

Faber, Johanni

(named MALLEUS HIERETICORUM from one of his books against Protestants), archbishop of Vienna, was born at Leutkirch, in Suabia, in 1478, and studied at Freiburg. He, easily entered the Domninican order. His talents secured him rapid advancement. In 1519 the bishop of Constance made him his vicar general, and in 1526 he was made confessor to Ferdinand (afterwards emperor). At first his literary associations made him friendly with Erasmus and OEcolampadius, and especially with Zwingle, and he opposed the sale of indulgences in Switzerland strenuously. But about 1520 he went rapidly round to the other extreme of opinion, and in 1522 appeared his *Opus adversus nova quaedam dogmata M. Lutheri.*

After this he was an unwearied opponent of the Reformation in writings, colloquies, conferences, etc. His zeal was rewarded by the bishopric of Vienna, to which he was raised in 1531. He died in 1541. His principal

writings are the *Malleus Haereticorun* (1524, and Rome, 1569; a revision of the Opus above named), and sermons and controversial writings collected into 3 volumes, fol. (Cologne, 1537-1541). — Dupin. *Ecclesiastes Hist.* cent. 16, page 433: Kettuer, *Diss. de I. Fabri. Vita et Scriptis* (Lips. 1735, 4to); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 4:307; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generales*, 16:894.

Faber, Johannes

a Dominican monk and polemical writer, born at Heilbronn, 1504. His eloquence and learning gained him early distinction, and in 1534 he was made cathedral-preachear at Augsburg. He wrote largely against the Reformation. Among his writings are *Enchiridion Bibliorum* (Augsb. 1549, 4to): — *Fructus quibus dignoscuntur haeretici* (Augsb. 1551 4to): — *Quod fides esse possit sine chartitate* (Augsb. 1548, 4to): — Joel's *Prophetie erklart: — Testimonium Scripturae et Patrum, Petrum Apostolum Romae fuisse*, etc. See Echmard, *Script. ord. Praed.* 2:161; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen,Lex.* 3:870.

Faber, Johannes

of Augsburg, a Dominican monk of the 16th century, confessor of the emperor Maximilian, and afterwards court-preacher of Charles V. Erasmus calls him "a mild, eloquent, and learned man." He at first wished mild counsels to be followed against Luther, and sympathized with Erasmus, but afterwards seems to have changed his views. He died about 1531. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 15:894.

Faber, Johann Ernst

a distinguished German Orientalist, was born near Hildburghausen (Saxony), February 1745. He prepared for the university in the gymnasium at Coburg, and studied under walch, Heyne, and Michaelis at the University of Gottingein. In 1770 he was called to the chair of Oriental languages at the University of Kiel, and in 1772 to the same position at the University of Jena, where he died March 15 [April 14?],1774. His most important works are, *Descriptio commentarii in septuaginta interpret.* (Gotting. 1768-9, 2 volumes, 4to): — *Dissertat. de animalibus quorum fit mentio Zephan.* 2:14 (ibid. 1769, 4to; reprinted in the *Monuments scythes de la Palestine* by Cramer, Hamb. and Keil, 1777): — *Historia Marmae inter Hebraeos* (pars 1, Kiel, 1770; pars 2, Jena, 1773):— *Programma*

novum de Messia exactis 490 *annis post exilium Judaeorum Babylonicum nascituro ex Zach.* 3:8, 9, 10; *repetitum vaticinium, spatio LXX, hebdomadum* [illegible] *Daniel* 9:24 (ibid. [1771?] 1772, 4to): — *Jesus ex natalium opportunitate Messias* (Jena, 1772, 8vo): — *Archaeologie der Hebraer,* volume 1 (Halle, 1773, 8vo). Faber was also author of an Arabic Grammar and Chrestomathy, which he published at Jena in 1773. — Pierer, *Univ. Lax.* 6:53; *Biog. Universelle,* 14:5; Kitto, *Encl. of Bibl. Lit.* 3:1; Doering, *Theol. Deutschlande,* 1:390: (J.H.W.)

Faber, Johann Melchior

was born January 18 1743, near Hildburghausen (Saxony), and was educated at the gymnasium of Coburg and at the University of Gottingen. In 1768 he was appointed professor of Hebrew and Greek at the gymnasium of Thorn (Prussia); in 1770 he was called to Cobarg as professor of Greek and Rhetoric; and four years later (1774) he was made rector of the gymnasium at Ansbach. In 1795 he became church-counselor (Kirchenrath). He died January 31, 1809. Most of his writings were published in the form of programmes. He was also a contributor to the *Repertorium for biblische und morgenlandische Literatur,* and to Gabler's *Theologisches* Journal. The most important of his theological programmes are, *Programmata sex super libro Sapientiae* (Ansbach, 1776-77, 4to; of which a second part, ibid. 1786-89, 4to): — *Observationes in Epistolam Jacobi ex Syro* (ibid. 1771, 4to): — *De templorum apud Christianos antiquitate dubia* (lb. 1774, 4to): — *Litteras olim pro vocibus in numerando a scriptoribus V.T. esse adhibitas* (ibid. 1775, 4to): — *Unde origo doctrine de inmortalite animorum repetenda videatur* (ibid. 1773, 4to): — *In loca quaedam Habacuci Prophetae* (ibid. 1773, 4to): — *in Malachiam Prophetam* (ibid. 1779, 4to): — Quo *Eusebianae de Jacobi fratris Jesu, vita et morte narrationis partes quaedam explicantur ac defenduntur* (ibid, 1793, 4to): — Harmonia Maccaborum (pars 1, ibid. 1794; par.; 2:1797, 4to). — Doering, *Theologen Deutschlands,* 1:395; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* 2:1. (J.H.W.)

Faber, Petrus

(Pierre) Favre), born in Saxony, 1506, was one of the nine original companions of Loyola in the establishment of the order of Jesuits. He was a zealous coadjutor of Loyola, and rendered great service to the interests of the new order by his missionary journeys into Italy, Spain and Germany.

He died in 1546, on his way to the Council of Trent. His life, by Orlandini, was published at Rome, 1615, fol.; Lyons, 1617, 8vo. — Miigne, *Dict. de Biographie*, 2:156. *SEE LOYOLA; SEE JESUITS*.

Faber

(Favre), Pierre Francois, a Roman Catholic divine, was born about the opening of the 18th century, at St. Barthelemie, canton de Vaud. He was priest at Laudun, in Lower Languedoc, when chosen by the bishop of Halicarnassus, Francois de la Baumae personal secretary and confessor on his visitation-tour to Cochin China. They reached Macao July 15, 1738, and were there, under the pretense of being entertained as visitors, kept as prisoners of the Jesuits some eight months. On their arrival in Cochin China in May, the bishop commenced his visitation work among the missionaries. The converted natives complained bitterly against certain missionaries who had excommunicated them under pretense of Jansenism, but really on account of their refusal to adhere to the heathen ceremonies and funeral sacrifices which thie Jesuits allowed their Chinese converts to follow. The bishop took the side of the people, and ewas accused by the Jesuits before the mandarins as a disturber of the public peace, and he, as well as his secretary, narrowly escaped execution. The bishop appointed Favre his agent to visit the Southern provinces. The opposition with which both were met by the Jesuits shortly afterwards inclined the bishop to divide the country between the Jesuits, the French missionaries, and the Franciscans. The death of the bishop was hastened by sorrow and ill treatment as Faber has it, or by poison as one of the Franciscans reported to Rome. Faber attempted to assume the duties of his position as agent, but, finding that he could not act with success against the opposition of the Jesuits, he returned to Rome August 8, 1741, in order to report to the propaganda and to the pope. But even in Rome he found the Jesuits beforehand in undermining him by slander and every other means in their power, and the decree of the pope did not appear until Faber had almost abandoned the hope of ever receiving it. This decree (issued 1745) in the main sanctioned the acts of Faber and his predecessor. He gives a full account of the mission in *Lettres edifiantes et curieuses sur la visite apostolique de M. de la Bausme, Eveque d'Halicarnasse, a la Cochinchine en* 1740; *ou l'on vouit les voyages et les travaux de ce zele Prelat, la conduite des Missionaires Jesuites, et de quelques autres, avec de nouvelles observations*, etc. The work was condemned by the bishop at Lausanne, and was publicly burned at Freiburg. All copies that could be

procured the Jesuits bought up, in order to prevent its circulation. An extract is given by Simler in his *Samml.* a. u. n. *Urkunden zur Beleuch. tung der Kirchengesch,* 1:195-256. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:309.

Faber Tanaquil

SEE LEFEBVRRE TANNEGUY.

Faber the Oratorian

SEE FABRE.

Fabianus

(pope) is recorded as the 19th bishop of Rome, from 236 to 250, but there is some dispute both as to his name and as to the time of his episcopate. In the Alexandrian Chronicle he is called Flavianus. Eusebius gives an account of certain wonders that happened on his election to the bishopric. "The faithful had assembled in a church for the purpose of the election, and several persons of consideration were proposed, without any thought of Fabianus, though he was present. Of a sudden, a white dove descended from above and alighted on his head. Then the faithful, recalling to their recollection that the Holy Spirit had manifested itself in a like form at the baptism of Jesus Christ, exclaimed that God had exhibited to them his will. Immediately Fabianus was proclaimed pope, and conducted to the episcopal see without other formality than the imposition of hands",(*Hist.* <21002>*Ecclesiastes* 6:29). From this fable the court of Rome derives support for its theory that the Holy Ghost always directs in the election of a pope. Cardinal Cusa says that "what happened in the election of Fabianus happens to every pope, though we do not see it with our natural eyes. In vain, electors, are all your intrigues; the person on whose head the heavenly dove perches will, in spite of them, be chosen" *(De Meth. Consistorii,* 7:85). We have had strange illustrations of this in Borgia and others. Fabianus suffered martyrdom in Decius' persecution, A.D. 250. See *Acta Sanctorum,* January 20; Tillemont, *Memoires,* 3:364; A. Butler, *Lives of Saints,* January 20; Bower, *History of the Popes* (London, 1750), 1:47.

Fable

*(*μύθος, a *myth),* a legend or fictitious story, applied in the N.T. (<54104>1 Timothy 1:4; 4:7; <55004>2 Timothy 4:4; <56014>Titus 1:14; <61016>2 Peter 1:16) to the Jewish traditions and speculations which were prevalent in the apostolic

days, and were afterwards embodied in the Talmudical writings. (See Fleischmann's *Comment.* in 1 Timothy 1:4.)

1. Taking the words fable and parable, not in their strict etymological meaning, but in that which has been stamped upon them by current usage, looking, i.e., at the Esopic fable as the type of the one, at the parables of the N.T. as the type of the other, we have to ask (a.) in what relation they stand to each other as instruments of moral teaching? (b.) what use is made in the Bible of this or of that form? That they have much in common is of course obvious enough. In both we find "statements of facts, which do not even pretend to be historical, used as vehicles for the exhibition of a general truth" (Neander, *Life of Christ*, Harper's ed. page 67). Both differ from the Mythus, in the modern sense of that word, in being the result of a deliberate choice of such a mode of teaching, not the spontaneous, unconscious evolution of thought in some symbolic form. They take their place so far as species of the same genus. What are the characteristic marks by which one differs from the other, it is perhaps easier to feel than to define. Thus we have (comp. Trench, *On Parables*, page 2)

(1.) Lessing's statement that the fable takes the form of an actual narrative, while the parable assumes only that what is related might have happened;

(2.) Herder's, that the difference lies in the fable's dealing with brute or inanimate nature, in the parable's drawing its materials exclusively from. human life;

(3.) Olshausen's (on Matthew 13:1), followed by Trench (1.c.), that it is to be found *in* the higher truths of which the parable is the vehicle. Perhaps the most satisfactory summing up of the chief distinctive features of each is to be found in the following extract from Neander (1.c.): "The parable is distinguished from the fable by this, that in the latter, qualities or acts of a higher class of beings may be attributed to a lower (e.g. those of men to brutes), while in the former the lower sphere is kept perfectly distinct from that which it seems to illustrate. The beings and powers thus introduced always follow the law of their nature, but their acts, according to this law, are used to figure those of a higher race... . The mere introduction of brutes as personal agents in the fable is not sufficient to distinguish it froml the parable which may make use of the same contrivance; as, for example, Christ employs the sheep in one of his parables. The great distinction here, also, lies in what has already been remarked; brutes introduced in the parable act according to the law of their nature, and the two spheres of

nature and of the kingdum of God are carefully separated from each other. Hence the reciprocal relations of brutes to each other are not made use of, as these could furnish no appropriate image of the relation between man and the kingdom of God."

Of the fable as thus distinguished from the parable we have but two examples in the Bible:

(1.) that of the trees choosing their king, addressed by Jothaml to the men of Shechem (Judges 9:8-15);

(2.) that of the cedar of Lebanon and the thistle, as the answer of Jchoash to the challenge of Amaziah (2 Kings 14:9). The narrative of Ezekiel 17:1-10, though, in common with the fable, it brings before us the lower forms of creation as representatives of human characters and destinies, differs from it in the points above noticed,

[1.] in not introducing them as having human attributes;

[2.] in the higher prophetic character of the truths conveyed by it. The great eagle, the cedar of Lebanon, the spreading vine, are not grouped together as the agents in a fable, but are simply, like the bear, the leopard, and the lion in the visions of Daniel, symbols of the great monarchies of the world.

In the two instances referred to, the fable has more the character of the Greek αἶνος, or supernatural *tale* (Quintil. *Inst. Orat.* 5:11), than of the, μῦθος, or *myth;* that is, is less the fruit of a vivid imagination, sporting with the analogies between the worlds of nature and of men, than a covert reproof, making the sarcasm which it affects to hide all the sharper (Muller and Donaldson, *History ,of Greek Literature,* volume 1, c. 11). The appearance of the fable thus early in the history of Israel, and its entire absence from the direct teaching both of the O. and N.T., are, each of them in its way, significant. Taking the received chronology, the fable of Jotham was spoken about B.C. 1209. The Arabian traditions of Lokman do not assign to him an earlier date than that of David. The earliest Greek αἶνος, or proper fable; is that of Hesiod *(Op. et D.* 5:202), and the prose form of the fable does not meet us till we come (about B.C. 550) to Stesichorus and AEsop. The first example in the history of Rome is the apologue of Menenius Agrippa, B.C. 494, and its genuineness has been questioned on the ground that the fable could hardly at that tine have found its way to

Latium (iiller and Donaldson, 1.c.). It may be noticed, too, that when collections of fables became familiar to the Greeks, they were looked upon as imported, not indigenous. The traditions that surround the name of AEsop, the absence of any evidence that he *wrote* fables, the traces of Eastern origin in those ascribed to him, leave him little more than the representative of a period when the forms of teaching, which had long been familiar to the more Eastern nations, were traveling westward, and were adopted eagerly by the Greeks. The collections themselves are described by titles that indicate a foreign origin. They are Libyan (Arist. *Rhet.* 2:20), Cyprian, Cilician. All these facts lead to the conclusion that the Hebrew mind, gifted, as it was, in a special measure with the power of perceiving analogies in things apparently dissimilar, attained, at a very early stage of its growth, the power which does not appear in the history of other nations till a later period. Whatever antiquity may be ascribed to the fables in the comparatively later collection of the Pancha Tranta, the land of Canaan is, so far as we have any data to conclude from, the fatherland of fable. To conceive brutes or inanimate objects as representing human characteristics, to personify them as acting, speaking, reasoning, to draw lessons from them applicable to human life — this must have been common among, the Israelites in the time of the judges. The part assigned in the earliest records of the Bible to the impressions made by the brute creation on the mind of man when "the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them" (<01029>Genesis 2:19), and the apparent symbolism of the serpent in the narrative ofthe Fall (<01001>Genesis 3:1), are at once indications of teaching adspted to men in the possession of this power, and must have helped to develop it (Herder, *Geist der Ebrdischen Poesie, Werke,* 34, page 16, ed. 1826). The large number of proverbs in which analogies of this kind sre made the bases of a moral precept, and some of which (e.g. <20611>Proverbs 26:11; 30:15, 25-28) are of the nature of condensed fables, show that there was no decline of this power as the intellect of the people advanced. The absence of fables accordingly from the teaching of the O.T. must be ascribed to their want of fitness to be the media of the truths which that teaching was to confer. The points in which brutes or inanimate objects present analogies to man are chiefly those which belong to his lower nature, his pride, indolence, cunningand the like, and the lessons derived from them accordingly do not rise higher than the prudential motality which aimis at repressing such defects (comp. Trench, On *the Parables,* 1.c.). Hence the fable, apart from the associations of a grotesque and

ludicrous nature which gather round it; apart, too, from its presenting narratives which are "nec verne nec verisimiles" (Cicero, *De Invent.* 1:19), is inadequate as the exponent of the hbiher truths which belongs to man's spiritual life. It may serve to exhibit the relations between man and man; it fails to represent those between man and God. To do that is the office of the PARABLE, finding its outward framework in the dealing of men with each other, or in the world of nature as it is, not in any grotesque parody of nature, and exhibiting, in either case, real and not fanciful analogies. The fable seizes on that which man has inl common with the creatures below him; that parable rests on the truths that man is made in the image of God, and that "all things are double one against another."

It is noticeable, as confirming this view of the office of the fable, that, though those of AEsop (so called) were known to the great philosopher of righteousness at Athens, though a metrical paraphrase of some of them was among the employmenmts of his imaprisonment (Plato, *Phaedo,* page 60, 61), they were not employed by him as illustrations, or chanuels of instruction. While Socrates shows an appreciation of the power of such fables to represent some of the phenomena mf human life, he was not, hue says, in this sense of the word, μνθολογικός. The myths, which appear in the *Gosgias,* the *Phaedrus;* the *Phaedo,* the *Republic,* are as unlike as possible to the AEsopic fables, are (to take his own account of them) οὐ μῦθοι ἄλλα λόγοι, true, though figurative, representations of spiritual realities, while the illustrations from the common facts of life which were so conspicuous in his ordinary teaching, though differing in being comparisons rather than narratives, come nearer to the parables of the Bible (compare the contrast between τὰ Σωκρατικά , as examples of the παραβολή and the λόγοι Αἰσόπειοι, Aristot. Rhet. 2:20). It "may be said, indeed, that the use of the fable as an instrument of teaching (apart from the embellishments of wit and. fancy with which it is associated by such writers as Lessing and La Fontaine) belongs 'rather to childhood, and the child-like period of national life, than to a more advanced development.' In the earlier stages of political change, as in the cases of Jotham, Stesichorus (Aristot. *Rhet. 1.c.*), Menenius Agrippa, it is used as an element of persuasion or reproof. It ceases to appear in the higher eloquence of orators and statesmen. 'The special excellence of fables is that they are δημηγορικοί (Aristot. Rhet, 1.c); that "ducere animos solent, praecipue rusticorum et iniperitoruni" (Quintilian, *Instit. Orat.* 1.c.). — Smith, s.v.

2. The μῦθοι, or "fables" of false teachers claiming to belong, to the Christian Church, alluded to by writers of the N.T. in connection with "endless genealogies" (γενεαλογίαι ἀπέραντοι. <540104>1 Timothy 1:4), or with disparaging, epithets ("Jewish," Ἰουδαικοί, <560114>Titus 1:14; "old wives', γραωδεῖς, <540407>1 Timothy 4:7; "cunningly devised, σεσοφισμένοί, <610116>2 Peter 1:16), do not appear to have had the character of fables, properly so called. As applied :to them, the word takes its general meaning of anything false or unreal. Thus Paul exhorts Timothy and Titus (<540104>1 Timothy 1:4; 4:7; <560114>Titus 1:14) to shun profane and Jewish fables, as having a tendency to seduce men from the truth. By these fables souce understand the reveries of the Gnostics; but the fathers generally, and most modern commentators, interpret them of the vain traditions of the Jews. The great reservoir of Jewish tradition is the book, or rather the books, called the Talmud. At the time of the Christian aera, the traditions, as they were called, of the law (by which was meant the decisions of the doctors on disputed points of the Mosaic code, and the extravagant fables with which they adorned their comments) had attained so great a bulk and so high a degree of veneration as quite to supersede the law itself in the common estimation. These traditions which were supposed to have been handed down, some from the law of Moses, and some from a period far anterior, were, for the most part, mere directions for ridiculous ceremonies, questions of absurd casuistry, and fables which by their absurdity alone would have disgusted any other nation. Some of these fables and legends are too impious and blasphemous to be quoted, but we select a few specimens. Adam, of whose knowledge we can hardly form too high an idea; was said to be endued with magic. " God, "say the Talmudists, "gave him a precious jewel, the very sight of which would cure all diseases; this came afterwards into the possession of Abraham, but after his death, because, by resson of its exceeding brightness, it was likely to be worshipped, God hung, it in the sun." Our first parents were, according to rabbinical tradition, of a gigantic stature; and this legend has been borrowed and improved by the Mohamedans. The transmigration of souls is much insisted on in the Talmud, and the soul of Adam is said to have passed successively into the bodies of Noahs and David; it will also pass into the Messiah. This doctrine they took from the Egyptian mythology, and it is still ucore ancient than their residence in Egypt. Abraham was the person to whom, they say, it was first revealed, and he taught that the souls of men passed into women, beasts, birds, and even reptiles, rocks, and plants. The spirit of a man was punished by passing into a woman; and if

the conduct of the man had been very atrocious, it took some reptile or inanimate form; and if a woman act righteously, she will, in another state, become a man. Thus the ass that carried Balsam, the ravens that fed Elijaha, the whale that swallowed Jonah, are all supposed to have possessed reasonable, transmacigarated souls. The Mishna says, "The two tables of stone were upwards of two tons weight, but the moment God's word and commandments were engraved thereon by the *shanzir,* they became as light as a feather. When Moses left the mount and cace within sight of the nmolten calf; and heard the multitude shouting, he was alarmed; so that when the rays of the molten calf, which were of gold, came in contact with the tables of stone, the letters thereon immediately flewr away, and the tables of stone returned to their former weight, which was more than Moses could support, and therefore he threw them down, and they brake in pieces." It is also said that Moses was the richest man that ever was or ever will be. His riches consisted of diamonds, which be obtained possession of in the same way that every laborer gets rewarded, by being considered worthy of his hire. Moses never looked for any emolument from the Jews, and God therefore rewarded him in this manner. The two tables of stone were one solid mass of diamonds, and the chippings that came from the two tables were his own perquisites. But what was truly wonderful and astonishing, as the chippings flew off, they became regular and beautiful in their form. This circumstance gave the wicked Jews occasion to charge him with breaking the tackles purposely, in order that he might have the opportunity to obtain more chippings. It is said that Elijah the prophet is going about the world as an ambassador of God, and is everywhere present at one time, and is in his person a venerable old man, wearing a long beard. When Messiah shall appear, there will be a great feast, at which every Jew will be present, This feast will consist of fowl, of fish, and of flesh, which God created for the purpose at the beginning of the world. First, God provided a large fowl or bird, called Agal Loshder; also a large ox, called Shur Abur; and two large fish, called Leviathan. When God created these two great fish, male and female, being of such immense size, lest they should multiply, God slew the female, and buried it in salt, there to remain until it is wanted for this great feast. Then all the Jews that have been born, or that have existed since the creation of the world, will be restored to life. The table will be spread, and the provision placed upon it, and it is so ordained that each one will take his station according to his conduct in the present life. Moses will sit at the head of the table, and next to him Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the

prophets in rotation. Rabbi Simon says he was once sailing in the Great Sea, when he and the mariners espied a fish of such enormous size, that, although they had a fair wind, after they saw one eye of the fish, they sailed five days longer in a direct line before they reached the other eye of the same fish, which confirmed his belief in the report of the size of the leviathan. Much also is related concerning the size of the ox, which is said to be so immense that he eats up the whole of the grass that grows upon a thousand hills every day. The bird, also, is said to be of enormous size, and it is stated that one day this bird, in her flight, dropped an egg, which broke, and the yolk drowned fifty cities and villages (Stehelin, *Jewish Traditions.* passim). *SEE TALMUD.*

In the genuine fables and traditionary narratives of remote antiquity, especially those of the ancient classics, many correspondencies with the Biblical history are found, such as intimate that these traditions were derived from this history. Of such a nature are the tales concerning a golden age of our race, an apostasy, a general flood, a future restoration. It may with safety be inferred from these traditions that the records in the book of Genesis concerning the apostasy, etc., are not philosophical myths; for, were they nothing more than the emanations of some Hebrew philosopher, how could they have been spread abroad among all nations? These popular traditions point us to the time when the human family were collected into one place, and afterwards separated into various branches. In this separation every tribe took with it the traditions that were common to all. *SEE MYTHOLOGY.*

Fabre

SEE FABER.

Fabre, Jean Claude

a French ecclesiastic and father of the Oratory, was born at Paris in 1668, and died there October 22, 1753. In an edition of Richelet's *Dictionnaire* he inserted some passages which brought him under censure, and he was forced to quit the Oratorian order. He is chiefly known as the continuator of Fleury's *Histoire ecclisiastique,* of which he prepared volumes 21-35. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen,.* 16:923.

Fabri, Honore

a learned Jesuit, was born at Bugey, in France, in 1607. He entered the novitiate of the order of Jesuits at Avignon in 1626, taught philosophy and mathematics at the College of Lyons, and was subsequently called to Romne and appointed grand penitentiary. He was an indefatigable worker, and acquired great proficiency in almost every branch of learning, especially in natural sciences. He claimed to have taught the circulation of the blood before the publication, of the celebrated work of Harvey on the subject. He died at Rome in 1688. He wrote several works in defense of the casuistic writers of his order against the attacks of the Jansenists: *Pithanophilus* (Rome, 1659): — *Note in Notas Wilhelmi Wendrockii ad Ludovici Montaltii Litteras* (Cologne, 1659): — *Ludovici Montaltii epistolares Libelli ad provincialem refutati* (Cologne, 1660): — *Apologeticus doctrinae moralis societatis Jesu* (Lyons, 1670): — a summary of scholastic the. ology *(Summula theologica*, Lyons, 1699), and a large number of scientific, polemical, and other works. He bequeathed his MSS. to the establishment of the Jesuits at Lyons. Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 16:945.

Fabrica Ecclesie

the name given in the Latin Church to a special fund for defraying the expenses for building and repairing the Church edifices of a particular congregation. As early as the 5th century it was custonmary that one portion of the property of a particular church should be set aside to this end. According to the rescripts of the Roman bishops Simplicius (475) and Gelasius (494), it was to be the fourth part of the whole property of the church, while in Spain one third was used. The Council of Frankfort in 794 declared that the holder of ecclesiastical benefices had the duty of keeping the church edifices in a proper condition, and this declaration was frequently confirmed by imperial and ecclesiastical laws.. Charles the Bald in 846, besides confirming the same rule, ordered that all the serfs of the Church should work for repairing the churches at least twenty days every year. The parishioners generally were lequired to cooperate for keeping the Church edifices in proper order. There were, however, widely different usages in different localities. The Council of Trent (session 21, cap. 7) established as a general principle that building and repairing expenses should be defrayed from the general revenue of the Church; in case these are not sufficient, all the patrons and others who have any kind of income

from the church, and, if necessary, all the parishioners, are bound to cooperate to that end. This has since been the practice both in the Roman Catholic and in the Protestant state churches. The legislation of the first French empire (decree of 1809) charged the civil community with the duty of keeping the church edifices of all the recognized religions in good order. The civil laws of the European countries have many detailed provisions with regard to the subject, and in some points there is a wide difference.-ferzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 1:737; Wetzer und Welte, 4:876; Helfert, *Von d. Erbauung, Erhaltung ua. Herstellung d. kirch. Gebaude* (Prague, 1834). (A.J.S.)

Fabricius, Andreas

a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Hodege, a village of Liege, A.D. 1520. He studied at Ingolstadt, and became professor of philosophy at Louvain. The bishop of Augsburg sent him as his agent to Rome, where he remained six years under the pontificate of Pius IV. He was afterwards councillor to the duke of Bavaria, and provost of Ottingen, in Suabia, where he died in 1581. His principal work was *Harmonia Confessionis Augustinia* (Cologne, 1573 and 1587, fol.). He wrote also a *Catechismus Romanus ex Decreto Concilii Tridentini,* with notes and illustrations (1570 and 1574, 8vo), and some Latin tragedies. — Hock, *Eccl. Biog*. 5:48; Migne, *Dict. de Biographie Chretienne,* 2:135.

Fabricius, Christoph Gabriel

a German divine, was born at Shackdorf, in Lusatia, May 18, 1681, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg. He served as pastor at Mulhoritz and other places in Lusatia, and died June 12, 1757. He is noted especially for his bitter opposition to the modern Moravians. He wrote *Das entlarvte Herrnhuth* (Herrnhut unmasked, Wittenberg, 1743, 4to, and 1749, 8vo); *Entdeckte herrnhutische Satirerey* (1749, 8vo), in which he seeks to prove that Zinzendorf and the modern Moravians are not the successors of the Bohemian Brethren. — *Biog. Universelle,* 14:62.

Pabricius, Franciscus

a Dutch theologian, was born at Amsterdam April 10, 1663. He studied theology and the Oriental languages at the University of Leyden, at which he afterwards filled the chairs of theology and rhetoric. He died July 27, 1738. His chief works are,

1. *Christus unicum ac perpetuum fundamentum Ecclesiae* (Leyden, 1717, 4to): —

2. *De Sacerdotio Christi juxta Ordinem Melchizedeci* (ib. 1720, 4to): —

3. *Christologia Noachica et Abrahamica* (ib). 1733, 4to): —

4. *De Fide Christiana Patriarcharum et Prophetarum* (ib. 4to):-

5. *Orator Sacer* (ib. 1733. 4to), containing lectures on preaching. — Migne, *Diet. de Biographie Chretienne,* 2:136; *Biog. Universalle,* 14:61.

Fabricius, Georgius

a German philologist, was born at Chemnitz April 24, 1516, and after a liberal course of education traveled to Italy, and spent a long time at Rome, the fruit of which was his *Roma, antiquitatis monumenta,* etc. (Basel, 1550 and 1557, 8vo). He was endowed with some poetical talent, and wrote numerous sacred poems in Latin verse. — *Poematum Sacrorum lib. 15* (Basel, 1560, 16mo). From 1553 to his death (July 13, 1571) he was director of the college at Meissen. His most important work is *Poetarum veterum ecclesiasticorum opera Christiana, thesaurus catholicae et orthodoxae ecclesiae* (Basel, 1564, 4to), a very valuable collection of early Christian hymns and poetry. — Niceron, *Memoires,* 32:31; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale;* 16:958.

Fabricius, Johannes

a German theologian, was born at Altorf February 11, 1644. After a very diligent course of study in, theology and philosophy at the University of Altorf, he journeyed through Germany and Italy from 1670 to 1677. On his return he became professor of theology at Altorf, where he remained twenty years. In 1697 he became professor at Helmstadt, where he died, January 29, 1729. He bore a high reputation for scholarship, and for his minute acquaintance with the Romish controversy. His principal publications are, *Dissertatio de Altaribus* (Helmstadt, 1698, 4to): — *Amaenitates theologicae varii et selecti argumenti* (Helmst. 1699, 4to): — *Historia Biblioth. Fabricianae* (Wolfenbuttel, 1717-24, 6 volumes, 4to): — *Consideratio variarum controversiarum cue Atheis, Gentilibus ... Pontificiis et Reformatis:* (1704; also 1715, confined to the controversies

inter Evangelicos et Catholicos). He inherited the irenical tendencies of Calixtus (q.v.), and sought to show that the points of difference between Romanism and Protestantism are not so great as they are generally held to be; he even went so far as to believe that a Protestant might lawfully 'go over to the Romish Church. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* ◁0160▷*Genesis* 16:962; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* (N.Y. 1854), 3:490.

Fabricius, Johannes

a German Orientalist, was born at Dantzic in 1608. After studying at several German universities, he completed his academical course at Leyden, where he studied Arabic and persian under Golius. In 1635 he began to lecture on Oriental languages, and especially on Arabic, at Rostock. After, travelling, for literary purposes, over nearly all Europe, he was made professor of Hebrew at Dantzic in 1642, and died there in 1653. Among his numerous publications are *Dissertatio Philologica de Nomine Jehova* (Rostock, 1636, 4to): — *De Incarnatione* λογου, *contra Socinianos* (Rostock, 1637, 4to) — *Specimen Arabicum* (1638, 4to): — *Testamentum Mohammedis latine ex Gabrielis Sinaite versione* (Rostock, 1638, 4to). — J.A. Fabricius, *Centurea Fabriciorum;* Hoofer, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale,* 16:962.

Fabricius, Johannes Albert

"the most learned, most voluminous, and most useful of bibliographers," was born at Leipsic November 11, 1668. He lost his parents at an early age, but was sent to study at Quedlinburg, where, by reading Barthius's *Adversaria,* he was inspired with an ardent love of letters. He went to Hamburg in 1693, and spent five years as librarian for J.F. Mayer, dividing his time between preaching and study, till he was chosen professor of rhetoric and philosophy in the gymnasiumn of that city. In 1719 the landgrave of Hesse-Cassel offered him the professorship of theology at Giessen, and the post of general superintendent of the churches of the Augsburg Confession; but the magistrates of Hamburg augmented his salary for the sake of keeping him, and of this he ever after retained so grateful a sense that no offers of preferment could tempt him to leave them. He died at Hamburg April 3, 1736, with the character of being one of the most learned of men. The list of his published writings exceeds 100 titles.

His principal works are,

(1.) *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti,* Gr. et Lat. collectus, et Animadversionibus illustratus (Hamb. 1713, 12mo; 2d ed. with a supplementary volume, ib. 1722-23, 12mo): —

(2.) *Codex Apocryphus* N.T. (2d ed. Hamb. 1719, 3 volumes, fol.): *SEE APOCRYPHA OF N.T.*: —

(3.) *Observatiines selectae in varia loca Nov. Test. variorum auctorum* (Hamb. 1712, small 8vo): —

(4.) *Bibliotheca Antiquaria* (Hamb. 1,713; 2d ed. 1760, 2 volumes, 4to), containing notices of all writers on Hebrew, Greek, Roman, and Christian antiquities: —

(5.) *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (Hamb. 1718, fol.), collecting the works of a number of Latin ecclesiastical writers: —

(6.) *Bibliotheca Graeca, sive notitia Script. Vet. Grcecorum, quorumcunque monum. integ. aut. fragm. edita, extant* (Hamb. 1728, 14 volumes, 4to). Of this invaluable collection a fourth and enlarged edition, edited by Harles, was commenced in 1790, of which 12 vols. had appeared up to 1811, extending to volume 11, page 544 of the former edition: an *Index* to the whole was published in 1838: (4to).

(7.) Collection of authors on Christian Evidences, under the title *Delectus Artumentorum et Syllabus Scriptorum qui veritatem religionis Christianae asseruerunt,* etc. (Hamb. 1725, 4to): —

(8.) *Bibliotheca Latina* (Venice, 1728, 2 volumes, 4to; re-edited by Ernesti, Lips. 1774, 3 volumes, 8vo): —

(9.) *Bibliotheca mediae et infirme Latinitatis* (best edit. Mansis, Padua, 1754, 6 volumes, 4to): — *Hydrotheologia,* written in German, and translated into French under the title *Theologie de l'Eau, ou Essai sur la Bonte, la Sagesse et la Puissance de Dicu, manifestees dans la Creation de l'Eau* (La Haye, 1741, 8vo): — *Conspectus Thesauri Litterarii Italiae* (1749, 8vo); or notices of the principal collections of the historians of Italy, as well as of other writers who have illustrated the antiquities, geography, etc., of that country, including the great works of Burmlannus and Graevius, with an account of the Italian literary journals existing or which had existed before the time of Fabricius, of the Italian academies, and a catalogue of Italian bibliographers and biographers classed according to the

particular towns which they have illustrated: — *Salutaris Lux Evangelii, sive Notitia Propagatorum per Orbem totum. Christianorum Sacrorum: accedunt Epistolea quaedan ineditae Juliani Imperatoris, Gregorii Habessini Theologia AEthiopica, necnon Index geographicus Episcopatum Orbis Christiani* (1731, 4to): — *Centifolium Lutheranum, sive Notitia Literaria Scriptorum omnis generis de Martino Luthero, ejus Vita, Scriptis, et Reformatione Ecclesiae editorum* (1730, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Centuria Fabriciorums Script. clarorum qui jam diem. suam obierunt collecta (1709, 2 volumes, 8vo, with a continuation in 1727). The author has included in his list not only the authors whose name or surname was Fabricius, but also those whose names may be turned into the Latin Fabricius, such as Lefevre. Fabri, the German Schmidts, etc. Independently of the above and other minor works, Fabricius published editions of Sextus Empiricus, of the Gallia Orientalis of father Colomies, of the works of St. Hippolytus, and many others. For an account of his life and writings, see Reimar, *De vita et Script. J.A. Fabricii comment. (1737,* 8vol). — *Biographie Universelle,* 14:54 sq.; *English Cyclopaedia,* s.v.

Fabricius, Johann Ludwig

a Swiss divine, was born at Schaffhausen in 1632; studied at Utrecht and Paris, and in 1656 became pastor and professor, first of Greek, afterwards of theology, at Heidelberg. In 1664 he was made councillor to the elector palatine in ecclesiastical affairs. When Heidelberg was taken by the French in 1688, he retired to Schaffhausen, and afterwards to Frankfort. On his return to Heidelberg, when the castle and city were set on fire in the bombardment, he saved the archives of the city and university, and carried them to Frankfort, where he died in 1697. Among his writings are *Apologeticum pro Genere humano contra Calumniam Atheismi: — De Baptismo infantibus heterodoxorum conferendo: — De Ludis Scenicis: — De baptismo per mulierem vel hominem privatum administrato* — all gathered, with others, in an edition of his writings published by J.H. Heidegger (Zurich, 1698, 4to). — *Biog. Universelle,* 14:55.

Fabricius, Lorenz

a German divine, was born at Dantzic, 1555, and studied at various German universities, especially at Strasburg, in Hebrew, and at Wittemberg, where he became doctor of philosophy in 1587. In 1593 he was made professor of Hebrew at Wittemberg, in which office he remained

until his death, April 28, 1629. He published *Oratio de Lingua* Hebraea *(Wittemb.* 1594): — *Partitiones Codicis Hebraei* (Wittemb. 1610, 4to): — De *Reliquiis Sanctis Syrarum Vocum in N.T.* (Wittemb. *1613,* 4to): — *Metrica Hebrae*orum (Wittemb. 8vo). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 14:959.

Fabricius, Theodor

a German divine and reformer, was born in Anholt (in Prussia) February 2, 1501, of very poor parents. He was apprenticed to a shoemaker, and could not begin to go to school until he was sixteen years old. His diligence and success attracted the attention of count Oswald of Bergen, who sent him to Cologne to study at the university. He afterwards went to Wittemberg, where he not only studied Hebrew thoroughly, but also imbibed from Luther and Melancthon the principles of the Reformation. His patron abandoned him; but although he was reduced to great straits of poverty, he maintained his integrity, and courage. Returning to Cologne, he taught Hebrew, but was soon driven away as a heretic. Philip of Hesse received him, and made him his almoner. In 1536 he became pastor at Allendorf. In 1540 he was imprisoned by the elector for preaching against polygamy. In 1543 he returned to Wittemberg, as professor of Hebrew and of theology. His life, in many respects a stormy one, ended on the 15th of October, 1550. He published *Instutiones Grammaticae in Lingunam Sanctum* (Cologne, 1528, 1531, 4to): — *Tabulae de verbis et nominibus Heb.* (Basel, 1545). There is a sketch of his life in Hase, *Biblio. Bremensis,* part i. *Biog. Universelle,* 14:46.

Fabricy, Gabriel

a French archaeologist, was born at Saint-Maximin, in the Provence, about 1725, entered the Dominican order, and became professor of theology at Rome where he died in 1800. Among his writings are *Censoris theologi Diatribe, qua bibliographiae antiquariae et sacrae critices capita aliquot illustrantur* (Rome, 1782, 8vo). He entered upon the study of Pheonician antiquities and literature, but did not live to complete his plans; the partial fruit of his labors appears in *De Phaeniciae Litteraturae Fontibus* (Rome, 1803, 2 volumes, 8vo). Perhaps his best work is *Des Titres primitifis de la Revelation, ou considerations critiques sur la purete et l'integrite du texte original des livres saints de l'ancien Testament* (Rome, 1772, 2 volumes, 8vo), which is still of value in Biblical criticism. — Biog. *Universelle,* 2:66.

Facciolati

(FACCIOLATO), JACOPO, was born at Torreglia, Italy, January 4, 1682. He was educated in the college at Este, and afterwards in the seminary at Padua, where he became professor of theology and philosophy, and director of studies. "The seminary of Padua had then, as subsequently, a high reputation as a place for the study of Latin, and for the numerous and generally accurate editions of the classics and other school-books which have come from its press. Facciolati contributed to support this reputation by his labors. Among other works, he published improved editions of the *Lexicon* of Schrevelius, of the *Thesaurus Ciceronianus* of Nizolius, and of the vocabulary of seven languages, known by the name of *Lexicon Calepinum* (1731, 2 volumes, fol.). In this last undertaking he was greatly assisted by his pupil, Egidio Forcellini, although he was not willing to acknowledge the obligation. It was in the course of his joint labors with Facciolati that Forcellini conceived the plan of a totally new Latin dictionary, which, after more than, thirty years' assiduous application, he brought to light under the title of *Totius Latinitate Lexicon* (Paduua, 1771, 4 volumes, fol.). This work has superseded all other Latin dictionaries. Forcellini, more generous than Facciolati, acknowledged in the title-page of his work that its production was in great measure due to the advice and instruction of his deceased master. The MS. of his *Lexicon*, in 12 volumes, fol., is preserved in the library of the seminary." The best editions are (1) that of Furlanetto (Patav. 1827-32, 4 volumes, 4to; ed. by Hertel and Voigtlander, Schneeberg, 1835-38, 4 volumes, fol.; also by Giacehetto, 18394.5, 4 volumes, 4to); (2) that of Bailey, with English renderings (1828, 2 volumes, 4to). "In 1722, Facciolati, being appointed professor of logic in the University of Padua, delivered a series of introductory Latin discourses to the students of his class, which were received with considerable applause. His Latin epistles, as well as his *Orations*, or discomuinses, have been admired for the purity of their diction. The king of Portugal sent Facciolati a flattering invitation to Lisbon to take the direction of the public studies in his kingdom, but Facciolati declined the honor on account of his advanced age. He, however, wrote instructions for the reorganization of the scholastic establishments of that country, which had become necessary after the expulsion of the Jesuits." Facciolati died at Padua August 25, 1769. Besides numerous morks on philosophy, he published *Vita at Acta Jesu Christi secundum utransque generationum, divinam ac humanam* (Padua, 1761, 24mo): — *Viatica Theologica*

(Padua, 1763): — *Vita ea Acta Mariae Virginis (Pasdua,* 1764). — *English Cyclopadia,* s.v.; *Biog. Universelle,* 14:80.

Face

(usually μynPæ *,panim', πρόσωπον),* whatever of a thing is most exposed to view; hence the face of the country, ground, waters, sky, etc. In Scripture, this term is often used to denote *presence* in the general sense; and, when applied to the Almighty, denotes such a complete manifestation of the divine presence, by sound or sight, ss was equivalent, in the vividness of the impression, to the seeing of a fellow-creature "face to face." The "face of God," therefore, denotes in Scripture anything or manner by which God is wont to manifest himself to man. Thus, when it is said that Adam and Eve hid themselves from "the face of Jehovah," we understand that they hid themselves from his presence, however manifested; for the term there used is the only proper word to denote presence in the Hebrew language. It was a very common and ancient opinion that our mortal frame could not survive the more sensible manifestations of the divine presence, or "see God face to face and live" (<01320>Genesis 32:30). Hence, in this passage, the gratitude and astonishment of Jacob that he still lived after God had manifested himself to him more sensibly than by dreams and visions. This imupression was confirmed to Moses, who was told, "Thou canst not see my face: no man can see my face and live" (<02330>Exodus 33:20), which clearly signifies that no one can in this present state of being endure the view of that glory which belongs to him (<461312>1 Corinthians 13:12; <620302>1 John 3:2; <662204>Revelation 22:4). The ancient heathen entertained the same notion, which is remarkably expressed in the celebrated mythological story of Semele, who, having prevailed on the reluctant love to appear to her in his heavenly splendor, was struck dead by the lightnings of his presence. It is to be borne in mind that God is usually represented to us in Scripture under a human force; and it is indeed difficult for even more spiritualized minds than those of the Hebrews to conceive of him apart from the form and attributes of the highest nature actually known to us. The Scriptures sanction this concession to the weakness of our intellect, and hence arise the anthropomorphous phrases which speak of the face, the eyes, the arm of God. The appearances of the angels in the Old Testament times were generally in the human form (<071306>Judges 13:6, etc.), and from this cause alone it would have been natural, in the imagination, to transfer the form of the messengers to him by

whom they were sent. *SEE ANTHROPOMORPHISM*. The presence of Jehovah (<02314>Exodus 33:14, 15) and the "angel" (<02320>Exodus 23:20, 21) is Jehovah himself; but in <23609>Isaiah 63:9, the angel of his presence is opposed to Jehovah himself. The light of God's countenance is a token of his favor, and is therefore put synonymously with favor (<19403>Psalm 44:3; <27917>Daniel 9:17). Thus, as in man, if the countenance be serene, it is a mark of good will; if fiery or piercing, of anger or displeasure. "Face" also signifies anger, justice, and severity (<01606>Genesis 16:6, 8; <02125>Exodus 2:15; <19701>Psalm 78:1; <66616>Revelation 6:16).

The Jews prayed with their faces turned towards the Temple (<11838>1 Kings 8:38, 44, 48), and those residing out of Jerusalem turned it towards that point of the heavens in which Jerusalem lay (<27610>Daniel 6:10); thus the Mohammedans, when praying, always turn their faces towards Mecca. To bow down the face in the dust (<23423>Isaiah 49:23) is a mark of the lowest humiliation and submission. *SEE ATTITUDES.*

The "bread of faces" is the show-bread which was always in the presence of God. *SEE SHOW-BREAD.*

Faculties

a term of the Roman Catholic Church lay, designating certain rights as to ecclesiastical functions which an ecclesiastical superior confers upon subordintes., The most important faculties are those conferred by the popes upon bishops, especially with regard to dispensations. The first instances of such dispensations being given to foreign missionaries occur in the 13th century. Subsequently, especially since the 16th century, very extensive faculties were granted to the papal nuncios. As the Council of Trent reserved many dispensations which in former times had been granted by the bishops to the pope, and as many bishops regarded the Jurisdiction exercised by the nuncios as injurious to their authority, they applied to the pope for special faculties with regard to a number of dispensations. These faculties were generally granted for a term of five years *(facultates quinquennales*). An effort made in the 18th century by some of the German archbishops to reassert their own authority in the cases covered by the papal faculties was unsuccessful, *SEE EMS, CONGRESS OF*, and the *facultates quinquennales* are still conferred upon the bishops by the pope. Besides this general class of faculties, which contains twenty different provisions, many special faculties are conferred upon bishops in particular cases. The bishops, in their turn, confer faculties upon the vicars-general,

deans, and common priests of their dioceses, either delegating to them rights which properly belong to bishops, or subdelegating papal rights which they have been specially authorized to subdelegate. — Herzog, *Real-Encklop.* 4:315; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirch.-Lax.* 4:879. (A.J.S.)

Faculty

in England, is a special privilege or dispensation granted by favor and indulgence to enable a person to do that which he is not permitted to do without it. There is a court of the Facultie the chief officer of which is master of the Faculties, under the archbishop of Canterbury that has power, by 25 Henry VIII, 21, to grant dispensations to marry, to hold two or more incompatible benefices, and the like; and in it are registered the certificates of peers to their chaplains to qualify them for pluralities and non-residence. The last gives authority to grant such dispensations "for any such matters, not being repugnant to the holy Scriptures and the laws of God, whereof before such dispensations, etc., had been accustomed to be had at the see of Rome. Up to the time of passing this act, the pope, notwithstanding the statutes which had been passed restraining his authority, continued tou exercise his powmer, and to draw a commsiderable revemamme for indmilgences, etc. the sittings of the court have always been held at Doctors' Commons" (q.v.).

Faculty

SEE UNIVERSITY.

Facundus

bishop of Hermiane, in Africa. He took part in the conference held at Constantinople in 547 by pope Vigilius (q.v.), to discuss the *tria capitula*, *SEE CHAPTERS, THE THREE*, and sustained the side of Theodore and Theodoret against the emperor's view. Vigilius demanded that he (with other opposing bishop) should sign the condemnation of Ibas, Theodore, and Theodoret. He refused absolutely, and bore with firmness the persecution and banishment which followed. He "is supposed to have died about A.D. 553. His treatise *Pro defensione trium Capitulorum*, lib. 12, will be found in Sirmond, *Opera Varia*, 2:297 (Venet. 1728, 2 volumes, fol.); *in Bib. Max. Patr.* 10; in D'Achery, *Spicalegum*, 3:307, of the first edition, and in 3:106, edit. of 1723; and in Migne, *Patrologic Latina*, 67:527 sq. His *Contra Mocianum Liber*, condemning Mocianus and

Vigilius for their course with regard to the "Three Chapters," is also given in Migne (67:853).

Neander says that the writings of Facundus "are characterized by qualities seldomn to be met with in that age — a freedom of spirit unshackled by humas fear, and a candid, thorough criticism, superior in many respects to the prejudices of the times. Nobly did he protest against the uncalled-for dogmatism which had ever been the source of so much mischief to the Greek Church, these useless disputes having in fact proceeded from no other cause. 'While,' he said, 'in all other arts and occupations, no one presumed to pass judgment on what he had never learned; in matters of theology, on the contrary, they who learned the least were the most arrogant and peremptory in their judgments. When the civil power overstepped its province, it might indeed plunge numbers in ruin by misleading them to deny the truth with their lips, but still it could never effect its object, for it could not instil into the minds of men other convictions than they had: its power reached only to what was outward, not to the soul.' He spoke eith scorn of those bishops who accused themselves in pleading, in excuse of their behavior, the constraint under which they were placed; for it was not even the force of torture, but only the fear of the emperor's displeasure, which had brought them to yield *(Const. Mocianum,* f. 595). 'As if,' said he, 'we had been ordained bishops for no other purpose than to be enriched by the presents of princes, and to sit with them among the high authorities of the state. But if, amidst the many cares of the state, through the deceitful arts of the wicked, of which there is never any lack, anything has been admitted by them which tended to injure the Church or to disturb its peace, as if it were not our duty to set before them the truth for their own benefit, and, if it be necessary, to resist them with the authority of religion, and patiently endure their displeasure if we must incur it. If God should now raise up an Ambrose,' said he, 'there would not fail to be a Theodosius'" *(Church History,* Torrey's, 2:544). There is a remarkable pas.sage in the *Defensio* showing that Facundus did not hold the Romanist doctrine as to the corporeal presence in the Eucharist: "Potest sacramentum adoptionis adoptio nuncupari, sicut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis ejus, quod est in pane et poculo consecrato, corpus ejus et sanguinem dicimus: non quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguis sed quod in se mysterium corporis ejus et sanguinis continent" ("The sacrament of adoption may be called adoption itself, as we term the sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the

bread and the consecrated cup, his body and blood; *not that the bread is properly his body and the cup his blood,* but because they contain within them the mystery of his body and blood" (9:5, Migne, 67:762). — Neander, *Ch. History,* 2:544; Neander, *History of Dogmas* (Ryland), 1:278; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* 1:520; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Paris, 1862), 11:285 sq.; Waterland, *Works* (Oxford), 4:599, note.

Fadus Cuspius

(Graecized Κούσπιος Φάδος, Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 4), a Roman knight of the time of the emperor Claudius. After the death of king Agrippa, in A.D. 44, he was appointed by Claudius procurator of Judaea. During his administration peace was restored in the country, and the only disturbance was created by one Theudas (q.v.), who came forward with the claim of being a prophet. He and his followers were put to death by command of Fadus. He was succeeded in the administration of Judaea (A.D. cir. 46) by Tiberius Alexander (Josephus, *Ant.* 19:9; 20:5, 1; *War,* 2:11, 5; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5:9; Zonaras, 12:11; Eusebius, *Hist.* <21021>*Ecclesiastes* 2:11). — Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v. *SEE PROCURATOR.*

Fagius, Paulus

(properly BUCHLEIN), was born at Rheinzabern in 1504. His studies were pursued at Heidelberg and Strasburg, where he became a great proficient in Hebrew, and was led into close acquaintance with Capito, Hedio, Bucer, Zell, and other learned reformers. In 1537 he entered the ministry, and was pastor at Isny until 1543. Here he studied Hebrew thoroughly under Elias Levita (q.v.) and also established a Hebrew press. In 1541, when the plague began to rage in Isny, he publicly rebuked those of the wealthy classes who forsook the place without making provision for the relief of the poor, and himself visited the sick in person, and administered spiritual comfort to them day and night, and yet escaped. On the death of Capito at Strasburg, the senate called Fagius to succeed him as professor and pastor there (1544). In 1546, Frederick II, the elector palatine, intending a reformation in his churches, called him to Heidelberg, and made him professor there. He opposed the Interim (q.v.), and when it was introduced he was compelled to leave Strasburg. In 1548 he accepted the invitation of Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and came to England. He was nominated by the archbishop to the professorship of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Before he went to Cambridge he resided with the

archbishop at Lambeth, where he was associated with Bucer. His labors while there, in addition to the preparation necessary for his professional office, are thus described by Strype: "As it has been a great while the archbishop's desire that the Holy Bible should come abroad in the greatest exactness, and true agreement with the original text, so he laid this work upon these two learned men, viz. Fagius and Bucer. First, that they should give a clear, plain, and succinct interpretation of the Scripture, according to the propriety of the language; and, secondly, illustrate difficult and obscure places, and reconcile those that seemed repugnant to one another. And it was his will and his advice that to this end and purpose their public readings should tend. This pious and good work, by the archbishop assigned to them, they most gladly and readily undertook. For their more regular carrying on this business, they allotted to each other, by consent, their distinct tasks. Fagius, because his talent lay in the Hebrew learning, was to undertake the Old Testament, and Bucer the New. The leisure they now enjoyed with the archbishop they spent in preparing their respective lectures. Fagius entered upon the evangelical prophet Esaias, and Bucer upon the Gospel of the evangelist John; and some chapters in each book were dispatched by them. But it was not long but both of them fell sick, which gave a very unhappy stop to their studies." He died at Cambridge November 13,1549. His body, along with Bucer's, was dug up and burnt in queen Mary's time. He wrote various books on Biblical and Hebrew literature, among which are *Metaphrasis et Enarratio Epis. Paul. ad Romans* (Strasb. 1536, fol.): — *Sententiae sapientum Hebraeorum* (Isny, 1541, 4to): — *Annotationes in Targum* (Isny, 1546, fol.): — *Expositio literalis in IV priora Capita Geneseos, cui accessit Textus Hebraici et Paraphraseos Chaldaic. collatio,* 4to (this and the last work reprinted in the *Critici Sacri)*: — *Precationes Hebraicae, ex libello Hebraico excerptae cui Nomen, Liber Fidei* (1542, 8vo): — *Tobias Hebraicus in Latinam translatus* (1542, 4to): — *Ben Syrae Sententiae Morales, cum succincto Commentario* (1542,4to): — *Isagoge in Linguam Hebraicam* (Constance, 1543, 4to). — Middleton, *Evang. Biography,* 1:260; Melchior Adam, *Vitae theolog.* 1:99; Hook, *Ecclesiastes Biog.* 5:50.

Fagnani, Prosper

an Italian writer on ecclesiastical law, was born in 1598. He was for fifteen years secretary of the Congregation for the Interpretation of the Council of Trent *(Congregatio Conc. Trid. Interpret.),* and subsequently professor of canon law at the Roman Academy. He was regarded as the ablest Roman

jurist of his time, and was frequently consulted by the popes. Alexander VII charged him with compiling a commentary on the Decretals, which appeared in 3 volumes, fol. at Rome in 1661 (reprinted at Cologne, 1676; Venice, 1697, and in many other editions). As Fagnani had been entirely blind from his forty-fourth year, he had to dictate the whole commentary to a clerk. He died at Rome in 1678. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 4:883.

Fair

(properly hpy; *yapheh'*, καλός). Travellers inform us that in hot countries the greatest difference imaginable subsists between the complexions of the women. Those of high condition seldom go abroad, and are ever accustomed to be shaded from the sun with the greatest attention, and their skin is consequently fair and beautiful. But women in the lower ranks of life, especially in the country, being, from the nature of their employments, more exposed to the scorching rays of the sun, are in their complexion remarkably tawny and swarthy. Under such circumstances, a high value would of course be set by the Eastern ladies upon the fairness of their complexions, as a distinguishing mark of their superior quality, no less than as an enhancement of their beauty. This notion appears to have obtained as early as the time of Abraham (<01211>Genesis 12:11-13). Thus, also, how natural is the bride's self-abasing reflection in <22106>Song of Solomon 1:5, 6, respecting her tawny complexion among the fair daughters of Jerusalem, who, as attendants on a royal marriage, were of the highest rank. Roberts observes, in reference to the daughters of Job being very fair (<18215>Job 42:15), "The word fair may sometimes refer to the form of the features as well as the color of the skin; but great value is attached to a woman of a light complexion. Hence our English females are greatly admired in the East, and instances have occurred where great exertions have been made to gain the hand of a fair daughter of Britain. The acme of perfection in a Hindu lady is to be of the color of gold." *SEE BEAU'TY.*

Fairbanks Erastus, LL.D.

governor of Vermont, was born at Brimfield, Massachusetts, October 28, 1792. He obtained such education as the district school afforded, and at seventeen himself taught a district school. From his youth he was diligent in self-culture. In 1812 he removed to St. Johnsbury, Vermont, and in March, 1814, he united with the Congregational Church in that place. From this time to the end of his life the interests of religion and the Church

were paramount to all others in his life and habits of thought. After various vicissitudes in trade, he began in 1830 the manufacture of the patent — "platform scale," which is now in use all over the world, and from the sale of which he laid the foundation of a large fortune. The village of St. Johnsbury grew in population, wealth, and virtue, so as to have become a model place under his skillful guidance. "Drunkenness and disorder were things unknown; industry, intelligence, and thrift were universal." In 1828 he became a deacon of the Congregational Church. In 1836 he was elected a member of the State Legislature, in 1844 and 1848 presidential elector, and in 1852 and 1860 he was chosen governor of the State of Vermont. In the execution of his official duties he was conscientious and faithful, and acquired and retained, in an unusual degree, the confidence of all parties. During his second term of office the civil war broke out. "His firm having a great amount of property in the South which must be lost in case of war, it was for his pecuniary interest to keep peace. But this had no weight with him. Day and night he toiled raising troops, where, three months before, not even a knapsack was to be found, and sending regiment after regiment of the brave Green Mountain Boys forward to the seat of war." The Legislature conferred upon him almost unlimited power in the discharge of his duties, and placed at his sole disposal a million of dollars, and at the close of his official term in 1861 passed votes of approval of his labors, ability, and patriotic devotion. He never touched even the salary to which he was entitled. He was for many years a corporate member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and both in this field and in that of home missions he devoted time, talents, and money freely to the cause of God. His personal literary culture was diligently carried on during his life, and in 1860 the University of Vermont conferred on him the degree of LL.D. He died November 20, 1864. To trace the thirty-four years of his life from 1830 to his death "is to record the daily acts of a life devoted to every good and noble work. Rare must be the talent which could organize and direct such a business in the face of so many obstacles, in an inland town, remote from business centres, sand guide it safely through all the financial embarrassments to which the country has been subject. But a fact far more rare and interesting is that, in the midst of so many cares, time abundant was always found, and means equally abundant, not only for aiding in every good work, but for leading in new bencevolent movements, for which many, with far less to do thought they could find no time." "His munificent contributions to benevolent purposes and objects were proverbial long before his death, and in

connection with 'good words and works' the name of Erastus Fairbanks had, to the people of his state, come to be as familiar as household words. In public life he was honored and confided in as a capable, honest, and reliable man; and in the walks of social and private life he was esteemed as a kind neighbor, a sincere friend, and a Christian gentleman." — *Congregational Quarterly*, 1867, No. 1.

Fair Ha'vens

(Καλοί Διμένες), a harbor in the island of Crete (Acts 27:8), not mentioned in any other ancient writing. There seems no probability that it is, as most early commentators thought (see Biscoe, On *the Acts,* page 347, ed. 1829), the Καλὴ Ἀκτή, or *Fair Beach,* of Steph. Byz. (see Kuindl, Comment. in loc.); for that is said to be a city, whereas Fair Havens is described as "a place near to which was a city called Lasma." Moreover, Mar. Pashley found *(Travels in Crete,* 2:57) a district called *Acte;* and it is most; likely that Καλη Ἀκτή was situated there; but that; district is in the west of the island, whereas Fair Havens was on the south. Its position is now quite certain. Though not mentioned by classical writers, if is still known by the old Greek name, as it was in the time of Rauwolf (who calls it Calismene), Pococke (2:250), and other early travelers mentioned by Mr, Smith *(Voy. and Shipwr. of St. Paul,* 2d ed. page 80-82). LASKEA, too, has recently been most explicitly discovered. — In fact, Fair Havens appears to have been practically its harbor. These places are situated four or five miles to the east of Cape Matala, which is the most conspicuous headland on the south coast of Crete, and inencediately to the west of which the coast trends suddenly to the north. This last circumstance explains why the ship which conveyed Paul was brought to anchor in Fair Havens. In consequence of violent and continuing northwest winds she had been unable to hold on her course towards Italy from Cnidus (Acts 27:7), and had ran down, by Salmone, under the lee of Crete. It was possible to reach Fair Havensa but beyond Cape Matala the difficulty would have recurred so long as the wind remained in the same quarter. A considerable delay took place (verse 9), during which it is possible that Paul may have had: opportunities of preaching the Gospel at Lassea, or even at GORTYNA, where Jews resided (1 Macc. 15:23), and which was not far distant; but all this is conjectural. A consultation took place, at which it was decided, against the apostle's advice, to make an attempt to reach a good harbor named PHENICE (verse 12). However, the south wind, which sprang up

afterwards (verse 13), proved delusive; and the vessel was caught by a hurricane *SEE EUROCLYDON* on her way towards Phenice, and ultimately wrecked. — Smith, s.v. *SEE SHIPWRECK (of Paul).* The name of the place is appropriate. It is shut in on the west by a bold headland, on the summit of which are the ruins of an ancient convent dedicated tose St. Paul. On the south it is sheltered by two little islands; and between these and the shore is a safe anchorage. The roadstead, however, is open to the sea, and we can thus see the truth of Luke's statement that it was " incommodious to winter in" (ἀνεύθετος πρὸς παραχειμασίαν, verse 12; see Smith, page 256; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 2:320). *SEE CRETE*.

Fairs

(μυναβαζ][æSept. ἀγορά,Vulg. *nun. din, forum),* a word which occurs only in Ezekiel 27, and there no less than seven times (verses 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 27, 33) in the last of these verses it is rendered "wares," and this appears to be the true meaning of the word throughout (so Furst, *Hebrews Handwb.* s.v.; but Gesenius, *Hebrews Lex.* s.v., thinks it means traffic in general, and also *gains*). It will be observed that the word stands in some sort of relation to br;[}mi *manab',* throughout the whole of the chapter, the latter word also occurring seven times, and translated sometimes "market" (verse 13, 17, 19), and elsewhere "merchandise" (verses 9, 27, 33, 34). The words are used alternately, and represent the alternations of commercial business in which the merchants of Tyre were engaged. That the first of these words cannot signify "fairs" is evident from verse 12; for the inhabitants of Tarshish did not visit Tyre, but *vice versa.* Let the reader substitute "paid" or "exchanged for thy wares" for "occupied in thy fairs," and the sense is much improved. The relation which this term bears to *maarab*, which properly means barter, appears to be pretty much the same as exists between exports and imports. The sense of *izzabon* (ˆwbZ;[athe presumed sing. form) thus becomes essentially that proposed by Gousset *(Commentarii Ling. Hebr.* page 594) and adopted by Havernick *(Commentar.* page 464), namely, *exchange,* or *equivalent.* The requirements of the Tyrians themselves, such as slaves (verse 13), wheat (verse 17), steel (verse 19), were a matter of *maarab;* but where the business consisted in the exchange of Tyrian wares for foreign productions, it is specified in this form: "Tarshish *paid for thy wares* with silver, iron, tin, and lead" (see Hitzig, Commentar, in loc.). The use of the terms would

probably have been more intelligible if the prophet had mentioned what the Tyrians gave in exchange: as it is, he only notices the one side of the bargain, viz. what the Tyrians received, whether they were buyers or sellers. *SEE COMMERCE*. The natural sea-port of Western Asia, and the center of the commerce of the East, was Tyre, or, rather, the ports of Phoenicia, for Tyre was but one of them. Phoenicia early grasped this commerce, and retained it until the rise of Alexander. Sidon first rose to opulence; and then Tyre, her "daughter," better situated for commerce, soon eclipsed her glory, and became the mart of the world. The enumeration of the articles of traffic in Ezekiel 27 shows that a large part of the commerce of Tyre was in articles of luxury, though it was the grand mart for all the trade of the Eastern and Western world. *SEE TYPRE*.

Fairs, however, although not directly referred to by the above Hebrews terms, were doubtless anciently common, as now, in the East. Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, 2:152 sq.) thus describes the scene at these Oriental mercantile gatherings: "On Monday of each week a great fair is held at the khans, when, for a few hours, the scene is very lively and picturesque. These gatherings afford an excellent opportunity to observe Syrian manners, customs, and costumes, and to become acquainted with the character and quality of her productions. Thousands of people assemble from all parts of the country either to sell, trade, or purchase. Cotton is brought in bales from Nablus; barley, and wheat, and sesamum, and Indian corn from the Humleb, the Hauran, and Esdraelon. From Gilead and Bashan, and the surrounding districts, come horses and donkeys, cattle and flocks, with cheese, milk, oil, honey, and similar articles. Then there are miscellaneous articles, such as chickens and eggs, figs, raisins, apples, melons, grapes, and all sorts of fruits and vegetables in their season. The peddlers open their packages of tempting fabrics; the jeweller is there with his trinkets; the tailor with his ready-made garments; the shoemaker with his stock, from rough, hairy sandals to yellow and red Morocco boots; the farrier is there with his tools, nails, and flat iron shoes, and drives a prosperous business for a few hours; and so does the saddler, with his coarse sacks and his gayly-trimmed cloths. And thus it is with all the arts and occupations known to this people. The noise is incessant, and at a distance sounds like that 'of many waters.' Every man is crying his wares at the top of his voice, chickens cackle and squall, donkeys bray and fight, and the dogs bark. Every living thing adds somewhat to the many-toned and prodigious uproar. It is now a miscellaneous comedy in full operation,

where every actor does his best, and is supremely gratified with his own performance. The people find many reasons for sustaining these antiquated and very curious gatherings. Every man, woman, and child has inherited the itch for trading, and, of course, all classes meet at this grand *bourse* to talk over the state of the markets, from the price of a cucumber to that of cotton, or of a five-thousand dollar horse from the Hauran. Again, every Arab is a politician, and groups gather around the outskirts of the crowd to discuss the doings of the 'sallied powers,' the last firman from the sultan, or the new tax demanded by their own petty emir. Descending to more ordinary matters, these fairs are great places for gossip and scandal. Friends meet friends, and exchange the news of weddings, births, and deaths, and all the multifarious incidents and accidents between those grand extremes of human life. In a word, these fairs supply the places of mancy of the appliances of more civilized society. Theys are the daily newspaper, for there is one for everyday within a circuit of forty miles. They are the exchange and the *forwarding office*, and the political caucus, and the family gathering, and the grand festa and gala days, and underlying the whole is the ever-present idea and aim of making money." *SEE BAZAAR.*

Faith

(Gr. πίστις, *Lat. fides, Jiducia)* is essentially *trust.* The various uses of the word (both objective and subjective) may be summed up as follows:

1. An objective body of truth: "the faith;" designated by the schoolmen as *fides quae creditur*, the faith which is believed. So the Augsburg Confession speaks of "our holy faith and Christiasn religion." (This sense does not occur in N.T.)

2. A rule of thought, the *fides penes quam creditur:* so the Romanm Catholics say such a thing is "of faith" (not found in N.T.).

3. A personal quality, act, or habit of the individual man; the *fides* qua creditur; the faith by which we believe. This latter is either (I) the exercise of our natural gifts (natural faith), or (II) the exercise of natural gifts under the influence of the divine Spirit with regard to divine things, and especially with regard to the person and work of Christ (the gift of God). This latter is Christian faith, and it includes two elements: (1) the spiritual apprehension of the invisible and eternal (<3810>Hebrews 11:1), and, specifically, (2) trust in Christ as a personal Savior; and, as such, in the

Christian system, it is the necessary condition of salvation. It is the instrument or means by which the redemption of Christ is appropriated, and, so far as it is man's act, it is the act of the whole man, mind, affections, and will. It is "a saving grace whereby we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation, as he is freely offered to us in the Gospel."

I. *Natural Faith.* — All our knowledge presupposes faith. Insthis view Goethe said that he was a "believer in the five senses;" and Fichte, that "man apprehends all reality external to himself through faith alone, a faith that is born with him." In the article BELIEF *SEE BELIEF* (q.v.) it was shown that there is a foundation laid for the exercise of this principle in the primary laws of thought or self-consciousness in the reason, not of the individual man, but of humanity. Psychologically, "faith is the faculty of grasping evidence, with a propensity to admit it when duly presented to the mind. Just as by sensation and perception we discern certain objects through the medium of the senses, and as by reason we discover some truths, or discern them upon their simple presentation (Chalmers, *Institutes of Theology,* book 3, chapter 6), without any other warranty than the voice within, so also by faith we discern other truths through the means of testimony or by the voice of authority. Attempts to analyze this quality of the human mind have been often made and as often failed. But still the fact remains that, according to the original, constitution of our nature, we are able and disposed to yield to evidence in proportion to its nature and its strength (Hooker, *Ecclesiastes Pol.* book 2, chapter 7, § 5); to assent to testimony concerning facts not preasent and manifest; and to submit to authority in the announcement or proposition of truths independently of any internal and direct perception of them by ourselves (Van Mildert, *Boyle Lect.* serm. 16). In matters of common life, from childhood to old age, we continually act, and are compelled to act, upon this principle (Barrow, On *the* Creed, seim. in; Hare, *Victory of Faith,* serm. 4). The child believes its parent or its nurse, and reposes in this belief; and under certain conditions, the man believes the records of past history, the testimony of eye-witnesses, and the affirmations of trustworthy persons capable of understanding that which they affirm. And it is not too much to say that, apart from this principle and practice of belief, man, even in the full exercise of all his other intellectual powers, would be enveloped in such a cloud of ignorance on even the most ordinary subjects, that an arrest would be laid upon all the affairs of civilized life, and there must be an end of all social harmony and order. It is by this'means that we obtain a

certainty, not of sight, not of demonstration, not of direct and immediate intuition, but yet a real and efficient certainty in many matters of high practical importance concerning which we must otherwise be hopelessly ignorant and in the dark. This principle lies at the foundation of human affections and family ties, of agricultural and commercial activity, and of a large portion of our most valuable knowledge in science, and our highest attainments in art. Above all, it is thus that we obtain our knowledge of many things divine, and especially of relations subsisting between God and ourselves; an acquaintance with which, as we shall hereafter see, is of the utmost importance to us, while yet, independently of the exercise of faith, it is utterly beyond the reach of every man living" (Rogers, *Reason and Faith;* Riddle, *Bampton Lectures,* 1852, lect. 1). Faith "is that operation of the soul in which we are convinced of the existence of what is not before us, of what is not under sense or any other directly cognitive power. It is certainly a native energy of the mind, quite as much as knowledge is, or conception is, or imagination is, or feeling is. Every human being entertains, and must entertain, faith of some kind. He who would insist on always having immediate knowledge must needs go out of the world, for he is unfit for this world, and yet he believes in no other. It is in consequence of possessing the general capacity that man is enabled to entertain specific forms of faith. By a native principle he is led to believe in that of which he can have no adequate conception in the infinity of space and time, and, on evidence of his existence being presented, in the infinity of God. This enables him to rise to a faith in all those great religious verities which God has been pleased to reveal" (McCosh, *Intuitions of the Mind,* part 3, book 2, chapter 5; see also part 2, book 2, chapter 4).

Guizot, *Med. et Etudes Morales* (transl. in *Journal of Sacred Literature,* 12:430 sq.), has a thoughtful essay in which he distinguishes *natural* beliefs from faith as follows: "No one can doubt that the word faith has an especial meaning, which is not properly represented by belief, conviction, or certitude. Custom and universal opinion confirm this view. There are many simple and customary phrases in which the word faith could not be replaced by any other. Almost all languages have a specially appropriated word to express that which in English is expressed by faith, and which is essentially different from all analogous words. This word, then, corresponds to a state of the human soul; it expresses a moral fact which has rendered such a word necessary. We commonly understand by faith a certain belief of facts and dogmas — religious facts and dogmas. In fact,

the word has no other sense when employing it absolutely and by itself — we speak of *the faith*. That is not, however, its unique, nor even its fundamental sense; it has one more extensive, and from which the religious sense is derived. We say, I have *full faith* in your words; this man *has faith* in himself, in his power, etc. This employment of the word in civil matters, so to speak, has become more frequent in our days; it is not, however, of modern invention; nor have religious ideas ever been an exclusive sphere, out of which the notions and the word *faith* were without application. It is, then, proved by the testimony of language and common opinion, First, that the word *faith* designates a certain interior state of him who believes, and not merely a certain kind of belief. Secondly, that it is, however, to a certain species of belief — religious belief — that it has been at first and most generally applied. Now our *natural* beliefs germinate in the mind of man without the co-operation of his reflection and his will. Our *scientific* beliefs, on the other hand, are the fruit of voluntary study. *But faith* partakes of, and at the same time differs from, natural and scientific beliefs. It is, like the latter, individual and particular; like the former, it is firm, complete, active, and sovereign. Considered in itself, and independent of all comparison with this or that analogous condition, faith is the full security of the man in the possession of his belief: a possession freed as much from labor as from doubt; in the midst of which every thought of the path by which it has been reached disappears, and leaves no other sentiment but that of the natural and pre-established harmony between the human mind and truth."

II. *Christian Faith. — So* far as faith is a voluntary act, quality, or habit of man, it is psychologically the same in the theological sense as in common life; the difference lies in the *objects* of the faith. In order to venerate or love a fellow-man, we must believe in his worthiness; so, for the fear and love of God, which are fundamental elements of the Christian life, faith must pre-exist. But this direction of the soul towards God does not spring from the *natural* working of the human mind; it is the gift of God (Ephesians 2:8), and is wrought in the heart by the Holy Spirit through the word of the Gospel and the free grace of Christ (Romans 10:17; 1 Corinthians 1:21). *Fides donum dei est, per quod Christum redemptorem nostrum in verbo Evangelii recte agnoscimus (Form. Concord.* 3:11). Not that the Holy Spirit endues the soul with any new faculty for the single purpose of receiving Gospel truth; but it quickens and directs an existing faculty, at the same time presenting to it an appropriate

object. The true faith. thus excited, is an operation at once of the intellect, the heart, and the will. As said above, this faith, so far as it saves man in Christendom, is specifically trust in Christ as a personal Savior. In further treating it, we give,

(I.) The uses of the words πίστις, *faith*, and πιστεύω, *I believe*, in the Scriptures (condensed from Cremer, *Worterbuch d. N. Test. Gracitat*, Gotha, 1866, 8vo).

(II.) A history of the idea of faith in Christian theology up to the Reformation.

(III.) The Protestant and Romanist doctrines of faith in contrast and comparison with each other.

(IV.) Later Protestant statements of the doctrine.

(I.) *Use of the words Faith and believe in Scripture.*— Πίστις.

1. In profane Greek, πίστις means primarily *trust* or *confidence*, such as one man can have in another; more seldom *fidelity* or *faithfulness* which one pledges or keeps; and also the *pledge of fidelity*, e.g. Sophocles, *O.C.* 1632; δός μου χερὸς σῆς πίστιν Examples of the primary meaning *(trust* or *confidence)* are: Herodotus, 3:24; Sophocles, *O. Colossians* 950; Xen. *Hier.* 4:1. In the passive tense *(credit)* it is found e.g. Aristotle, *Eth.* 10:8. Parallel with the primary meaning *(trust* or *confidence)* stands that of *conviction*, e.g. πίστιν ἔχειν τινὸς *(to have faith in a thing);* but this conviction is based upon *trust*, and not upon knowledge: so that in this sense ὁ πιστεύων stands opposite to εἰδώς, and πίστις to ἐτιστήμη (comp. Plat. *Repub.* 10:601). In this sense πίστις is used (in the sphere of religion) of belief in the gods, and of acknowledgment of them, not based upon knowledge (comp. Plutarch, *Mor.* 756, B; Plato, *Legg.* 976, C, D; Eurip. *Med.* 413, 414). Rather characteristic is the fact that this faith is not designated as in the N.T. by the verb πιστεύειν, but by νομίζειν (Xen. *Mem.* I, 1:1).

This element of "acknowledgment," as distinct from *knowing* (εἰδέναι), is found also in the N.T. significations of the word as used by Paul and others; e.g. <470507>2 Corinthians 5:7, "For we walk by *faith (*πίστεως*)*, not by sight;" <581127>Hebrews 11:27, "By faith *(*πίστει*)* he forsook Egypt;" <581101>Hebrews 11:1, "Now *faith* (πίστις) is the substance of things hoped

for, the evidence of things *not seen ;"* <450418>Romans 4:18, "Who against hope *believed* (ἐπίστευσεν) in hope;" <432029>John 20:29, "Blessed (are) they that have not seen and (yet) have *believed"* (πιστεύσαντες). But this opposition to "knowledge" or " sight" is not essential to the idea of faith, as is seen from <430442>John 4:42; 11:45; <540403>1 Timothy 4:3; Philem. 6, *et al.* In fact, the N.T. faith differs from the profane πίστις generally in that it is not a conviction held without reference to any ground or authority (compare <600315>1 Peter 3:15; 1:21).

In the O.T. the word "faith" is *comparatively* seldom used; the relation of mian to God and to his revelation is generally designated bysome other term befitting the economy of the law, e.g. "doing God's will," "keeping the commandments," "remembering the Lord" (<020315>Exodus 3:15), et al. Nevertheless, we do find (as one species of phrases among many to express this relation) terms denoting "trusting," "hoping," "waiting on the Lord" j f b, h s j , hWq, ἐλπίζειν, πεποιθέναι, υπομένειν etc.). But in some of the *most important* passages of the Old Test. history the word "faith" occurs; e.g. with regard to Abraham (<011506>Genesis 15:6), "he *believed* in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness;" of the people of Israel (<020431>Exodus 4:31; compare 1, 5, 8; 14:31); with regard to the possession of Canaan (<050923>Deuteronomy 9:23; comp. 1:32; <197822>Psalm 78:22, 32; 106:24); with regard to the covenant of the law (<021909>Exodus 19:9). In view of these pregnant passages, we may say that the foundation laid for the N.T. in the Old is laid in "faith" (comp. <142020>2 Chronicles 20:20; <235301>Isaiah 53:1; 7:9; 28:16; <320305>Jonah 3:5). But unbelief is far oftener spoken of in the O.T. than *faith* (comp. <192713>Psalm 27:13; <121714>2 Kings 17:14; <197822>Psalm 78:22, 32; 106:24; <042012>Numbers 20:12; <050923>Deuteronomy 9:23; <230709>Isaiah 7:9; 53:1; <041411>Numbers 14:11; <19A612>Psalm 106:12; 119:66). The verb used in all these passages ˆymæh, Hiph. of ˆma, *to fasten, build to make firm*. From the last of these significations follows that of to *support*, to rely upon, to *trust* (<183911>Job 39:11, 12; 4:18; 15:15); holding a thing for certain and reliable (<111007>1 Kings 10:7; <140906>2 Chronicles 9:6; <250412>Lamentations 4:12; <244014>Jeremiah 40:14; <052866>Deuteronomy 28:66; <182422>Job 24:22). Used with relation to God, it denotes a cleaving to him, resting upon his strength, sure confidence in God, which gives fixedness and stability (<142020>2 Chronicles 20:20; <230709>Isaiah 7:9).

But there is apparently no corresponding noun to the verb ˆymah. For hnWmæ corresponds to the partic. in Kal and Niphal, ˆWma; ˆmaæn, and

denotes *steadfastness, stability* (as an objective quality; e.g. <233306>Isaiah 33:6). In other passages it denotes the personal quality of *fidelity, faithfulness* (but not of *holding fast by faith)*, e.g. <130222>1 Chronicles 2:22; <143118>2 Chronicles 31:18 (sense wrong in English version); <122207>2 Kings 22:7; <240728>Jeremiah 7:28. In these passages, where the word refers to man, the Sept. translates it πίστις; but where it refers to God it makes it ἀλήθεια, e.g. <193304>Psalm 33:4. Here it may be remarked that the reference to this hnwma *(faithfulness of God) eby* Paul (<450302>Romans 3:2 sq.) helps us to fix his idea of faith as definitively *trust.* As a designation of the religious relation of man to God, hnwma, πίστις is only seldom used in the O.T. (see <092623>1 Samuel 26:23; <240503>Jeremiah 5:3). In these passages it denotes not simply *candor, honesty,* but rather faithfulness, i.e., *faithfulness to the covenant* (comp. <240503>Jeremiah 5:3 with 1:5, and <402323>Matthew 23:23). But, after all, we have not yet found our idea of faith. But <350204>Habakkuk 2:4 affords a passage in which is decidedly to be found the Pauline idea: hy,j]yæ /tn:WmaæB, qyDx'[w] (Sept. ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως μου ζήσεται Apparently this passage was not understood by the Sept., which changed the suffix, of the third person to that of the first, and referred it to the faithfulness and the reliability of God. But hnWma stands here with regard to the relation in which the just man, compared with the haughty Chaldsean; holds himself to the divine promises; and it refers, therefore, not tio the relation itself, but to the *quality of the relation*, as the Talmudic Wnmyheæ tWnmyhe denotes the *confiding faith* (compare Levy *Chald. Wdrterbuch).* Paul, in citing <350204>Habakkuk 2:4, changes the order of the words from that in the Sept. to ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται (<450117>Romans 1:17; comp. Delitzsch, Habakkuk pages 50-53 Keil, *Kleine Proph.* in loc.). So, then, we find laid in the O.T. the ground for the N.T. doctrine of faith as *complete confidence, trust;* and this, too, combined with a conviction amounting to a recognition of the invisible (compar<581101>Hebrews 11:1).

Conviction combined with trust, as opposed to doubt, so far as the intellect is concerned, and as opposed to fear, so far as the heart is concerned — these appear, so far, to be the essential elements of faith (comp. <402121>Matthew 21:21; <590106>James 1:6; <581039>Hebrews 10:39; <410440>Mark 4:40; <580612>Hebrews 6:12; <661310>Revelation 13:10).

2. We find πίστις seemingly used, especially in the Synoptical Gospels, with regard to the relation of individuals to the Lord, to designate *special*

acts of confidence (<40810>Matthew 8:10; 9:2, 22; Luke, 7:9, 50; 8:48; 17:19, 18:42; <41034>Mark 5:34; 10:52; comp. <40153>Matthew 15:28). But the Synoptists also use the word to denote (not simply special and single exertions of belief, but also) full trust in Christ, and in the divine revels tion in him (<42188>Luke 18:8; comp. <40810>Matthew 8:10; <42825>Luke 8:25; <41040>Mark 4:40; <42232>Luke 22:32; 17:5; <40720>Matthew 17:20; 21:21). Compared with this (and Paul points out the contrast emphatically), the O.T. revelation was an education for faith (<48323>Galatians 3:23-26: "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" comp. <45132>Romans 11:32; <44731>Acts 17:31). But it is to be fully understood also that the epistle to the Hebrews makes faith the means of holding to the God of revelation, in the sphere of the entire econesay of redemption in the O.T. as well as the N.T. (Hebrews 11). In the Acts faith seems to be used as more particularly characteristic of the sphere of the N.T. revelation (<44607>Acts 6:7; compare <45105>Romans 1:5; 16:26; <44138>Acts 13:8; 17:31; <48023>Galatians 1:23). In Paul's epistles, while the O.T. faith is clearly recognized (e.g. with reference to Abraham, and the citation of <35204>Habakkuk 2:4), nevertheless the prevailing O.T. *unbelief* is especially emphasized (e.g. <45132>Romans 11:32); and the contrast between law and gospel (<48302>Galatians 3:12 sq.) brings out clearly the chief element of N.T. faith as unconditional trust.

The *promise*, as the correlate of the *Gospel*, is the N.T. element of the O.T. economy, and demands faith (<48322>Galatians 3:22; compare 4:21 sq.), but the absence of a σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται (seed to whom the promise was made, <48019>Galatians 3:19) made necessary the interposition of the law; not a νόμος πίστιως (law of faith), but ἔργων (of works), which, by manifesting sin, was an educator into faith (<45319>Romans 3:19; <48022>Galatians 3:22, 23). This throws light upon the contrast of πίστις and ἔργα-χάρις and ὀφείλημα-or πίστις and νόμος (<48023>Galatians 3:23; also <45027>Romans 3:27, 28; comp. 4:2, 5; 9:32; <48216>Galatians 2:16; 3:2, 5; comp. 3:12; <49208>Ephesians 2:8; and in contrast to νόμος, <45413>Romans 4:13, 14, 16; 9:30; <48011>Galatians 3:11, 12, 23-25). This contrast, it will be observed, is only introduced by Paul in passages in which he is expressly pointing out the difference between the O.T. economy of salvation and that of the N.T.

3. The following classification of the passages in which the waord πίστις occurs will be found useful:

(1.) It is used *with reference to an object*, <580601>Hebrews 6:1; <520108>1 Thessalonians 1:8; <411122>Mark 11:22; <530203>2 Thessalonians 2:13; <510212>Colossians 2:12; Philippians1:27; <442424>Acts 24:24; 26:18; <510205>Colossians 2:5; <442021>Acts 20:21; comp. Philemon 5; <550313>2 Timothy 3:13; <480326>Galatians 3:26; <490115>Ephesians 1:15; <550315>2 Timothy 3:15; <450325>Romans 3:25; with the obj.-genit., <450322>Romans 3:22; <480216>Galatians 2:16; 3:22; <490212>Ephesians 3:12; <500309>Philippians 3:9; <480220>Galatians 2:20; <440316>Acts 3:16; <590201>James 2:1; <661203>Revelation 2:13; 14:12; with <560101>Titus 1:1, compare <661714>Revelation 17:14.

(2.) *Without nearer definition*, simply as *faith*, which adheres with full, conviction and confidence to the N.T. revelation of salvation, and makes this its foundation (support). Here is especially of importance the expression (<440316>Acts 3:16), *the faith which is by him*, an expression which is used to point out the salvation arising from the mediation of Christ, through the *looking unto Jesus*, the author of faith (<581202>Hebrews 12:2). Under this class, besides the passages of the Synoptical Gospels already referred to, we mention <441422>Acts 14:22; 16:5; <510223>Colossians 1:23; <600509>1 Peter 5:9; <451401>Romans 14:1; 4:19, 20; <461613>1 Corinthians 16:13; <451120>Romans 11:20; <470124>2 Corinthians 1:24; 13:5; <540215>1 Timothy 2:15; <550407>2 Timothy 4:7; <470807>2 Corinthians 8:7; 10:15; <530303>2 Thessalonians 1:3; <510207>Colossians 2:7; <540119>1 Timothy 1:19; <590201>James 2:1, 14,18; <560113>Titus 1:13; 2:2; <470705>2 Corinthians 5:7; <450117>Romans 1:17; <480311>Galatians 3:11; <581038>Hebrews 10:38 (comp. <480220>Galatians 2:20); <441308>Acts 13:8; <550218>2 Timothy 2:18; <540119>1 Timothy 1:19; 4:1; 5:8, 12; 6:10, 21; <550308>2 Timothy 3:8. Then the Pauline expressions ἐκ πίστεως εἶναι, οἱ ἐκ π (they which are *of faith;* <480307>Galatians 3:7, 9, 12, 22; <450416>Romans 4:16; 3:26; comp. <581039>Hebrews 10:39), ἐσμὲν πίστεως (we are of them that *believe)*, are used of faith proper (compare <451422>Romans 14:22, 23). The phrases ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῦν, δικαιοῦσθαι, make faith the necessary condition of justification (<450330>Romans 3:30; comp. <480314>Galatians 3:14; <450501>Romans 5:1; <480216>Galatians 2:16; 3:8; <450413>Romans 4:13; ἐκ πίοτεως, 9:30; 10:6; <500309>Philippians 3:9; comp. <450117>Romans 1:17; 4:5, 9). The word πιστις is found joined to ἀγάπη, <490623>Ephesians 6:23; <520306>1 Thessalonians 3:6; 5:8; <540114>1 Timothy 1:14; 4:12; 6:11; <550105>2 Timothy 1:5, 13; 2:22; Galatians 5: 6; <461313>1 Corinthians 13:13; <660219>Revelation 2:19; with ἐλπίς, ὑπομονή, <461313>1 Corinthians 13:13; <530104>2 Thessalonians 1:4; <661310>Revelation 13:10. The word

is also found <44065>Acts 6:5, 8; 11:24; 14:27; 15:9; <45108>Romans 1:8, 12; 3:31; 4:12; 5:2; 10:8,17; 12:6; <46105>1 Corinthians 2:5; 15:14, 17; <47024>2 Corinthians 1:24; 4:13; <48105>Galatians 5:5, 22 , 6:10; <49087>Ephesians 3:17; 5:5, 13; 6:16; <50125>Philippians 1:25, 7:7; <51004>Colossians 1:4; <52003>1 Thessalonians 1:3; 3:2, 5, 7, 10; <53002>2 Thessalonians 2:2; <54002>1 Timothy 1:2, 4; 2:7; 3:9; 4:6; 6:12; <55005>2 Timothy 1:5; 3:10; <56001>Titus 1:1, 4; 3:15. Philemon 6; <58002>Hebrews 10:22; 13:7; <59003>James 1:3, 6; 2:5, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26; 5:15; <60105>1 Peter 1:5, 7, 9, 21; <61001>2 Peter 1:1, 5; <65003>Jude 1:3, 20.

That even in James, *confidence, trust* (and not mere *recognition),* is the essential element of faith, is manifest from the passage (<59515>James 5:15), ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν κάμνοντα (the *prayer of faith* shall save the sick). The *works of faith* are, according to James, such as show forth faith, and without which faith sinks into a mere recognition (<59219>James 2:19), as *dead* faith (νεκρά).

It must be noted that the word πίστις occurs in John's epistles only in one place, <62504>1 John 5:4, and in his Apocalypse in four places (<66213>Revelation 2:13, 19; 13:10; 14:12).

There remain a few passages in which πίστις apparently does not denote "trust" in salvation by Christ, as <45203>Romans 12:3 (comp. Alford, *in loc.,* and also <44173>Acts 17:31). <46302>1 Corinthians 13:2 is easily explained by comparison with <40221>Matthew 21:21; <42705>Luke 17:5, 6, and here will be best joined <46209>1 Corinthians 12:9. In the signification *faithfulness,* πίστις, like the O.T. hn‡mE, is spoken of God, <45303>Romans 3:3; of men, <40223>Matthew 23:23; <56210>Titus 2:10. With the former passage compare <23501>Isaiah 5:1 sq.

Πιστεύω *General meaning: a.* to *trust,* to *depend upon,* τινὶ e.g. ταῖς σπονδαῖς θεῶν θεσφάτοις, Polyb. 5:62, 6; Sophocl. *Philoct.* 1360; Demosth. <50106>*Philippians* 2:67, 9. With the dative of the person and the acc. of the thing, π. τινί τι = to intrust (confide) something to a person, <42611>Luke 16:11; <43024>John 2:24; in the passive, πιστεύομαί τι, I am trusted with a thing; without obj.: I am trusted, <45302>Romans 3:2; <46907>1 Corinthians 9:17; <48007>Galatians 2:7; <52004>1 Thessalonians 2:4; <53010>2 Thessalonians 1:10; <54011>1 Timothy 1:11; <56003>Titus 1:3. *b.* Very frequently πιστεύειν τινὶ denotes to *trust a person,* to *give credence to,* to *accept statements* (to be convinced of their truth); Soph. *El.* 886, τῷ λόγῳ. In a broader sense, πιστεύειν τινί τι, to *believe a person;* e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 710, λόγοις ἐμοῖσι πίστευσον τάδε *;* Xen. *Apol.* 15. Then πιστεύειν τι, to *believe*

a thing, to rec. ognise it (as true); e.g. Plat. *Gorg.* 524, A, ἃ ἐγὼ ἀκηκοὼς πιστεύω ἀληθῆ εἶναι; Aristot. *Analyt.* pr. 2, 23; also πιστεύειν περὶ, ὑπέρ τινος , Plut. *Lye.* 19, where πιστεύειν stands alone, to *be inclined to believe, recognize* a thing; while e.g. in <430918>John 9:18, the specific aim is added: "But the Jews did not *believe* concerning him that he had been blind, and received his sight."

In the N.T. (in which πιστεύειν has regard to our conduct towards God and his revelation) all these constructions are found, as well as the combinations (unusual in the profane Greek) of πεὶς, ἐπί τινα, ἐπὶ τινι and also πιστεύειν standing alone. The question is whether the original signification is *confidence,* or *accepting as true.*

(1.) We find πιστεύειν in the signification to *believe,* to *takefor true,* and hence to *be convinced,* to *recognize (accept);*

(a) *with the acc. following,* <431126>John 11:26, πιστεύεις τοῦτο*;* comp. 25, 26; <620416>1 John 4:16; <441341>Acts 13:41; <461118>1 Corinthians 11:18; <540316>1 Timothy 3:16 (comp. <402423>Matthew 24:23, 26; <422267>Luke 22:67); <431025>John 10:25;

(b) *with the infinitive after it,* <441511>Acts 15:11 *(*πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι*);*

(c) *with or after it,* <400928>Matthew 9:28; <411123>Mark 11:23, 24; <440926>Acts 9:26; <590219>James 2:19, σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς ὁ θεός ἐστιν*;* compare <442725>Acts 27:25; <430421>John 4:21, πίστευέ μοι, ὅτι ἔρχεταιώρα This construction of πιστεύειν ὅτι is especially frequent in the writings of John, in St. Paul's meaning of it. It. is also used by Paul in <450608>Romans 6:8; <520414>1 Thessalonians 4:14; but in <451009>Romans 10:9, ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήση, the sense of *trust* predominates over that of *takingfor true.* Compare also <581106>Hebrews 11:6, with 11:1; 4:3.

In John this construction with ὅτι is found in chapters <430421>John 4:21; 8:24; 10:38; 11:27 (compare <430669>John 6:69); <431142>John 11:42 (compare <431703>John 17:3); <431319>John 13:19; 14:10,11; 16:27; (and have *believed* that I came out from God), <431630>John 16:30; 17:8, 21; 20:31; <620501>1 John 5:1, 5 (comp. with 5:10). In these passages the sense of πιστεύω is that of *assent, belief, recognition, conviction of truth.* This meaning is also predominant in the following passage: <430312>John 3:12 (If I have told you earthly things, and ye *believe* not, how shall ye *believe* if I tell you of heavenly things) (comp.

3:11). Note also the connection with γινώσκειν *(to know),* 6:69; 10:37, 38; 17:8; and note also the relation of Christ's works and of *sight* to faith, <4004>John 4:48 (Except ye *see* signs and wonders, ye will not *believe);* <4310>John 10:37, 38; <4311>John 14:11; 6:36; 20:8,29 (compare 20:25); <4001>John 1:51; 4:39-42.

Let us look now at the constructions πιστεύειν τινί εἴς τινα. It is clear that πιστεύειν τινὶ of itself cannot signify to *accept* a person; but only to *believe* what he says, to trust his *word;* e.g. <4022>John 2:22 (they *believed the Scripture* and *the word* which Jesus had said); <4547>John 5:47; 12:38 (comp. <4220>Luke 1:20; <4244>Acts 24:14; 26:27; <6401>1 John 4:1). In this sense also we understand <4546>John 5:46 (for had *ye believed Moses,* ye would have *believed me);* 8:31, 45, 46; 10:37 (comp. with 10:36); 14:11. Nevertheless, as it is the *witness of Jesus* himself that is in question, the acceptance of his words implies the acceptance of his person (<4546>John 5:46; comp. with 5:37-39). Connect with these the unique passage <6123>1 John 3:23 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτ ἵναπιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ this is the commandment, that *we should believe on the name* of his son Jesus Christ" (elsewhere εἰς τὸ ὄν, <4012>John 1:12; 2:23; 3:18; <6513>1 John 5:13); comp. also <4629>John 6:29; 16:9; <6510>1 John 5:10 (He that *believeth on* [εἰς] *the Son* of God hath the witness in himself; he that *believeth not God* [τῷ Θεῷ] hath made him a liar, because he believeth not εἰς] the record that God gave of his Son). Here πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ, *to believe God,* is to receive his testimony, π. εἰς την μαρτυρίαν, and consequently to receive Him for whom the testimony is borne. Farther comp. <4638>John 5:38 with 37, 24, 47, and 44. These passages show that John's idea of faith includes

(1) accepting the testimony of God,
(2) accepting the testimony of Christ concerning himself, and therefore
(3) accepting Christ himself.

The construction πιστεύειν εἰς is found in <4211>John 2:11; 3:16, 18, 36; 4:39; 6:29, 40 (47); 7:5, 31, 38, 39, 48; 8:30; 9:35, 36; 10:42; <4125>John 11:25, 26, 45, 48; 12:11, 37, 42, 44, 46; 14:1, 12; 16:9; 17:20; <6513>1 John 5:13. The only passage in the writings of John in which another preposition occurs is <4815>John 3:15, where Lachmann reads ἐπ αὐτόν, Tischendorf ἐν αὐτῷ, instead of εἰς αὐτόν.

(2.) But the sense of *admitting, accepting as true,* thus far developed, is by no means the whole of John's idea of faith in Christ. It includes not only this, but also *adherence to Christ; cleaving to* hium. See, for instance, the whole passage, <43935>John 9:35-38, and comp. 11:48; 10:26, 27; 6:69; 1:12. Both these are evidently contained also in the πιστεύειν τινὶ, <43630>John 6:30; comp. with 6:29: τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν σοι (What sign showest thou, that we may see and believe in *thee?);* 29: ἵνα πιστεύσητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεός (that ye believe on him"whom He hath sent). Compare especially also <42742>Matthew 27:42; <41532>Mark 15:32.

It is plain, now, that John's idea of faith includes the element of *cleaving to* Christ as well as of *accepting* him; and this cleaving to him includes the idea of *full trust* in Christ as Savior, as illustrated in the important passage, <43315>John 3:15: ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εν αὐτῷ (that whosoever believeth *in* him, not εἰς αὐτον). Tischendorf ἐν, Lachmsann ἐπ αὐτόν). "Here is involved the anguish, in the believer, of the bite of the fiery serpent, and the earnest looking on him in whom sin is crucified with the inner eye of faith" (Alford, in loc.). In this full sense of the word John uses πιστεύω by itself *(to believe)* in <43007>John 1:7, 51; 4:41, 42, 48, .h3; 6:36, 64; 9:38; 10:25, 26; 11:15, 40; 12:39, 47; <43429>John 14:29; 16:31; 19:35; 20:31 (comp. 3:12; 6:69; 20:8, 25, 29). And this faith is the condition "ofthe gifts of life,light, and salvation; <43026>John 10:26, 27; <43012>John 3:12, 16, 18, 36; 6:35, 40, 47; <43738>John 7:38; 11:25, 26; <43231>John 20:31 (comp. <43558>John 5:38); 8:24; 1:12; 12:36, 46 (comp. <43812>John 8:12 and <43140>John 11:40).

(3.) Paul's use of πιστεύειν also includes the idea of intellectual *conviction, recognition;* see the passages above cited under πίστις, and comp. also <45420>Romans 4:20 (strong in *faith);* 1:5; 16:26, and the relation of πιστεύειν to κηρύσσειν (<45014>Romans 10:14, 16; <46512>1 Corinthians 15:2, 11; <49113>Ephesians 1:13). But the sense of *trust in Christ tas Savior* is always predominant in Paul. The construction πιστεύειν τινι to *trust, rely upon,* is found <55112>2 Timothy 1:12 (I know in *whom I have believed,* and am persuaded); <56308>Titus 3:8; <45403>Romans 4:3; <48306>Galatians 3:6; <45406>Romans 4:6; compare 4:18. Instead of the dative we find πιστεύειν ἐπί τινα, <45405>Romans 4:5: ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ (on him that justifieth the ungodly), 4:24. The πιστεύειν εἰς also denotes always faith in Christ — (<45014>Romans 10:14; <48216>Galatians 2:16; <50129>Philippians 1:29); likewise ἐπὶ with the dative, <54616>1 Timothy 1:16; <45033>Romans 9:33. And πιστεύειν is used standing alone to designate the fullest *trust* of faith,

Romans 1:16; 3:22; 4:11, 18; 10:4, 10; 13:11; 15:13; 1 Corinthians 1:21; 3:5; 14:22; 2 Corinthians 4:13; Galatians 3:22; Ephesians 1:13, 19; 1 Thessalonians 1:7; 2:10, 13; 2 Thessalonians 1:10.

In James 2:19, *to believe* denotes intellectual assent, but in verse 23 it denotes trust (see under πίστις). In Peter the two elements of assent and trusts are conjoined (comp. 1 Peter 1:8, with 1 Peter 2:6, 7; 1:21).

In the Acts and Synoptical Gospels, the import of the word (whether assent or trust, or both conjoined) must be decided by the context.

The result of our examination is, that "faith" in the N.T. includes three elements, each and all necessary to the full meaning of the word, while one or another of them may hbecome prominent according to the connection, viz.

(1) full intellectual acceptance of the revelation of salvation,

(2) adherence to the truth and to the person of Christ thus accepted;

(3) absolute and exclusive trust in the redeeming work of Christ for salvation. In no one of the writers of the New Testament is any one of these three elements wanting.

(II.) *Early History of the Doctrine of Faith.* —

1. In the early Church, the Pauline doctrine of faith as a condition of justification was universally maintained. But the Eastern thinkers did not give much attention to faith in a doctrinal way, and its true meaning was not prominently developed, nor was the distinction between faith and works (as conditions) sharply drawn. During the Apologetic period (from A.D. 100 to A.D. 250), while attention was "principally directed to theoretical knowledge,faith was for the most part considered as historico-dogmatic faith in its relation to γνῶσις. This gave rise to the opinion that knowledge in divine things justifies, while ignorance condemns. Minucius Felix (t 208), 35: *Imperitiet Dei sfficit ad pa*nam, *notitia prodest ad veniam.* Theophilus of Antioch (t181) also knows of a *fides historica* alone, upon which he makes salvation to depend, 1:14: Ἀπόδειξιν οὖν λαβὼν τῶν γινομένων καὶ προαναπεφωνημένων, οὐκ ἀπιστῶ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύω πειθαρχῶν θεῷ, ᾧ εὐ βούλεὶ καὶ σὺ ὑποτάγηθι, πιστεύων αὐτῷ, μὴ νῦν ἀπισθήσας, πεισθῆς ἀνιώμενος τότε ἐν αἰωνίοις τιμωρίαις. But, though it was reserved for men of later times

to investigate more profoundly the idea of justifying faith in the Pauline sense, yet correct views on this subject were not entirely wanting during this period." Clement of Rome (t 100) says in a Pauline spirit, "Called by the will of God in Christ, we can be justified, not by ourselves, not by our own wisdom and piety, but only by faith, by which God has justified all in all ages. But shall we, on this account cease from doing good, and give up charity? No, we shall labor with unwearied zeal as God, who has called us, always works, and rejoices in his works" (1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 32, 33). Ireanaus (t 202) contrasts the new joyful obedience which ensues on the forgiveness of sins with the legal standpoint. "The law which was given to bondmen formed men's souls by outward corporal work, for it coerced men by a curse to obey the commandments, in order that they might learn to obey God. But the Word, the Logos who frees the soul, and through it the body, teaches a voluntary surrender. Hence the fetters of thee law must be taken off, and man accustom himself to the free obedience of love. The obedience of freedom must be of a higher kind; we are not allowed to go back to our earlier standpoint; for he has not set us free in order that we may leave him; this no one can do who has sincerely confessed him. No one can obtain the blessings of salvation out of communion with the Lord; and the more we obtain from him, so much the more must we love him; and the more we love him, so much greater glory shall we receive from him" (Irenseus, Haer. Uk. 4, chap. 13:1, 23; Neander, *History of Dogmas,* Ryland, page 216). Tertullian (220) adv. Marc. 5:3: *Exfidei hibertate justisficatur homo, non eax legis servitute, quiajustus ex fide vivit.* According to Clement of Alexandria (+ 218), faith is not only the key to the knowledge of God *(Coh.* page 9), but by it we are also made the children of God (ib. page 23). Clement accurately distinguishes between theoretical and practical unbelief, and understands by the latter the want of susceptibility of divine impressions, a carnal mind which would have everything in a tangible shape (Strom. 2:4, page 436). Origen (A.D. 250) in *Numbers Hom.* 26 (Opp 3, page 369): *Impossibile est salvari sines fide;* Comm. in *Ep. ad Rom.* (Opp. 4, page 517): *Etiamsi opera quis habeat ex lege, tames, quia* non *sunt cedificata supra fundamentum fidei, quamvis videantur esse bona, tames oparatanum suum justificare non possunt, quod eas deestfides, quae est signacurum eorum, qui justificantur a Deo* (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* § 70; comp. also § 34). Apollinaris (t 885) on [4867]John 6:27, says: "The eternally enduring food, by which we are sealed by the Father and assimilated to Christ, is the faith which makes alive" and on verse 28, "Faith both justifies and sanctifies without human

works, seeing that it contains within itself the noblest energy, and is not slothful or inactive" (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl., div. 1, volume 2, page 389). Hilary (t 368): "By faith we become, not merely in a moral way, but essentially, one with Him" *(ibid.* page 418).

2. The Latins, more earnest on the practical than on the theoretical side, seem to have had deeper notions of faith (see Tertullian, cited above). But the minds of theologians were turned almost wholly to the doctrines of sin, grace, and free will (Pelagian controversy), and not to the appropriation of redemption by faith. The relations of faith to knowledge were set forth clearly and strongly, however, in the maxim *Fides prcecedit intellectum*, first announced by Origen, and adopted by Augustine (Epist. 120:3; ed. Migne, 2:453, cited by Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, 1:162). Compare also Augustine, *De Utilitate Credendi, c.* 23, where he shows the natural analogies for faith; e.g. that friendship among men, filial piety, etc., are grounded on faith. He makes a distinction between fides quae; and fides qua creditur *(De Trin.* 13:2); and uses the phrase *fides Catholica* in the objective sense, to denote the body of doctrine "necessary to a Christian" *(De temp. serm.* 53; and *adv. Jud.* c. 19). Augustine, says Melancthon, did not set forth fully Paul's doctrine, though he came nearer to it than the Scholastics *(Letter to Brentius, opp. ed.* Bretschneider, 2:502).

3. In the scholastic period the idea of the kingdom of God degenerated into that of an ecclesiastical theocracy, and the outward side of the religious life (penance and good works) was prominent. Nevertheless, the great doctrinal truths of Christianity were carefully studied, and the aim of the greatest thinkers (e.g. Anselm) was to show that faith can be verified to the intellect as truth, while, at the same time, it is the necessary condition of science, as well as of salvation. "First of all," he says, "faith must purify the heart: we must humble ourselves, and become as little children. He who believes not cannot experience; he who has not experienced cannot understand. Nothing can be done till the soul rises on the wings of faith to God" *(De Fide Trinitat.* c. 2). The great Greek theologian, John of Damascus (8th century), who may be considered as beginning the period of scholastic theology, defined faith as consisting of two things:

1. belief in the truth of revealed doctrines, the πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς (the faith which cometh *by hearing*, Romans 10:17);

2. firm confidence in the promises of God, the faith which is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (⁵⁸Hebrews 11:1).

The first of these, he says, is the work of our own minds; the second is the gift of the Spirit *(De Fide Orthod.* 4:10). "Anselm comprises the whole doctrine of faith and morals in the question, how man appropriates redemption to himself. He says, 'The mere idea does not make faith, although this cannot exist without an object; in order to true faith the right tendency of the will must be added, which grace imparts' *(De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio,* c. 6). He distinguishes *(Monologium,* page 72; compare page 75) between *credere Deum, Christum,* and *credere* IN *Deum,* IN *Christum;* the former denotes a mere outward faith which only retains the form; the latter denotes the true, living faith, which lays hold of communion with God *(credendo tendere in divinam essentiam):* the former is valueless and dead; the latter contains the power of love, and testifies its power and its life by love. The faith which is connected with love cannot be inoperative; it proves its vitality, by so operating. Hugo of St. Victor develops the general idea of faith in connection with the religious nature of man. Faith marks the manner in which invisible blessings dwell within our souls *(quodam modo in nobis subsistunt),* the real vital communion with God, his true existence in the human soul. For divine things cannot be apprehended by us through the senses, the understanding, or the imagination, since they have nothing analogous to all these, but are exalted above all images. The only vehicle of their appropriation is faith. Two elements meet in it the tendency of the disposition, and the matter of cognition. This latter is the object of faith, but its essence consists in the tendency of the disposition; and although this is never altogether without the former, yet it constitutes the value of faith. Bernard agrees with Hugo in his view of the nature of faith: ‘even now,' he says, 'many who believe with confidence have only scanty knowledge; thus many in the O.T. retained firm faith in God, and received salvation by this faith, although they knew not when and how salvation would come to them.' Abelard's expressions are also important *(Sentent.* c. 4). 'Faith,' he says, 'always refers to the invisible, never to thevisible. But how is this? when Christ said to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed." What Thomas saw before him was one thing, what he believed was another. He confessed the man whom he saw to be the Lord, in whom he believed. He saw the flesh, but he believed in the God veiled in the flesh'" (Neander, *Church*

History, Torrey, 4:375). Not merely Abelard, but also most of the other schoolmen, understood by *Justificatio per fidem* not objective justification, but a subjective character of the disposition, which proceeds from faith, the true inward sanctification in love which arises out of faith. Bernard, on the other hand, was led by his experience to a more objective view: 'No one is without sin *(Sermo on Solomon's Song,* 23, § 15); for all righteousness it is enough for me that he is gracious to me who has redeemed me. Christ is not merely righteous *(Ib.* 22, § 8), but righteousness itself.' The scholastic doctrine on this point received a fixed form through Peter Lombard *(Sentent.* in, dist. 28). He makes a threefold distinction in faith: *Deum credere, Deo credere,* and *in Deum or Christum credere.* The two first amount merely to holding a thing to be true, but the last is the faith by which we enter into communion with God. With such a faith love is necessarily connected, and this faith alone is justifying. Love is the effect of this. faith, and the ground of the whole Christian life. Applying to faith the Aristotelian distinction between theform as the formative principle *(*εἶδος*, forma),* and the inorganic material determined by it (ὕλη, *materies),* Peter distinguishes faith as the *qualitas mrentis informnis,* the mere material of faith, and the *fidesformata,* when the vivifying power of love is added to it, which forms and determines it. *The fides formata* is a true virtue and this faith, working by love, alone justifies" (Ne ander, *History of Dogmas;* Ryland, page 522 sq.).

The Scholastics generally recognised the distinction (hinted by Augustine) between objective and subjec tive faith (*fides qua creditur* and *fides quae creditur*) and also distinguished between developed *(explicita)* and undeveloped *(implicita)* faith (Aquinas, *Sumnma,* 2, qu. 1, art. 7). But in all the scholastic period, the prevalence of the sacerdotal theory of religion hindered, if it did not absolutely prevent, a just apprehension of the nature of faith, and naturally developed the theory of the merit of good works. Peter Lombard, indeed, says that good works are those only that spring from the love of God, which love itself is the fruit of faith *(opus fidei; Sentent.* lib. in, dist. 23, D); but the "views of Thomas Aquinas were not quite so scriptural; thus *(Surmm.* part. 2:2, qu. 4, art. 7) he speaks of faith itself as a *virtue,* though he assigns to it the first and highest place among all virtues." He defines faith to be “an act of the intellect assenting to divine truth in virtue of the operation of the Spirit of God upon the will" *(Summa,* 2:2, 1, 4), and reckons faith among the theological virtues, which he distinguishes from the ethical (Neander, *Wiss. Abhandlung.* ed. Jacobi.

1851, page 42) "Such notions, however, led more and more to the revival of Pelagianism, till the forerunners of the Reformation returned to the simpler truths of the Gospel" (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines,* § 186). According to Aquinas, the faith by which we are cleared from sin is not the *fides informis,* which can coexist with sin; but is the *fides formata per charitatem* (faith informed by love). In justification there is a *motes charitatis as* well as a *motuss fidei* (Summa, part 3, qu. 44, art. 1). This statement contains the germ of the later Roman Catholic doctrine (see other passages in Moheler, Symbolism, N.Y. 1844, page 205; comp. Beck, *Dogsaengeschichte,* 1864, page 365). Its doctrine (as that of the period generally) is that justification is "not an objective act, but something subjective, making man internally righteous by the communication of the divine life in fellowship with Christ. For the attainment of *justificatio,* moreover, faith can only be the first step; it was not sufficient for jusfification, but love must be added; the *gratia justificans* was first given in *the fides formata,* making mman internally righteous. Since this external idea of faith required that for effecting justification something must be added from without, the additional aid of the Church here was demanded" (Neander, *Dogmas,* page 661). *SEE JUSTIFICATION*.

4. John Wessel (t 1489) was a precursor of the Reformation in his views on faith, as well as on many other points. None of the theologians of the Scholastic age expressed the principle of faith so fully in the Pauline spirit as Wessel. He considers it "not a mere taking for granted of historical facts, but the devotion of the whole mind to fellowship with God through Christ; it is the basis of the whole higher life; not merely in the relations of man to man, but also in the relations of man to God" (Ullmann, *Reformers before the* Reformation, Edinb. 1855, 2:468).

Practically, at the dawn of the Reformation (and for ages before), Christian people were taught by their pastors that the pardon of sin was to be secured, not bh faith in the merits of Christ, but by penitential observancms and good works, followed by priestly absolution; andfaith itself was generally held to be simply the reception of the teaching of the Church. In practice, faith was transformed into credulity.

(III.) *The Protestant and Roman Catholic Doctrines of Faith compared.* — *The ProtestantDoctrine.* — The central point of the Reformation, in a doctrinal point of view, was justification by faith. Its development will be treated in our article *SEE JUSTIFICATION*; we can here only briefly give

the distinction between the Protestant and Roman Catholic doctrines of faith: 1. that of the Reformers; 2. that of the Roman Catholic Church.

1. *The Reformers.* — The Reformers, in opposition to the Scholastic doctrine of justification as a subjective work (the making just), brought out prominently the *Objective* idea of justification (as a work donefor us by Christ). "On the other side, correspondingly, they regarded faith as subjective, and as the *principle* of the transformation of the whole inner life" (Neander, Dogmas, 2:662). The prominent position of faith in the theology of the Reformers was a fundasmental part of the change that was taking place, at the time, in the general religious views of Christendom. " The mind was not satisfied with an objective and outward salvation, however valid and reliable it might be. It desired a *consciousness* of being saved; it craved an experience of salvation. The Protestant mind could not rest in the Church, neither could it pretend to rest in an atonement that was unappropriated. The objective work of Christ on Calvary must become the subjective experience and rejoicing of the soul itself. While, however, the principle and act of faith occupies such a prominent place in the soteriology of the Reformation, we should not fail to notice that it is never represented as a *procuring cause* of justification; it is only the instrumental cause. Protestantism was exceedingly careful to distinguish justification from legal righteousness on the one hand, and from sanctification by grace on the other. It could not, consequently, concede to anv species of human agency, however excellent, a pecular and atoning efficacy. Hence we find none of that supplementary or perfecting of the work of Christ by the work of the creature which is found in the papalu sotetiology. And this applies to the highest of acts, the act of faith itself. Faith itself, though the gift and the work of God, does not justify, speaking accurately, but merely accepts that which does justify" (Shedd, *History of Doctrines*, 2:337-8). Luther was led to the true Pauline doctrine of faith by his profound conviction of the desperate condition of humanity, not simply from its sense of finiteness (which could only have led him to faith as a realization of the invisible and eternal), but also and chiefly from the crushing sense of personal guilt on account of sin. He regards faith not merely as a mere attribute, but, "so to speak, as a substantial and divine thing, so far as it cleaves to God, and God is in it. Faith is in the state of the *unio* mystica, union with God; and yet it is, at the same time, man's true existence." It is no mere intellectual act, but a giving up of the whole man to trust in Christ; and conversely, a penetration of the whole man by the life of Christ. "Faith makes new

creatures of us. MY holiness and righteousness do not spring from myself; theys arise alone out of Christ, in whom I am rooted by faith" (Dorner, *Person of Christ*, 2:58, 64). In the *Preface to the Epistle to the Romans* Luther says: "Faith alone justifies, and it alone fulfils the law; for faith, through the merits of Christ, obtains the Holy Spirit. And then, at length, from the faith thus efficaciously working and living in the heart, freely *(fluunt)* proceed those works which are truly good... . But faith is an energy in the heart; at once so efficacious, lively, breathing, and powerful as to be incapable of remaining inactive, but bursts forth into operation. Neither does he who has faith (*moratur*) demur about the question whether good works have been commanded or not; but even though there were no law, feeling the motions of this living impulse putting forth and exerting itself in his heart, he is spontaneously borne onward to work, and at no time does he cease to perform such actions as are truly pious and Christian. Faith, then, is a constant *fiducia*, a trust in the mercy of God toward us; a trust living and efficaciously working in the heart, by which we cast ourselves entirely on God, and commit ourselves to him; by which, *cer to fraeti*, having an assured reliance, we feel no hesitation about enduring death a thousand times." "Luther laid the greatest stress at all times on the *assurance* of salvation, and of the divine truth of Christianity. The ground certainty, on which all other certainty depends, is with him the justification of the sinner for Christ's sake apprehended by faith; of which it is only the objective statement to say that to him the fundamental certainty is Christ as the Redeemer, through surrender to whom faith has full satisfaction, and knows that it stands in the truth" (Dorner, Ge*schichte d. Prot. Theol.*, Miunchen, 1867, page 224). — "To believe those things to be true which are preached of Christ is not sufficient to constitute thee a Christian; but thou must not doubt that thou art of the number of them unto whom all the benefits of Christ are given and exhibited, which he that believes must plainly confess, that he is holy, godly, righteous, the Son of God, and certain of salvation, and that by no merit of his own, but by the mere mercy of God poured forth upon him for Christ's sake" (Luther, Serm. on Gal 1:4 *Galatians* 1:4, in Fish, *Masterpieces of Pulpit Eloquence*, 1:462). Zwingle held that faith, in the sense of the appropriation by man, through grace, of the redemptive work of Christ, is the only means or instrument of salvation. It was one of his grounds of objection to the Roman and Lutheran doctrines of the Eucharist that these doctrines detract from the glory of faith by representing it as insufficient for salvation (Dorner, Per*son of Christ*, div. 2, volume 2, page 116). Melancthen, in a letter to Brentius,

May, 1531, says: "Faith alone (sola) justifies, not because it is the root *(radix), as* you write, but because it *lays hold of Christ,* on whose account we are accepted. It is not love, the fulfilling of the law, which justifies, but faith alone, not because it is a perfection in us, but only because it lays hold on Christ" (edit. Bretschneider, Hal. Sax. 1835, 2:501). Calvin (*Institutes,* book 3, chapter 11) treats of faith at large, and distinguishes it from "a common assent to the evangelical history," and refutes the nugatory distinction made by the schools between *fides forsata* and *fides informis.* "The disputes of the schools concerning faith, by simply styling God the object of it, rather mislead miserable souls by a vain speculation than direct them to the proper mark. For, since God, 'dwelleth in the light which, no man can approach unto,' there is a necessity for the interposition of Christ as the medium of access to him." "This evil, then, as well as innumerable others, must be imputed to the schoolmen, who have, as it were, concealed Christ by drawing a veil over him; whereas, unless our views be immediately and steadily directed to him, we shall always be wandering through labyrinths without end. They not only, by their obscure definitions, diminish, and almost annihilate, all the importance of faith, but have fabricated thee notion of implicit faith, a term with which they have honored the grossest ignorance, and most perniciously deluded the miserable multitude." "Is this faith to understand nothing, but obediently to submit our understanding to the Church? Faith consists not in ignorance, but in knowledge; and that not only of God, but also of the divine will... . For faith consists of a knowledge of God and of Christ, not in reverence to the Church.

In short, no man is truly a believer unless he be firmly persuaded that God is a propitious and benevolent Father to him, and promise himself everything from his goodness; unless. he depend out the promises of divine benevolence to him, and feels an undoubted expectation of salvation. He is no believer, I say, who does not rely on the security of his salvation, and confidently triumph over the devil and death" (Calvin, *Institutes,* book 3, chapter 2).

The passages from the several Confessions will be given more fully in the art. *SEE JUSTIFICATION*; we cite here a few. *Augsburg Cosfession.* — "Men are justified freely for Christ's sake through faith when they believe that they are received into favor, and their sins are remitted for Christ's sake; this faith doth God impute for righteousness upon him" (Art. 4). The nature of *saving faith* is set forth in Art. 20: "It is to be observed here that

a mere historical belief; such as wicked men and devils have, is not here meant, who also believe is the history of the sufferings of Christ, and in his resurrection from the dead; but that genuine faith is here meant which causeth us to believe that we can obtain grace and forgiveness of sins through Christ, and which giveth us the confidence that through Christ we have a merciful God, which also gives us the assurance to know God to call upon him, and to have him always in remembrance, so that the believer is not without God, as are the Gentiles" (compare the *Apology for the Confession,* art. 2, 3). *Heidelberg Catechism. — Qu.* 21. "*What is true faith?* Ans. It is not only a certain knowledge whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in his word, but also a hearty trust, which the Holy Ghost works in me by the Gospel, that not only to others, but to me also, forgiveness of sins, everlasting righteousness, and salvation are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merit." *Remonstrants' Confession'* (11:1). — "Faith in Christ is a firm assent (*assensus*) *of* the mind to the word of God, joined with true trust (*fiduci*) in Christ, so that we not only faithfully receive Christ's doctrine as true and divine, but rest wholly on Christ himself for salvation." *Westminster Confession* (10, 14)."Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is the alone instrument of justifications; yet it ... is no dead faith, but worketh by love. By this faith a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the word ... but the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace. This faith is different in degrees, weak or strong; may be often and many ways assailed and weakened, but gets the victory, growing up in many to the attainment of a fell assurance through Christ." In all the Confessions, both Lutheran and Reformed, faith is held to be a laying hold on Christ, by whom we are saved (and not by our own works, or by any work of sanctitication done in us).

2. Roman *Catholic Doctrine.* — The Augsburg Confession (Art. 20) speaks of the long desuetude of the doctrine of faith in the Church, and the substitutiopof childish and needless works (fasts, pilgrimages, etc.), of the great cause of its corruption, and furnishing the chief occasion for the reformation of doctrine. "Our adversaries now," they say (A.D. 1530), "do not preach concerning these unprofitable works as they were wont: moreover, they have now learned to make mention of faith, about whichm, in former times, entire silence was observed. Theys now teach that we are

not justified before God by works alone, but join faith in Christ thereto, and say faith and works justify is before God; which doctrine imparts more consolation than mere confidence in good works." This was the chief theological dispute of the Reformation, and was also the main topic of theological discussion at the Council of Trent (1545-63). A few of the divines there (the archbishop of Sienna, the bishop of Cava, and others) held that faith alone justifies; but this ancient doctrine was too inconsistent with the sacerdotal system to find favor with the majority. "Great pains were taken to discuss thoroughly the assertion that 'man is justified by faith,' and to affix some determinate meaning to that expression; but the task was not easy. Some busied themselves in searching for the different seamses in which the word 'faith' is used in Scripture, which they made to amount to fifteen, but knew not in which it is employed when applied to justification. At length, after much disputing, it was agreed that faith is the belief of all things which God has revealed, or *the Church has commanded to be believed.* It was distinguished into two sorts: the one said to exist even in sinners, and which was termed *unformed,* barren, and dead; the other peculiar to the just, and working by charity, and thence called form*ed, efficacious,* and *living faith.* Still, as father Paul observes, 'they touched not the principal point of the difficulty, which was to ascertain whether a man is justified before he works righteousness, or whether he is justified by his works of righteousness" (Cramp, *Text-book of Popery,* chapter 7).

The decision of the Council is as follows (sess. 6; c. 8): "When the apostle says that man is justified 'by faith,' and 'freely,' these words are to be understood in that sense in which the Catholic Church hath always held and explained them, nanmely, that we are said to be justified 'by faith' because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God, and come into the fellowship of his children; and that we are said to be justified 'freely,' because nothing which precedes justification, whether faith or works, can deserve the grace thereof." Here, two things are to be noted:

(1) That the Roman idea of faith in general is that of the acceptance of the body of doctrine taught be the Church: "'La foi necesssaire pour la justification est la foi Cathohique d'apres laquelle nous croyons ce que Dieu a revels a son eglise" (Drioux, note to his edit. of Aquinas's Summa, 6:600); thus substantially making the intellect alone the seat of faith, as Bellarmine expressly puts it in his contrast between the Protestant and the

Roman ideas of faith: "*haeretici fidem fiduciam esse definiunt*; *Catholici fidem in intellectu sedem habere volunt*" *(De Justif.* 1:4). How thoroughly *external* a thing this faith may become in practice is evinced by the fact that the recitation of a creed, in Romanist language, is called an "act of faith" (Bergier, *Dict. de Theologie,* 3:54).

(2.) That, accordingly, the Council of Trent makes faith only the "beginning of human salvation" *(salutis humanae initium),* and "the *root* of all justification" *(radix omnis justificationis).* If faith is simply an intellectual act, it is fitly described as only the "beginning" of justification, and not its instrument. So Mohler, in commenting on this passage, expressly says that "Roman Catholics consider faith as the reunion with God in Christ *especially* by means of the faculty of knowledge, illuminated and strengthened by grace" *(Symbolism,* N.Y. 1844, page 204). In the same vein is the definition given by the Catechism of Trent, viz. that the "faith necessary to salvation is *that faith* by which we yield our entire assent to whatever has been revealed by almighty God" (Baltimore edit. page 19). It is plain that the notion of faith, as Protestants hold it, and as they believe that Paul held it, is totally wanting in the Roman doctrine. Naturally, too, with this conception of faith, the Romanists deny that faith alone justifies, affirming, in the way of the Scholastics (see above), that faith must be informed by charity, as the germ of new obedience, a gift bestowed first in baptism, and renewed by confession and absolution. So J.H. Newman *(Difficulties of Anglicanism,* cited by Hare, *Contest with Rome,* page 113) declares that Roman "Catholics hold that faith and love, faith and obedience, faith and works, are simply separable, and ordinarily separated in fact; that faith does not imply love, obedience, or works; that the firmest faith, so as to move mountains, may exist without love that is, true faith, as truly faith in the strict sense of the word as the faith of a martyr or a doctor." On this Hare remarks: "This belief is not faith. To many persons, indeed, it may appear that this is little more than a dispute about words; that we use the *word faith* in one sense, and the Romanist in another, and that it is not worth while to argue about the matter. But when we call to mind how great are the power and the blessings promised to faith by the Gospel, it surely is a question of the highest moment whether that power and those blessings belong to a lifeless, inert, inanimate notion, or to a living, energetic principle. This is the great controversy between Romanism and Protestantism. Their stay is the *opus operatumn,* ours *Jides operans — faith,* the gift of God, apprehending him through Christ,

renewing the whole man, and becoming the living spring of his feelings, and thoughts, and actions" *(Contest with Rome,* note 1). A letter of Bunsen's in 1840 illustrates the Roman idea of faith, as it had taken root in the mind of J.H. Newman before he went over to Rome. A pastor in Antwerp (named Sporlein) was troubled about episcopal ordination, and came to England for light. He was invited to breakfast at Newman's, and found him and a number of his friends ready to hear him. "He unburdened his heart to them, and they gave their decision — the verdict of a Newmanic jury on a case of conscience, viz. that 'Pastor Sporleln, as a Continental Christian, was subject to the authority of the bishop of Antwerp.' He objected that by that bishop he would be excommunicated as a heretic. ' Of course; but you will conform to his decision.' 'How can I do that,' exclaimed Sporlein, 'without abjuring my faith?' 'But your faith is heresy.' 'How? Do you mean that I am to embrace the errors of Rome, and to abjure the faith of the Gospel?' 'There is no faith but that of the Church.' 'But my faith is in Christ crucified.' 'You are mistaken; you are not saved by Christ, but by the Church' " *(Memoir of Bunsen,* by his Widow, London, 1868, 1:614).

(IV.) *Later Protestantism. —*

1. Whatever minor differences may have arisen in Protestant theology as to faith, all evangelical theologians agree in the following points:

1. That saving faith not only recognises the supernatural, but also accepts and trusts *absolutely* on Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as Savior;

2. that this saving power is the gift of God;

3. that it invariably brings forth good works;

4. that the faith which appropriates the merits of Christ must be a living faith;

5. that it is not the faith, nor the vitality of the faith, which justifies and saves man, but it is the *object* of the faith, i.e., the merits of Christ the Redeemer, and therefore that it is an error to attach a saving quality to any merely subjective faith. The earlier Reformers and Confessions made *assurance* an essential part of saving faith, but this doctrine was not long held. *SEE ASSURANCE; SEE JUSTIFICATION.*

2. *Divisions of Faith* — Faith is divided by the theologians *into fides historica and fides salvifica* (historical faith and saving faith). The former is intellectual knowledge and belief of the Christian doctrine; the latter a genuine appropriation of the merits of Christ unto salvation. True faith embraces both. The *parts* of faith, in theological language, are three:

a. *Notitia* (act of the intellect), knowledge, instruction in the facts and doctrines of Christianity (<45104>Romans 10:14).

b. *Assensus* (act of the will), assent to the doctrine, or reception of it as true and credible.

c. *Fiducia* (act of the heart), trust or confidence in the divine word. "True and saving faith in Christ consists both of assent and trust; but this is not a blind and superstitious trust in the sacrifice of Christ, like that of the heathens in their sacri'fices, nor the presumptuous trust of wicked and impenitent men, who depend on Christ to save them in their sins, but such a trust as is exercised according to the authority and direction of the word of God; so that *to know* the Gospel in its leading principles, and to have a cordial of *belief* in it, is necessary to that more specific act of faith which is called *reliance,* or, in systematic *language, fiducial assent"* (Watson, *Institutes,* 2:243).

3. *Faith in Christ; justifying Faith as Condition of Salvation.* —

(a.) Though the entire revelation of God is set forth, in one sense; as the object of faith (<42425>Luke 24:25, 26; Hebrews 11), yet Christ, the incarnate Son of God, the dying and risen Redeemer, is κατ᾽ ἐξοχνὴν, the object of faith (<48216>Galatians 2:16; <43172>John 17:21). In the evangelical churches, justifying faith is understood to be exercised specifically in Christ, as by his death making expiation and satisfaction for the sinner's guilt, or (to put the same idea in another light) in God's covenant with mankind in Christ, as offering them pardon for the sake of Christ's death; and this faith is yet viewed *merely* as a condition of justification.

(b.) "What faith is it, then, the ough which we are saved? It may be answered, first, in general, it is a faith in Christ; Christ, and God through Christ, are the proper objects of it. Herein, therefore, it is sufficiently, absolutely distinguished from the faith either of ancient or imodern heathens. And from the faith of a devil it is fully distinguished by this it is not barely a speculative, rational thing, a cold, lifeless assent, a train of

ideas in the head, but also a disposition oftthe heart. For thus saith the Scripture, 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.' And, 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe with thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' It acknowledges his death as the only sufficient means of redeeming man from death eternal, and his resurrection as the restoration of us all to life and immortality; inasmuch as he 'was delivered for our sins, and rose again for our justification.' Christian faith is, then not only an assent to the whole Gospel of Christ, out also a full reliance on the blood of Christ; a trust in the merits of his life, death, and resurrection; a recumbency upon him as our atonement and our life, as given for us, and living in us. It is a sure confidence which a man hath in God that through the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favor of God; and in consequence thereof, a closing with him, and cleaving to him, as our 'wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption,' or, in one word, our salvation" (Wesley, *Serm. on Justification).*

(c.) Faith is not meritoriously, but instrumentally, the condition of our pardon. "If Christ had not merited, God had not promised; if God had not promised, justification had never followed on this faith: so that the indissoluble connection of faith and justification is from God's institution, whereby he hath bound himself to give the benefit upon performance of the condition. Yet there is an aptitude in faith to be made a condition; for no other act can receive Christ as a priest propitiating and pleading the propitiation, and the promise of God for his sake to give the benefit. As receiving Christ and his gracious promise in this manner, it acknowledgeth man's guilt, and so man renounceth all righteousness in himself; and honoreth God the Father, and, Christ the, Son as the only Redeemer. It glorifies God's mercy and free grace in the highest degree. It acknowledgeth on earth, as it will be perpetually acknowledged in heaven, that the whole salvation of sinful man, from the beginning to the last degree thereof, whereof there shall be no end, is from God's freest love, Christ's merit and intercession, his own gracious promise, and the power of his own Holy Spirit" (Lawson). Wesley, speaking of faith as the condition of our justification, says, "We mean this mnuch, that it is the only thing without which no one is justified; the only thing that is immediately indispensably, absolutely requisite in order to pardon. As, on the one hand, thouh a man should have everything else, without faith, yet he cannot be justified; so, on the other, though he be supposed to want everything else, yet if he hath

faith he cannot but be justified. For suppose a sinner of any kind or degree, in a full sense of his total ungodliness, of his total inability to think, speak, or do good — suppose, I say, this sinner, helpless and hopeless, casts himself wholly on the mercy of God in Christ (which, indeed, he cannot do but by the grace of God), who will affirm that any more is required before that sinner can be justified?" (Wesley Sermon on *Justification;* Neander, *Planting and Training,* 2:128 sq.). "Faith, as it is mere belief, may be produced by rational evidence. But when that is attained,.the work of grace in the heart is nowhere said in Scripture to be carried on by the natural operation of these credited truths. The contrary fact, that men often credit them and remain uninfluenced by them, is obvious. When a different state of mind ensues, it is ascribed to the quickening influence of the Spirit, an influence which may be ordinarily resisted. By that influence men are 'pricked in their heart;' and the heart is prepared to feel the dread impression which is conveyed by the manifestation of man's perishing state, not merely in the doctrine of the word, but as it stands in the Spirit's application to the heart and conscience. But, though this was previously credited, and is still credited; and though its import and meaning are now more fully perceived as the perishing condition of the awakened man is more clearly discovered, the faith of affiance does not therefore follow. 'A person in these circumstances is not to be likened to a man drowning, who will instinctively seize the rope as soon as it is thrown out to him. There is a perverse disposition in man to seek salvation in his own way, and to stand on terms with his Savior. There is a reluctance to trust wholly in his atonement, and to be saved by grace. There is a sin of unbelief; an evil heart of unbelief; a repugnance to the committal of the soul to Christ, which the influence of grace, not merely knowledge of the opposite truth and duty, must conquer. Even when this is subdued, and man is made willing to be saved in the appointed way, a want of power is felt, not to credit the truth of the sacrifice of Christ, or its merits, or its sufficiency, but a want of power to trust wholly, and with confidence, in it, as to the issue It is then that, like the disciples, and all good men in all ages, every man in these circumstances prays for faith; for this power to trust personally, and far himself, in the atonement made for his sins. Thus he recognizes Christ as 'the Author and Finisher of faith,' and faith as the gift of God, though his own duty: then there is in the mind an entire renunciation of self on the one hand, and a seeking of all from Christ on the other, which cannot but be followed by the gift of faith, and by the joy which springs, not from mere sentiment, but from the attestation of the Spirit to our acceptance with

God. ‘Then the Holy Spirit is given, not only as the Comforter, but as the Sanctifier.' It is in this way, too, that faith saves us to the end, by connecting us with the exerted influence and power of God, through Christ. 'The life that I live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.' These are views which will, it is true, be a stumbling-stone and a rock of offense to the philosophers of this world. But there is no remedy in concession. Still this will stand, "Whosoever receiveth not the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein'" (Watson, Works, London, 1835, 7:224).

Pye Smith *(First Lines of Christian Theology,* book 5, chapter 5, § 3) defines the specific act of saving faith to be that act of the mind which directly and necessarily arises from the principle of faith, which is the proper and characteristic exertion of that principle, and in which the real nature, design, and tendency of genuine faith is made apparent. This act or exercise is expressed in Scripture by the terms “coming to Christ — looking to him — receiving him — eating the flesh of the Son of Man, and drinking his blood — trusting in him, and being fully persuaded of his truth and faithfulness." It is that which our old and excellent divines usually denoted by the phrase (perhaps too familiar, but very expressive and easily understood) *closing with Christ.* President Edwards expresses it thus: "The whole act of acceptance, or closing of the soul or heart with Christ" *(Works,* 8:546). "Faith is an assured resting of the soul upon God's promises of mercy in Jesus Christ for pardon of sins here and glory hereafter" (Dr. Owen's *Catechism).*

4. It has been said (above) that Protestant theologians are substantially agreed as to the nature of saving faith. But there is a class of divines in the Church of England (the so-called sacramental or Romanizing party) who seem to have gone back wholly to the scholastic doctrine of faith, if not, indeed, to that of Rome. One of the best writers of this school is bishop Forbes, of Brechin, who, in treating on Art. 11 of the Church of England, asserts that the faith by which we are justified is not the *fiducia* of Luther, but is "that beginning and root of the Christian life whereby we willingly believe, etc.," thus adopting the very phraseology of Trent in framing his definition of faith. So, also, he adopts Bellarmine's statement that "love is the vivifying principle of the faith which impetrates justification." While he admits that the fathers often affirm that we are justified by faith alone, he adds that "they never intended, by the word alone, to exclude all works of faith and grace from the causes of justification and eternal salvations"

(Explanation of the 39 *Articles*, London, 1867, 1:177 sq.). These views are sot Protestant; yet bishop Forbes, and the set of theologians who agree with him in going back to Romish doctrine, still belong to a Church which calls itself Protestant, in happy contrast, we cite another divine of the same Church, Dr. O'Brien, who, in his excellent treatise on *Justification by Faith* (Lond. 2d ed. 1863), after a clear statement of the nature of Christian faith as "trust in Christ; an entire and unreserved confidence in the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us, a full reliance upon him and his work," protests against the error that, "in justification, faith is accounted to us for righteousness because it is in itself a right principle, and one which naturally tends to produce obedience to divine precepts;" and he shows that, " while it is the fit instrument of our justification, and the seminal principle of holy obedience, it is, notwithstanding, the instrument of our justification, essentially and properly, because it unites us to the Lord Jesus Christ, so that we have an interest in all that he has done and suffered. God having, in his infinite wisdom and mercy, appointed that we should be pardoned and accepted for the sufferings and for the merits of another, seems most fitly to have appointed, too, that our voluntary acceptance of this his mode of freely forgiving and receiving us, by putting our trust in him through whom these blessings are to be bestowed upon us, should necessarily precede our full participation of all the benefits of this gracious scheme, and that nothing else should... . If for *our justification* it be essential, and sufficient, that we be united to Christ — one with *Christ* — *found in Christ* — does not the act whereby we take him for our defense against that wrath which we feel that we have earned — whereby, abjuring all self-dependence, we cast ourselves upon God's free mercies in the Redeemer, with a full sense of our guilt and our danger, but in a full reliance upon the efficacy of all that he has wrought and endured; does not this act, whereby we cleave to him, and, as far as in us lies, become one with him, seem the fit act whereunto to annex the full enjoyment of all those inestimable benefits which, however dearly purchased they were by him who bought them, were designed to be, with respect to us upon whom they are bestowed, emphatically free? With less than this, our part in the procedure would not have been, what it was manifestly designed to be, intelligent and voluntary; with more, it might seem to be meritorious. Whereas *faith* unites all the advantages that we ought to look for in the instrument whereby we were to lay hold on the blessings thus freely offered to us: it makes us voluntary recipients of them, and yet does not seem to leave, even to the deceitfulness of our own deceitful hearts, the power of

ascribing to ourselves any meritorious share in procuring them" (page 119-121).

The relation of faith to works, and the question of the apparent difference between the doctrine of Paul and that of James on this point, will be treated in our article *SEE WORKS*. We only remark here that the Protestant theology (as has been abundantly shown in the extracts already given) holds that true faith always manifests itself by love and good works (see *Augsburg Confession, Apology,* c. 3); any other faith is mere belief, or what St. James calls "dead faith." The minor differences among Protestants as to the nature of faith depend chiefly upon differences as to the nature of justification. *SEE JUSTIFICATION*.

See, besides the works already cited, Edwards, *Works* (N.Y. edit., 4 volumes, 8vo), 1:110; 2:601 sq.; 4:64 sq.; Waterland, *Works* (Oxf. 1843), 6:23-29; Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. 1; Wardlaw, *Systematic Theology* (Edinb. 1857, 3 volumes, 8vo), 2:728 sq.; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics* (Edinb. 1866, 8to), pages 37, 38 sq.; Knapp, *Christian Theology*, § 121 sq.; Browne, *On* 39 *Articles* (N.Y. 1865), page 308 sq.; Burnet, *On* 39 *Articles*, art. 11; Nitzsch, *Christliche Lehre*, § 143; Monsell, *Religion of Redemption* (Lond. 1867, 8vo), page 219 sq.; Bohmer, *Christl. Dogmatik* (Breslau, 1840), 1:4; 2:259 sq.; Perrone (Romans C.), *Prcelectiones Theologicce* (ed. Miane, 2 volumes), 2:1414 sq.; Mohler (R.C.), *Symbolism* (N.Y. 1844), book 1, chapter 3, § 15, 16; Buchanan, *On Justification* (Edinb. 1867, 8vo), page 364 sq.; Hare, *Victory of Faith* (reviewed in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1860, art. 2); Lepsius, *Paulin. Rechtfertigungslehre* (Leips. 1853, 8vo), page 94 sq.; Usteri, *Paulin. Lehrbegriff (Zr.* 1824, 8vo); Ritschl, *Altkathol. Kirche* (Leips. 1857, 8vo), page 82 sq.; Schulz, *Die Christliche Lehre v. Glauben* (Leips. 1834, 8vo); Cobb, *Philosophy of Faith* (Nashville); Neander, *Katholicismus u. Protestantismus* (Berlin, 1863, 8vo), pages 131-146; Hase, *Protestant. Polemik* (Leips. 1865, 8vo), page 242 sq.; Baur, *Katholicismus und Protestantismus* (Tiibingen, 1836, 8vo), pages 259-264; Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, book 1, chapter 2; Baur, *Dogmengeschichte* (Leips. 1867, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:200 sq.; Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, chapter 21; Beck, *Dogmengeschichte* (Tiibingen, 1864, 8vo), page 364-369. *SEE JUSTIFICATION*; *SEE SANCTIFICATION*.

Faith, Act Of

SEE AUTO DA FE.

Faith, Articles Of

SEE ARTICLES, AND FUNDAMENTAL.

Faith And Works

SEE WORKS.

Faith, Confessions Of

SEE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

Faith, Fundamental Articles Of

SEE FUNDAMENTAL.

Faith, Rule Of

I. *Regula Fidei.* — In the early Church the summary of doctrines taught to catechumens, and to which they were required to give their assent before baptism, was called in Greek πίστις, *the faith;* ὅρος πἰστεως, *the limit or determination of the faith;* ἔκδοσις πίστεως, *exposition of the faith;* κανών, *rule;* and in Latin, *Regula Jidei,* rule of faith. This term was afterwards applied to the Apostles' Creed. *SEE CREED, APOSTLES; SEE REGULA FIDEI.*

II. From the ancient usage, the phrase has been adopted (not very aptly) in modern theology to denote (1) the true source of our knowledge of Christian truth; and (2) the criterion or standard of Christian doctrine. Protestants find this rule in the Scriptures alone; the Greek and Roman churches, and some Anglicans, find it not only in Scripture, but also in the Church, as the authorized (inspired) interpreter of Scripture, whose interpretations are embodied in tradition. The supreme authority, according to the Romanists, lies in tradition, and in the pope as its living expounder. Some of the mystics and the Quakers make the "inner light" the supreme rule: thus Robert Barclay says that the highest source of knowledge divine revelation and illumination is something internal, trustworthy, and self-evident, which commands reason to accept it by the indwelling evidence. The Rationalists make reason the final arbiter, and the mind of man the measure of truth.

(I.) *The Protestant Doctrine*. —

1. One of the chief doctrinal elements of the Reformation was the *sufficiency* of Scripture for faith and salvation. Wickliffe, indeed, anticipated the Reformation in asserting the authority of Scripture. "When we truly believe in Christ," he says, "the authority of Holy Writ is greater for us than that of any other writing." He makes the acknowledgment of the divine word to spring from the immediate relation of the soul to Christ, while Rome puts the Church between the soul and Christ. Luther also rejected all mediation between the soul and Christ. "Yet, before he had consciously developed the principle that the holy Scriptures must be the highest source of knowledge, his doctrine had already been formed upon it, and unconsciously he was guided by the principle to admit nothing which was at variance with the Scriptures. Controversy first brought him to carry out this principle with scientific clearness." It was, however, first "scientifically stated by Melancthon on the occasion of the Leipsig disputation, in which Eck attacked a statement made by that reformer in one of his letters, which thus acquired notoriety. He says that it is a duty to abide by the pure and simple meaning of Holy Writ, as, indeed, heavenly truths are always the simplest; this meaning is to be found by comparing Holy Writ with itself. On this account we study Holy Writ, in order to pass judgment on all human opinions by it as a universal touchstone" *(Cont. Eckium Defensio,* Melancthonii *Opera,* ed. Bretschneicder, 1:113, cited by Neander, *History of Dogmas,* [Ryland], page 623). Both tradition and the apocryphal books were rejected by the Reformers. While the material principle of Protestantism is justificationn by faith, its formal principle (*principium cognoscendi* knowledge-principle, or principle of cognition) is that the word of God, given in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, "is the pure and proper *source,* as well as the only certain measure of all saving truth" (Schaff, *Principle of Protestantism,* Chambersburg, 1845, page 70).

2. The chief *Protestant Confessions* agree as to the rule of faith. The *Augsburg Confessiosc* repudiates the traditions of the Church of Rome as to penances, fasts, etc. (art. 15), discrimina ciborum, etc. (part 2, art. 5); and see especially *Apologia Confess.* cap. 8, page 206; *De tradition ibus humanis in Ecclesia; and Praef. ad Conf. August.* page 6, "We offer our confession ... drawn from the sacred Scriptures and the pure word of God." The *Formula Concordii,* Epit. 1:1, is more definite: "Credimus, confitemur et docemus unicam regulam et normam, secundum quam omnia dogmata, omnesque doctores aestimari et judicari oporteat, nullam omnino

aliam esse quam prophetica et apostolica scripta cum veteris tum novi Testamenti, sicut scriptum est <19910 6>Psalm 119:106; <4801 8>Galatians 1:8." "Reliqua vero sive patrum sive neotericorum scripta, quocunque eniant nomine, sacris literis nequaquam sunt aequiparanda, sed universa illis ita subjicienda sunt, ut alia ratione non recipiantur, nisi testium loco, qui doceant, quod etiam post apostolorum tempora et in quibus partibus orbis doctrina illa prophetarum et apostolorum sincerior conservata sit." "Coetera autem symbola et alia scripta, quorum paullo ante mentionem fecimus, non obtinent auctoritatem judicis; haec etiam dignitas solis sacris literis debetur, sed dumtaxat pro religione nostra testimonium dicunt, etc." (We believe, confess, and teach that the one rule and criterion by which all doctrines and teaching are to be tested is Scripture ... all other writings, whether ancient or modern; all symbols, creeds, etc., are of use [not as of equal authority, but only] as witnesses of the preservation of the revealed doctrines, and testimonies for our rel'igion, etc.). *Conf. Gall.* art. 5: "It is not lawful to oppose either antiquity, custom, multitude, man's wisdom and judgment, or edicts, or any decrees, or councils, or visions, or miracles, unto this holy Scripture, but rather that all things ought to be examined and tried by the rule and square thereof. Wherefore we do for this cause also allow those three creeds, namely, the Apostles', the Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds, because they be agreeable to the written word of God." *Conf. Helvet.* 2:1: "In controversies of religion on matters of faith, we cannot admit any other judge than God himself, pronouncing by the holy Scripture what is true, what is false, what is to be followed, or what to be avoided. So we do not rest but in the judgment of spiritual men drawn from the Word of God." *Conf. Belgic.* art. 7: "We believe also that the holy Scripture doth most perfectly contain all the will of God, and that in it all things are abundantly taught whatsoever is necessary to be believed of man to attain salvation." *Westminster Confessions*, art. 1: "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Seripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit or traditions of men. Nevertheless, cem acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the word," etc. "All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture

or other,' that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them." *Church of England,* art. 6 (5th of the Methodist Episcopal Church): "Holy Scripture containeth all thing's necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith." So the Creeds (art. 8) are commanded to reception and belief only because they may be proved by certains "warrants of holy Scripture;" works of supererogation (14) are rejected as contradicted by the word of Christ; things ordained even by general councils are affirmed (21) to have neither strength nor authority unless it be declared that they "be taken out of holy Scripture;" purgatory, pardons, image worship, relics, saintly invocation (22), and transubstantiation (28) are rejected as grounded "upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

(II.) The Romanist Doctrine. — The Council of Trent (sess. 4, April 8, 1546, *On the Canon*) declares that the "Gospel promised before by the prophets in the sacred Scriptures was first orally published by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who afterwards commanded it to be preached by his apostles to every creature, as the source of all saving truth and discipline; and that this truth asnd discipline are contained both in written books and in unwritten traditions, which have come down to us, either received by the apostles from the lip of Christ himself, or transmitted by the hands of the same apostles, under the dictation of the Holy Spirit;" and names as canonical all tmhe books of the O.T. and the Apocrypha, according to the Vulgate edition; declaring that the Council "doth arceive and reverence, with equal piety and veneration, all the books, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, the same God being the author of both and also the aforesaid traditions, pertaining both to faith and manners, whether received from Christ himself or dictated by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Catholic Church by continmal succession." The *Catechism of the Council of Trent* declares *(Preface)* that "all the doctrines of Christianity in which the faithful are to be instructed are derived from the Word of God, which, includes Scriptures and tradition." These statements are not so decided as those of later Roman theologians, but they were nevertheless received at the time as ordaining a new rule of faith in the Church. Bernard Gilpin (t 1583) had, it is said, been hesitating about accepting Protestantism, but the publication of the decree of Trent decided him: "While he was distracted with these things, the rule of faith changed by the

Council of Trent astonished him. For he observed that not only the ancient divines, but even the modern ones, Lombard, Scotus, and Aquinas, all confessed that the rule of faith was solely to be drawn from Scripture, whermeas he found, according to the Council of Trent, that it might as well be drawn from human traditions. The Church of Rome kept the rule of faith entire till it was changed by the Council of Trent. From that time he thought it a point of duty to forsake her communion, that the true Church, thus called out, might follow the Word of God" *(Life of Bernard Gil*pin, page 69, Glasgow, 1824, cited by Cramp, *Text-book of Popery,* chapter 3). Bellarmine (t 1621), perhaps the greatest of Roman theologians, sets forth the Roman theory more fully in his treatise *De Verbo Dei.* He divides it into the written and the unwritten word. The written word includes the Scriptures of the O. and N.T.; the unwritten is tradition, i.e.,

1. divine tradition, including doctrines communicated by Christ himself to the apostles, and taught by them, but not recorded;

2. *apostolical* tradition, doctrines taught by the apostles, but not recorded in their writings;

3. *ecclesiastical* tradition, including ancient customs and usages handed down in the Church. The necessity for these traditions he maintains on the express ground of the *insufficiency* of Scripture as a rule of faith and life — (asserimus in Scripturis non contineri expresse totam doctrinam necessariam sive de fide sive de moribus, *De Verbo Dei,* 4:3). The substance of these passages is, that in the rule of faith tradition is an authority indapeendent of Scripture, and in all respects equal to it in binding force. Mdhler *(Symbolism,* § 38) attempts to refine the Roman doctrine, but, in fact, disguises it esnder an ideal theory of his own, intended to be adapted to "the spirit of the age," or else inspired by it. nBut the substance of the Roman doctrine remains, in spite of his skill, in his statement that "it is the Church in which alone man arrives at the true understanding of Holy Writ." One of the latest and most skillful advocates of the Romam view is archbishop Manning, who, in his *Grounds of Faith* (London, 1852, 8vo), maintains that "universal tradition is the supremae interpreter of Scripture," and that this tradition is maintained only in the Church of Rome, of which the pope is the head and exponent. Dr. Schaff sums up the vices of the Romanist theory of the rule of faith as follows: "The distinction between the divine and the human is unsettled by it. This pantheistic feature runs through the whole system, culminating in the

respect shown towards the pope as lawfully holding and exercising the threefold office of Christ himself. Too much is allowed, again, to human agency in the formation of the sacred Scriptures, by limiting the inspiration of the Holy Ghost to mere assistance and guidance *(assistentia et directio).* Still farther, the Latin translation of Jerome, a work of course proceeding from a particular Church position, and reflecting its image, is not only placed on a par with the original text, but in actual use preferred to it altogether (Bellarmine, De Verbo *Dei,* 2:10). In the fourth place, the charge of darkness and ambiguity is brought against the Scriptures, whence tradition is held to be necessary for their interpretation, and it is counselled that the laity should not read them except in cases of special qualification, of which the bishop is to be the judge. In short, the whole tendency of the Roman Catholic Church has for its object to subordinate the Bible to tradition and then to make itself the infallible judge of truth, with power to determine at pleasure what is God's word and the doctrine of the Church, and to anathematize everything that may go beyond its past decisions, even though, as in the case of the Reforma'tion and Jansenism, it should be ad actual deepening of the Christian consciousness itself" *(Principle of Protestantism,* page 74).

(III.) *The new Anglican Doctrine.* — The so-called Tractariasm party in the Church of England adopted, almost at its first beginning in Oxford, in substance, "the Romanist theory of the rule of faith; so, e.g. *"Tracts far the Times"* (No. 70): "Catholic tradition teaches revealed truth, Scripture proves it: Scripture is the document of faith, tradition the witness of it: Scripture and tradition, taken together, are the joint rule of faith." The truth was, that the men comprising this new party had already embraced several of the Romanist doctrines, and, not finding any warrant for them in Scripture, sought it in tradition. Thus Keble (*Sermon on Tradition)* asserts that without tradition it would be impossible to demonstrate the doctrine of the "real presence," that of the "clergy as a distinct order," and that "consecration by apostolical authority is essential to the Eucharist" (see further in Goode, *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice,* 2:18 sq.). Some of these writers soon began to decry Protestantism as a failure, and the Reformation as a schism; and the next step was to assert that the Scriptures are both defective and obscure, and that many Doctrines necessary to faith are not in Scripture at all, but must be learned from tradition, which is "partly the interpretation and partly the supplement of Scripture" (see an able article in the *Princeton Review* 1842, page 598 sq.). Dr. Arnold

remarks (Edinb. Review April, 184), that, according to the Tractarian theory, "the Scriptures are not the sole or a perfect rule of faith; they are to be *supplementead* by tradition; they furnish at best but the germ of an imperfectly developed Christianity, which is to be found full blown and perfect somewhere (no one can tell where) in the third, or fourth, or fifth, or sixth century, or some century still later; and the fathers have much to tell us of undoubted apostolical authority, which the apostles themselves have failed to tell. Infinite are the disputes which such a theory instantly gives rise to. In essence and principle it in nowise differs from that of Rome (for it affirms both a written and an unwritten *word);* it differs only in the pleasant and gratuitously perplexing addition that it is impossible to assign the period within which the circle of Catholic verities may be supposed complete the period when the slowly developed Church system became ripe, but had not yet become rotten. The unity of faith which is thus sought is farther off than ever, for the materials of discord are enlarged a thousand fold.

1. There is the dispute as to whether there be any such authoritative rule of faith at all, and this alone promises to be an endless controversy.

2. Even if we were to admit the possible existence of such a rule, the uncertainty in its application would preclude the possibility of its being of any use.

3. Even if men in general are told that they neednot inquire for themselves, but just receive what their authorized guides choose to tell them, private judgment is still pressed with insuperable difficulties; for, alas! we find that the 'authorized guides' themselves, in the exercise of their private judgment, have arrived at very different conclusions as to. what is Catholic verity and what is not. It is very easy for Mr. Newman to talk in magniloquent phrase of that much abused abstraction, the 'Church,' and to represent his system of 'Church principles' as one and complete in every age. But when we inquire *which* is that Church, *what* are the doctrines it has delivered as the complete circle of verity, and who are its infallible interpreters, we find those whom these authorized guides proclaim equally authorized at endless variance — Romanists, Greeks, and Anglicans differing in judgment from each other and from themselves. In a word, we find the 'Church' is just Mr. Newman or Dr. Pusey — not unbecomingly disguised in the habiliments of a somewhat antiquated lady, and uttering their 'private judgments' as veritable oracles. What can one of these 'guides' say to 'a brother guide'

who declares; 'I adopt your principles, and it appears to me and many others that, on the same grounds on which you contend for the apostolical succession — that is, on the authority of the ancient Church — I must contend for the celibacy of the clergy?' Or to another, who declares, 'On our common principles I think there is good a-eason to admit the invocation of saints, the worship of images, the doctrine of the efficacy of holy relies, the monastic institute, to be, of apostolical origin?' Or to another, 'It appears to me that the doctrine of purgatory is but a development of the doctrine which justifies prayers for the dead?'" Dr. Arnold was right in his view of the tendency of the Tractarian doctrine: J.H. Newmnan and many others went logically to Rome, while Dr. Pusey illogically remained in the Church of England to corrupt it. And now, 1869, the Romanizing party in that Church bids defiance to both "Protestant tradition" and the state law.

III. It is one of the charges brought by Romanists against Protestantism that it has violently separated itself from the historical life of Christianity by its denial of tradition. But the charge is unfounded. Protestantism is the continuation of the true life of Christianity, reformed from the errors of Ronee, ancong which errors was the exaltation of tradition to a level ewmith Scripture as an *authority*. No such view of tradition can be found either in Scripture or in the early Church writers. According to the Protestant view, the Greek and Roman doctrine of the rule of faith takes away Christ, and puts an ecclesiastical corporation in his place. But Protestantism does not deny the value of tradition in transmitting Christian doctrine: its value is inestimable. But it is not authoritative or final; it is a servant, not a master. In fact, the question of the rule of faith is closely connected with that of the true idea of the Church, or, indeed, identical with it in the last analysis. So, at the fourth session of the Council of Trent, when the question of Scripture and tradition came up for discussion, Vincent Lunel, one of the members of the council, a Franciscan, "thought it would be preferable to treat of the Church in the first instance, because Scripture derived its authority from the Church. He added that if it were once established that all Christians are bound to obey the Church, everything else would be easy, and that this was the only argument that would refute the heretics." While Protestantism leads to Christ through the Scriptures, and through Christ to the Church, Rome pretends to lead through the Church to Christ and the Scriptures; the authority of the Protestant doctrine being its conformity with *revealed* truth, that of the

Roman Catholic system the *assumed* infallibility of the Church. *In causis spiritualibus necessario admittendus aliquis supremus judex controversiarum* (in spiritual things there must needs be some final and supreme Judge to decide controverted questions) is the old postulate of those who contend for a visible Church endowed with God's own infallibility. Grant them their postulate, in their own sense of it, and the whole theory of “Church principles," as the modern successors of Hildebrand complacently name their dogmas, will inevitably follow. On the other hand, let it be settled that the Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone, constitute the true rule of Christian faith and practice, and we shall have done forever with the juggling priestcraft which has so long disgraced Christianity, and which finds its only hope of support in ecclesiastical tradition. The question is a vital one. It is not a mere matter of detail, about which men can differ at pleasure; it is the Rubicon which separates Protestantism from Popery. It involves " a choice between the Gospel of Christ as declared by himself and his apostles, and that deadly apostasy which Paul in his lifetime saw threatening — nay, the effects of which, during his captivity, had nearly supplanted his own gospel in the Asiatic churches, and which he declares would come speedily with a fearful power of lying wonders" (Stanley, *Life of Arnold,* 2:110). The Church of God, according to the Protestant, is built upon the "foundation of the prophets and the apostles, Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" according to the traditionist, upon the sands of antiquity as well. From the beginning men have made the word of God of none effect through their traditions. *SEE BIBLE, USE OF;SEE FATHERS; SEE INFALLIBILITY; SEE PROTESTANTISM; SEE ROMANISM; SEE TRADITION.*

Literature. — Besides the authors already named in the course of this article, see Winer, *Comp. Darstellung,* 1866, page 27; Nitzsch, *System d. christl. Lehre,* § 36-39; Daille, *Right Use of the Fathers* (Philada. 1842,12mo); Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism,* book 1, chapter 1 and 3; Jeremy Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery* (Heber's ed.), 10:383 sq.; Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini;* Chillingworth, *Religion of Protestants* (Philadel. 1838), 8vo; Marsh, *Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome* (Cambridge, 1814, 8vo); Stillingfleet, *Protestant Grounds of Faith (Works,* Lond. 1709, volumes, 4, 5, and 6); Knapp, *Christian Theol. §* 8; Goode, *Divine Rule of Faith and Practice* (2d ed. Lond. 1853, 3 volumes, 8vo); Peck, *Appeal from Tradition to Scripture* (New York, 1844, 12mo, reviewed by M'Clintock in the *Biblical*

Repository, January 1846, art. 2); *Edinb. Review*, April, 1843; Lightfoot, *Works*, 6:54; Rosenmuller, *De Orig. Theolog.* cap. 11, § 35; Holden, *Authority of Tradition* (Philippians 1841); Hawkins, *Dissert. on Tradition* (Oxf. 1819, 8vo); Burnet, *On 39 Articles;* Browne, *On*, 39 *Articles;* Forbes, *On* 39 *Articles* (each on art. 6).

Faith And Reason

Religion and science express in the abstract and in the concrete the two opposite poles of human knowledge, between which there must always be discrepance, and has usually been discord. In all ages in which there has been any notable activity of intelligence there has been a controversy, more or less violent, between the claims of religious authority and the pretensions of human reason. The acrimony of the strife has been increased, and the importance of appeasing it has been augmented by every extension of the domain of precise, coherent, systematic reasoning. Every creed accepted by a cultivated and speculative community has been in turn assailed by a spirit of speculative scrutiny, whichhas gradually encroached upon the sacred domain, and has ultimately denied all validity to doctrines not established by the processes of ratiocination, or discovered and confirmed by direct observation and experiment. The primeval theology of the Hindoos, the capricious and graceful fantasies of the Greek mythology, the stern solemnity of the Roman Fasti, the arbitrary credulities of Islamism, have all experienced this phase of hostility, as well as Christianity, in the various periods and forms of its dissemination. But never has this war been more deadly in mode or iin. menace than in this current age, when the foundations, of revealed truth are undermined by insidious approaches, and when science erects its multitudinous batteries against all the ramparts of the Christian faith.

In other times, attempts, more or less unsuccessful, have been made to restore natural amity between, these embittered adversaries. The Euhemerism of the Greeks was an effort to explain the legendary superstitions of Greece so as to render them acceptable to the enlightened doubts of Hellenic philosophy. *SEE, EUHEMERUS*. A second and more elaborate plan forthe maintenance of the expiring reverence for the divinities of the pagan world was hazarded by the Neo-Platonists. *SEE NEO-PLATONISM*. Both experiments signally failed. In a much later period, with wholly dissimilar weapons, and with much vaster interests at stake, the illustrious Leibnitz undertook to reconcile religion and reason in

a treatise equally remarkable for the classical elegance of its style, and for the vigor and profundity of its argumentation. It was negative, in its character, and only offered a compromise. Such was also the complexion of the admirable work of bishop Butler on the *Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion.* In consequence, these luminous essays only interpose as landmarks in the midst of the waves between the hardy skepticism of the beginning and the revolutionary atheism of the close of the 18th century. The war has become more determined, even though it may have gradually lost much of its earlier bitterness. Extremists on both sides now declare that there is an implacable antagonism between faith and science. Ministers of religion may be found denouncing the procedures and conclusions of science as "enmity with God," and as incompatible with revealed truth; as if the laws of the creation could be at variance with the declarations of the Creator. Adepts in scientific research, on the other hand, proclaim the deceptiveness and inanity of all religious doctrine as contradictory to the clearly ascertained processes of the universe; as if the phenomena of matter could controvert the constitution of the human mind, and the ineradicable instincts, appetencies, and requirements of the human heart.

Yet, even in this apparently hopeless state of discord, renewed endeavors have been made to bring the great adversaries into harmonious union. The most recent and the most notable of these is that of Herbert Spencer, which is plausible in its pretensions, but most delusive in its results. It is singularly insidious ii design and in execution. It betrays with a kiss, and deals a mortal stab while inquiring, "How is it with thee, my brother?" It recognises the universality, the indestructibility, the necessity of religious belief, admits the impossibility of ignoring or dispelling the attributes of a Supreme Being, and yet attenuates everything thus admitted till it sublimates these conceptions into a vaporous phenomenalism, a misty hallucination of the human mind under the perennial bypochondria of a morbid fantasy. No suspension of arms has been obtained, because each party hopes for a decisive victory. But the prolongation and exacerbation of this strife are most disastrous, not merely to the legitimate authority of religion, but to the equally legitimate demands of science. One portion of the Christian community is repelled from the prompt acceptance and the zealous encouragement of the discoveries of science by the apprehension that the bulwarks of revealed religion may be surrendered to an unsparinig foe, Another portion rejects the teachings of the Church and of the Christian creed from disgust at an unreasoning and unreasonable

opposition to science. A third party, intermediate between the two, extends ashand to both; surrenders whatever rationalism questions, and professes to retain in a changed sense all that is essential in the dogmas of religion. Meanwhile, those of vicious inclinations find an excuse for the indulgence of their passions and the rejection of moral restraints in an intelligent repudiation or in a doubtful acknowledgment of religion; while the multitude, careless and stolid, pursues its private ambitions or pea sonal whims without regard to the obligations of this life, without concern for that great hereafter which occupies no place in its thoughts. The conciliation of faith and science thus becomes more urgent than in any former time, and its urgency is increased by the difficulty of accomplishing it in the midst of contentions between reciprocally repellant combatants, armed on the one side with the thunders of the Almighty, the promises of heaven, and the terrors of hell, and on the other with the dazzling panoply of modern investigation, and with weapons wreathed with the laurels of a century of scientific achievements.

The re-establishment of fraternal union between two so widely alienated disputants must be an arduous and always a somewhat doubtful task. "*Quis concordabit tantam contrarietatem*?" A mere truce will answer no good purpose. It would simply convert a running sore into a purulent condition of the whole system. The conciliation, to be efficient, must rest on an essential harmony of principles, oa a recognised dis-similarity of aims and applications. Even then the agreement may be liable to occasional rupture from reciprocal jealousies; but room must be allowed for partial dissent, as in these high questions no more can be expected than an unsteady *conquiesceaca — discordia concars.* Whether even this agreement is attainable must be uncertain till it has been attained; it may be reserved for that blessed expansion of our discernment when we shall no longer "see as through a glass darkly." But, in the mean time, there is a high obligation resting upon those who would repudiate neither the sanctifying influences of a holy life, nor the illumination of secular learning, to seek out the grounds of reconciliation, and to renew the marriage of the liberal arts weith theology. This seems to be the appropriate duty and the peculiar aspiration of the present age, and the imperfect or delusive efforts made in this direction indicate the latent consciousness that it is so. The instinctive ntsus, often grievously misdirected, always precedes the solution of the great enigmas of humanity. Before any reasonable hope, however, of a satisfactory result can be entertained, it is necessary so ascertain the

conditions of the problem, and to discover among the obvious and multitudinous discrepances whether there is any essential identity between the opposing forces. If there is, there may be a prospect of final accordance; if there is not, the antipathies are ineradicable and immedicable.

The conditions under which the question presents; itself are thus, the determination of the nature of the contending parties; the detection of any agreement ins their intrinsic character; and the discernment of the causes of their opposition and diverse procedure. It becomes expedient, therefore, to ascertain the peculiar character and functions of faith and science respectively. This cannot be accomplished by any mode of mere logical division and definition, because faith resides in our spiritual susceptibilities, and is incapable of verbal circumscription; and because scienee admits of no immutable boundaries, but "grows forever and forever." But the character of each may be sufficiently described to permit the contradistinction of the two to exhibit their contrasts, and to disclose any haamony that may exist between them.

Science is precise, definite, systematic knowledge, attained and co-ordinated by the application of human reasoning to admitted facts or observed phenomena. The conclusions of science are reached and are connected together by the discovery of the general principles which regulate the occurrence of the phenomena and reveal the conditions of their occurrence. These principles are established by the employment of thea two processes of deduction and induction; and science is the determination by the arts of reasoning of suchl knowledge as is apprehensible by the logical faculties of the human mind. The conclusions attained are more or less firmly believed according to the sufficiency or insufficiency of the reasoning; but, when firmlyestablished, are believed on the strength of the evidence, and cannot be doubted except by rememberingthe finite power and comprehension, and consequent. fallibility of the reasoning mind itself. This limitation, though properly may inevitably overlooked in the constitution and acceptance of scientific truth, cannot be safely disregarded in the estimation of the validity and certainty of scientific procedure.

Faith is something more than rational belief — something more firm and assured than scientific or philosophic conviction. Convtioin is produced by the strength of the arguments adduced by the influence of the

demonstration or other evidence of the understanding. Faith goes far beyond this, both in the assurance conveyed, and in the disproportion between. the testimony and what is accepted on that testimony.

“Seeing is believing," but he who "walks by faith" "walks not by sight." We believe in the results of science; we have faith in the truths of revelation. We believe that the earth is round; we have faith in the existence of God, and in the immortality of the soul. Conviction questions and scrutinizes; faith confides, and does not cavil. The belief which is founded uponreasoning ponders the arguments propounded, the evidence presented; faith is itself "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." This distinction may not be acceptable to persons of loose habits of thought, who employ words without disculminating their delicate shades of meaning; but itseems to be required by more than one passage of thee New Testament, and is fully sustained by the most acute, profound, and sagacious of the achoolmen, Thomas Aquinas (Summa *Theologia*, 2 a, qu. 2, art. 10; qu. my, art. 1). It is of the essence of faith to transcend the logical evidence, to accept more than is contained in any logical premises, and to hold the tenet thus retained with a more earnest tenacity than any deaconstration or generalization can produce. Not that faith is independent of evidence or testimony; but the cogency of such proof is not intrinsic or indisputable in itself, but is derived from its acceptance, and from the submissive adherence of the recipient. It is "the Spirit of truth" which "will guide you into all truth." This exposition may seem applicable only to religious faith, or to faith in supernatural truth; but It is with faith of this kind that the controversy on the part of science is maintained. It is therefore in this domain that the essence of faith is to be specially considered. Nevertheless, a little reflection and examination will show that all faith possesses the same general characteristics. The faith which we repose in another similarly transcends, and usually precedes the evidence: the faith which we hold in regard to the regular order of nature is manifested without thought of the arguanents by which that order is proved; the faith which we entertain in the necessity and generally beneficent action of government is wholly irrespective of our opinions in relation to its particular measures. *SEE FAITH.*

Thus widely contrasted, then, are the characteristics of faith and science. The, former is out of all proportion to the proof addressed to the reasoning faculties; the other is strictly limited by the proof. The one is an adhesion of our whole spiritual nature, undoubting, and unvisited by any anxious

concern; the other is simply the acquiescence of the understanding, which may be dispelled by further discoveries. The one may be resisted, the other cannot be denied; the one is of voluntary acceptance, the other of compulsory belief. 'The being' of God may be denied; the validity of a demonstration of Euclid cannot be gainsaid, ithe terms and the logical process are apprehended.

But, though these things be thus disparate in their ordinary and in their ultimate manifestations, they are identical in their foundations and in their point of departure. It has been stated already that scientific reasoning proceeds by way of deduction or of induction. Deduction, however, proceeds from premises which are either established by induction, or are received without demonstration; and induction requires general principles, not reached by induction, to render induction possible. First principles admit of neither definition nor proof. The conception of order, the admission of the uniformity of natural laws, are not inductions. Supposing, however, that those things which are confirmed by science, and receive their expansion and development from science, are reached by scientific reasoning, still the conceptions of mind, matter, and similar primordial phenomena with which science deals are intuitive, and are accepted by an unreasoning, though rational faith. They are only perplexed and weakened by argumentation on the subject. The contrasted conceptions of mind and matter are universally recognised as contrasted, even bs those who deny the reality of matter, and represent it as a mere image or phantasm of the mind; and by those who deny the distinct character of mind, and profess to regard it as nothing more than a modification or efflorescence of matter. The distinction is admitted, although the distinctness of essence or of substance be denied. So pressing is the intuitive consciousness of the contrast that recent votaries of science, who would cashier the whole realm of faith, are compelled by an unavowed and unsuspected instinct to disembody and to evaporate, as well as despiritualize, the whole universe which they pretend to explain by ascribing a purely apparent existence to facts and to the evolution of facts — a merely phenomenal validity to demonstrated changes and the laws of change. They make shadows chase shadows in a spectral world for the entertainment of shadowy observers. In this manner they convert the material and the intelligible universe into an impalpable phantasmagoria: they render it a reflection upon the clouds, a giant of the Brocken, an intricate dance of fantastic unrealities. But the ghosts which they evoke from the dissipated forms of being are as

intractable and as hostile as the spirits and bodies which they have attempted to annihilate. Faith, the same in kind, though greater in degree, is required for the admission of such *idols* of mind and matter, and nothing is gained for their own purposes by embracing the cloud instead of the goddess.

The true doctrine with respect to the foundations of scientific procedure is laid down by Aristotle in the close of the *Posterior Analytics.* "It is evident," says he, "that, as demonstration is not the beginning of demonstration, so neither is science the first principle of science." Nearly six centuries later, Proclus similarly declares in his Theological Institutes that "intuition is the principle and first cause of knowledge." After the lapse of more than twelve hundred years, the Sage of Verulam reasserted the same position in a somewhat different form in *The Fable of Cupid,* and again in the *Novum Organon* (1 *Aph.* 66). Thus the founder of science, the most extreme of Transcendentalists, and the restorer of inductive philosophy, concur in recognising that science is not self-sustaining, but is dependent upon principles beyond the sphere of science. Their declarations, too, are no isolated testimonies, but are merely echoes of the convictions of philosophers of the most divergent schools (Plato, *Timceus,* ch. i; Aristotle, *Met.* 3:4; 10:5, 6; Theophrastus, *Met.* 5; Alex. Aphrodisiensis, *Schol. in Aristot.* ed. Brandis, pages 525, 527, 592, 605, 653; Asclepiades, *Ibid.* page 599; Ammonius, *Ibid.* page 519; Des Cartes, *Med.* 2; Spinoza, *De la Reforme de l'Entendement, Euvrres,* 2:281, ed. Saisset.; Leibnitz, *Opera,* 1, page 144, 161, ed. Dutens). A remarkable testimony to the same effect was recently (August 1868) given by Prof. Tyndall in his introductory address before the Mathematical Section of the British Association.

It is not simply a metaphysical axiom, but an obvious truism, that there can be neither definition nor demonstration of first principles of those fundamental and primary facts upon which not merely all knowledge, but all possibility of knowledge depends. Life is consciousness, not a conclusion of the reason. Personal identity admits neither proof nor denial. Mind escapes from the formulas of scientific knowledge; matter cannot be seized or established by them. The theory of Boscovich may be invalid, but it cannot be disproved. Thus the very foundations of scientific knowledge rest upon faith, and upon faith only upon faith in primitive facts — faith in the testimony of the senses — faith in our intellectual apprehensions. Accordingly, the faith which is supposed to make unreasonable demands in

requiring the acceptance of theological truths is equally, though not in an equal degree, required for scientific speculation. Science cannot commence its speculations without humbly receiving dogmas communicated and held by faith; it cannot advance a single step without implicit acquiescence in their truth, and without their necessary, though latent support. On all sides we are encompassed by mystery. Religion and science thus spring from a common root. They address themselves in the first instance to a common characteristic of the intelligence. In both, faith must precede knowledge; and in either, the celebrated maxim of St. Augustine finds its application: *"Credo, utintelligam."* They are twin sisters, sustained by a common life, nourished by a common sustenance, illumined by the radiance proceeding from a common fountain of light. Both require τὸ θεῖον ψυχῆς ὄμμα τὰ θεῖα προλάμβανον ; and both may turn to the Father of Lights and exclaim, *"Angelorum esca nutrivisti populum tuum, et paratum panem de caelo praestitisti illis sine labore, omne delectamentum in se habentem et omnis saporis suavitatem."*

But, though religion and science are intimately united in the cradle by participation in faith and in the works of faith, their development follows along widely divergent lines. Religion proceeds on its sacred mission accompanied, supported, and guided by faith throughout the whole journey, and calls in the aid of reason only to remove the obstacles and impediments occasioned by the weakness or scepticism of the finite intelligence. Science, like the prodigal son, leaves his father's house to wander in strange lands and among strange scenes, and too often forgets the annocence, the purity, and the heavenly illumination of his paternal home. But still the first lessons of faith — "the vision splendid" of his youth attend his course, return to his memory, recall his origin, and silently reclaim him to his early home.

"Perchance he may return with others there,
When he has purged his guilt."

Science thus reposes on faith, upon principles of the same generic character as those which furnish the substance of religion; but it requires them only as premises which are soon left out and forgotten in its strictly ratiocinative development. It is willingly oblivious of the fact that "there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy." Religion receives these and the like principles of faith as its

commencement, beginning, and end. Science commences where religion leaves off, but it is ushered into its career by faith.

These brief and undeveloped views may perhaps indicate the means of securing a valid conciliation of faith and reason, of religion and science, and of establishing the limits of their respective spheres, and the characteristics of their respective procedures. Interpreted as they have been here explained, their contrasts and functions remain distinctly marked, but they cease to be antagonistic, and have neither reason nbr excuse for enmity. — Compare Shedd, *History of Doctrines,* 1:154 sq.; Chlebus, *Stud. u. Krit:* 1846, page 905 sq.; *Edinburgh Review,* October 1849. art. 1; Westcott, *Study of the Gospels,* page 393; M'Cosh, *Intuitions of the Mind,* book 2, chapter 1, and part 3, book 2, chapter 5; Miles, *Philosophical Theology* (Charleston, 1850, 8vo). (G.F.H.)

Faith of Jesus

Society of the (or FATHERS OF THE FAITH), an ecclesiastical order in the Church of Rome, founded by Paccanari, a Tyrolese enthusiast, and formerly a soldier of the pope, under the patronage of the archduchess Mariana. The intention of Paccanari was to give to the Church a substitute for the order of the Jesuits, which had been suppressed by Clement XIV. The foundation of the society was laid by Paccanari and twelve companions in 1798 at a villa near Spoleto, which a nobleman had offered to them for that purpose. The rule adopted by Paccanari was almost identical with that of the Jesuits. Pope Pius VI, who was at that time kept a prisoner by the government of France in a monastery near Florence, and whom Paccanari visited, encouraged the new society, and recommended to it the pupils of the Propaganda whom the government of the Roman republic had expelled from their college. In 1799, Paccanari, while on a visit to Rome, was arrested, together with his companions, but they were soon set at liberty on the condition that they should leave the Roman territory. In the same year the "Society of the Sacred Heart," a society which had been established in 1794 by some ex-Jesuits for the purpose of reviving the order of the Jesuits under a different name, united, in consequence of an express order of the pope, with the Fathers of the Faith, and recognised Paccanari as their superior. The latter, who up to this time had been a layman, now received minor orders at the hands of the papal nuncio in Vienna, and in 1800 was ordained priest. The society, which had already taken charge of several missions in Africa, established houses in

Bavaria, Italy, France, England, and Holland, and in 1804 numbered about eighty members. Pope Pius VII was, however, not favorable to them. Some of the members joined the Jesuits, who had been restored in Russia and (in 1804) in Naples, while others repudiated the authority of Paccanari, and placed themselves under the direct authority of the diocesan bishops. Paccanari himself was summoned before an ecclesiastical court, and sentenced to life-long imprisonment. The second invasion of Rome by the French restored to him his liberty, but the society was wholly dissolved in 1814, when its last members joined the order of the Jesuits, who in that year were restored for the whole Church. — Henrion-Fehr, *Gesch. der Moncchs orden,* 2:62.

Faithful

1. A title given in Scripture to Christians (<4047>1 Corinthians 4:17; <4062>Ephesians 6:21, et al.).

2. The term, πιστοὶ, *the faithful* (FIDELES), was the general and favorite name in the early Church to denote baptized persons. By this name they were distinguished, on the one hand, from the ἄπιστοι, such as were not Christians; and, on the other, from the catechumens. -Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 1, chapters 3, 4; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* book 2, chapter 5.

Fakir

(also spelled FAQUIR). This word, derived from the *Arabic fakr* (poverty), is used by the Arabs to designate those mendicant orders called by the Persians and Turks *dervishes.* By Europeans it is commonly used to denote certain Hindoo sects noted for asceticism and austerities. For a brief account of the Mohammedan Fakirs, see the article DERVISH *SEE DERVISH*. We mention here, in addition, only a sect of them styled *Calenders,* from the name of their founder, Santone Kalenderi, described by Knolles *(History of the Turks)* as Epicureans, whose motto is, “This day is ours, tomorrow is his who may live to enjoy it," and in whose view the tavern is as holy as the mosque, and God as well pleased with their debaucheries, i.e., "liberal use of his creatures" as with the austerities of others (see D'Herbelot, s.v. Calender).

1. *History.* — We find no religious devotees of this kind among the Mohammedans earlier than the 13th century after Christ, though the origin of Hindoo fakirism is bysome writers referred back to Sakyamuni. *SEE*

BUDDHISM. But a satisfactory explanation of the origin of fakirism may be found in that perverted human tendency which in all ages has sought to earn the favor of God and the praise of men through abstraction of the soul and chastenings of the flesh, and has been too prone to accord to such acts undue homage and sanctity. Nowhere has this tendency been more marked than among the imaginative and superstitious peoples of the East. The account which Strabo, on the authority of Megasthenes, Aristobulus, and others, has given us of the Gymnosophists, especially that class called by him *Garmanes,* and by others *Sarmani* or Samansei, shows that ascetics, very similar in modes of life, doctrines, and practices to the Fakirs of modern India, were found there at the time of Alexander's conquests. This conclusion is strengthened by the descriptions of Quintus Curtius,, Arrian, Plutarch, Pliny, Clemens Alexandrinus, and other ancient authors, when treating of the philosophers of India. It seems not a merely speculative view which assumes that the *naked philosophers,* so celebrated in ancient times, were, in an ethical sense at least, the progenitors of the modern Fakirs (see Heeren, *Asiatic Nations,* 2:242, note).

Among the mendicant devotees who abounded in India at the date of the Mohammedan conquests we find the Fakirs mentioned as prominent in the veneration of the people, and exercising an almost unlimited influence over them; and frequent mention is made of these fanatics and their strange practices by the travelers who have described India since the period named. D'Herbelot estimated that there was in India 800,000 Mohammedan and 1,200,000 idolatrous Fakirs, while the number of both sorts is now estimated at over 1,000,000. Fakirism, with other forms of superstitious fanaticism, seems to be rapidly losing ground under the influences and agencies which, since the prevalence of British rule, have been diffusing the light of the purer doctrines of the Gospel through India.

2. *Sects or Fraternities.* — They are divided into sects or orders, each differing from the others more or less in dress, habits, etc. Owing perhaps to the lack of organization and the number of their fraternities, the accounts of travelers and other authorities in this respect seem conflicting and fragmentary. Without attempting any precise classification, we may group them usnder two heads: 1. Those living in *communities* either in convents, as Western monks, or wandering about in troops, sometime's amounting to thousands. 2. Those living *singly,* as hermits or as vagabond mendicants, passing from place to place, practicing the arts and tricks of their order, and receiving from the credulous superstition of the people the

entertainment and alms provided at public expense in the villages for persons of their class.

"The Fakirs of India," says Zimmermann (Vonder *Einsamkeit,* 2:107), "have a sect which is called the Illuminated, or those who are united with God. The Illuminated have overcome the world, live in some secluded garden, like hermits, so deeply sunk in contemplation that they look for whole hours at one spot, insensible to all outward objects. But then, as they state, with indescribable delight they perceive God as a pure white light. For some days before they live on nothing but bread and water, sink into deep silence, look upward for some time with fixed gaze, turn their eyes in deep concentration of the soul to the point of the nose, and now the white light appears" (Ennemoser, 1:205-6).

The Fakirs, or Yogees, of the Senessee tribe travel over Hindoostans, living on the charity of the other Hindoos, generally entirely naked, and "most of them robust, handsome men. They admit proselytes from the other tribes, especially youths of bright parts, and take great pains to instruct them in their mysteries." Collected in large bodies, and armed, they make pilgrimages to sacred places, laying the country under contribution. Led on by an old woman named Bostimia, who pretended to possess the gift of enchantment, one of their hosts, 20,000 strong, defeated an army of Aurungzebe, and for a time, through the influence of superstitious fears, paralyzing his powers of resistance, spread terror and dismay through his court and capital. Niebuhr, the traveler, speaks of the Bargais and the Gusseins, two orders of Fakirs, as travelling armed, and in troops of thousands. The *Iconographic Encyclopedia* (4:232) names three classes of Hindoo ascetics, viz. *Sanashis* or *Saniassi, Vish*navins, and *Penitents.*

3. *Peculiar Doctrines and Austerities.* — The profession of poverty constitutes a fundamental principle of fakirism, as the name itself indicates. One author says "the quality which God most loves in his creatures is poverty;" and tradition reports Mohammed as saying to his servant Belal, "See to it that you appear before God poor and not rich, for the poor have the chief places in his mansion." Another fundamental principle is the virtue of self-torture, penances, and seclusion of spirit as means for the attainment of sanctity. The Fakir, says Hassan al Basri, is like a dog in ten things: he is always hungry; has no fixed abode; watches during the night; leaves no heritage when he dies; does not abandon his master, though ill treated; chooses the lowest place; yields his place to whomsoever wishes it; returns

to him who has beaten him when a crust of bread is offered; keeps quiet while others eat, and follows his msaster without thinking of returning to the place he has left. The variety and character of their penances and mortifications of the flesh display no little ingenuity of conception, sand demand great powers of endurance in performance. Some go naked, or wear only filthy rags, suffering the heat of the sun, the storms of rain, and the cold of the night in the open air, sleeping on cow-dung or other ordure, "delighting in nastiness and a holy obscenity with a great show of sanctity," with hair uncut, and body and face besmeared with ashes, looking more like devils than men. One has kept his arms in one position until they shrivelled up; another has kept his hands clasped together until the nails grew through the flesh. Some have buried themselves up to their chins in pits, and thus remained for days; others have imprisoned themselves for life in iron cages; one has had his cheeks and tongue pierced with a sharp iron, kept in its place by another passing under the chin; another would drag along a heavy chain, one link of which passed through the tenderest part of the body, the penis; one bears on his neck a heavy yoke, with heavy weights in his hands; another lies down on a bed of iron spikes; one suspends himself head downwards over a fire until his scalp is burned to the bone; another traverses long distances by rolling on the ground, receiving his food and drink from the hands of the people; one makes the singular vow to perform a long journey by rolling himself along as a sort of cart-wheel: having for this purpose fastened his wrists and ankles together, and caused a tire, made of chopped straw, mud, and cows' dung, to be laid along the ridge of his back-bone, with a bamboo-stick passed through the angle made by his knees and elbows for an axle, he rolls himself to the first village on his route, where he is received with demonstrations of joyous respect, and conducted to the tank or well for ablution. Ascertaining emhat house of the village promises the best cheer, thither he repairs, and there remains until the supplies fail. He then repeats the process of preparation, and journeys to another place. Some fakirs have combined traffic with their religious pilgrimages, and by the exchange of valuable, yet easily transported articles, carried in their belts and clothing, have made great gains in the pelf of the world which they so much affect to despise. The lives of some, perhaps, comport with the spirit of sanctity and self-denial professed, but most of them are in secret addicted to gross vices, and whenever favorable opportunity offers, the pride and cruelty of their hearts display themselves.

4. Literature. — Strabo, § 712-719; Arrianus, *Indica*, cap. 12; Quintus Curtius, lib. 8, cap. 9; Plutarch, *Vita Alexandri;* Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* lib. 7, cap. 2; Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromata, lib. 1:305 d.; Bohlen, *Das Alte Indien;* Coleman, *Mythology of the Hindus;* Duff, India and Indian *Missions;* Ward, *Hist. Literat. Mythology, etc. of the Hindus; Iconographic Encyclope*dia, 4:12-13 (N.York, 1851); D'Herhelot, *Bibliotheque Orientale*, s.v. Fakir and Calender; Ennemoser, *History of Magic*, 1:205-10 (Bohn's ed. 1854); *India, Pictorial, Descriptive, and Historical,* page 73, 115-119, 430 (Bohn's Illustr. Library); Ruffner, *The Fathers of the Desert*, 1:23-51. For pictorial illustrations, see *Harper's Weekly* for 1857, page 540, and *Iconographic Encyclopcedia,* Plates to *Mythology and Religious Rites,* ph. 2, fig. 20, and ph. 3, fig. 10, 11, and 12. (J.W.M.)

Falaquera, Sean Tobias Ben-Joseph Ben,

a Spanish Jew of great learning, and a philosopher of the school of Maimonides, was born about 1228. Besides a work on *The Relation of Religion and Philosophy,* he wrote, in 1263, çqbmh, the Inquirer (printed at Amsterdam, 1779). Later he wrote çpnh 8s, *Psychology* (Amst. 1835), in which he follows the Arabic school of Aristotle's disciples 8 µyç[mh twmlç, *Ethics;* and in 1280 a work as the philosophical parts of Morehe, hrwmh hrwm (printed at Pressburg, 1837). We mention also tyanq tjnm, a work written in 1290 in defense of Maimonides. — Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. seiner Sekten*, 3:27.

Falashas

(Black Jews), a large and peculiar race inhabiting the province of Semen, on the shores of the Tzana Sea, near Gondar and the mountainous regions of northern Abyssinia. The word *Falasha* means *exile,* and sufficiently indicates that they were not natives of the soil. They have a skin more or less dark, without possessing, however, the negro type, and speak both the dominant language of the country — the Ambaric, and a dialect of the Agaon language. They possess the whole of the Jewish Canon (O.T. Canon): in the Gueez language (a sister language of the Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramoean dialects, and from which the Amharic is derived), together with the apocryphal books accepted by the Abyssinian Church. Their mriests, who live round the inclosures of the temple (which are situated near the edge of the Falasha vilslages, and have, more the appearance of

the ancient sanctuary than the modern synagogue), observe the laws of purity with rigor, prepare their own food, and keep aloof from the world. They are principally engaged in the education of youth, making the Bible and the traditional practices the basis of their instruction. The Falashas deviate from Jewish usages in many reaspects. Thus the fringed praying-scarf (taleth, q.v.), the phylacteries (q.v.), are not used in their devolions. They retain the usage of offering sacrifices, but rather as commemorative ceremonies than as real Sacrifices; the most common is the offering for the repose of the dead. No sacrifices can be offered on the Sabbath or on the day of atonement. The Falashas, with all other Jewish sects, hope for a return to the sacred city, Jerusalem. While polygamy is not forbidden by law, it is nevertheless censured. They have a special hatred of slave-dealers, yet slavery is tolerated among then; they instruct the slaves in the law of Moses, and manumit them on conversion. They are a very industrious race, and have the reputation of being good farmers. They are also able warriors (many fought under king Theodore in the late Abyssinian war), but are averse to commerce, which they consider an obstacle to fidelity and rigor in religious observances. The Falashas were formerly governed by an independent prince, whose residence was in the fastness of Ainba Gideon, and it is only since 1800, after the extinction of the race of their original masters, that they have passed under the domination of the princes of Tigres. They claim that their ancestors settled in Abyssinia as early as the time of Solouceon, but it is likely that they came much later. The knowledge of Hebrew they have lost. In 1867, the central committee of the Jewish *Alliance Universelle,* which has its seat in Paris, sent M. Leon Halevy to Abyssinia to make a tour of exploration among the falashas, and report on what might be done for their education, with a special view to counteracting the influence of the Christian missionaries who had been sent out from India. After his return, M. Halevy made, in July, 1868, a very interesting report on the Falashas, and announced the publication of an "Essay on the Falashah," — which will undoubtedly be the first thorough work on the subject. He brought with him a young Falashah, who will be educated in France. — Pierer, *Univarsal-Lexikon,* 6:79; *Israelite,* volume 15, No. 21 and 25. (J.H.W.)

Falcandus, Hugo

a distinguished historian, lived in the 12th century. According to the Benedictine authors of the work *L'Art de Verifier les Dates,* he was a native of France (his original name being Fulcandus or Foucault);

accompanied his patron Stephen de la Perche, archbishop of Palermo, and grand-uncle of king William II, to Sicily, and finally became abbot of St. Denys, at Paris. Gibbon is of opinion that he was a native of Sicily. His celebrated work, *Historia Sicula*, which procured for him the surname of the Sicilian Tacitus, was published in 1189 or 1190, and is of great importance for the Church history of that period. — Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirch.-Lex.* 4:885.

Falcon

Picture for Falcon 1

a bird of the hawk tribe, anciently trained to assist in hunting, and still used in the East for the same purpose. Dr. Thomson (*Land and Book*, 1:309 sq.) thus speaks of the practice in Palestine: "The beg at the castle of Tibnin, which we are now approaching, always keeps several of these large falcons on their perches in his grand reception-hall, where they are tended with the utmost care. I have been out on the mountains to see them hunt, and it is a most exciting scene. The emirs sit as their horses, holding the birds on their wrists, and the woods are filled with their retainers, beating about and shouting, to start up and drive toward them the poor partridges. When snear enough, the falcon is launched from the hand, and swoops down upon his victim like an eagle hasting to the prey. After he has struck his quarry, the falcon flies a short distance, and lights on the ground, amid the redoubled shouts of the sportsmen. The keeper darts forward, secures both, cuts the throat of the partridge, and allows his captor to suck its blood. This is his reward. Notwithstanding the exhilaration of the sport, I could never endure the falcon himself. There is something almost satanic in his eye, and in the ferocity with which he drinks the warm life-blood of his innocent victim. I once saw some men of Tortosa catching the Syrian quail with a small hawk. This was done on foot, each sportsman carrying his bird on the right wrist, and beating the bushes with a stick held in his left hand. These quails are less than the American; are migratory, coming here in early spring, and passing on to the north. They hide under the bushes, and will not rise on the wing unless forced to do so by a dog, or by the hunter himself. I was surprised to see how quickly and surely the little hawk seized his game. His reward also was merely the blood of the bird. I do not know whether or not the Jews in ancient days were acquainted with falconry, but David complains that Saul hunted for his blood as one doth hunt for a partridge in the mountains (1 Samuel 26:20); and this hunting

of the same bird on these mountains, and giving their blood to the hawk, reminds one of the sad complaint of the persecuted son of Jesse. In the neighborhood of Aleppo the smaller falcon is taught to assist the sportsman to capture the gazelle. Neither horse nor greyhound can overtake these fleet creatures on the open desert, and therefore the Arabs have taught the hawk to fasten on their forehead, and blind them by incessant flapping of their wings. Bewildered and terrified, they leap about at random, and are easily captured. They are also trained to attack the bustard in the same region. This bird is about as large as a turkey, and highly prized by the lovers of game; but, as they keep on the vast level plains, where there is nothing to screen the cautious hunter, it is almost impossible to get within gunshot of them. When they rise in the air, the little falcon flies up from beneath and fastens on one of their wings, and then both come whirling over and over to the ground, when the hunter quickly seizes the bustard, and delivers his brave bird from a position not particularly safe or comfortable. They will even bring down the largest eagle in the same way; but in this desperate game they are sometimes torn to pieces by the insulted majesty of the feathered kingdom." *SEE HAWK*.

Picture for Falcon 2

Falconer Thomas, A.M.,

a Church of England divine, was born at Bath in 1771; was made fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1794, and died in 1839. He published *The Resurrection of our Saviour* (1798): — *Eight Discourses on the alleged Dissonances in the Gospels,* in reply to Evanson (q.v.) (Bampton Lecture, Oxf. 1811, 8vo): — The *Case of Eusebius of* Caesarea (Lond. 1822, 8vo); and other critical and historical writings.

Faldistorium or Fald-stool

a stool folding like a camp-stool, formerly used in the inthronization of bishops, and in coronations, both for sitting and kneeling. In modern times the name is (improperly) given to a small stool at which, in some English churches, the Litany is read. In those churches in which it is used it is generally placed in the middle of the choir, near the steps of the communion-table. The name is probably from falden, plicare, and stoul, sedes. — Maskell, *Monsum. Ritualia,* 3:86; Siegel, *Alterthiimen,* 2:453.

Falkner, Thomas

a missionary Jesuit, the son of an eminent surgeon at Manchester, England, was born at Manchester about 1710, and. was bred to his father's profession. He visited Buenos Aires, and falling ill there, was nursed by the Jesuits, and under the influence of their kindness was led to abandon the Presbyterian Church in which he had been brought up, to enter the Roman Church, and to join the order of Jesuits. He devoted himself to missionary labors, in which his medical skill was of great use. He spent forty years in this service in various parts of South America. After the suppression of the order he returned to England, where he died January 30, 1784. He wrote a *Description of Patagonia* (London, 1774, 4to). — *Botanical and other Observations in America* (4 volumes, fol.). — Migne, *Diet. de Biog. Chrit.* s.v.

Fall of Man

a phrase which “does not occur in Scripture, but is probably taken from the book of Wisdom, chapter 10:1. It is a convenient term to express the fact of the revolt of our first parents from God, and the consequent sin and misery in which they and their posterity were involved.”

1. *Scriptural Account of the Fall*. —

(1.) The Mosaic account is (<010203>Genesis 2:3), that a garden having been planted by the Creator for the use of man, he was placed in it to dress it and to keep it; that in this garden two trees were specially distinguished, one as the tree of life, the other as the tree of knowledge of good and evil; that Adam was put under the following probation by his Maker (<010216>Genesis 2:16, 17): "And the Lord God commanded the man, saving, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" that the serpent, who was more subtil than any beast of the field, tempted the woman to eat, by denying that death would be the consequence, and by assuring her that her eyes and those of her husband should be opened, and that thev should be "as gods, knowing good and evil;" that the woman took of the fruit, gave of it to her husband, who also ate; and that for this act of disobedience they were expelled from the garden, made subject to death, and laid under various maledictions.

(2.) Whether this account be a literal history or not, has been matter of great discussion, not merely between Christians and unbelievers, but also among: Christian interpreters. One theory is that the passage is an. allegory, signifying the origin of sin in the abuse of free-will, under which the appetites of man were allowed to obtain supremacy over his higherpowers. Another (later) view makes the narration mythical. The general current of Christian interpretation has held the passage to be historical, and has interpreted it literally. Philo Judaeus (t c. 40), speaking of the account of Paradise, says: "These accounts seem to me to be symbolical; not mere fabulous isventions like those of the poets and sophists. but rather types shadowing forth allegorical truth according tosome mystical explanation." So he makes the serpent the symbol of pleasure, etc. (On *the Creation of the World*, Bohn's translation, London, 1854, page 46 sq.).

Among the early Church writers, Clement considers the narrative of the Fall partly as fact and partly as allegory *(Strom.* 5:11, pages 689, 90), and, following Philo, makes the serpent the image of voluptuousness. Origen regards the account as allegorical *(De princ.* 4:16; *contra Cels.* 4:40; comp. also Origen, *Fragm. in Gen.* ad loc.). Irenaeus held the passage to be historical; so also Tertullian, *adv. Judaeos*, 2:184; *De virg.* verse 11; *adv. Macc.* 2:2. "He insists upon the literal interpretation of the particulars of the narrative, as they succeeded each other in order of time *(De resurr. carn.* 61. Adam ante nomina animalibus enunciavit, quam de arbore decerpsit; ante etiam prophetavit, quam voravit). The Gnostics made it allegorical or mythicas. On the Gnostic (Basilidian) doctrine of the Fall *(*σύγχυσις ἀρχική*)*, compare Clem. Strom. 2:20, page 488; Gieseler, *Stud. u. Kritiken* (1830), page 396. The author of the Clementine Homilies goes so far in idealizing Adam, as to convert the historical person into a purely mythical being (like the Adam-Cadmon of the Cabbalists), while he represents Eve as far inferior to him. Hence Adam could not trespass, but sin makes its first appearance in Cain; Baur, *Gnosis*, page 339" (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 61). Among the later fathers, and in the scholastic period, the account was generally held to be historical. Augustine *(De Civitate Dei*, 13:21) asserts the historical verity of the narration, but adds that true spiritual and typical meanings are contained in it; e.g. Paradise is the Church, the true of knowledge is the type of free-will, etc.

The theologians of the Reformation followed the Scholastics in adhering to the literal interpretation, but differ in the exposition of several parts of thee narrative; e.g. the serpent is held by some to be a natural serpent; by others, Satan in the guise of a serpent, etc. Calvin (*Commentary on Genesis* 3) speaks as follows: "It appears, perhaps, scarcely consonant with reason that the serpent only should be here brought forward, all mention of Satan being suppressed. I acknowledge, indeed, that from this place alone nothing more can be collected than that men were deceived by the serpent. But the testimonies of Scripture are sufficiently numerous in which it is plainly asserted that the serpent was only the mouth of the devil; for not the serpent, but the devil, is declared to be 'the father of lies,' the fabricator of imposture, and the author of death. The question, however, is not yet solved why Moses has kept back the name of Satan. I willingly subscribe to the opinion of those who maintain that the Holy Spirit then purposely used obscure figures, because it was fitting that full and clear light should be reserved for the kingdom of Christ. In the mean time the prophets prove that they were well acquainted with the meaning of Moses when, in different places, they cast the blame of our ruin upon the devil. We have elsewhere said that Moses; by a homely and uncultivated style, accommodates what he delivers to the capacity of the people, and for the best reason; for not only had he to instruct an untaught race of men, but the existing age of the Church was so puerile that it was unable to receive any higher instruction. There is, therefore, nothing absurd in the supposition that they whom, for the time, we know and confess to have been but as infants, were fed with milk. Or (if another comparison be more acceptable) Moses is by no means to be blamed if he, considering the office of schoolmaster as imposed upon him, insists on the rudiments suitable to children. They who have an aversion to this simplicity must of necessity condemn the whole economy of God in governing the Church." A similar view is given by Kurtz, *Bible and Astronomy* (Phila. 1861), page 174 sq. The modern extreme Rationalists generally interpret the narrative as mythical. Eichhorn *(Urgeschichte)* finds truth in it in the form of poetry, that is, he makes it a myth; so Gabler, Paulus, and others. Kant, Schelling, and other recent German philosophers and interpreters make it a "speculative myth." Von Bohlen *(On Genesis* 3) follows Rosenmuller in supposing that the narrator had the Zendavesta in view. Julius Muller gives up the historical character of the narrative. “ If now," he says, "we turn to the narrative in the book of Genesis, we shall find that not sin, but physical suffering and death, are there connected with Adam's fall. This fact, and the

lesson that man's ruin originated in himself, are the great truths which are to be gathered from the story, which must be regarded as fundamentally true, although the story is in the form of a fable. That it is not to be taken literally is plain from Scripture, for the story in Genesis speaks of the serpent as the agent in the temptation of Eve. St. Paul speaks of the same temptation as coming from Satan. It is usual to assume that the serpent was the mere instrument of Satan, but there is nothing to lead us to this view in the words of the narrative. St. Paul, by interpolating this into the narrative, shows us that it is not to be taken as literally true. We find in <4004>John 8:44, 'the devil was a murderer from the beginning,' an allusion to the ruin of man by the temptation. If this be so, it is a plain reference to Satan as the cause of man's bodily death. To bring in the idea of spiritual death seems less appropriate, for our Lord was rebuking the murderous intentions of the Jews. It was through conduct like that of the devil that they showed themselves his children" *(Doctrine of Sin,* Edinb. 1868, pages 78, 79).

The more recent German interpreters of the better class (e.g. Havernick, Delitzsch, Keil, etc.) admit the historical character of the account, but there are, of course, various theories among them as to its interpretation. Martensen *(Christian Dogmatics, §* 79) interprets the Mosaic account as a combination of history and sacred symbolism, a figurative representation of an actual event. Lange *(On Genesis,* Amst. edit. page 243), speaking of the narrative, says: "Like the Biblical histories everywhere, and especially the primitive traditions of Genesis, it is a historical fact, to be taken in a religious ideal, that is, a symbolical form. It is just as little a mere allegory. It is just as little a pure, naked fact, as the speaking of the serpent is a literal speaking, or as the tree of life, in itself regarded, is a plant whose eating imparted imperishable life. That sin began with the beginning of the race, that the first sin had its origin in a forbidden enjoyment of nature, and not in the Cainitic fratricidor similar crimes, that the origin of human sin points back to the beginning of the human race, that the woman was ever more seducible than the man, that along with sin came in the tendency to sin, consciousness of guilt, alienation from God, and evil in general all these are affirmations of the religious historical consciousness — which demand the historicalness of our tradition, and would point back to some such fact, even though it were not written in Genesis."

The interpretations of the *serpent* have been very variant. Eusebius *(Praep. Evang.* 1:10) says that Moses calls the evil spirit *(*πονηρὸς δαίμων*)* by the name of "serpent," as he is "full of poison and malice." Adam Clarke

(Commentary on Genesis, chapter 3) interprets the word *nachash* (rendered "serpent") to mean "a creature of the ape or ourangatang kind." His notes on the whole passage afford a very curious specimen of exegesis. We cite Lange *(Genesis,* Amer. edit. page 228) as follows: "True it is that the serpent appears as the probable author of this temptation, but such probability is weakened by what is said in 1:25 and 2:20. 'The serpent was a good creation of God, though different, as originally created, from what it afterwards became' (Delitzsch). As a type, the serpent is just as well the figure of health and renovation as of death, since every year it changes its skin, and ejects, moreover, its venom. This double peculiarity and double character, as ἀγαθοδαίμων and κακοδαιμων, is indicated not only in language, but also in myths, in sculpture, and in modes of worship. In this relation, however, we must distinguish two diverging views of the ancient peoples. To the Egyptian reverence for the serpent stands in opposition the abhorrence for it among the Israelites, *SEE SERPENT*, Greeks, Persians, and Germans." ""That Satan made use of the serpent, and that a serpent was somehow employed, is likely; the language of Jehovah subsequently, while it was literally true of the instrument, being in a higher sense true of the agent, the one being made the emblem of the other (<01014>Genesis 3:14). Was the language here entirely symbolical and figurative, having nothing in it literal whatever? This does not seem likely. Why should such an allusion have been employed at all to describe the outcast and degraded condition of a fallen angel, had there been nothing whatever giving the serpent any connection with the temptation and the fall? Is it not more reasonable to consider both as blended, the literal and the symbolical? (<01004>Genesis 3:4; <47103>2 Corinthians 11:3; <66209>Revelation 12:9; 20:2; <01015>Genesis 3:15; <51025>Colossians 2:15; <45620>Romans 16:20; <62308>1 John 3:8; <43844>John 8:44). Conjectures, too, have arisen out of the terms in which the serpent was addressed: 'Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life.' 'The serpent, perhaps,' says Gill, 'formerly moved in a more erect posture, but was doomed to lick the dust.' 'Probably his original residence and food,' guesses another, 'were in the trees, but now he is degraded to the earth.' That sentence evidently, whatever might be its literal application to the serpent, was emblematically meant of Satan himself. 'Plainly figurative,' says Dwight, 'to express a state of peculiar degradation and suffering' " (Wardlaw, *Systematic Theology,* page 85-7). Watson defends the historical character of the narrative *(Institutes,* part. 2, chapter 18), as also does Holden, *Dissertation on the Fall* (Lond. 1823, 8vo). Conyers Iliddleton *(Essay on the Allegorical and Literal*

Interpretation of the Fall, Works, 1775, 2:437) maintains the allegorical view. Comp. Pye Smith, *First Lines of Theoloqgy,* book 4, chapter 2.

A writer in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* (1:351 sq.) seeks to show that the common opinion that the serpent was the instrument of the tempter is untenable, on the ground that the Scripture does not state that the serpent was an *instrument;* and that the literal application of the words of the narrative to a ser pent as the instrument of Satan appears to be inconsistent with the present relation of the serpent to other animals, and also with the testimony of geology as to fossil remains, etc. He maintains that under the name serpent Satan is meant, as there are "probable grounds for the conclusion that *the serpent* was, during the earliest ages, the name of the Evil One, reflecting the conception of him that then prevailed." Bishop Newton *(Dissert. on Creation and Fall,* 1st edit.) takes a similar view, viz. that Satan is spoken of in the passage under the "well-known" symbol or hieroglyphic of the serpent, which was a proper emblem, he holds, of the deceiver of mankind, as in popular estimation it was held to be the most cunning and insidious of animals. Sherlock *(Use and Intent of Prophecy,* diss. 3) refers to the "common usage of Eastern countries, which was, to clothe history in parables and similitudes;" and remarks that "it seems not improbable that for this reason the history of the fall was put into the dress in which we now find it. The serpent was remarkable for an insidious cunning, and therefore stood as a proper emblem of a deceiver; and yet, being one of the lowest of God's creatures, the emblem gave no suspicion of any power concerned that might pretend to rival the Creator." What was the particular nature of the sin of our first parents it is not an easy matter to determine. Bishop Newton remarks (1.c.) that "eating forbidden fruit is nothing more than a continuation of the same hieroglyphic characters wherein the history of the fall was recorded before the use of letters. It was plainly the violation of a divine prohibition; it was indulging an unlawful appetite; it was aspiring after forbidden knowledge, and pretending to be wise above their condition. So much may be safely asserted in general; we bewilder and lose ourselves in search of more particulars." In a later edition of this dissertation *(Works,* 1:91), bishop Newton modified the statement above given, and gave his adherence to the view that a real serpent was concerned in the fall (see Quarry, *On Genesis* 9). Martensen *(Christian Dogmatics, §* 103) passes by the question whether the "serpent was led by an evil spirit, or whether an evil spirit assumed the form of the serpent;" but he adds, "if we abide by the original narration, we may say that the

serpent is ithe allegorical designation for the criminal principle which opposed itself to man in temptation." Dirtenbach (in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 15:209, art. Sunde) maintains that the serpent was a real serpent, the tree a real tree, etc. Quarry gives a copious dissertation on Paradise and the Fall in his *Genesis and its Authorship* (London, 1866, 8vo). The aim of this writer is to withdraw the scriptural statements "altogether from the range of physical interpretation." He cites a remark of Hengstenberg's *(Christologie,* th. 1, abt 1, page 26, ed. 1829), to the effect that if the serpent be symbolical, the whole history is symbolical, as, in a connected passage like this, unity of interpretation must prevail; and it is not allowable to follow at one moment the symbolical, and at the next moment the literal interpretation. Admitting the truth of this Quarry states that, nevertheless, the narrative may be, as a whole, not simply an apologue illustrating true principles, but a true history of great facts represented symbolically. He interprets the tree of life (compare <660207>Revelation 2:7; 22:2, 14), and the eating the fruit of the tree of knowledge, as mystical; the former denoting the promise of eternal life conditioned on man's obedience, the latter denoting the act of disobedience and its moral consequences, consciousness of guilt and shame. He maintains that the supposition of a real serpent is untenable, as there is no ground tor the belief that Satan can possess at will any living creature, or work such a miracle as to make a serpent speak. 'A natural serpent is literally spoken of, but this natural serpent is only the symbol of the real tempter; otherwise the innocent animal receives all the punishment, while the really guilty tempter escapes." The real sin itself must have arisen at some point at which "natural appetite passed into that stage of its progress when, as St. James says, lust has conceived, and at which the sin thus conceived has quickened into mental transgression. This point, lost in the mystery which envelopes every beginning of existence, mental or material, of thought, act, or substance, was the real fall, and is better represented by the mystical symbol of the participation of forbidden fruit than by a historical narrative that should only specify the overt act in words to be taken in their literal acceptation." After answering Hengstenberg's objections to the symbolical interpretation (especially the objections drawn from those passages of the N.T. in which the history of the fall is taken as actual history, <471103>2 Corinthians 11:3; <540213>1 Timothy 2:13, 14; <451512>Romans 5:12), he concludes with the general statement that "enough of the historical facts are patent to suffice for all the moral and religious uses of such a narrative, the creation and the fall being unquestionable verities;" but "nothing is told merely to gratify

curiosity; the details that could only serve this end are withdrawn behind the veil of a mystical mode of representation" (page 155). See also Knapp, *Christian Theology, §* 75.

Heathens Traditions. — There are many heathen traditions concerning the creation and the fall, some of which have marked points of resemblance to the Bible account. In some mythologies the serpent is an object of worship, while in others "mythology represents that reptile as trampled under the feet of a mighty deliverer. In a coin of Antoninus Pius Hercules is represented as plucking apples from a tree round the trunk of which a serpent is entwined." Among the Goths, the Persians, and the Hindoos, traditions of a serpent of various kinds are found. Stillingfleet ingeniously observes that from this origin has come the use of serpents to so great an extent in divination, Satan appearing 'ambitious to have the world think that the knowledge of good and evil was to come by the serpent still.' The Hebrew word for serpent signifies at the same time *to divine,* and the Greek word οἰωνίζεσθαι has the same derivation from οἰωνός, a serpent; 'thus we see how careful the devil was to advance his honor in the world under that form wherein he had deceived mankind into so much folly and misery'" (Wardlaw, *Systematic Theology,* 2:85 sq.). It has been the fashion to deny that the traditions of the various peoples, analogous to the Mosaic account, are at all confirmations of that account. But the harmony of these traditions has never been rationally explained apart from the theory that regards them as springing from common reminiscences of an actual occurrence. Auberlen remarks that "these oldest traditions of the human race confirm the historical credibility of the Mosaic narrative, down to its details, just as much as they do the inner purity and elevation of them, compared with the myths of heathenism. In regard to this latter view, it is especially seen how Israel alone, along with the fact, retains the deep, divine idea of it. The heathen, while they preserve with great fidelity the outward circumstances, clothe them in fantastic and national vesture. The difference is the same in kind as that between the canonical and apocryphal gospels." He cites also Herder, concerning the narration in Genesis, as follows: "Its sound has gone out into all the earth, and its very words into all lands! Whence is it that the remotest nations have their knowledge of it? How comes it that they built on it religions and mythologies; that it is, in fact, the sinplest foundation of all their arts, institutions, and sciences? If firm it things may be made plain and clear as sunlight that are as chaos and dark as night when it is denied, or when men prate of their hypotheses; if

from this a whole antiquity may be reduced to order, and a line of light be drawn through the most confused events of the early history of nations — light which, like that in Correggio's picture, shines from the cradle of the race — what then have ye to say, ye manufacturers of myths, ye who would profane the revelation of God?" (Herder, aelt. *Urkunde der Menschengeschlechts;* Werke, Carlsruhe, 1827, 5:187; 6:4).

II. *Doctrinal Import of the Narrative.* — Whatever views are held as to the nature of the narrative in Genesis 2, 3, all who believe it to be a record of divine revelation find in it the following points of doctrine:

1. That God, after creating man, placed him in a state of probation;

2. that the test of his probation was obedience to the divine law;

3. that the temptation to disobedience came from an evil power outside of man;

4. that the temptation appealed both to the intellect and to the senses, leading first to unbelief in God, secondly to putting "self" in place of God, and thereby to the beginning of evil lust;

5. that in the exercise of free will man yielded and sinned;

6. that the consequences of the sin were knowledge of good and evil, separation from: God, and death, the curse lighting upon man and upon nature also. Auberlen, referring to the three constituents of the first sin named above, viz, unbelief; self-love, and lust, remuarks as follows: "That these three parts of the idea of sin are not accidental, but substantially express it and exhaust it, is shown not only in the fact that all sin that comes before us in life may be referred to them, but also in the fact that they correspond to the three fundamental elements of man's being and consciousness — spirit, soul, body — the God-consciousness, self-consciousness, and world-consciousness. These have all become corrupted and perverted. They have become, respectively, alienation from God, selfishness, love of the world. The first and highest element of human nature — the spiritual— is negatived, obscured, made powerless; the two others — the lower — are pushed into extreme but unhealthy prominence and activity. Man has become physical and fleshly. Unbelief is the negative, the union of self-seeking and the lust of the senses is the positive element in the idea of sin. Man no longer wishes for God; he is bent on having the creature in both ways, the mental and natural, the subjective and objective;

he will heave his own Ego and the world too. According to Genesis 3:5, 6, the selfishness is, as it were, the soul; sensuousness, the body of sin: the first is the deep, invisible root; the second, the external manifestation. The Ego, separated from God, seeks in the world the elements on which it lives. Genesis thus comprehends the various opposing theories of men on the nature of sin, the theory of selfishness, which in recent times is represented by Julius Muller, and that of the senses by Schleiermacher and Rothe. It leads both ethical theories back to a religious basis, and in that matter modern thought has a great deal to learn" *(Divine Revelation,* Edinb. 1867, page 184).

The theological question of the connection between the sin of Adam and that of the whole human race will be treated under the articles IMPUTATION *SEE IMPUTATION*; SIN *SEE SIN*. For the specific *loss* of man by the fall, in the theological sense, involving the difference between the RomamCatholic anthropology and the Protestant, *SEE IMAGE OF GOD; SEE JUSTIFICATION; SEE SIN.* In this place we give the views of various writers as to the general doctrinal significance of the narrative.

Lange

(On *Genesis,* Am. cd., page 73 sq.) remarks that “the significance of Paradise is this, that it declares the original ideal state of the earth and the human race, the unity of the particular and the general, the unity of spirit and nature, the unity of spiritual innocence and the physical harmony of nature, the unity of the fall and the disturbance of nature; lastly, the unity of the facts and their symbolical meaning, which both the barely literal and mythical explanations of the record rend asunder. The tree of knowledge of good and evil existed in some one form, but with it all nature is in some measure designated as a test. But the serpent, as the organ of that temptation, is not only the type of temptation and of sin, but, as originally a worm, the type of its brutality, its degradation, and its subjection. The record of the actual fall stands there as an eternal judgment upon the theoretical, the human, view of moral evil, especially upon the errors of Dualisue and Manicheism, Pelagianism and Pantheism. Hence arise the numerous and strong objections which the most diverse systems in old and modern times have raised against this record. The earthly origin of evil out of the abuse of freedom offends dualism, which derives it from an evil deity, from dark matter, or from the supremacy of sense, Although the serpent sustains the doctrine that, prior to the fall of man, sin had existed in

a sphere on the other side, working through demasoniac agency upon this (for the serpent was not created evil, <0101125>Genesis 1:25; generally not even fitted for evil, and can only be regarded, therefore, as the organ of a far different evil power), yet the visible picture of the fall in this sphere is a certain sign that the fall in that sphere could only have risen through the abuse of the freedom of the creature. But if we observe the progress of sin from the first sin of Eve to the fratricide of Cain; if we view the opposition between Cain and Abel, and the intimation of the moral freedom of Cain himself, so the Augustinian view, raising original sin to absolute originals death, receives its illuminatiom and its juist limits. But how every Pelagian view of life falls before this record, as it brings into prominence the causal connection, between the sin of the spirit world and that of man, between the sin of the woman and the man, between the sin of our first parents, and their own sinfulness, and the sinfulnesss of their posterity! If we take into view the stages of the development of evil in the genesis of the first sin, how limited and vapid appears the modern view, which regards the senses as the prime starting-point of evil! But when Pantheism asserts the necessity of sin, or rather of the fall, as the necessary transition of men from the state of pure innocence to that of conscious freedom, the simple remark that the ingenuousness of Adam ewould have been carried directly on in the proper eay if he had stood the test, just as Christ through his sinlessness has reached the knowledge of the the distinction between good and evil, and has actually shown that sin, notwithstanding its inweaving with human nature, does not belong to its very being, clearly refutes the assertion. But how clear is the explanation of evil, of punishment, and of judgment, as it meets us in this account! that the natural evil does not belong to the moral, but, notwithstanding its inward connection with it, is still, the divine counteracting force against it; that punishment is to redeem and purify; that from the very acme of the judgment breaks forth the promise and salvation. These truths which are far above every high and-Christian view of the world, make it apparent that the first judgment of God, as a type of the world-redeeming judgment of God, has found its completion in the death of Christ upon the cross." "The deceptive promise of the serpent was fulfilled: man's eyes were opened (chapter 3:7), but he saw only his misery and nakedness. He was now brought to know good and evil, hut with the painful consciousness of having trifled with and lost the one, and of being sunk in thee depths of woe by the other. He had become as god; he had boldly cast off as allegiance to the one God, and assumed sovereignty over himself. He had constituted himself a God, no

longer the representative of God; he had become his own master, free as God; but this likeness to God brought notwith it the happiness which pertains to the divine Being, but was fraught with the deepest misery and c-noe" (Kurtz, *Bible and Astronomy*, page 171). Muller, after affirming that "there is really nothing in the narrative of the fall: obliging us to consider that event as the primary beginning of sin, in the strict sense of the word," and "'that neither 'the image of God,' wherein man was created, nor God's pronouncing everything 'very good,' prevents our believing that the fall was only the outward manifestation of a perversion of the will preceding the empirical life of man — the outgo of an evil already 'presents its *potentia*, which might, indeed, by a persevering effort, have been crushed, but which forms the basis of an original moral depravity in human nature. The endeavor of the tempter was to bring out to view, and into action, this hidden evil" *(Doctrine of Sin*, Edinb. 1868, 2:385). This view of Muller's rests upon his theory of a sin of man in some pre-existent state, which he calls a "self-determination of the transcendental freedom before our individual existence." Rothe, on the other hand *(Ethik*, 2:180), places the es.sence of sin chiefly in the necessity of matter. " The passage through sin, in his opinion, is a metaphysical necessity. He conceives of our first parents not as anature at their creation, but destined to spiritual development; consequently their material part, in the absence of training, must gain the upper hand; and imperceptibly, and without blame, they found themselves, by their development, in sin. Hence evil lies in the divine world-plan, not merely as something permitted; it lies unavoidably in the creature, on account of his origin in the fact of *his coming into existence* in contradistinction from God; but as creature-evil has been ordained in the plan of the world, so also has its destruction, as it may come to light. Rothe (page 204) openly declares that the 'effort to separate evil from all connection with the divine causality must ever remain an idle undertaking;' although even he himself, in a measure startled at this result, imagines himself to hold the causation of human sin entirely apart from God. He says: 'The divine production of evil is at the saune time its absolute destruction. Within the sphere of redemption the necessity of sinning is not entirely removed, but is conceived of as constantly vanishing.'"

In opposition to Muller and Rothe, as well as to all who presuppose evil as fundamental and its development as necessary, Pastor Rinck wrote an able article, *Von dem Ursprung des Bosen*, in the *Theol. Studien a. Kritiken* for 1852 (page 651 sq.; translated by Dr. Nadal in the *Methodist* Quarterly,

October, 1853), from which we make the following extract. After stating that it matters not, for this discussion, whether the Scripture narrative be literal or figurative, he states its substantial import as follows: "God caused thee tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil to grow up in the midst of the garden, and commanded man, 'Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat; for in the day thou atest thereof thou shalt surely die.' This tree of knowledge, as planted by God, is not yet evil, but contains in itself the *choice between* good and evil — the innate possibility of sinning, which possibility is wound up with the very conception of a free being, whose liberty is not the divine necessity, "but lies outside of it. It is a tree of divine commands and prohibitions — objectively conceived, the object of knowledge; or, subjectively, the possibility of transgressing the command, the object of free choice. Alongside of this stands the tree of life; and both are united to prove that the mere possibility of evil, which is involved in the creation of man, is not yet anything evil or death-bringing. Only with the realization of the possibility does opposition to the tree of life arise, i.e., the true life is forfeited, and death, curse, and destruction appear in its place. The tree of life which the living God had planted for man, and his expressed will not to eat of the tree of knowledge, presuppose the possibility of not transgressing, because God could neither require anything impossible of man, nor involve him inextricably in the meshes of a scheme which would certainly exclude him from the tree of life. The origin of evil from absolute good must forever remain inconceivable; not so with relative good. If we hold fast to this difference, the objection of Rothe will not hold: 'The religious-moral perfection of the first parents of our race would exclude all psychological possibility of the fall.' But this possibility is explained by the *creation* of man, who, as it were, stands out of God; not holy and perfect like God, and yet not a mere creature like the beast: he is not under and in the law of necessity, but possesses the likenes of God and freedom. The perfection of a creature is not divine, not absolute. The want of such perfection in a creature casts no shadow upon the Creator. According to the doctrines of Emanation and Pantheism, which mix God and the world, the fall cannot be explained, but only according to the doctrines of God and of the creation. When then, by the creation God set free beings out of himself, then the possible departure from God was given, and the question, Wherefore did not God hinder the evil that he foresaw? is entirely inadmissible. God does not prevent evil, because by so doing, contrary to his own will, he would injure and destroy the province of freedom (the divine image). Thus our Savior did not hinder the murderous

blows of his enemies, while at the same time he did not will or excuse them. In like manner, God was Lord over the parents of our race and over the serpent; but if he by his own will restrained his highest power, and left free play-room to free created beings, and still retains the government, he is not therefore destitute of power, but only consistent, and worthy to be adored. Man should rather complain of hinmself, but give thanks to God that he has endowed him with such prerogatives, and glorify him with soul and body, which are God's. There was no necessity at all to sin; that complaint can only be established on the ground that, as Rothe teaches, evil inevitably developed itself. Besides, from the beginning of the world God had provided for the human race, whose fall he foresaw, the most perfect means of grace and gifts, in order to make that injury abundantly good, and to lead back the fallen ones to himself and his kingdom. Indeed, as all evil, so also must the sin of our first parents redound to the praise of the merciful God, because by it was conditioned the miss sion of the second Adam as the Redeemer of the world, But the *possibility* of the fall without blame to the Creator being admitted, another question sarises: Through what incitement did it become a *reality?* Even to this question the Scriptures give a satisfactory answer: it took place through outward prompting through evil spiritual influence, which was already existing in creation. Upon the basis of a breated but still spiritual existence, the possibility of being moved and poisoned by an influence at enmity with God must be admitted. The inexperience of our first parents, who were not isolated in the new world, corresponded exactly witthe subtlety of Satan in the form of a serpent. The kingdom of Satan, as a spiritual power, and the peccability of the first pair, whose pure self-determination was ensnared and obscured through that power, furnish a satisfactory explanation of the fall. The fall itself was certainly a free self-determination, otherwise no blame could attach to it; but not altogether so: both the decision and the guilt were shared by the devil, as the murderer from the beginning: it was a co-operation of human freedom with the temptation of the evil principle itself. But, according to the Scripture account, the temptation of our first parents was gradual, and the motives to the fall are thus psychologically clear. First of asl, the serpent raised a doubt concerning the divine prohibition and the ruinous consequences of sin: 'Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?' 'Ye shall not surely die.' Then he awakened pride, inducing man to overleap his appointed condition to become like God, and to use his freedom arbitrarily, and according to his own pleasure: 'God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof then your eyes

shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.' After this preparation came the thought that the tree was good for food, pleasant to look upon, and to be desired to make one wise. The sensual desire would now naturally start up, and the woman seduced became the seducer. The powers of the soul were corrupted before the actual sin took place; the faculty of knowledge by doubt and unbelief toward God, the faculty of desire through unbounded striving and proud excess, as the Grecian fable of Prometheus represents it; and, finally, the faculty of feeling, through sensual longing, which propensity the religion of the Greeks sets forth .by Epimetheus and Pandora. Thus did the possibility of the fall, which rests upon the freedom of the creature, pass over into reality under evil outward influences. The conversation between Eve and the serpent shows how accessible she was the woman, as the weaker part, is first approached and misled, and not till then the man, and even then only through her; as also the apostle Paul expresses it (⁵⁴1 Timothy 2:14), the woman was first in the transgression. Rothe, indeed (page 221), thinks that the assumption of a satanical temptation does not at all help the difficulty, because that assumption always presupposes a real susceptibility of being tempted, a sinful predisposition, a rminimum of sin. But the possibility of being tempted to sin is not yet sin; with Rothe that predisposition is rather something already existing. It is certainly nmuch more worthy of God to conceive of his creatures as pure and good they first determining themselves to evil, and the enemy active therein. If even the Son of God could be tempted without injury to his sinlessness, much more the first Adam, whose personality and divine resemblance were specifically lower. If, in fine, we compare the scriptural theory, thus under'stood, with the modern philosophical explanations of the fall, the result will be that the former will be found to contain incomparably more truth and wisdom than the latter; although Rothe (page 221) is of the opinion that the Biblical account of the fall can no longer be maintained, and that the fall cannot be explained from the Mosaic stand-point. Only the Bible (and perhaps, agreeing with it, the mythology of antiquity) tells us of a man created in the image of God, in a paradisiacal state of innocence; and, in accordance with this fact, .shows how this state was interrupted and perverted into one of guilt. Dr. Julius Miller, on the contrary, although Paradise has still a place in his system, places Adam in it as already a sinner. In the same way Rothe presupposes what he ought to show, sines he assumes evil as original and necessary in the development of the world. We cannot see, either according to Miiller or Rothe, whence it could properly come into the

natural world. Rothe, with his presupposition, is obliged to assume one of two things: either he must dualistically establish an evil principle in matter, and deny the pure creation of God, or he must ascribe the origin of sin, not to the perverted will, but to God himself: in both cases he has a Manicheean life-view of sentient beings. Sin with him is not a free act of man, proceeding out of the heart and will; it springs from the overmatching power of material nature sulb-duing his personality with inevitable necessity (page 226). 'The origin of evil from pure good must forever remain inconceivable' (page 222); thus he establishes an impure material creation. Is anything ex-plained by this means? Whence comes, then, impurity into the material creation before all acts of the will? Is not the question more easily explained by the abuse of freedom than by metaphysics; more easily through the devil and man than by the act of the Creator? The fall, according to the doctrine of the Church, says Rothe (page 220), was a blunder in the work of the earthly creation, as it were, at the beginning. In order to avoid this, either an evil principle must have been co-operative in the creation, or else God himself must have ruined his own work at its commencement. Shall we call this escaping the blun. der made at the beginning? Is it not rather increasing it, and carrying it over into the region of the perfect and the holy? The latter of these two opinions, strictly taken, is that of Rothe, since he assumes matter as created by God, and from matter deduces sin. But the positions, Matter was created by God, and Matter is the opposite of God, and hence the origin of sin, contradict each other."

Literature. — Besides the books already cited in this article, see Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines;* Neander, *History of Dogmas;* Shedd, *History of Christian Doctrine* (all under *Anthropology);* Hase, *Evang. Protest. Dogmatik,* Lips. 1860, § 71-73; Fletcher, *Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense;* Doderlein, *Inst. Theol. Christ. §* 178; Fairbairn, *Typology of Scripture,* 1:240 sq.; Richers, *Schopfungsgeschichte* (Leips. 1854, 8vo); Middleton, *Essay on the Creation and Fall of Man, Works* (1755, 5 volumes), 3:437 sq.; Zeller, *Die altests Theodicae* (Jena, 1803, 8vo); Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection,* Intr. 66; Cunningham, *Historical Theology,* volume 1, chapter 19; Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology* (Edinu. 1867), page 147 sq.; Monsell, *The Religion of Redemption* (Lond. 1867), page 20 sq.; *Meth. Quar. Review,* October 1867, art. 7.

On the effects of the fall on nature, *SEE NATURE*.

Fallow-deer

(רְמַחְיַ *yachmur';* Sept. βούβαλος [but δορκάς in 1 Kings], Vulg. *bubalus),* mentioned among the beasts that may be eaten in <05145>Deuteronomy 14:5, and among the provisions for Solomon's table in <11423>1 Kings 4:23 [<58103>Hebrews 5:3]. There are three animals of the *Cervidae* family with which different writers have identified it. *SEE ZOOLOGY.*

Picture for Fallow-Deer 1

1. Most commentators (following Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:910; 2:260) regard it as properly translated in our version, deriving the word from רמַחַ; *chamar',* in the sense of *being red,* and thus referring it to a species of deer of a reddish color; probably the *Cervus dama* of Linnaeus, originally a native of Barbary, where it is still found wild. It is stated to be found very generally dispersed over Western and Southern Asia, and is said to have been introduced into England from Norway (see *Penny Cyclopcedia,* s.v. Deer). It is smaller than the stag *(Cervus elaphus),* having horns or branches serrated on the inside, which it sheds annually. The color in winter is a darkish brown, but in summer bay, spotted with white. The fallow-deer. *(Cervus dama)* is deemed by most authorities to be undoubtedly a native of Asia; indeed, Persia seems to be its proper country. Hasselquist *(Trav.* page 211) noticed this deer in Mount Tabor. Oedmann *(Verm. Samml.* 1:178) likewise believes that the *yachmur* is best denoted by the *Cervus dama.* The female is called in the Talmud אַרְמַחְיַ and is identified by Lewysohn with the German *Damhirsch.* It is, however, lifficult to suppose that Jerusalem could have received my appreciable amount of flesh-meat from such a source, remote as it is from a forest country. *SEE DEER.*

2. Kitto *(Pict. Bibl.* Deuteronomy 1. c.) says, "The *yachmur* of the Hebrews is without doubt erroneously identified with the fallow-deer, which does not exist in Asia," and refers the name to the *Oryx leucoryx,* citing Niebuhr as authority for stating that this animal is known among the Eastern Arabs by the name of *yazmur.* This is the opinion which we have adopted, from Hamilton Smith, who is the best modern authority on such questions. *SEE ANTELOPE*

Picture for Fallow-Deer 2.

3. Still others, on the authority of the Septuagint rendering in Deuteronomy, regard the term as denoting "the *Antilope bubalus* (Pallas); the βούβαλος of the Greeks (see Herod. 4:192; Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* 3:6, ed. Schneider, and *De Part. Anim.* 3:2, 11, edit. Bekker; Oppian, *Cyn.* 2:300). From the different descriptions of the *yachmur* as given by Arabian writers, and cited by Bochart *(Hieroz.* 2:284 sq.), it would also seem that this is the animal designated; though Damir's remarks in some respects are fabulous, and he represents the *yachmur* as having deciduous horns, which will not apply to any antelope. Still Cazuinus, according to Rosenmuller, identifies the *yachmur* with the *bekker el-wmash* ('wild cow'), which is the modern name in North Africa for the *Antilope bubalus* (see Shaw's *Travels*, page 242, and Suppl. page 75, fol.; Buffon, *Hist. Natur.* 12:294). The term *bubalus* evidently points to some animal having the general appearance of an ox. Pliny *(N.H.* 8:15) tells us that the common people, in their ignorance, sometimes gave this name to the *Bison (Auroch)* and the *Urus*. He adds, the animal properly so called is produced in Africa, and bears a resemblance to the calf and the stag; a middle position between the cervine and bovine ruminants that corresponds to the external appearance of the animal in question. The *bekker el-wash* appears to be depicted in the Egyptian monuments, *SEE CHASE*, where it is represented as being hunted for the sake of its flesh, which Shaw tells us (Suppl. p. 75) is very sweet and nourishing, much preferable to that of the red deer (see Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* 1:223, figs. 3, 4, and page 225, fig. 19). This animal, which is about the size of a stag, is common in North Africa, and lives in herds." *SEE WILD OX.*

Fallow ground

(רִיִן, *nir*, broken up with the plough), a field (especially of sward) just ploughed (figuratively, <2404>Jeremiah 4:3; <2810>Hosea 10:12; literally, "tillage" <2013>Proverbs 13:23). *SEE AGRICULTURE*.

Fallow year

Among the Hebrews every seventh year was a sabbath of rest to the land. The commencement of this year was on the first day of the seventh month, Tisri=October. There was neither sowing nor reaping; the vines and the olives were not pruned; there was no gathering of fruits; for all

spontaneous productions were left to the poor, the traveler, and the wild beast (<03201>Leviticus 25:1-7; <05501>Deuteronomy 15:1-10). The sabbatical year was instituted in order that the land might be improved, and that the Hebrews might be taught economy and foresight, and also invited to exercise a large degree of trust in the providence of Jehovah their king. During this year they could fish, hunt, take care of their bees and flocks, repair their buildings, manufacture furniture and cloths, and carry on commerce. Debts, on account of there being no income from the soil, were not collected (<05509>Deuteronomy 15:9; 31:10-13). Nor were servants manumitted on this year, but at the end of the sixth year of their service (<02102>Exodus 21:2; <05512>Deuteronomy 15:12; <24014>Jeremiah 34:14). The Hebrews remained longer in the tabernacle or temple this year, during which the whole Mosaic law was read, in order to be instructed in religious and moral duties, the history of their nation, and the wonderful works and blessings of God (<05310>Deuteronomy 31:10-13). When Jehovah gave the Hebrews this remarkable institute, in order to guard them against the apprehension of famine, he promised, on. the condition of their obedience, so great plenty in every sixth harvest that it alone would suffice for three years (<03250>Leviticus 25:20-22). However, through the avarice of the Hebrews, this seventh year's rest, as Moses had appi ehended (<03634>Leviticus 26:34, 35), was for a long time utterly neglected (<14621>2 Chronicles 36:21); for in all the historv of the Hebrew kings there is no mention of the sabbatical year, nor of the year of jubilee. The period when this wise and advantageous law fell into disuse may probably be understood from the prediction of Moses in <03633>Leviticus 26:33, 34, 43; comp. with <14621>2 Chronicles 36:21; <24511>Jeremiah 25:11. Thus was it foretold that the Hebrews, for the violation of this law, should go into captivity: "To fulfill the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had paid off her sabbaths: for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfill threescore and ten years." Here it is taken for granted that seventy sabbatical years, including the jubilee years which succeeded every seventh sabbatical year, had been neglected by the unfaithful people. The Hebrews were frequently weary of the law; and at different periods during the commonwealth they appear to have utterly neglected the fallow or sabbatical years. Hence it appears that the captivity of the Hebrews and the desolation of their country was an act of retributive Providence, brought upon them for this very reason, that the land might pay off those sabbatical years of rest, of which the Hebrews had deprived it, in neglecting the statute of Jehovah their king (<03643>Leviticus 26:43). After the exile the

fallow or sabbatical year appears to have been more scrupulously observed, as we learn from Josephus *(Ant.* 11:11, 8). *SEE JUBILEE*.

False Prophet

*(*ψενδοπροφήτης, a *pseudo-prophet),* i.e., one falsely professing to come as a prophet or ambassador from God, a false teacher (<4707>Matthew 7:15; 24:11, 24, etc.; comp. Test. 12 Patr. page 614; Josephus, Ant. 8:13, 1; 10:7, 3; War, 6:5, 2). *SEE PROPHET*. In <6163>Revelation 16:13, the term is distinctively used, "the false prophet," with reference to the mythological system of paganism, the second "beast" (q.v.), supporting the first or secular power of Rome; allegorically interpreted of the impostor Mohammed (Mathes, *De pseudoprophetismo Hebraorum,* L.B. 1859, 8vo)

Fama clamosa

(general bad report), in the Scottish ecclesiastical law, is a ground of action before a presbytery or synod against a minister or member of the Church, founded on common report, and not a charge by accusation. If the rumor, or *flama clamosa,* be general and hurtful, the court can investigate it without any accuser, for the vindication of the oharacter of the Church and of the court, and with a view to the preservation of good morals in the community. *SEE HILL, Church Practice,* page 49.

Familia Charitatis

SEE FAMILISTS.

Familiars of the Inquisition

officers of that tribunal whose function it is to apprehend accused or suspected persons and convey them to prison. They belong to the family of the inquisitor, and are therefore calledfamiliars. The office was formerly held in high honor, and men of noble family often held it, especially in Spain. Innocent III granted large indulgences to familiars. The same plenary indulgence is graanted by the pope to each exercise of this office as was granted by the Lateran Council to those who succored the Holy Land. "'When several persons are to be taken up at the same time, these familiars are commanded to order matters that they may know nothing of one another's being apprehended; and it is related that a father and his three sons and three daughters, ,who lived together in the same house, were carried prisoners to the Inquisition without knowing anything of one

another's being there till seven years afterwards," when those that were alive were released by an *Auto da Fe*. *SEE INQUISITION.*

Familiar Spirit

(b/a *ob*, a leathern *bottle* or water-skins, <183219>Job 32:19; hence, the conjurer, being regarded as the vessel containing the inspiring demon), a necromancer, or sorcerer who professes to call up the dead by means of incantations, to answer questions (<051811>Deuteronomy 18:11; <122106>2 Kings 21:6; <143306>2 Chronicles 33:6; <031931>Leviticus 19:31; 20:6; <092803>1 Samuel 28:3, 9; <230819>Isaiah 8:19; 19:3). Put also specially for the *python* (<441616>Acts 16:16) or divining-spirit, by the aid of which such jugglers were supposed to conjure (<032027>Leviticus 20:27; <092807>1 Samuel 28:7, 8), and for the *shade* or departed spirit thus evoked (<232904>Isaiah 29:4). *SEE DIVINATION*. The term is rendered by the Septuagint ἐγγαστρίμυθος, "a ventriloquist," *but* is rather a wizard who asked counsel of his familiar, and gave the responses received from him to others — the name being applied in reference to the spirit or demon that animated the person, and inflated the belly so that it protuberated like the side of a *bottle*. Or it was applied to the magician, because he was supposed to be *inflated* by the spirit *(*δαιμονοληπτός), like the ancient Εὐρυκλεῖς (εἰς ἀλλοτρίας γαστέρας ἐνδύς, Ar. *Vesp.* 1017, *malusa spirituns per verend t naturce excipiabat; Schosl.* in Ar. Plut.). The *ob* of the Hebrews was thus precisely the same as the *pytho* of the Greeks (Plutarch, *De def. Or.* 414; Cicero *De div.* 1:19), and was used not only to designate the performer, but the spirit itself, πνεῦμα Πύθωνος, which possessed him (see <032027>Leviticus 20:27; <092808>1 Samuel 28:8; also <441616>Acts 16:16). A more specific denomination of this last term was the necromancer (literally *seeker of the dead*, b/a laev; <051810>Deuteronomy 18:10; comp. la,ˆyvirDo), one who, by frequenting tombs, by inspecting corpses, or, more frequently, by help of the *ob*, like the witch of Endor, pretended to evoke the dead, ad bring secrets from the invisible world (<014108>Genesis 41:8; <020711>Exodus 7:11; <031926>Leviticus 19:26; <051810>Deuteronomy 18:10-12). Compare the µyFiai *whisperers* ("charmers"), of <231903>Isaiah 19:3. But Shuckford, who denies that the Jews in early ages believed in spirits, makes it mean "I consulters of lead idols" (Connect. 2:395). These ventriloquists "peeped and muttered" (compare τρίζειν, Homer, *Il.* 23:101; "squeak and gibber," Shaksp. *Jul. Caesar)* from the earth to imitate the voice of the revealing 'familiar" (<232904>Isaiah 29:4, etc.; <092808>1 Samuel 28:8; <032027>Leviticus 20:27; compare στερνόμαντις, *Soph.*

Frag.). Of this class was the witch of Endor (Josephus, Ant. 6:14, 2), in whose case intended imposture may have been overruled into genuine necromancy (Ecclus. 46:20). On this wide subject, see Chrysostom ad 1 Corinthians 12; Tera tullian, *adv. Marc.* 4:25; *De Anima,* page 57; Augustine, *De doctr. Christ.* § 33; Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 1:16, and the commentators on AEn. 6; *Critici Sacri,* 6:331; Le Moyne, *Var. Sacr.* page 993 sq.; Selden, *De Diis Syr,* 1:2; and, above all, Bottcher, *De Inferis,* pages 101-121, where the research displayed is marvellous. Those who sought inspiration, either from the dasmons or the spirits of the dead, haunted tombs and caverns (<236604>Isaiah 65:4), and invited the unclean communications by voluntary fasts (Maimon. *De Idol.* 9:15; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebrews* ad <400101>Matthew 10:1). That the supposed ψυχομαντεῖα was often effected by ventriloquism and illusion is certain; for a specimen of this even in modern times, see the *Life of* Benvenuto Cellini. *SEE NECROMANCER.*

Closely connected with this form of divination are the two following:

(1.) rbj, *che'ber,* a *spell* or enchantment, by means of a cabalistic arrangement of certain words and implements (<051811>Deuteronomy 18:11; <234709>Isaiah 47:9, 12), spoken also of serpent-charming (<191806>Psalm 58:6). *SEE CHARMING; SEE ENCHANTMENT.*

(2.) Sorcery (either *wizard,* [ydy *knowing* one, <031931>Leviticus 19:31; 20:6; <051811>Deuteronomy 18:11; <092803>1 Samuel 28:3, 9; spoken also of the imp or spirit of divination by which they were supposed to be attended, <032027>Leviticus 20:27; or some form of

ãvK; *'kashaph',* to act the *witch,* literally by magic incantations, <142336>2 Chronicles 23:6; <020711>Exodus 7:11; <051810>Deuteronomy 18:10; <270212>Daniel 2:2, etc.), which signifies practicing divination by means of the black art, with an implied collusion with evil spirits; applied usually to pretending to reveal secrets, to discover things lost, find hidden treasure, and interpret dreams. *SEE WIZARD.*

Familists, Familia Charitatis, Family of Love

a sect founded in the 16th century by Henry Nicholas, a native of Munster, in Westphalia, who, after residing for some time in Holland, went to England in the latter part of the reign of Edward VI, and there established (1552) his *familia charitatis,* or *Huis des Liefde* (Strype's Cranmer,

2:410). His doctrines have often been confounded with those of David Joris *SEE JORIS*, which they resemble in many respects, and generally with those of the Anabaptists. His followers however, published a *Confession of Faith* in 1575 (given in Strype, Annals, 2:577), and soon after an *Apology*, in which they attempt to prove the identity of their doctrines with those of the evangelical Confessions. The characteristic feature of this sect was a tendency to mystic contemplation, and the belief that, through love, man could become absolutely absorbed in and identified with God, in a subjective sense. Nicholas represented himself as the apostle of this "service of Love," and it is said went so far as to claim superiority over Christ, on the ground that Moses only preached hope, Christ faith, but he preached love. The sect was accused of denying the divinity of Christ, and of even rejecting the divinity of God himself, in its higher attributes, by maintaining that man would, in this life, become identified with God. They, on the contrary, maaintained in their Apology their belief in the three general Christian creeds, and particthlarly in the satisfaction rendered by Christ, while they merely claimed to emulate the state of life exhibited by him. As they looked upon themselves as perfect, they could not acknowledge the need of forgiveness, and stated in their Apology that they tried with all the heart to believe and keep the commandments, leaving the rest to God, as the power of so doing could only come from him. They distinguished themselves from the Anabaptists by their recognition of infant baptism, and by their indifference as to the external part of the established worship, which the Anabaptists assailed with especial violence. Nicholas, who at first kept proselyting quietly, came out more boldly during the reign of Elizabeth, and announced himself as a prophet appointed by the Lord, and anointed by the Holy Spirit. He is said to have been an uneducated man, yet appears to have succeeded in gaining the ear of several theologians and persons of high rank. In 1580 Elizabeth issued a proclamation against the sect, and directed an inquiry to be made into their practices. They seem to have attracted considerable attention at that period, and accusations of all kinds were brought forward against them. Their books were ordered to be burnt in October, 1580. In 1604 they presented a petition to James I, to clear themselves from the imputations laid against them. From this time their numbers diminished, but they were not extinct even as late as 1645. King James I, in his Βασιλικὸν δῶρον, calls them *infamem anabaptistarum sectam, quae familia amoris vocatur.* A person named Etherington was made to recant as a Familist in 1627; but he does not appear to have held precisely the same doctrine as the older

Familists. See a curious book by J.R. (John Rogers), entitled *The Displaying of an horrible Sect naming themselves the Family of Love* (Lond. 1579); and Knewstub, *Confutatios of monstroays and horrible Heresies taught by H.N.* etc. (Lond. 1579); Mosheim, *Church History, c.* 16, § 3, part 2, § 25; Collier, *Ecclesiastes Hist. of England,* 6:609; 7:311; Hardwick, Reformation, chapter 5.

Family

The idea of the family (οἶκος), in Greece, was that of the nucleus of society, or of the state. "Aristotle speaks of it as the foundation of the state and, quotes Hesiod to the effect that the original family consisted of the wife and the laboring ox, which held," as he says, to the poor the position of the slave *(Polit.* 1:1). The complete Greek family, then, consisted of the man, and his wife, and his slave; the two latter, Aristotle says, never having been confounded in the same class by the Greeks, as by the barbarians (Ib.). In this form, the family was recognized as the model of the monarchy, the earliest, as well as the simplest, form of government. When, by the birth and growth of children, and the death of the father, the original family is broken up into several, the heads of which stand to each other in a co-ordinate rather than a strictly subordinate position, we have in these the prototypes of the more advanced forms of government. Each brother, by becoming the head of a separate family, becomes a member of an aristocracy, or the embodiment of a portion of the sovereign power, as it exists in the separate elements of which a constitutional or a democratic government is composed. But at Rome the idea of the family was still more closely entwined with that of life in the state, and the natural power of the father was taken as the basis not only of the whole political, but of the whole social organization of the people. Among the Romans, as with the Greeks, the family included the slave as well as the wife, and ultimately the children, a fact which, indeed, is indicated by the etymology of the word, which belongs to the same root as *famulus,* a slave. In its widest sense, the *famalia* included even the in-animate possessions of the citizen, who, as the head of a house, was his own master *(sui juris);* and Gaius (2:102) uses it as synonymous with patrimonium. In general, however, it was confined to persons — the wife, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, if such there were, and slaves of a full-blown Roman citizen. Sometimes, too, it signified all those who had sprung from a common stock, and would have been members of the family, and under the potestas of a common ancestor, had he been alive. In this sense, of course, the slaves belonging to

the different members of the family were not included in it. It was a family, in short, in the sense in which we speak of 'the royal family,' etc., with this difference, that it was possible for an individual to quit it, and to pass into another by adoption. Sometimes, again, the word was used with reference to slaves exclusively, and, analogically, to a sect of philosophers, or a body of gladiators." See Smith's *Dictionary of Greek* and *Roman Antiquities.*

The *Christian* family, on the contrary, is a communion resting as an ethico-religious foundation, and forming the closest of all human relationships. It is a copy of the highest and most perfect union, that of the Church with Christ its head. Christianity, considered as the true (ideal) family, wherein Christ's power begets, through the Word and the Spirit, children of faith unto God, who mutually aid each other with their several spiritual gifts, is imaged in the natural family; imperfectly, indeed, since the life of the Christian family is yet a life in the flesh (comp. Galatians 2:20); yet truly, because its bond of union is spiritual, being the spirit of Christ. The basis of the Christian family is Christian marriage, or monogamy, the exclusive union of one man to one woman. The deepest ground of this union, and its true aim, without which Christian marriage and family are impossible, is the consciousness of unity in Christ, or in the love of God in Christ, the source of individual sympathy, as well as of brotherly and universal love. Marriage has, in common with Christian *friendship,* the bond of tender sentiments; but the former is an *exclusive* bond between two persons of different sexes, whose personality is complemented, so to speak, by each other. It is therefore a lifelong relation, while friendship may be only temporary. *SEE MARRIAGE.*

Two persons thus joined in marriage lay the foundation of a Christian family; indeed, they constitute a family, though yet incomplete and undeveloped. It awaits its completion in the birth of children. In proportion, however, as the married couple live in a state of holiness, so are the natural desires for issue and their gratification made subservient to the divinely ordered end of the marriage, and accompanied by a sense of dependence on the will and biessingof God. And in order duly to attain this higher end of the family, it is necessary that, keeping the merely carnal passions subordinate, both husband and wife should endeavor to subserve each other's moral and spiritual completeness; and also that they should, when children are born, faithfully help each other in training them properly, by the combination of their particular dispositions, the father's sternness being tempered with the mother's gentleness, and the mother's tenderness

energized by the father's authority. The children should *see* the unity between the father and the mother, in their unity of aim, though manifested according to their different dispositions. Early baptism should be followed by careful religious training. In this the mother has a certain priority, inasmuch as, aside from giving her children birth, she is also first in giving them the bodily and spiritual care they require. Yet even in this early period she derives assistance from the husband, who, as the head of the family, counsels, strengthens, and assists her. In after years their relative shares in the education of the children become more equalized, the sons coming, however, more under the influence of the father, while the daughters remain more under the mother's. Those who wish theirs to be a real Christian family must from the first inculcate on their children (aside from the habit of absolute, unquestioning obedience to the parental authority as divinely instituted) the true ground of obedience, as laid in obedience to God, springing from love to God. "The order in which the love of the child graduates is from the stage of instinctive love to moral affection; and from this to the love of its heavenly Parent. Desirous as the parents may be to lead its affections up at once to the Creator, the previous stages of the path must first be passed through. For a while the maternal care is the only Providence it knows; and the father's experience is to it a world of grand enterprise, and of power unlimited. In vain it strives to climb the height of his knowledge — his virtual omniscience; nor can it conceive of a diviner guarantee than his promise. To see its parents bend in worship, and to hear them speak with holy awe of their Father in heaven, is itself solemn and suggestive as a ladder set up from earth to heaven. The wise discipline, too, which leads the parent kindly to repress its selfish desires, and constantly to aim at its moral welfare, invariably begets in return the highest order of filial love and confidence; evincing the power of the child to discriminate between instinctive and moral affection, and preparing it to embrace that heavenly Parent of whom the earthly is but an imperfect representation. And let the parents remark that, from the moment they begin to point their child to God as all object of reverence and love, they are pursuing the certain course for augmenting its moral affection for themselves; while its intelligent love for them is a valuable means and a pledge for its ascending to the love of God" (Harris, *Patriarchy, or the Family,* page 352). This divine liberty, based on fear and love, far from diminishing the respectful love of the children for their parents, will exalt and purify it, and bring it to its highest degree of perfection; it will make it become part of their religion, and whenever a collision may occur between

the parental wishes and the will of God, it will lead the children, while obeying the latter, to cherish all possible reverence and respect for the former. By this personal development of their spiritual life the sons and daughters will *become friends* to their parents; a higher kind of trust; such as is felt in one's equals, is thus reached, without diminishing the respect which is the, duty of the child and the right of the parents. This is the true graduation of the Christian family life, in which the elder children become helps to the parents for the education of the younger, while at the same time they become more thoroughly fitted to fulfill their own duties as heads of families in after life. Where the blessing of children has been denied, it can in some measure, though not completely, find a substitute in the adoption of orphans or other children, and then the duties towards these are the same as towards one's own.

The Christian family includes also what heathen Rome called the family in a subordinate sense — the *servants.* Their position, wherever the principles of Christian humanity prevail, is not one of slavery, but is a free moral relation, entered into by the consent of both parties, and giving each peculiar rights and duties. The Christian, penetrated with the spirit of his Master, will not lose sight of the fact that this spirit inclined Him much more to serve others than to have them serve Him, and he will not be satisfied by rewarding his servants with wages only, but with all the spiritual blessings of which the family is the proper sphere. They should take part in the family worship, and even an active part, as in reading, singing, praying. The more they come to take part in the life of the family, in its interests, its joys, its griefs, and receive from it the sympathy and help they require, either for the body or the mind, the more does the general family lead a really Christian life.

The entire life of the Christian family is a continuous act of worship in the more extended sense of the word, and must gradually become more and more so, since all its actions are done in the name of Christ and for the glory of God. This thoroughly Christian conduct is, however, sustained and strengthened by the *family worship* in the proper sense, in which the family, as such, seeks for strength in the Word and in the Spirit of God. The more perfectly this family worship is organized, the more will it resemble public worship, consisting, like it, in the reading and exounding of Scripture, singing, and prayer. The eader in the religious exercises of the family should be the father, as priestly head of the house. This, however, is not to exclude the co-operation of the mother, children, and other members

of the family their participation, on the contrary, adds much to theinterest of the service, and makes it an admirable supplement to public worship, as in the family the feeling of trust in each other and of self-dependence add much: to liberty in prayer. This constitutes the true hearth of the family, the center around which all meet again, from whence they derive light and warmth, and whose genial influences will be felt through life. From the bosom of such a family the spirit of Christianity goes out with its healthful influence into the Church, the school, the state, and even the whole world.

See generally the writers on moral philosophy and Christian ethics, and especially Herzog, *Real-Encyklopddie* 4:318; Rothe, *Theolog. Ethik*, in, 605; Schaff,. *Apostolical Age, §* 111; Harris, *Patriarchy, or the Family* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Anderson, *Genius and Design of the Domestic Constitution* (Edinb. 1826, 8vo); Thiersch, *Ueber christliches Familienleben* (4th ed. Frankf. 1859; translated into several languages).

Family, Holy

One *of* the most favorite themes of Christian art, from its earliest period in the Catacombs, has been the presentation of scenes from the infancy and childhood of the Savior. The name "holy family" is given especially to those paintings and sculptures in which the parents, Joseph and Mary, are worshipping the infant Savior, or are holding him up for the adoration of spectators. In a wider sense, it is also applied to the birth of the Savior, the adoration of the magi, of the shepherds, and of the mythical three kings, to the flight into Egypt, the finding of Christ in the Temple disputing with the doctors, and all other scenes from the childhood of Christ that are drawn from the gospels. Accessory figures of angels, saints, and of persons contemporary with Christ or with the artist, and sometimes of the artist or the donor of the painting to the church, are often added. (G.F.C.)

Family of Love

SEE FAMILISTS.

Family prayer

SEE FAMILY; SEE PRAYER; SEE WORSHIP.

Famine

(properly b [;r ; *raab',* λιμός, *hunger,* whether of individuals or of nations). "In the whole of Syria and Arabia, the fruits of the earth must ever be dependent on rain; the watersheds having few large springs, and the small rivers not being sufficient for the irrigation of even the level lands. If, therefore; the heavy rains of November and December fail, the sustenance of the people is cut off in the parching drought of harvest-time, when the country is almost devoid of moisture. Further, the pastoral tribes rely on the scanty herbage of the desert-plains and valleys, for their flocks and herds; for the desert is interspersed in spring-time with spontaneous vegetation, which is the product of the preceding rain-fall, and fails almost totally without it. It is therefore not difficult to conceive the frequent occurrence and severity of famines: in ancient times, when the scattered population, rather of a pastoral than an agricultural country, was dependent on natural phenomena which, however regular in, their season, occasionally failed, and with them the sustenance of man and beast.

"Egypt, again, owes all its fertility — a fertility that gained for it the striking comparison with the 'garden' of the Lord' — to its mighty river, whose annual rise inundates nearly the whole land, and renders its cultivation an easy certainty. But this very bounty of nature has not unfrequently exposed the country to the opposite extreme of drought. With scarcely any rain, and that only on the Mediterranean coast, and with wells only supplied by filtration from the river through a nitrous soil, a failure in the rise of the Nile almost certainly entails a degree of scarcity, although if followed by cool weather, and if only the occurrence of a single year, the labor of the people may in a great measure avert the calamity. The causes of dearth and famine in Egypt are occasioned by defective inundation, preceded, and accompanied, and followed by prevalent easterly and southerly winds. Both these winds dry up the earth, and the latter, keeping back the rain-clouds from the north, are perhaps the chief cause of the defective inundation, as they are also by their accelerating the current of the river — the northerly winds producing the contrary effects. Famines in Egypt and Palestine seem to be affected by drought extending from northern Syria, through the meridian .of Egypt, as far as the highlands of Abyssinia.

"It may be said of the ancient world generally that it was subject to periodical returns of dearth, often amounting in particular districts to

famine, greatly beyond what is usually experienced in modern times. Various causes of a merely natural and economical kind contributed to this, apart from strictly moral considerations. Among these causes may more especially be mentioned the imperfect knowledge of agriculture which prevailed, in consequence of which men had few resources to stimulate, or in unfavorable seasons and localities to aid, the productive powers of nature; the defective means of transit, rendering it often impossible to relieve the wants of one region, even when plenty existed at no great distance in another; the despotic governments, which to so great an extent checked the free development of human energy and skill; and the frequent wars and desolations, in a great degree also the result of those despotic governments, which both interrupted the labors of the field and afterwards wasted its fruits. Depending, as every returning harvest does, upon the meeting of many conditions in the soil and climate, which necessarily vary from season to season, it was inevitable that times of scarcity should be ever and anon occurring in particular regions of the world; and from the disadvantages now referred to, under which the world in more remote times labored, it was equally inevitable that such times should often result in all the horrors of famine."

The Scriptures record several famines in Palestine and the neighboring countries. The first occurs in <01210>Genesis 12:10, which is described as so grievous as to compel Abraham to quit Canaan for Egypt (<01260>Genesis 26:1). Another occurred in the days of Isaac, which was the cause of his removal from Canaan to Gerar (<01267>Genesis 26:17). The most remarkable one was that of .seven years in Egypt, while Joseph was governor. It was distinguished for its duration, extent, and severity, particularly as Egypt is one of the countries least subject to such a calamity, by reason of its general fertility. The ordinary cause of famine in Egypt is connected with the annual overflow of the Nile. But it would appear that more than local causes were in operation in the case noticed in <01430>Genesis 41:30, for it is said that "the famine was sore in all lands," that "the famine was over all the face of the earth." By the foresight and wisdom of Joseph, however, provision had been made in Egypt during the seven preceding years of plenty, so that the people of other parts sought and received supplies in Egypt — "all countries came into Egypt to buy corn." Among other lands, Canaan suffered from the famine, which was the immediate occasion of Jacob sending his sons down into Egypt, and of the settlement in that land of the descendants of Abraham; an event of the highest consequence in the

sequel, and serving to illustrate the benignity and wisdom of divine Providence in bringing there a band of shepherds to prepare and qualify them for becoming ultimately the founders of the Hebrew nation.

The fruitfulness of Egypt depends upon the inundations of the Nile; but these are occasioned by the tropical rains which fall upon the Abyssinian mountains. These rains depend upon climatic laws of wide extent and great regularity. Yet there is scarcely a land on the earth in which famine has raged so often and so terribly as in Egypt, or a land that so very much needs the measures which Joseph adopted for the preservation of the people. The swelling of the Nile a few feet above or below what is necessary proves alike destructive. Particular instances of famine which history has handed down to us are truly horrible, and the accounts of them are worthy of notice also, inasmuch as they present the services of Joseph in behalf of Egypt in their true light. Abdollatif relates thus: "In the year 596 (A.D. 1199), the height of the flood was small almost without example. The consequence was a terrible famine, accompanied by indescribable enormities. Parents consumed their children; human flesh was, in fact, a very common article of food; they contrived various ways of preparing it. They spoke of it and heard it spoken of as an indifferent affair. Men-catching became a regular business. The greater part of the population were swept away by death. In the following year, also, the inundation did not reach the proper height, and only the lowlands were overflowed. Also much of that which was inundated could not be sown for want of laborers and seed; much was destroyed by worms which devoured the seed-corn; also of the seed which escaped this destruction, a great part produced only meagre shoots which perished." (See the account of this famine translated in the *Am. Bibl. Repos.* 1832, page 659 sq.) Compare with this account the "thin ears and blasted with the east wind" (Genesis 41:6). "Of the horrors in this second year's famine, the year of the Flight, 597 (A.D. 1200), Abdollatif, who was an eye-witness, likewise gives a most interesting account, stating that the people throughout the country were driven to the last extremities, eating offal, and even their own dead, and mentions, as an instance of the dire straits to which they were driven, that persons who were burnt alive for eating human flesh were themselves, thus ready roasted, eaten by others. Multitudes fled the country, only to perish in the desert-road to Palestine.

"But the most remaikable famine was that of the reign of the Fatimi Khalifeh, El-Mustansir billah, which is the only instance on record of one

of seven years' duration in Egypt since the time of Joseph (A.H. 457-464, A.D. 1064-1071). This famine exceeded in severity all others of modern times, and was aggravated by the anarchy which then ravaged the country. Vehement drought and pestilence (says Es-Suyuti, in his *Hosn el-Mohdarah,* MS.) continued for seven consecutive years, so that they [the people] ate corpses, and animals that died of themselves; the cattle perished; a dog was sold for 5 dinars, and a cat for 3 dinars ... and an ardebb (about 5 bushels) of wheat for 100 dinars, and then it failed altogether. He adds that all the horses of the Khalifeh, save three, perished, and gives numerous instances of the straits to which the wretched inhabitants were driven, and of the organized bands of kidnappers who infested Cairo, and caught passengers in the streets by ropes furnished with hooks and let down from the houses. This account is confirmed by El-Makrizi (in his *Khitat;* Quatremere has translated the account of this famine in the life of El-Mustansir, contained in his *Memoires Geographiques et Historiques sur 'Egypte),* from whom we further learn that the family, and even the women of the Khalifeh fled, by the way of Syria on foot, to escape the peril that threatened all ranks of the population. The whole narrative is worthy of attention, since it contains a parallel to the duration of the famine of Joseph, and at the same time enables us to form an idea of the character of famines in the East. The famine of Samaria resembled it in many particulars; and that very briefly recorded in 2 Kings 8:1, 2, affords another instance of one of seven years: “Then spake Elisha unto the woman whose son he had restored to life, saying, Arise, and go thou and thy household, and sojourn wheresoever thou canst sojourn: for the Lord hath called for a famine; and it shall also come upon the land seven years. And the woman arose, and did after the saying of the man of God: and she went with her household, and sojourned in the land of the Philistines seven years." Bunsen *(Egypt's Place,* etc., 2:334) quotes the record of a famine in the reign of Sesertesen 1, which he supposes to be that of Joseph; but it must be observed that the instance in point is expressly stated not to have extended over the whole land, and is at least equally likely, apart from chronological reasons, to have been that of Abraham.

"In Arabia, famines are of frequent occurrence. The Arabs, in such cases, when they could not afford to slaughter their camels, used to bleed them and drink the blood, or mix it With the shorn fur, making a kind of. black pudding. They ate also various plants and grains, which at other times were

not used as articles of food. Thus the tribe of Hanifeb were taunted with having in a famine eaten their god, which consisted of a dish of dates mashed up with clarified butter asnd a preparation of dried curds of milk *(Sihah,* MS.)."

Famine is likewise a natural result, in the East, when caterpillars, locusts, or other insects destroy the produce of the earth. The prophet Joel compares locusts to a numerous and terrible army ravaging the land (chapter 1). Famine was also an effect of God's anger (<12801>2 Kings 8:1, 2). The prophets frequently threaten Israel with the sword of famine, or with war and famine, evils that frequently go together. Amos threaten.s another sort of famine: "I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord" (<30811>Amos 8:11). In ancient times, owing to the imperfect modes of warfare in use, besieged cities were more frequently reduced by famine than by any other means, and the persons shut up were often reduced to the necessity of devouring not only unclean animals, but also human flesh (compare <05822>Deuteronomy 28:2242; 2 Samuel 21; <12065>2 Kings 6:25-28; 15:3, <24445>Jeremiah 14:15; 19:9; 42:17; <26610>Ezekiel 5:10-12, 16; 6:12; 7:15).

The famine predicted by Agabus (<441128>Acts 11:28) was the same with that which is related by Josephus (Ant. 20:2, 6) as having taken place in the fourth year of Claudius, and affected especially the province of Judaea. (See Kuinol, Comment. proleg.) *SEE DEARTH*.

Fan

(הרִזְמִי, mizreh', πτύον), a *winsowing-shovel,* with which grain was thrown up against the wind, in order to cleanse it from the brokensstraw and chaff (<23024>Isaiah 30:24; <24507>Jeremiah 15:7; <400312>Matthew 3:12 ; <420317>Luke 3:17). *SEE AGRICULTURE*. At the present day in Syria, the instrument used is a largee wooden fork. (See Robinson's *Researches,* 2:277, 371; Smith's *Dict. of Class., Antiq.* s.v. Pala). Both kinds of instruments are delineated on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, 2:4046). *SEE WINNOWING*.

Fanaticism

1. The ancients primarily gave the name of *fanatici* to those who uttered oracular announcements, or exhibited wild antics and gestures under the (supposed) inspiration of some divinity whose temples (*fana*) they frequented. The heathen vates, who pretended to prophesy under the

guidance of an indwelling spirit *(*δαίμων*)*, was called by the Greek writers ἔνθεος, and by the Latinsfanaticus (see Suidas, s.v. ἔνθους*;* Bingham, Orig. *Ecclesiastes* 16, 5:4). Thence the name was transferred to persons actuated by a frantic zeal in religion.

2. The word is sometimes improperly used to stigmatize such Christians as are "zealously affected in a good thing" (<40418>Galatians 4:18). Its only legitimate application is to such as add to enthusiasm and zeal for the cause which they believe to be the cause of truth a hatred of those who are opposed to them, whether in politics, philosophy, or religion. Isaac Taylor, speaking of religious fanaticism, remarks that, "after rejecting from account that opprobious sense of the word fanaticism which the virulent calumniator of religion and of the religious assigns to it, it will to found, as we believe, that the elementary idea attaching to the term in its manifold application is that *of fictitious fervor* in religion, rendered turbulent, morose, or rancorous by junction with some one or more of the unsocial emotions. Or, if a definition as brief as possible were demanded, we should say that fanaticism is enthusiasm inflamed by hatred." He classifies the chief varieties of fanaticism "under four designations, of which the first will comprehend all instances wherein malignant religious sentiments turn inward upon the unhappy subject of them; to the second class will belong that more virulent sort of fanaticism which looks abroad for its victims; the third embraces the combination of intemperate religious zeal with military sentiments, or with national pride and the love of power; to the fourth class must be reserved all instances of the more intellectual kind, and which stand connected with opinion and dogma. Our first sort, then, is austere, the second cruel, the third ambitious, and the fourth factious.' Or, for the purpose of fixing a characteristic mark upon each of our classes as above named, let it be permitted us to entitle them as follows — namely, the first, the fanaticism of the scourge, or of personal infliction; the second, the fanaticism of the brand, or of immolation and cruelty; the *third,* the fanaticism of the banner, or of ambition and conquest; and the *fourth,* the fanaticism of the symbol, or of creeds, dogmatism, and ecclesiastical virulence" *(Fanaticism,* Neew York, 1834, 12mo, page 62).

The fanatic begins by rejecting the light of reason to abandon himself to the dictates of his fancy. He generally adopts some single and exclusive idea, which destroys the proper balance of his mind. This absorbing idea may have a germ of truth in it, but the fanatic will not recognize it, if in another form, in others: he cannot admit that truth which has taken a certain shape

for him may have taken another in the eye of his neighbor without ceasing to be the truth. He thus becomes exclusive, malevolent, and prone to persecue tion. The hatred of blood relations is more intense and fierce than that between strangers, and so the fat. natic is all the more fierce and tyrannical against others in proportions as their views approach, his own, without being identically the same. He will undergo any suffering rather than abate one jot of his claims, or retreat one step forathe sake of charity and union. He prefers darkness to light, the letter to the spirit, hatred to love, the wildness of passion to the calmness of inquiry. Fanaticism may show itself in all the relations of life, but its special field is found in politics and religion; and it becomes most dangerous when the two are combined. Being entirely one-sided, it is yet liable to go in the most opposite directions, and then goes all lengths. Thus we have in politics fanatics of peace, who want peace at any cost, and under all circumstances; fanatics of unrest, who believe only in the overthrow of existing institutions; fanatics of progress, who think anything good if it is only new; and fanatics of the past, or conservatives, who wish to hold fast whatever is, no matter how bad it is; fanatics of liberty, who, however, require others. to view liberty in the same light as they do, or else deny it to them; and fanatics of despotism, who would wish all hearts to beat in unison, like so many well-reagulated clocks. We find cosmopolitan fanatics, who glory in reviling their own country, and patriotic fanatics, who consider alil other nations but their own as barbarians; and heathens; fanatics of rationalism, who consider every opponent a blockhead, and fanatics of orthodoxy, who think the pope requires only might to make him perfect, and who pray for the re-establishment of the Inquisition and the stake. Fanaticism has left especially sad records of its excesses in the religious history of the world, not only among the heathen in India, the Moslems and the Jews, but also among Christians. It caused the bloody encounters of the monks of Constantinople at the time of the controversy between the Eutychians and the Nestorians. It envenomed the quarrels of the Montanists and the Donatists. It persecuted the Jews in the Middle Ages. It organized the Inquisition, developed the method of the *cogite intrare* (Luke 14:23), and invented a new sense for the words in Titus 3:10 (hareticum de vita!); it instigated the crusade against the Albigenses, who when they were indiscriminately massacred, were comforted with the assurance that "the Lord would know his own;" it aimed the dagger in the hands of Ravaillac against the breast of his king; it inspired the *Te Deum* of Gregory XIII as a thanksgiving for the massacre of St. Bartholomew's. In the Protestant

world we find fanaticism in the Anabaptists of Munster, in the Crypto-calvinistic troubles, and in the wars of the Cavaliers and Roundheads of England (Beck, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:327 sq.). "Fanaticism is the most incurable of all mental diseases, because in all its forms — religious, philosophical, or political — it is distinguished by a sort of mad contempt for experience, which alone can correct errors of practical judgments" (Mackintosh, *Works*, London, 1851, 2:671). See also Stillingfleet, *Works*, 5:19, 92, 130; Fletcher, *Works* (N.Y. ed.), 4:233 sq.

Fanino or Fannio, Faventino

a nativeof Faenza, in Italy, one of the first martyrs of the Reformation in Italy. The Scriptures in Italian (probably Bruccioli's version, 1532) fell into his hands, and he soon began to speak of the truth to his neighbors. When the ecclesiastical authorities heard of his course they arrested and imprisoned him. His wife and family came to him with entreaties and tears when first apprehended, and he yielded to their persuasions to gain his release from prison by recantation. Under the bitter reproaches of conscience he soon determined to confess Christ openly, and he went publicly through Romagna preaching the Reformed doctrines. He was arrested at Bagna Cavallo, and condemned to the stake. He was removed to Ferrara, where, for eighteen months, persuasion, promises, and tortures were used in vain to induce him to recant. Soon after the accession of pope Julius III a brief was issued for the execution of Fanino. He embraced the messenger, saying, "I accept death joyfully for Christ's sake." Being urged to recant for the sake of his wife and children, whom he was about to leave without a protector, he replied, "I have recommended them to the care of the best of guardians." "What guardian?" "Jesus Christ! I think I could not commit them to the care of a better." He was ironed,and led out to execution; and on the way, being reproached by his enemies for his cheerfulness, when Christ was exceeding sorrowful at the approach of death, he answered, "Christ sustained all manner of pangs and conflicts with death and hell on our account, and by his sufferings freed those who really believe in him from the fear of them." He was strangled at dawn, and his body was burned at noon, in September, 1550. — Young, *Life of Aonio Paleario* (1860, 2:111); M'Crie, *Reformation in Italy*, chapter 5.

Fannio

SEE FANINO.

Fan-tracery Vaulting

Picture for Fan-tracery Vaulting

"a kind of vaulting used chiefly in late Perpendicular work, in which all the ribs that rise from the springing of the vault have the same curve, and diverge eqmmally in every direction, producing an effect something like that of the bones of a fan. This kind of vaulting admits of considerable variety in the smibordinate parts, but the general effect of the leading features is more nearly uniform. It is very frequently used over tombs, chantry chapels, and other small erections, and fine examples on a larger scale exist at Henry the Seventh's Chapel; St. George's Chapel, Windsor; King's College Chapel, Cambridge, etc.," in England.

Farel, Guillaume

one of the boldest pioneers of the Reformation in Switzerland and France, was born near Gap, in Dauphiny, in 1489. He studied at Paris with great success, and was for some time teacher in the college of cardinal Le Moine, to which post he was recommended by Lefevre d'Etaples. *SEE FABER STAPULENSIS*. At this period of his life he had no personal religious convictions; but yet, while devoured with a love of letters, he was zealous in the service of the Roman Catholic Church. But he was led, under the influence of Lefevre, to the study of the Scriptures. About 1521 he went to Meaux, at the invitation of Lefevre, and the bishop (Brimonnet, q.v.) gave him authority to preach. His mind was now fixed substantially in the Reformed doctrine, and he preached, perhaps, with more zeal than discretion; and in 1523, Briconnet, now becoming timid, sent away the ardent young preacher. He soon found it best to retire to Switzerland. At Basel, Febtruary 15, 1524, he sustained publicly thirteen theses on the chief points in controversy *(Themata quaedam Latine et Germaniae praposita* Basel, 1528). During his few months' stay at Basel he visited some of the Swiss cities, and made friends of Myconius, Haller, and Zwingle. At Basel, OEcolampadius was his warm friend, admiring his zeal and energy, but, at the same time, not unaware of his lack of discretion. Farel was soon involved in a dispute with Erasmus, whose "trimming" tendency was just the opposite of his own ardent and decided nature. He compared Erasmus to Balaarm; but the scholar soon proved too strong for the young reformer, who was compelled to leave Basel. In one of his later letters, Erasmus say's of him *(Epist.* page 798, ed. Lond.): "You have in your neighborhood the

new er angelist Farel, than whom I never saw a man more false, more virulent, more seditious." But the abuse of Erasmus could not, in the long run, injure Farel. Towards the end of March 1524, Farel went to Strasburg, where he made the friendship of Bucer and Capito. Under the direction of OEcolampadius, he went to serve a newly-formed society at Montbeliard. Here he preached successfully, but yet with great violence. Once, on a procession day, he pulled out of the priest's hand the image of St. Anthony, and threw it from a bridge into the river; he narrowly escaped being torn to pieces by the mob. His friends became alarmed, and (Ecolampadius censured him for his imprudence, (see *Correspondance des Reformateurs,* Paris, 1866, 1:265). Leaving Montbeliard in the spring of 1525, he spent a short time at Basel, and the next year partly in Alsace and partly in Switzerland. In 1527 he went to Aigle, and in 1528, when Berne became Protestant, he extended his labors to all the territory connected with Berne. Under his labors, Aigle and Bex became Protestant in 1528-9; Morat and Neufchaltel in 1530; Orbe in 1531. His labors during these years were not only vast, but perilous; but the government of Berne gave him strong and steady support. In 1531 he was sent as a deputation (with A. Saunier) to the Waldensian Synod at Angrogne. He always retained great influence among the Waldenses.

In 1532, on his return from the Waldensian meeting, he came to Geneva, then full of religious strife. His first preaching was private, but it was too successful to be kept secret and he was sumnmoned before the episcopal council, at the time trembling for its authority, and therefore the more likely to be severe. The meeting with the council was a scene of bitter recriminations, and when Farel was leaving it a gun was fired at him. He coolly remarked, "Your shots do not terrify me." But he was forced to quit Geneva for the time, and sent Froment and Olivetan to continue the work there. In 1533 he returned to Geneva, where the Reformation was gaining ground. Farel's situation here was full of trial and peril, but his courage and devotion admirably fitted him for his task. The triumph came August 27, 1535, when the city council, by an edict, formally proclaimed the adhesion of Geneva to the Reformation. Farel was full of toil and anxiety in organizing the Reformed discipline and worship, is which he was assisted especially by Viret (q.v.). In 1536, Calvin stopped at Geneva to visit the Reformers. Farel urged him to stay, and, on Calvin's refusal, thus addressed him: "I declare, in the name of God, that if you do not assist us in this work of the Lord, the Lord will punish you for following your own interest

rather than his call." Calvin, struck with this denunciation, submitted, and was appointed preacher and professor. *SEE CALVIN*. From that time on Farel's labors were closely united eith those of Calvin. The confession of faith drawn up by Farel, with Calvin's counsel, was approved by the people in July, 1537. The same year the Council of Geneva conferred on Farel the honor of a burgess of the city, in token of their respect and gratitude. But the popular will was not prepared for the severe discipline of the Reformers, and in a short time the people, under the direction of a faction, met im a public assembly and expelled Farel and Calvin from the place (April 1538). Farel went to Neufchatel, emhere the Church was in a state of disorder, in consequence of the troubles occasioned by the severity of the Reformed discipline. He dealt with offenders severely; even a lady of noble birth did not escape. She had left her husband; Farel urged her to return to him and on her refusal rebuked the scandal and its authors publicly from the pulpit. A great strife arose, and the people emere on the point of expelling Farel; but at last his energy overcame the factious party, and the council by vote, in 1542, proclaimed his triumph. In that year he returned to Geneva, and went thence to Metz, to organize the Reformed Church. He preached first in the Dominican cemetery, amid the ringing of the convent bells purposely to drown his voice. Thousands afterwards flocked to hear him. Once, when a Franciscan was preaching Mariolatry, Farel contradicted him, and nearly fell a victim to the fury of the mob, especially of the women. On October 2, 1542, the city council forbade his preaching in the city, and he retired to the neighboring town of Montigny, and afterwards to Gorze, where the count of Furstemberg took him and his friends under his protection. On March 25, 1543, an armed band fell upon the evangelicals while celebrating the Easter communion. Many were killed and wounded; among the latter was Farel, who took refuge in the castle. He escaped in disguise, and went to Strasburg, where he remained a flew months. He then visited his old friends in Neufchatel and Geneva. Here he approved the execution of Servetus (q.v.). In 1557 he was sent, with Beza, to the Protestant princes of Germanmy, to implore their aid for the Waldenses, and on his return he went to preach the Refornation among the Jura Mountains. At sixty-nine he married a young wife, very much to Calvin's disgust, who spoke of him under the circumstances as *our poor brother* (povre frere). In 1560 he visited his native Dauphiny, established a Reformed Chureh at Grenoble, and passed several months at Gap, preaching against Rome with all the vehemence of his youth. On November 24, 1561, he was thrown into prison, but was rescued by his friends, who

took him from the rampart in a basket. In 1564 he paid a visit to the dying Calvin, and then passed some months with his old flock at Metz. He returned to Neufchaetel worn out with fatigue, and died there September 13, 1565.

Farel was an ardent, impulsive man, a missionary rather than an organizer, an iconoclast rather than a theologian. His gifts admirably supphemented those of Calvin. Beza *(Life of Calvin)* says of Farel that in his preaching "he excelled in a certain sublimity so that none could hear his thunders without trembling." Among his writings are *Sommaire; brieve declaration d'aillcuns lieux fort necessaires a un chacum Chretien,* etc. (many editions; reprinted in 1865, along with *Du vray usage:* see below): — *De Oratione Domin*ica (1524, 8vo), afterwards in French, enlarged (Gene's. 1543, 12mo): — *Traite du Purgatoire* (1543, 12mo): — La *Glaive de l'Esprit* (against Libertines; Genev. 1550): *Du vray usage de ha croix de J. C.* (Genev. 1560, 8vo; new ed., with other letters and writings of Farel, Neufchautel, 1865, 8vo): — *Traite de la Cene* (1555). There are several lives of Farel: Ancillon, *Vie de Guill. Farel* (Amst. 1691); Kirchhofer, *Leben Farel* (Zurich, 1833, 2 volumes); translated, Kirchhofer's *Life of Farel* (Lond. 1837, sm. 8vo); Blackburn, *Life of Farel* (Phila. Presb. Board). See also Schmidt, *Etudes sur Farel* (Strasb. 1834); Haag, *La France Protestante,* vol. iv; Bayle, Dictionnare, s. vr.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* Generale, 17:103; *Cosrespondance des Reformateurs dans les Pays de langue Francaise* (Paris, 1866, tom. 1).

Farfa

one of the three most celebrated Italian monasteries of the Middle Ages (Montecassino, Nonantula, and Farfa), situated on the little river Farfa, in Central Italy. It was in existence before the invasion of the Lombardians, by whom it was destroved, togethor with a number of other monasteries. It was re-established in 681 by the priest Thomas of Maurienea, who, on his return from the Holy Land, came to Farfa. It soon became celebrated, and received numerous presents and privileges from popes and kings. The moamastery was so strongly fortified that abbot Peter, at the close of the 9th century, was able for nine years to resist a siege by the Saracens, though he was finally compelled to depart emith the monks and the treasures of the monastery. Having remained abandoned and desolate for 48 years, it was re-established about the middle of the 10th century by king Hugo, but it afterward became the seat of frightful disorders. Several

abbots were assassinated and poisoned; and the monks, without restraint and disguise, defied all the laws of the Church and the state. At the beginning of the 11th century a stop was put to these disorders, and the reformation of Clugny was carried through at Farfa. Since then the history of the monastery presents no points of special interest. A work of considerable importance for the history of Italy, called after the monastery, *Chronicon Farfense*, was compiled at the close of the 11th century by Gregory, a monk and librarian of Farfa (died 1100). After many vicissitudes, the monastery is still in existence. — Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 3:904.

Farindon, Anthony

an eminent divine of the Church of England, was born at Sunning, in Berkshire, England, in 1596; was admitted scholar of Trinity College, in Oxford, in 1612, and was elected fellow in 1617. He took his M.A. degree in 1620, and, entering into holy orders, he became a tutor in his college. In 1634, being then B.D., he was called to be vicar of Bray, in Berkshire, and soon was made divinity-reader in the king's chapel at Windsor. During the Civil War he was ejected for conformity to the Church of England, and was reduced to such extremities as to be very near starving. Sir John Robinson, alderman of London, and some of the parishioners of Milk Street, London, invited him to be pastor of St. Mary Msagdalen there, "which invitation he gladly accepted, and preached to the great liking of the royal party. In the year 1657 he published a folio volume of these sermons and dedicated them to his kind patron Robinson, ‘as a witness or manifesto,' says he to him, 'of my deep apprehension of your many noble favors, and great charity to me and mine, when the sharpness of the weather and the roughness of the times had blown all from us, and well-nigh left us naked."' He died at his house in Milk Street in September, 1658. Three posthumous volumes of his sermons (folio) were published (1658-1673) in 1663, a second folio volume of his sermons containing forty, and a third in 1673 containing fifty. He also left in manuscript several memorials of the life of Hales (q.v.) of Eton, his intimate friend. A new edition of *his Sermons, with a Life of the Author* by F. Jackson, appeared in London in 1849 (4 volumes, 8vo). They afford a "fine specimen of sterling English, and of rich and varied eloquence." See Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses;* Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography,* 5:57; Jackson, *Life of Farindon,* prefixed to the new edition of his sermons.

Farissol or Peritzol Abraham Ben-Mordecai,

a French Rabbi, distinguished alike in geography, polemics, and exegesis, was born at Avignon about the middle of the 15th century. In 1472 he went to Ferrara as minister to a Jewish congregation, and while there gave most of his time and attention to the study of the sacred writings. He published in 1500 a commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled µyNiv/v yjeP] *(the flower of lilies),* which, according to De Rossi, was begun in 1468. Next followed an apologetic and polemic work, µhr;b}ai^gem;*(the shield of Abraham),* consisting of three parts, of which the first is an apology for Judaism, the second an attack on Mohammedanism, and the third against Christianity. About 1517 he published a scholarly commentary on Job, b/Yail[ivWrPe, printed in the Venetian Rabbinical Bible (1517, fol.), and in the Amsterdam Rabbinical Bible (edited by Frankfurter, 1727-1728). In 1524 he published his famous cosmography, trÇaiµl/[t/jr}a; Itinera Mundi (Venice, 1587, 8vo, very rare; reprinted Offenbach, 1720; and again with a Latin translation and elaborate notes by the English Orientalist, Thomas Hyde, Oxford, 1691). In this lastnamed work Farissol describes the abodes of the ten tribes, the Sambation [Eldad], and the garden of Eden, which he places in the mountains of Nubia (chapter 18 and 30). A year later Farissol completed a Commentary on the book of Ecclesiastes, rpÞsevWrPet lhqo, which has, however, never been printed. He died about the end of 1528, shortly after his return to Avignon. — Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums u. s. Sekten,* 3:122; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrews Liter.* page 453; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 39:614; Kitto, *Cyclopedia,* 2:4; Furst, *Bib. Jud.* 1:276. (J.H.W.)

Farm

Picture for Farm

(ἀγρός, elsewhere usually rendered "field"), a plot of arable land (<4015>Matthew 22:5). Moses, following the example of the Egyptians, made agriculture the basis of the Hebrew state. He accordingly apportioned to every Hebrew a certain qaantity of land, and gave him the right of tilling it himself, and of transmitting it to his heirs (<0463>Numbers 26:33-54). This equal distribution of the soil was the basis of the Hebrew agrarian law. As in Egypt the lands all belonged to the king, and the husbandmen were not the proprietors of the fields which they cultivated, but farmers or tenants

who were obliged to give to the king one fifth of their produce (<01472>Genesis 47:20-25), just so Moses represents Jehovah as the sole possessor of the soil of the Promised Land, in which he was about to place the Hebrews by his special providence; and this land they held independent of all temporal superiors, by direct tenure from Jehovah their king (<03253>Leviticus 25:23). Moses further enacted that for the land the Hebrews should pay a kind of quit-rent to Jehovah, the sovereign proprietor, in the form of a tenth or tithe of the produce, which was assigned to the priesthood. The condition of military service was also attached to the land, as it appears that every freeholder was obliged to attend the general muster of the national army, and (with few exceptions, <05105>Deuteronomy 20:5-9) to serve in it, at his own expense, as long as the occasion required. The Hebrews appear to have acquired in Egypt considerable knowledge of agriculture; but the physical circumstances of the land of Canaan were in many respects essentially different, as it was not a land rarely refreshed with rain as Egypt (<05110>Deuteronomy 11:10-15). The Hebrews, notwithstanding the richness of the soil, endeavored to increase its fertility in various ways. In order to avert the aridity which the summer droughts occasioned, they watered the soil by means of aqueducts communicating with the brooks, and thereby imparted to their fields a garden-like verdure (<19103>Psalm 1:3; 65:10; <21201>Proverbs 21:1; <23302>Isaiah 32:2, 20). In the hilly part of the country terrace cultivation was practiced, so that the hills otherwise barren were rendered fertile (<05111>Deuteronomy 11:11; <19716>Psalm 72:16; 104:10: <23025>Isaiah 30:25). With the use of manure the Hebrews were undoubtedly acquainted; and that the soil might not be exhausted, it was ordered that every seventh and every fiftieth year the whole land should lie fallow. The dung, the carcasses, and the blood of animals were used to enrich the soil (<12937>2 Kings 9:37; <19710>Psalm 73:10; 8:2; <24922>Jeremiah 9:22). Salt, either by itself, or mixed in the dunghill in order to promote putrefaction, is specially mentioned as a compost (<40513>Matthew 5:13; Luke, 4:34, 35). The soil was enriched, also, by means of ashes, to which the straw, stubble, husks of corn, brambles, grass, etc., that overspread the land during the fallow or sabbatical year, were reduced by fire. The burning over the surface of the land had also the good effect of destroying the seeds of noxious herbs (<21931>Proverbs 24:31; <23025>Isaiah 30:25). The soil of Palestine is very fruitful, if the dews of spring, and the rains of autumn and winter are not withheld. "Nevertheless," observes Hengstenberg, "it is to be considered that the Canaan of which Moses speaks is in a manner an *ideal* land. It was never what it might have been, since the bond of allegiance, in consequence of

which God had promised to give the land its rain in its season, was always far from being perfectly complied with." Among the Hebrews the occupation of the husbandman was held in high honor, and even distinguished men disdained not to put their hands to the plough (<09116>1 Samuel 11:5-7; <11919>1 Kings 19:19; <14260>2 Chronicles 26:10). The esteem in which agriculture was held diminished as luxury increased, but it nevsqr wholly ceased; even after the exile, when many of the Jews had become merchants and mechanics, the esteem and honor attached to this occupation still continued, especially under the dynasty of the Persians, who were agriculturists from religious motives. *SEE LAND.*

In ancient Egypt, the peasants or husbandmen, like the modern *fellahs* of the same country, seem to have formed a distinct class, if not caste, of society (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 2:1, 2). The government did not interfere directly with the peasants respecting the nature of the produce they intended to cultivate, and the vexations of later times were unknown under the Pharaohs. They were thought to have the best opportunities of obtaining, from actual observation, an accurate knowledge on all subjects connected with husbandry; and, as Diodorus observes, "being from their infancy brought up to agricultural pursuits, they far excelled the husbandmen of other countries, and had become acquainted with the capabilities of the land, the mode of irrigation, the exact season for sowing and reaping, as well as all the most useful secrets connected with the harvest, which they had derived from their ancestors, and had improved by their own experience." "They rented," says the same historian, "the arable lands belonging to the kings, the priests, and the military class, for a small sum, and employed their whole time in the tillage of their farms;" and the laborers who cultivated land for the rich peasant, or other landed proprietors, were superintended by the steward or owner of the estate, who had authority over them, and Che power of condemning delinquents to the bastinado.lrhis is shown by the paintings of the tombs, whichfrequently represent a person of consequence inspecting the tillage of the field, either seated in a chariot, walking, or leaning on his staff, accompanied by a favorite dog. To one officer were intrusted the affairs of the house, answering to "the ruler," "overseer," or "steward of Joseph's house" (<01305>Genesis 39:5; 43:16, 19, 44:1); others "superintended the granaries," the vineyard (comp. <42018>Matthew 20:8), or the culture of the fields; and the extent of their duties, or the number of those employed, depended on the quantity of land, or the will of its owner.

At the present day the lower orders in Egypt, with the exception of a very small proportion, chiefly residing in the large towns, consist of fellahhin (or agriculturists). Most of those in the great towns, and a few in the smaller towns and some of the villages, are petty tradesmen or artificers, or obtain their livelihood as servants, or by various labors. In all cases their earnings are very small; barely sufficient, in general, and sometimes insufficient, to supply them and their families with the cheapest necessaries of life. Their food chiefly consists of bread (made of millet or of maize), milk, new cheese, eggs, small salted fish, cucumbers and melons, and gourds of a great variety of kinds, onions and leeks, beans, chick-peas, lupins, the fruit of the black egg-plant, lentils, etc., dates (both fresh and dried), and pickles. Most of the vegetables they eat in a crude state. When thee maize (or Indian corn) is nearly ripe, many ears of it are plucked, and toasted or baked, and eaten thus by the peasants. Rice is too dear to be an article of common food for the fellahin, and flesh-meat they very seldom taste. It is surprising to observe how simple and poor is the diet of the Egyptian peasantry, and yet how robust and healthy most of them are, and how severe is the labor which they can undergo (see Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* chapter 7).

Dr. Thomson thus describes the modern lower class of farmers in Palestine (Land *and Book,* 1:531 sq.): "These farmers about us belong to el-Mughar, and their land extends to the declivity immediately above Gennesaret, a distance of at least eight miles from their village. Our farmers would think it hard to travel so far before they began the day's work, and so would these if they had it to do every day; but they drive their oxen before them, carry bed, bedding, and board, plow, yoke, and seed on their donkeys, and expect to remain out in the open country until their task is accomplished. The mildness of the climate enables them to do so without inconvenience or injury. How very different from the habits of Western farmers! These men carry no cooking apparatus, and, we should think, no provisions. They, however, have a quantity of their thin, tough bread, a few olives, and perhaps a little cheese in that leathern bag which hangs from their shoulders — the 'scrip' of the New Testament — and with this they are contented. When hungry, they sit by the fountain or the brook, and eat; if weary or sleepy, they throw around them their loose *'aba*, and lie down on the ground as contentedly as the ox himself. At night they retire to a cave, sheltering rock, or shady tree, kindle a fire of thornbushes, heat over their stale bread, and, if they have shot a bird or caught a fish, they broil it on

the coals, and thus dinner and supper in one are achieved with the least possible trouble. But their great luxury is smoking, and the whole evening is whiled away in whiffing tobacco and bandying the rude jokes of the light-hearted peasant. Such a life need not be disagreeable, nor is it necessarily a severe drudgery in this delightful climate. The only thing they dread is an incursion of wild Arabs from beyond the lake, and to meet them they are all armed as if going forth to war." *SEE AGRICULTURE.*

Farmer, Hugh

a learned Independent minister, was born in 1714, near Shrewsbury, England. He studied under Doddridge, and gained his entire esteem and approbation. On leaving Northampton, he became assistant to Mr. David Some. His services, however, proving acceptable to the Dissenters in the neighborhood of Walthamstow, a place of worship was soon built, and for many years he continued there. In 1761 he became afternoon lecturer at Salters' Hall, and soon after Tuesday lecturer at the "Merchants' lecture." As he declined in years, he gradually relinquished his engagements as a preacher. In 1772 he resigned the afternoon lecture at Salters' Hall, and eight years after he gave up the Tuesday morning sermon; but he did not leave his church at Walthamstow till a few years later, when he gave up pulpit exercises entirely. He died February 6, 1787. He published *A Dissertation on Miracles* (London, 1771, 8vo); *An Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness* (London, 1776, 8vo, 3d ed.); and An *Essay on the Deaoniacs of the New Testament* (London, 1775, 8vo), in which he endeavored to prove that these were not cases of real possession, but of persons afflicted wtih epilepsy or madness. "This publication was answered by the late Mr. Feal, one of the tutors of Homerton Academy; and a controversy ensued, in which much acrimony of temper was discovered on both sides. Mr. Farmer was rather of a high spirit and hasty temper; but, abating these defects, he was a most estimable man," though he allowed himself larger liberty in speculation than was common in that age. Thus he interprets the temptation of Christ as a vision, and demoniacal possession as a disease. *SEE DEMONIACS*. A clause in his will directed his manuscripts to be burned; among them was a treatise on Balaam, and a revised edition of his essay on miracles. See Dodson, *Memoirs of Farmer* (London, 1805, 8vo); Jones, *Christian Biography*, page 145.

Farneworth, Ellis

an English divine, was born in the parish of Bonsall, Derbyshire, England, of which his father was rector, pursued his studies first at Chesterfield School, then at Eton, and then at Jesus College, Cambridge. In 1763 he was presented to the rectory of Carsington, in his native county, where he died in 1763. His works, which are all translations, are:

1. *Life of Pope Sextus V,* from the Italian of Gregorio Leti, with Preface, etc. (London, 1754, fol., and Dublin, 1778, 8vo): —

2. *A Short History of the Israelites,* from abbe Fleury's *Les Fleurs des Israelites* (Lond. 1756, 8vo; new editiaon by Adam Clarke, Lond. 1805, 12mo; republished N.Y. in 16mo): —

3. *The History of the Civil Wars of France,* from the Italian of Davila (1757, 2 volumes, 4to): —

4. *The Works of Machiavelli,* translated, with Notes, Anecdotes, and Life (1761, 2 volumes, 4to, and 1775, 4 volumes, 8vo), a work not appreciated during the life of the translator, but now commanding a high price (Disraeli, *Calamities of Authors,* Lond. and N.Y. 1859, page 84). See Rose, *New Genesis Biog. Dict*., and Allibone, *Dict. of Authors,* s.v. (J.W.M.)

Farnovius

(STANISLAUS FARNOUSKI or FARNESIUS), one of the principal Antitrinitarians of Poland, was a pupil of Peter Gonesius (q.v.). After siding for some time with the Socinians, he became in 1567 a violent champion of the right wing of Unitarianism, teaching, in the true Arian sense, the subjection of the Son to the Father, without, however, denying the preexistence of the supernatural part of his nature. The followers of his system are called Farnovians or Farnesians. Farnovius vigorously attacked the Socinian wing which maintained that Christ was essentially a man, but is to be worshipped as God since his ascension. He found it difficult, however, to retain the half-way position he had taken, and in the course of events most of his followers joined the main body of the Unitarians, especially when Socinus became the chief of that party. His own school vanished at his death, about 1614. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:331; Zeltner, *Hist. Crypto-Socinismi,* 1:1201; Bock, *Hist. Antitrinitariorum;* 0.

Fock, *Socinianismus,* 1:155 sq.; Mosheim, *Church History,* 3:242; Trechsel, *Die protest. Antitrinitarier,* volumes 1 and 2.

Faroe Islands

SEE DENMARK.

Farrant, Richard

an eminent composer of music, and regarded as one of the fathers of Church music in England, was born in the early part of the 16th century, and died about 1585. His name appears on the list of gentlemen of the chapel to Edward VI in 1564, and he was afterwards organist and master of the choristers of St. George's Chapel, Windsor. His "compositions for the Church, simple as they seem, are so solemn, so devout, so tender, and affecting, that they may:challenge comparison with the sacred music of any age or country" *(Pictorial Hist.).* Many of his pieces are found in the collections of Boyce and Barnard. The best are, "Hide not thou thy face," "Call to remembrance," and "Lord, for thy tender mercy's sake." — Rose, *New Genesis Biog. Dict.;* Allibone, *Diet. of Authors; Pictorial Hist. of England,* 3:562 (Chambers' ed.). (J.W.M.)

Farthing

Picture for Farthing 1

is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. for two Roman coins of different values. *SEE MONEY.*

1. The *assarius* (Graecized ἀσσάριον, <40:10:29>Matthew 10:29; <42:12:6>Luke 12:6), properly a small *as, assarium,* but in the time of our Lord used as the Gr. equivalent of the Lat. *as.* In the texts cited it is put (like our term "a copper") for any trifling amount. The Vulg. in <40:10:29>Matthew 10:29 renders it by *as,* and in <42:12:6>Luke 12:6, puts *dipondius* for two *assaria,* the *dipondius* or *dupondius* being equal to two *ases.* The ἀσσάριον is therefore either the Roman *as,* or the more common equivalent in Palestine in the Graeco-Roman series, or perhaps both. The rendering of the Vulg. in <42:12:6>Luke 12:6 makes it probable that a single coin is intended by two *assaria,* and this opinion is strengthened by the occurrence, on coins of Chios, struck during the imperial period, but without the heads of emperors, and therefore of the *Greek autonomous* class, of the words ACCAPION, ACCAPIA AYO, ACCAPIA TPIA. The *half assarion* of the same island has also been

found, yet it is of the same size as the full *assarion* (Akerman, *Numismatic Ilustrations of the New Testament,* page 7).

The proper *as* was a copper coin, the Roman unit of value for small sums, equal to a tenth of the *denarius* or *drachma,* i.e., 1½ cents (Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. As). *SEE PENNY.*

Picture for Farthing 2

Picture for Farthing 3

Picture for Farthing 4

2. The *quadrans (Grae.* cized κοδράντης, <41526>Matthew 5:26; <41242>Mark 12:42), the fourth of an *as,* equal to two *lepta* (Mark, l.c.), a small copper coin, equal nearly to two fifths of a cent. The name *quadrans* was originally given to the piece of three ounces, therefore also called *teruncius.* Hence it bore three balls as its distinctive mark (Kitto, *Pictorial Bible,* note on Mark, 1.c.). The *lepton,* small Greek copper coin, seven of which with the Athenians went to the χαλκοῦς, or *bronze* piece. The copper currency of Palestine, in the reign of Tiberius, was partly of Roman coins, partly of Graco-Roman (technically *Greek linperial).* In the former class there was no common piece smaller than the *as,* equivalent to the ἀσσάριον of the N.T. (above), but in the latter there were two common smaller pieces, the one apparently the quarter of the ἀσσάριον, and the other its eighth, though the irregularity with which they were struck makes it difficult to pronounce with certainty; the former piece was doubtless called the κοδράντης, or *quadrans,* and the latter the λεπτόν, or *lepton. SEE MITE.*

Fascination

SEE CHARM.

Fassari, Vincent

a Sicilian theologian, was born in Palermo in 1599, and died in the same city in 1663. He became a Jesuit in 1614, and taught successively belles-lettres, philosophy, theology, and the Scriptures. Of his religious and philosophical works, the most important are *Disputationes philosophicae, de quantitate, ejusque Compositione, Essentia,* etc. (Palermo, 1644, fol.); and *Immaculata Deiparce Conceptio theologicae Commissa trutinae*

(Lyons, 1666, fol.). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale;* Mongitore, *Bibliotheca Sicula; Bibliotheque des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jesus.* (J.W.M.)

Fassoni, Liberato

an Italian theologian, was born about A.D. 1700, and died at Rome in 1767. He was professor of theology in the college of his order at Rome. We have from him *De Leibnitiano Rat. Princ.* (Sinigaglia, 1754, fol.): — *De Graeca Sacrarum Litterarum editione a LXX interpretibus* (Urbino, 1754, fol.): *De Piorum in sinu Abrahae beatitudine ante Christi mortem* (Rome, 1760, 4to). — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale.* (J.W.M.)

Fast

(properly, μWx, *tsum,* strictly, *to keep the mouth shut;* νηστεύω, strictly, *not to eat).* In the early ages of the world, when the spontaneous productions of nature and the spoils of the chase formed man's chief aliment, fasting from time to time was compulsory, in consequence of the uncertainty of obtaining food when wanted. It would be easy for superstitious ignorance to interpret this compulsion into an expression of the divine will, and so to sanction the observance of fasting as a religious duty. The transition would be the easier at a time and in countries when the office of physician was united in the same person with that of priest; for in hot climates occasional abstinence is not without its advantages on the health; and an abstinence which the state of the body required, but which the appetite shunned or refused, the authority of the priest and the sanctions of religion would exact at once with ease and certainty. In the earlier stages of civilization no idea is more prevalent and operative than that the Deity is propitiated by voluntary sufferings on the part of his' creatures. Hence ensued all kinds of bodily mortifications, and even the sacrifice of life itself. Nay, "the fruit of the body" — the dear pledges of mutual affection, the best earthly gift from the heavenly Father — children, were sacrificed in expiation of "the sin of the soul." Human enjoyments were held to be displeasing in the sight of God. The notion that the gods were jealous of man's happiness runs through the entire texture of Greek and Roman mythology; and the development of this falsehood, as presented in Greek tragedy, has given birth to some of the finest productions of the human mind. But what more pleasurable than food to man, especially to the semi-barbarian? The denial of such a pleasure must

then be well-pleasing to the Divinity, the rather because, on occasions of family bereavement, of national disaster, or any great calamity, the appetite is naturally affected under the influence of grief, and is made to loathe the food which in its ordinary condition it finds most grateful. A connection between sorrow and fasting would thus be established which would carry with it a sort of divine siaction in being natural and inevitable in its origin. Accordingly, abstinence, which seemed imposed by Providence, if not in expiation of guilt, yet as an accompaniment of sorrow, easily became regarded as a religious duty when voluntarily prolonged or assumed, and grew to be considered as an efficacious means for appeasing the divine wrath, and restoring prosperity and peace. "Climate, the habits of a people, and their creed, gave it at different periods different characteristics; but it may be pronounced to have been a recognized institution with all the more civilized nations, especially those of Asia, throughout all historic times. We findd it in high estimation among the ancient Parsees of Irania. It formed a prominent feature in the ceremonies of the mysteries of Mithras; and found its way, together with these, over Armenia, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia Minor, to Palestine, and northward to the wilds of Scythia. The ancient Chinese and Hindus, and principally the latter, in accordance with their primeval view — which they held in conmmon with the Parsees — of heaven and hell, salvation and damnation, of the transmigration of the soul, and of the body as the temporary prison of a fallen spirit, carried fasting to an unnatural excess. Although the Vedas attach little importance to the excrumciation of the body, yet the Pavaka, by the due observance of which the Hindu believer is purified from all his sins, requires, among other things, an uninterrupted fast for the space of twelve days. Egypt seems to have had few or no compulsory general fasts; but it is established beyond doubt that for the initiation into the mysteries of His and Osiris, temporary abstinence was rigorously enforced. In Siam, all solems acts are preceded by a period of fasting, the seasons of the new and full moon being especially consecrated to this rite. In Java, where abstinence from the flesh of oxen is part of the religion of all, Buddhists and emorshippers of Brahma alike, the manner and times of the observance vary according to the religion of the individual. Again, in Tibet, the Dalailamaites and Bogdolamaites hold this law in common. That Greece observed and gave a high place to occasional fast-days — such as the third day of the festival of the Eleusinian mysteries, and that, for instance, those who came to consult the oracle of Trophonius had to abstain from food for twenty-four hours — is well known. It need hardly be added that the Romans did not omit so

important an element of the festivals and ceremonies which they adopted from their neighbors, though with them the periods of fasting were of less frequent recurrence" (Chambers, Encyclopedia, s.v.). The Mohammedans fast (till sunset) during the, whole of their ninth (lunar) month Ramadan (see D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Or.* s.v.). (On this religious observance among pagan nations, consult Meiners, *Gesch. der Relig.* 2:139; Lakemacher, *Antiq. Grcec. Sacr.* page 626; Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthum.* 2:237; Bottiger, *Kunstmythol.* 1:132.) *SEE ASCETICISM.*

I. *Jewish Fasting.* — The word μWx (νηστεία, *juni*um) is not found in the Pentateuch, but it often occurs in the historical books and the prophets (<101216>2 Samuel 12:16; <121209>1 Kings 21:9-12; <150821>Ezra 8:21; <196910>Psalm 69:10; <235805>Isaiah 58:5; <290114>Joel 1:14; 2:15; <300819>Zechariah 8:19, etc.). In the law the only term used to denote the religious oaservance of fasting is the more significant one, hNi[ivpn). *(*ταπεινοῦν τὴν ψυχήν*; affligeae* animam), "affflicting the soul" (<031629>Leviticus 16:29731; 23:27; <040103>Numbers 30:13). The word tyni[]Fi, i.e., *affliction,* which occurs <150905>Ezra 9:5, where it is rendered in A.V. "heaviness," is commonly used to denote fasting is the Talmuda, and is the title of one of its treatises.

The sacrifice of the personal will, which gives to fasting all its value, is expressed in the old term used in the law, *afflicting the soul.* The faithful son of Israel realized the blessing of "chastening his soul with fasting" (<196910>Psalm 69:10). But the frequent admonitions and stern denunciations of the prophets may show us how prone the Jews were in their formal fasts to lose the idea of a spiritual discipline, and to regard them as being in themselves a means of winning favoifroma God, or, in a still worse spirit, to make a parade of them in order to appear religious before seen (<235803>Isaiah 58:3; <380705>Zechariah 7:5, 6; <390314>Malachi 3:14; comp. <401616>Matthew 6:16).

The Jewish fasts were observed with various degrees of strictness. Sometimes there was entire abstinence frona food (<170416>Esther 4:16, etc.). On other occasions there appears to have been only a restriction to a very plain diet (<270103>Daniel 10:3). Rules are given in the Talmud (both in *Yoma* sand *Taanith)* as to the mode in which fasting is to be observed on particular occasions, The fast of the day, according to Josephus (Ant. 3:10, 3), Was considered to terminate at sunset, and St. Jerome speaks of the fasting Jew as anxiously waiting for the rising of the stars. Fasts were not

observed on the sabbaths, the new maoons, the great festivals, or the feasts of Purim and Dedication (Judith 8:6; *Taanith,* 2:10).

Those who fasted frequently dressed in sackcloth or rent their clothes, put ashes on their head and went barefoot (<12127>1 Kings 21:27; comp. Josepheus, Ant. 8:13, 8; <16901>Nehemiah 9:1; <19513>Psalm 35:13). The rabbinical directions for the ceremonies to be observed in public fasts, and the prayers to be used in theam, may be seen in *Taanith,* 2:1-4 (see the *Cod. Talm. "Taanith," c. verss. et notis* De Lundii, Traj. ad Rh. 1694, 8vo). Consult also Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezeka, Hilchoth Taunioth,* 1:315 sq.; Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraic* on <42182>Luke 18:12; Schottgen, *Horae Hebraicae* on <42182>Luke 18:12 Reland, *Antiquitates Sacrae Veteruin Hebraorum* (1717), page 538 sq.; Bloch, in Geiger's *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift fur judische Theol.* 4:205 sq.; Fink, in Ersch und Grasber's *Encyklopadie,* s.v. Fasten; Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten* (Leipzig, 1857), 1:184 sq.; Bauer, *Gottesd. Verf.* 1:348 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* page 233 sq.

1. The sole fast required by Moses was on the great day of annual atonement. This observance seems always to have retained some prominence as "the fast" (<44209>Acts 27:9). But what the observance of the enjoined duty involved we are nowhere expressly informed, and can approximate to a knowledge of precise details only so far as later practices among the Jews may be considered as affording a faithful picture of this divinely-sanctioned ordinance. In these remarks the opinion is implied that "the fast," whatever importance it may have subsequently acquired, was originally only an incident, not to say an accident, in the great solemnity of the annual atonement. *SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF*.

There is no mention of any other periodical fast in the O.T. except in <38701>Zechariah 7:1-7; 8:19. From these passages it appears that the Jews, during their captivity, observed four annual fasts in the fourth, fifth, seventh, aelnd tenth months. When the building of the second Temple had commenced, those who remained in Babylon sent a message to the priests at Jerusalem to inquire whether the observance of the fast in the fifth month should not be discontinued. The prophet takes the occasion to rebuke the Jews for the spirit in which they had observed the fast of the seventh emonth as well as that of the fifth (<38705>Zechariah 7:5-6); and afterwards (<38819>Zechariah 8:19), giving the subject an evangelical turn, he declares that the whole of the four fasts shall be turned to "joys and gladness, and cheerful feasts." Zechariah simply distinguishes the fasts by

the months in which they were observed; but the Mishna (Taanith, 4:6) and St. Jerome (in Zechariah 8) give statements of certain historical events which they were intended to commemorate:

(1.) The fast of the fourth month. — Kept on the 17th of Tamnmuz, to commemorate the making of the golden calf by the Jews, the breaking of the tables of the law by Moses (Exodus 24; comp. 33:3), the failure of the daily sacrifice for emant of cattle during the siege, and the storming of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (Jeremiah 52).

(2.) The fast of the fifth month. — Kept on the 9th of Ab, to commemorate the decree that those who had left Egypt should not enter Canaan (<04427>Numbers 14:27, etc.); the Temple burnt by Nebuchadnezzar. and again by Titus; and the ploughing up of the site of the Temple, with the capture of Bether, in which a vast number of Jews from Jerusalem had taken refuge in the time of Hadrian (comp. Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten,* 3:240).

(3.) The fast of the seventh month. — Commemorating the complete sack of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and the death of Gedaliah (2 Kings 25), on the 3d of Tisri (comp. *Sedera Olam Rabba, c.* 26).

(4.) The fast of the tenth month. — On the 10th of Tebeth, to commemorate the receiving by Ezekiel and the other captives in Babylon of the news of the destructian of Jerusalem (<263321>Ezekiel 33:21; compare <122501>2 Kings 25:1).

These four fasts have been Christianized, and tradition tells us that their transfer into the Christian Church was made by the Roman bishop Callistus (flour. A.D. 223). To deprive them, however, of their Jewish appearance, the whole year was divided into four seasons (quatnor tempora), and a fast was appointed for one week of each season (compare Herzog, *Encyklopadie,* 3:336).

(5.) The fast of Esther. — Additional to the above; kept on the 13th of Adar (<170416>Esther 4:16). *SEE ESTHER (FAST OF).*

Some other events mentioned in the Mishna are omitted as unimportant. Of those here stated several could have had nothing to do with the fasts in the time of the prophet. It would seem most probable, from the mode in which he has grouped them together, that the original purpose of all four was to commemorate the circumstances connected with the commencement of the captivity, and that the other events were subsequently associated with them

on the ground of some real or fancied coincidence of the time of occurrence. As regards the fast of the fifth month, at least, it can hardly be doubted that the captive Jews applied it exclusively to the destruction of the Temple, and that St. Jerome was right in regarding as the reason of their request to be released from its observance the fact that it had no longer any purpose after the new Temple was begun. As this fast (as well as the three others) is still retained in the Jewish calendar, we must infer either that the priests did not agree with the Babylonian Jews, or that the fast, having been discontinued for a time, was renewed after the destruction of the Temple by Titus.

The number of annual fasts in the present Jewish calendar has been multiplied to twenty-eight, a list of which is given by Reland *(Antiq.* page 274). *SEE CALENDAR.*

2. Public fasts were occasionally proclaimed to express national humiliation on account of sin or misfortune, and to supplicate divine favor in regard to some great undertaking or threatened danger. In the case of public danger, the proclamation appears to have been accompanied with the blowing of trumpets (<290201>Joel 2:1-15; comp. *Taanith,* 1:6). The following instances are recorded of strictly national fasts: Samuel gathered "all Israel" to Mizpeh and proclaimed a fast, performing at the same time what seems to have been a rite symbolical of purification, when the people confessed their sin in having worshipped Baalimn and Ashtaroth (<090706>1 Samuel 7:6); Jehoshaphat appointed one "throughout all Judah" when he was preparing for war against Moab and Ammon (<142003>2 Chronicles 20:3); in the reign of Jehoiakim, one was proclaimed for "all the people in Jerusalem, and all who came thither out of the cities of Judah," when the prophecy of Jeremiah was publicly read by Baruch (<243606>Jeremiah 36:6-10; comp. Baruch 1:5); three days after the feast of Tabernacles, when the second Temple was completed, "the children of Israel assembled with fasting, and with sackclothes and earth upon them," to hear the law read, and to confess their sins (<160901>Nehemiah 9:1). There are references to general fasts in the prophets (<290114>Joel 1:14; 2:15; Isaiah 58), and two are noticed in the books, of the Maccabees (1 Macc. 3:46-47; 2 Macc. 13:10-12).

There are a considerable number of instances of cities and bodies of men observing fasts on occasions in which they were especially concerned. In the days of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, when the men of Judah had been defeated by those of Benjamin, they fasted in making preparation for

another battle (<072026>Judges 20:26). David and his men fasted for a day on account of the death of Saul (<100112>2 Samuel 1:12), and the men of Jabesh Gilead fasted seven days on Saul's burial (<091313>1 Samuel 31:13). Jezebel, in the name of Ahab, appointed a fast for the inhabitants of Jezreel, to render more striking, as it would seem, the punishment about to be inflicted on Naboth (<111209>1 Kings 21:9-12). Ezra proclaimed a fast for his companions at the river of Ahava, when he was seeking for God's help and guidance in the work he was about to undertake (<150821>Ezra 8:21-23). Esther, when she was going to intercede with Ahasuerus, commanded the Jews of Shushan neither to eat nor drink for three days (<170416>Esther 4:16). A fast of great strictness is recorded in the Scriptures as having been proclaimed by the heathen king of Nineveh to avert the destruction threatened by Jehovah (<032005>Jonah 2:5-9).

Public fasts expressly on account of unseasonable weather and of famine may perhaps be traced in the first and second chapters of Joel. In later times they assumed great importance, and form the main subject of the treatise Taanith in the Mishna. The Sanhedrim ordered general fasts when the nation was threatened with any great evil, such as drought or famine (Josephus, *Life,* § 56; *Taanith,* 1:5), as was usual with the Romans in their supplications (Livy, 3:7; 10:23).

3. Private occasional fasts are recognised in one passage of the law (<043013>Numbers 30:13). The instances given of individuals fasting under the influence of grief, vexation, or anxiety are numerous (<090107>1 Samuel 1:7, 20:34; <100335>2 Samuel 3:35; 12:16; <112127>1 Kings 21:27; <150106>Ezra 10:6; <160104>Nehemiah 1:4; <270103>Daniel 10:3). The fasts of forty days of Moses (<022418>Exodus 24:18; 34:28; <051018>Deuteronomy 9:18) and of Elijah (<111908>1 Kings 19:8) are, of course, to be regarded as special acts of spiritual discipline, faint though wonderful shadows of that fast in the wilder ness of Judaea, in which all true fasting finds its mean ing (<400401>Matthew 4:1, 2). After the exile private fasts became verya frequert (Lightfoot, p. 318), awaiting the call of no special occasion, but entering as a regular part of the current religious worship (Sueton. *Aug.* 76; Tacit. *Hist.* 5:4, 3). In Judith 8:6 we read that Judith fasted all the days of her widowhood, "save the eves of the sabbaths, and the sabbaths, and the eves of the new moons, and the new moons, and the feasts and the solemn days of the house of Israel." In Tobit 12 prayer is declared to be good with fasting; see also <420237>Luke 2:37; <400914>Matthew 9:14. The parable of the Pharisee and Publican (<421809>Luke 18:9; comp. <400914>Matthew 9:14) shows how much the Pharisees were given to

voluntary and private fasts, "I fast twice a week." The first was on the fifth day of the week, on which Moses ascended to the top of Mount Sinai; the second was on the second day, on which he came down *(Taanith,* 2:9; *Hieros. Mlegillah,* 75, 1). This bi-weekly fasting has also been adopted in the Christian Church; but Monday and Thursday were changed to Wednesday and Friday *(feria quarta et sexta),* as commemorative of the betrayal and crucifixion of Christ. Of a similar semi-occasional character was the *First-born sons' fast* (d/kB] tyni[ ]T), on the day precedrng the feast of Passover, in commemoration of the fact that while God on that occasion smote all the first-born of the Egyptians, he spared those of the house of Israel (comp. <02129>Exodus 12:29, etc.; *Sopherim,* 21:3). *SEE FIRST-BORN*. The Essenes and the Therapeutae also were much given to such observances (Philo, *Vit. Contenmpl.* page 613; Euseb. *Prop. Evan.* 9:3). Fasts were considered a useful exercise in preparing the mind for special religious impressions; as in <27002>Daniel 10:2 sq. (see also <44103>Acts 13:3; 14:23). From <40172>Matthew 17:21: "Howbeit this kind (of demons) goeth not out but by prayer and fasting," it would appear that the practice under consideration was considered in the days of Christ to act in certain special cases as an exorcism.

Fasting (as stated above) was accompanied by the ordinary signs of grief among the Israelites, as may be seen in 1 Macc. 3:47. The abstinence was either partial or total. In the case of the latter food was entirely foregone, but this ordinarily took place only in fasts of short duration; and abstinence from food in Eastern climes is more easy and less detrimental (if not in some cases positively useful) than keeping from food would be with us in these cold, damp Northern regions (<17046>Esther 4:16). In the case of partial abstinence the time was longer, the denial in degree less. When Daniel (10: 2) was " mourning three full weeks," he ate no "*pleasant* bread, neither came *flesh* nor *wine* in his mouth." There does not appear to have been any fixed and recognized periods during which these fasts endured. From one day to forty days fasts were observed. The latter period appears to have been regarded with feelings of peculiar sanctity, owing, doubtless, to the above instances in Jewish history. There are monographs, entitled *De jejuniis Hebraeorum,* by Opitz (Kil. 1680), Peringer (Holm. 1684), and Lund (Aboae, 1696).

II. *In New Testament.* — We have already seen how qualified the sanction was which Moses gave to the observance of fasting as a religious duty. In

the same spirit which actuated him, the prophets bore testimony against the lamentable abuses to which the practice was turned in the lapse of time and with the increase of social corruption (<23804>Isaiah 58:4 sq.; <24142>Jeremiah 14:12; <38705>Zechariah 7:5). Continuing the same species of influence and perfecting that spirituality in religion which Moses began, our Lord rebuked the Pharisees sternly for their outward and hypocritical pretences in the fasts which they observed (<40616>Matthew 6:16 sq.), and actually abstained from appointing any fast whatever as a part of his own religion. In <40914>Matthew 9:14, the question of the reason of this avoidance is expressly put, “Whydo we (the disciples of John) and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?" The answer shows the voluntary character of fasting in the Christian Church, "Can the children of the bridechamber fast?"

It is true that a period is alluded to when these children "shall fast;" but the general scope of the passage, taken in connection with the fact that Christ's disciples fasted not, and with the other fact, that while John (<40118>Matthew 11:18, 19) "came neither eating nor drinking," the Son of man "came eating and drinking," clearly shows that our Lord, as he did not positively enjoin religious fasting, so by the assertion that a time would come when, being deprived of the (personal presence of the) bridegroom, his disciples would fast, meant to intimate the approach of a period of general mourning, and employed the term "fast" derivatively to signify rather sorrow of mind than any corporeal self-denial (Neander, *Leben Jesu*, pages 231, 305). In his sermon on the mount, however (<40617>Matthew 6:17), while correcting the self-righteous austerity of Pharisaic fasting, he clearly allows the practice itself, but leaves the frequency, extent, and occasion of its performance to the private conscience and circumstances of each individual. That the early Christians observed the ordinary fasts which the public practice of their day sanctioned is clear from more than one passage in the New-Testament Scriptures (<44132>Acts 13:2; 14:23; <470605>2 Corinthians 6:5); but in this they probably did nothing more than yield obedience, as in general they thought themselves bound to do, to the law of their fathers so long as the Mosaic institutions remained entire. Although the great body of the Christian Church held themselves free from all ritual and ceremonial observances when God in his providence had brought Judaism to a termination in the rasure of the holy city and the closing of the Temple, yet the practice of fasting thus originated might easily and unobservedly have been transmitted from year to year and from age to age, and that the rather

because so large a portion of the disciples being Jews (to say nothing of the influence of the Ebionites in the primitive Church), thousands must have been accustomed to fasting from the earliest days of their existence, either in their own practice, or the practice of their fathers, relatives, and associates (comp. Corinthians 7:5). *SEE FASTING*.

Literature. — Ciacconius, *De jejuniis apud antiquos* (Romans 1599); Tiegenhorn, *Descriptio jejuniorum* (Jen. 1607); Drexel, *Dejrjunio* (Antw. 1637); Dalleus, *De jejuniis et Quadragesima* (Dauentr. 1654); Ortlob, *De ritu jejuniorum* (Viteb. 1656); Lochner, *De jejunio contra pontificios* (Rost. 1656); Launoy, *De ciborum delectu in jejuniis* (Par. 1663); Funke, *Dejejuniis* (Altenb. 1663); Nicolai, *Dejejunio Christiano* (Par. 1667); Sommer, *De jejuniorum natura* (Jen. 1670); Sagittarius, *De jejuniis veterum* (Jen. 1672); Varenius, *Jejunium Christianorum* (Rost. 1684); Salden, *De jejuniis* (in *Otia theol.* [Amst. 1684], page 658 sq.); Thomasin, *Traite des jeunes* (Paris, 1690); Hooper, *Discourse concerning Lent* (Lond. 1696); Ortlob, *De jejunio Mosis quadragesim Tali* (Lips. 1701); Andry, *Le regime de careme* (Par. 1710); Pfanner, *De jejuniis Christianor.* (in *Obss. sacr.* 2:324-520); Mabillen, *Jeune de l'Ep'phanie* (in *(Euvresposth.* 1:431 sq.); Hildebrand, *De jejunio* (Helmst. 1719); Bohmer, De *jure cira jejunantes* (Hal. 1722); Schutz, *De quat. temporum jejuniis* (Wemig. 1723); Volland, *De jejuniis Sabbaticis* (Rost. 1724); Muratori, *De quat. temporuns jejuniis* (in *Anecd.* 2:246 sq.); Bernhold, *De jejunio partiali* (Altd. 1725); Walchf *De jejunio quadragesimali* (Jena, 1727); Bernhold, *De jejunio spirituali* (Altorf. 1736); Carpzov, *Dejejuniis Sabbaticis* (Rost. 1741); Seelen, *De jejuniis Sabbaticis* (Rost. 1741-2); Becker, *De jejuniis vett. Christianorum* (Leucop. 1742); Ehrlich, *De Quadragesimae jejunio* (Lips. 1744); Kiesling, *De xerophagia ap. Judeos et Christianos* (Lips. 1746); Seidel, *De Hieronymo, jejunii suasore* (Lond. 1747); Schickedanz, *De jejunio Sabbatico* (Servest. 1768); Karner, Jejunium *Christo* propasitum (Lips. 1776); Anon. *Gesch. den Fastenaustalten* (Vien. 1787); Anon. *Apologie dujeune* (Par. and Genev. 1790); Van Falekenhausen, *Ueb. d. 40thg.* Fisitengebet (Augsburg, 1809); Brauan, *Verth. d. Fastens* (AVien. 1830); Morin, *Jeune chez les anciens* (in Mim. *da l'Acad. des Inscr.* 4:29 sq.). On fasting in the Christian Church, *SEE FASTING*.

Fastidius

Priscus, an English writer, and, according to some authorities, bishop of London in the 5th century. He is proved by Holstenius to be the author of a treatise found in Augustine's works, volume 9, and published by Holstenius (Rome, 1663) under the title *De Vita Christiana et Viduotate.* Its precepts are good and practical, but Tillenont (Mem. 15:16) considers it as tending to Pelagianism, inasmuch as it reduces Christianity to love of God and our neighbors, including good works. It is given, with prolegomaena, in Galland, *Bib. Vet. Patr.* t. 9, and is reprinted in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* 1:377 sq. — Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Lit.* 2:152; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* 1:401.

Fasting In The Christian Church.

In the article FAST *SEE FAST* we have given an account of Jewish fasting, and also of the notices of fasting in the N.T. 'We confine ourselves in this article to a history of fasting in the Christian Church.

I. *Early Church.* — Fasting and abstinence have been practiced in the Christian Church from the beginning, *SEE ABSTINENCE*, as means of self-discipline. Where the ascetic spirit has prevailed, fasting has been used as a means of mortification and penance. *SEE ASCETICISM; SEE MORTIFICATION; SEE PENANCE.* In the N.T. fasting appears either (1) as a token of sorrow or repentance, or (2) as a means of preparation for and aid in the discharge of spiritual duties (e.g. prayer, etc.). It was free from superstition; and the N.T. nowhere makes fasting, of itself, a means of grace. But the ascetic tendency in the early Church led to reliance on fasting, etc., as not only helps to, but substitutes for, the inward and spiritual life. The theory which placed the origin and seat of sin in the body, *SEE SIN*, also tended to give value to the practice of fasting. It came at last to be considered as an effectual means of securing forgiveness of sin. The earliest notices of fasting in the Christian writers are in a better vein. "The days of holy consecration, of penitence and prayer, which individual Christians appointed for their own use, were oftentimes also a sort of fast-days. That they might be less disturbed by sense while their minds were intent on holy things, they were accustomed on such days to confine their bodily wants within stricter limits than usual, or else to fast entirely; where we must take into consideration the peculiar nature of that hot climate in ebhich Christianity first began to spread. Whatever they saved by their

abstinence on these days was appropriated to the maintenance of the poor brethren" (Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's, 2:274).

We cite some of the *Apostolical Fathers.* Hermias (1st century), *Shepherd (Simil.* 5, chapter 3): "This fasting is very good, provided that the commandments of the Lord be observed. Observe as follows the fasting you intend to keep. First of all, refrain both from speaking and from hearing what is wrong; and cleanse thy heart from all pollution, from all revengeful feelings, and from all covetousness; sand on the day thou fastest content thyself with bread, vegetables, and water, and thank God for these. But reckon up what thy meal on this day would have cost thee, and give the amount to some widow, or orphan, or to the poor. Happy for thee if, with thy children and whole household, thou observest these things." (See also Simil. 5, chapter 1.) The *Epistle of Barnabas* declares that the Jewish fasts are not true fasts, nor acceptable unto God, and cites <235804>Isaiah 58:4-9, as giving the true fast "which God hath chosen." The *Epistle of Polycarp* ,(2d century) exhorts Christians "to return to the word handed down from the beginning, watching unto prayer, and perseveringa in fasting" (chapter 7). Justin Martyr (t 165) also cites Isaiah 58 as giving the "true fast," and applies it to practical life. He speaks, how, ever, of fasting being joined with prayer is the administration of baptism *(Dial. c. Tryph.* ch. 15). Irenaeus (t 200) speaks of the fast before Easter, and says, "Not only is the dispute respecting the day, but also respecting the manner of fasting. For some think they ought to fast only one day, some two, some more days; some compute their days as consisting of forty hours night and day; and this diversity existing among those that observe it is not a matter that has just sprung up in our times, but long ago among those before us, who perhaps, not having ruled with sufficient strictness, established the practice that arose from their simplicity and inexperience. And yet with all, these maintained peace, and we have maintained peace with one another; and the very, difference ie our fasting establishes the unanimity in our faith" (Eusebius, *Ch. history*, 5:24). Clement of Alexandria (t 220?) notices the fact that many kinds of pagan worship required celibacy and abstinence from ameat and wine in'their priests; that there were rigid ascetics among the Indians, namely, the Sancaneats, and hente argued that usages which may exist also in other religions, and even be combined with superstition, cannot, in themselves considered, be peculiarly Christian. He then adds: "Paul declares that the kingdom of heaven consists not in meat and drink, neither therefore in abstaining from wine and flesh, but in righteousness

and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. As humility is shown, not by the castigation of the body, but by gentleness of disposition, so also abstinence is a virtue of the soul, consisting not in that which is without, but is that which is within the man. Abstinence has reference not to some one thing alone, not merely to pleasure, but it is abstinence also to despise nmoney, to tame the tongue, and to obtain bv reason the dominion over sin" (Strong. lib. 3). Clement also speaks of weekly fasts as the usage of the Church. It appears to be clear that weekly fasts were observed in the Church before the end of the 2d century, but that they were not enforced as essential means of grace. The Montanists were rigorous to excess with regard to fasting. "Besides the usual fasts, they observed special *xerophagiae (aridius victus),* as they were called; seasons of two weeks for eating only dry, or, properly, uncooked food, bread, salt, and water. The Church refused to sanction these excesses as a general rule, but alloweed ascetics to carry fasting even to extremnes. A confessor in Lyons, for example, lived on bread and water alone, but forsook that austerity when reminded that he gave offense to other Christians by so despising the gifts of God" (Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1, § 90). Tertullian (t c. 220), in his *De Jejuniis,* complains of the little attention paid by the Catholic Church to the practice of fasting, thereby showing that liberty of judgment was exercised with regard to it. Origen speaks of Wednesdays and Fridays in the Church at Alexandria as fastdays, on the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday and crucified on a Friday (Hom. 10 on *Leviticus).*

By the 6th century fasting ceased to be a voluntary exercise; for by the second Council of Orleans, A.D. 541, it was decreed that any one neglecting to observe the stated times of abstinence should be treated as an offender against the laws of the Church. In the 8th century it was regarded as meritorious, and the breach of the observance subjected the offender to the penalty of excommunication. In later times, some persons who ate flesh during prescribed seasons of abstinence cere punished with the loss of their teeth. These severities were, however, subsequently relaxed, and pernission was given to use all kinds of food, except flesh, eggs, cheese, and wine. Afterwards flesh only was prohibited, eggs, cheese, and wine being allowed; an indulgence which was censured by the Greek Church, and led to a quarrel between it and the Western. The following fasts generally obtained:

1. *Lent,* the annual fast of forty days before Easter. At first the duration of this fast was forty hours; in the time of Gregory I it was thirty-six days; but

afterwards, either by Gregory I or Gregory II (8th century), in imitation of the fasts of Moses, Elias, and our Savior, it was extended to forty days. *SEE LENT; SEE QUADRAGESIMA*.

2. *Quarterly fasts,* which cannot be traced beyond the 5th century, though Bellarmin asserts that they dated from the apostles' time.

3. A *fast of three days before the festival of the Ascension,* introduced by Mamercus of Vienne (5th century). In some places it was not.celebrated till after Whitsuntide. It was *called jejunium rogationum,* or *jejunium litaniarum,* the feast of rogations or litanies (hence rogation-days), on account of certain litanies sung on those days (Bingham, book 21, .c. 2, § 8).

4. *Monthly fasts,* a day in every month, except July and August, being selected.

5. *Fasts before festivals,* instead of the ancient vigils, which were abolished in the 5th century.

6. *Weekly fasts,* on Wednesdays and Fridays, entitled *stationes,* from the practice of soldiers keeping guard, which was called *statio* by the Romans.

7. There were also occasional fasts, appointed by ecclesiastical authority, in times of great danger, emergency, or distress (Tertull. *De Jejun.* c. 13). "The custom of the Church at the end of the 4th century may be collected from the following passage of Epiphanius: 'In the whole Christian Church, the following fast-days throughout the year are regularly observed. On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour (i.e. three o'clock in the afternoon), except during the interval of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, in which it is usual neither to kneel nor fast at all. Besides this, there is no fasting on the Epiphany or Nativity, if those days should fall on a Wednesday or Friday. But those persons who especially devote themselves to religious exercises (the monks) fast also at other times when they please, except, on Sundays and during the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide. It is also the practice of the Church to observe the forty days' fast before the sacred week. But on Sundays there is no fasting, even during the last-mentioned period (compare *Doctr. de fide).* But even at this late date there was no universal agreement in the practice of the Church in this matter, neither had fasts been established by law. The custom, so far as it existed, had been silently introduced into the Church, and its observance

was altogether voluntary. This fasting consisted, at first, in abstinence from food until three o'clock in the afternoon. A custom was afterwards introduced, probably by the Montanists, affecting the kind of food to be taken, which was limited to bread, salt, and water" (Siegel, *Alterthumer,* 2:77, translated by Coleman, *Anoient Christianity,* page 445).

II. *Roman and Greek Churches. — The* Church of Rome prescribes the times and character of fasts by law *(Concil. Trident.* session 25, *De delect. ciborum).* "Moreover, the holy council exhorts all pastors, and beseeches them by the most holy coming of our Lord and Savior, that as good soldiers of Jesus Christ they assiduously recommend to all the faithful the observance of all the institutions of the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all churches, and of the decrees of this and other oecumenical councils; and that they use all diligence to promote obedience to all their commands, and especially to those which relate to the mortification of the flesh, as the choice of meats and fasts." The Church commands fasts, and disobedience to her commands is sin. "See *Abstract of the Douay Catechism* (page 44): 'Slighting or neglecting the precepts of the Church, and living in habits of breaking tee fasts commanded, or of eating meat on Saturdays, or other days of abstinence, without just dispensation, were sins which excluded from the benefits of the jubilee, unless confessed and forsaken in the same manner as drunkenness, swearing, and debauchery' *(Instructions and Directions,* etc., page 24). But a papal dispensation changes the nature of things; the Spaniard who has paid the pope for a *flesh bull* may feast even in Lent; while his neighbor, who has neglected or declined to purchase the privilege, cannot eat an egg or drink a spoonful of milk during that period without committing mortal sin" (Cramp, *Text-book of Popery,* chapter 14). Among the "satisfactory" works of " penance" in the Roman Church, fasting goes along with prayer and almsgiving (Dens, *Theologia,* 6, *De Satisf.* 176). The Church distinguishes between days of fasting and of abstinence. On the former but one meal, and that not of flesh, is tasted during twenty-four hours; on the latter, flesh only is abstained from. The following is the distribution of Church fasts as given in bishop Challoner's *Garden of the Soul:*

1. The forty days of Lent.

2. The Ember Days, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday of the first week in Lent, of Whitsun Week, of the third week in September, and of the third week in Advent.

3. The Wednesdays and Fridays of the four weeks in Advent.

4. The vigils or eves of Whitsuntide, of the feasts of St. Peter and St. Paul, of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of All Saints, and of Christmas Day.

When any fasting day falls upon a Sunday, it is to be observed on the Saturday before. *Abstinence Days.*

1. The Sundays in Lent.

2. The three Rogation Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Ascension Day.

3. St. Mark, April 25, unless it falls in Easter Week.

4. The Fridays and Saturdays out of Lent, and the Ember Weeks, or such as happen to be vigils; but should Christmas Day fall upon a Friday or Saturday, it is not of abstinence.

In the *Practical Catechism upon the Sundays, Feasts, and Fasts,* the reason assigned for observing St. Mark's Day as a day of abstinence is, that his disciples, the first Christians of Alexandria, under his own conduct were eminent for their mortification; moreover, that St. Gregory the Great, the apostle of England, first set it apart in memory of the cessation of a mortality in his time at Rome. All Fridays and Saturdays, except those which fall between December 25 and February 2, are days of *Abstinence;* but in the United States there is a dispensation of Saturdays for twenty years from 1840. The *Fasting* days are, every day in Lent except Sunday; the Ember Days; the vigils of Pentecost, Assumption, All Saints, and Christmas.

In the Greek Church fasting is kept with great severity. There are four principal fasts. That of Lent, commencing according to the old style; one, beginning in the week after Whitsuntide, and ending on June 29, so that it varies in length, and is called the Fast of the holy Apostles; one, for a fortnight before the Assumption of the Virgin (August 15), which is observed even to the prohibition of oil, except on the day of the Transfiguration (August 6), on which day both oil and fish may be eaten; and one forty days before Christmas.

III. *Protestant Churches.* — In these, fasting is not made imperative as a term of membership in the Church, but is generally recommended as a

Christian duty, especially under circumstances of national or individual affliction.

1. *Church Of England.* — "In the reign of queen Elizabeth there was a royal ordinance for fasting; not, however, so much with a religious view as for the encouragement of the fisheries. The Church has only so far recognized the custom in its ecclesiastical law as to retain the fast-days and prayers, but has prescribed no regulation of diet. Abstinence from food is not, therefore, the duty which it enjoins on its members, but whatever each finds to be best adapted for self-discipline, and most suitable under his circumstances for a repentant spirit. Mention is made of abstinence in the 'Collect for the first Sunday in Lent;' but it is not the abstaining from food, or particular kinds of food, but such abstinence as shall subdue the flesh to the spirit, i.e., the abstaining habitu*ally* from excess" (Eden). No legal distinction is drawn between fasting and abstinence; so Wheatley, (On *Common Prayer*, chapter 5, § 4): "IIn the Church of Rome, fasting and abstinence admit of a distinction, and different days are appointed for each of them. But I do not find that the Church of England makes any difference between them. It is true, in the title of the table of vigils, etc., she mentions 'fasts and days of abstinence' separately; but when she comes to enumerate the particulars, she calls them all ' days of fasting or abstinence,' without distinguishing the one from the other. Nor does she anywhere point out to us what foad is proper for such times or seasons, or seem to place any part of religion in abstaining from any particular kinds of meat. It is true, by a statute still in force, flesh is prohibited on fast-days; but this is declared to be for a political reason, viz. for the increase of cattle, and for the encouragement of fishery and navigation. Not but that the statute allows that abstinence is serviceable to virtue, and helps to subdue the body to the mind; but the distinction of clean and unclean nmeats determined, it says, with the Mosaic law; and therefore it sets forth that days and meats are in themselves all of the same nature and quality as to moral consideration, one not having any inherent holiness above the other.' And for this reason it is that our Church, as I have said, nowhere nakes any difference in the kinds of meat; but, as far as she determines, she seems to recommend an entire abstinence from all manner of food till the time of fasting be over; declaring is her homilies that fasting (by the decree of the six hundred and thirty fathers, assembled at the Council of Chalcedon, which was one of the four first general councils, who grounded their determination upon the sacred Scriptures, and long-continued usage or practice both of the prophets and

other godly persons before the coming of Christ; and also of the apostles and other devout men in the New Testament) is a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food from the body for the determined time of fasting." The fixed days appointed by the Church of England for fasting and abstinence are the folloving: 1. The forty days of Lent. 2. The Ember Days at the four seasons, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, the feast of Pentecost, September 14, and December 13. 3. The three Rogation Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Holy Thursday, or the Ascension of our Lord. 4. All the Fridays is the year except Christmas Day. These days are — mentioned in 2 and 3 Edward VI, c. 19, and in 5 Elizabeth, c. 5; and by 12 Charles II, c. 14, January 30 is ordained to be a day of fasting and repentance for thea "martyrdom" of Charles 1. But an act passed in 1859, the 22 Victoria, repeals all enactments requiring special Church service to be observed on January 30, May 29, November 5, and October 23. Other days of fasting are occasionally appointed by royal proclamation (*Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*, s.v.).

2. *Lutheran* Church. — Luther by no means rejected or discountenanced fasting, but discarded the idea that it could be meritorious *(Comm. on Aatt.* 6:16). The *Augsburg Confession* (art. 26) repudiates "diversity of meats" and other traditions; but adds, "The charge, however, that we forbid the mortification of our sinful propensities, as Jovian asserts, is groundless. For our writers have always given instruction concerning the cross which it is the duty of Christians to bear. We moreover teach that it is the duty of every man, by fasting and other exercises, to avoid giving any occasion to sin, but not to merit grace hey such works. But this watchfulness over our body is to be observed always, not on particular days only. On this subject Christ says, Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting (<42234>Luke 21:34). Again, The devils are snot cast out but by fasting and prayer (<401721>Matthew 17:21). And Paul says, I keep under may body, and bring it into subjection (<461027>1 Corinthians 9:27). By which he wishes to intimate that this bodily discipline is not designed to merit grace, but to keep the body in a suitable condition for the several duties of our calling. We do not, therefore, object to fasting itself, but to the fact that it is represented as a necessary duty, and that specific days have, been fixed for its performance."

3. Calvin. — The views of Calvin on fasting have been very generally adopted in the Reformed churches: "Therefore let us say something of

fasting, because many, for emant of knowing its usefulness, undervalue its necessity, and some reject it as almost superfluous; while, on the other hand, where the use of it is not well understood, it easily degenerates into superstition. Holy and legitimate fasting is directed to three ends, for we practice it either as a restraint on the flesh, to preserve it from licentiousness, or as a preparation for prayers or pious meditations, or as a testimony of our humiliation in the presence of God, when eme are desirous of confessing our guilt before him. The first is not often contemplated in public fasting, because all men have not the saue constitution or health of body; therefore it is rather more applicable to private fasting. The second end is common to both, such preparation for prayer being necessary to the whole Church, as well as to every one of the faithful in particular. The same may be said of the third, for it will sometimes happen that God will afflict a whole nation with war, pestilence, or some other calamity; under such a common scourge, it behooves all the people to make a confession of their guilt. When the hand of the Lord chastises an individual, he ought to make a similar confession, either alone or with his family. It is true that this acknowledgment lies principally in the disposition of the heart; but when the heart is affected as it ought to be, it can scarcely avoid breaking aot into the external expression, and most especially when it promotes the general edification, in order that all, by a public confession of their sin, may unitedly acknowledge the justice of God, and may mutually animate each other by the influence of example. Wherefore fasting, as it is a sign of humiliation, is of more frequent use in public than among individuals in private, though it is common to both, as we have already observed. With regard to the discipline, therefore, of which we are now treating, whenever supplications are to be presented to God on any important occasion, it would be right to enjoin the union of fasting with prayer. Thus, when the faithful at Antioch laid their hands on Paul and Barnabas, the better to recommend their very important ministry to God, they ‘fasted,’ as well as 'prayed.' So, also, when Paul and Barnabas afterwards 'ordained elders in every church,' they used to 'pray with fasting.' In this kind of fasting their only object was that they might be more lively and unembarrassed in prayer. And we find by experience that after a full meal the mind does not aspire towards God so as to be able to enter on prayer, and to continue in it with seriousness and ardor of affection. So we are to understand what Luke says of Anna, that 'she served God with fastings and prayers.' For he does not place the worship of God in fasting, but signifies that by such means that holy woman habituated

herself to a constancy in prayer. Such was the fasting of Nehemiah, when he prayed to God with more than common fervor far the deliverance of his people. For this cause Paul declares it to be expedient for the faithful to practice a temporany abstinence from lawful enjoyments, that they may be more at liberty to 'give themselves to fasting and prayer;' for by connecting fasting with prayer, as an assistance to it, he signifies that fasting is of no importance in itself any further than as it is directed to this end. Besides, from the direction which he gives in that place to husbands and wives, to 'render to' each other 'due benevolence,' it is clear that he is not speaking of daily prayers, but of such as require peculiar earnestness of attention. That there may be no mistake respecting the term, let us define what fasting is; for we do not understand it to denote mere temperance and abstinence in eating and drinking, but something more. The life of the faithful, indeed, ought to be so regulated by frugality and sobriety as to exhibit, as far as possible, the appearance of a perpetual fast. But besides this, there is another temporary fast, when we retrench anything from our customary mode of living, either for a day or for any certain time, and prescribe to ourselves a more than commonly rigid and severe abstinence from food. This restriction consists in three things in time, in quality and in quantity of food. By time I mean that we should perform, while fasting, those exercises on account of which fasts are instituted. As, for example, if any one fast for solemn prayer, he should not break his fast till he has ,attended to it. The quality consists in an entire abstinence from dainties, and content with simpler and humbler fare, that our appetite may niot be stimulated by delicacies. The rule of quantity is that we eat more sparingly and slightly than usual, only for necessity, and not for pleasure. But it is necessary for us, above all things, to be particularly on our guard against the approaches of superstition, which has heretofore been a great source of injury to the Church. For it were far better that fasting should be entirely disused, than that the practice should be diligently observed, and at the same time corrupted with false and pernicious opinions, into which the world is constantly falling, unless it be prevented by the greatest fidelity andipxudence of the pastors. The first caution necessary, and which they should be constantly urging, is that suggested by Joel: 'Rend your heart, and not your garments;' that is, they should admionish the people that God sets no value on fasting unless it be accompanied by a corresponding disposition of heart, a real displeasure against sin, sincere self-abhorrence, true humiliation, and unfeigned grief arising from a fear of God; and that fasting is of no use on any other account than as an additional and

subordinate assistance to these things; for nothing is more abominable to God than when men attempt to impose upon him by the presentation of signs and external appearances instead of purity of heart. Therefore he severely reprobates this hypocrisy in the Jews, who imagined they had satisfied God merely by having fasted, while they cherished impious and impure thoughts in their hearts. 'Is it such a fast, saith the Lord, that I have chosen?' The fasting of hypocrites, therefore is not only superfluous and useless fatigue, but the greatest abomination. Allied to this is another evil, which requires the most vigilant caution, lest it be considered as a meritorious act, or a species of divine service. For as it is a thing indifferent in itself, and possesses no other value than it derives from those ends to which it ought tm be directed, it is most pernicious, superstition to confound it with works commanded by God, and necessary in themselves, without reference to any ulterior object. Such was formerly the folly of the Manichoeans in the refutation of whom Augustine most clearly shows that fasting is to be held in no other estimation than on account of those ends which I here mention, and that it receives no approbation from Gad unless it be practiced for their sake. The third error is not so impious indeed, yet is pregnant with danger, to enforce it with extreme rigor as one of the principal duties, and to extol it with extravagant encomiums, so that men imagine themselves to have performed a work of peculiar excellence when they have fasted. In this respect I dare not wholly excuse the ancient fathers from having sown some seeds of superstition, and given occasion to the tyranny which afterwards arose. Their writings contain some sound and judicious sentiments on the subject of fasting, but they also contain extravagant praises, which elevate it to a rank among the principal virtues. And the superstitious observance of Lent had at that time generally prevailed, because the common people considered themselves as performing an eminent act of obedience to God, and the pastors commended it as a holy imitation of Christ; whereas it is plain that Christ fasted; not to set an example to others, but in order that by such an introduction to the preaching ofthe Gospel, he might prove the doctrine not to be a human invention, but a revelation from heaven" (Calvin, Institutes, book 4, chapter 12, § 15-20). The *Westminster Confession* declares that "solemn fastings" are, "in their times and seasons," to be used in a holy and religious manner (21:5); and the *Westminster Catechism* makes "religious fasting" one of the duties required in the second comacmandment (quest. 109).

In *Scotland* there is generally a yearly fast appointed by the kirk-session of the Established Church of the parish, or by concurrence of kirk-sessions in towns, but generally by use and wont fixed as to their date. The fast-day is always some day of the weeke preceding the *Communion Sunday,* or Sunday set apart in the Presbyterian churches for the Lord's Supper. It is usually appointed as a day for 'fasting, hunliliation, and prayer.' Business is generally suspended, shops shut as on a Sunday, and churches opened for public worship. By an act of Parliament passed not many years since, factories are prohibited from carrying on work on the parish fast-day; but, in consequence of the ecclesiastical divisions in Scotland, it has become more common than it once was for agricultural and other kinds of work to be carried on" (Chambers, Encyclopaedia, s.v.).

America. — The New England Puritans rejected the ancient ecclesiastical fast-days. The Pilgrim fathers observed "seasons of fasting and prayer" before sailing from Europe, and after their arrival in America. They admitted the night and duty of the civil rulers to set apart days for fasting and prayer. This right has been recognized, and the duty observed, in most states of the American Union. During the Civil War (1861-5) the President of the United States appointed days of national fasting, which were generally observed by all the churches. The *Methodist Episcopal* Church enjoins "fasting, or *abstinence,"* upon the people in the "General Rules" *(Discipline,* part 1, chapter 1, § 3); advises weekly fasts to the clergy (2, chapter 2, § 3); and directs that "a fast be held in every society on the Friday preceding every quarterly meeting"' (part 2, chapter 2, § 17). The Presbyterian Church adopts the doctrine of the Westminster Confession on fasting (seeabove); makes "public solemn fasting" one of the ordinances established by Christ in the Church *(Form of* Government, chapter 7); ordains a fast-day in the congregation before an ordination (chapter 15), and declares that while "there is no day under the Gospel commanded to be kept holy except the Lord's day, which is the Christian Sabbath, nevertheless, to observe days of fasting and thanksgiving, as the extraordinary dispensations of divine Providence may direct, we judge both scriptural and rational. Fasts and thanksgivings may be observed by individual Christians or families in private; by particular congregations; by a number of congregations contiguous to each other; by the congregations under the care of a presbytery or of a synod; or by all the congregations of our Church. It must be left to the judgment and discretion of every Christian and family to determine when it is proper to observe a private fast

or thanksgiving, and to the church-sessions to determine for particular congregations, and to the presbyteries or synods to determine for larger districts. When it is deemed expedient that a fast or thanksgiving should be general, the call for them must be judged of by the Synod or General Assembly. And if at any time the civil power should think it proper to appoint a fast or thanksgiving, it is the duty of the ministers and people of our communion, as we live under a Christian government, to pay all due respect to the same" *(Directory for Worship,* chapter 14).

Besides the writers heretofore quoted, consult Tillotson, *Sermons* (sermon 39); Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* book 21, chapter 1-3; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity,* page 552 sq.; Bishop Morris, in *Meth. Quart. Review,* 1849, 205 sq.; Augusti, *Denkwurdigkeiten,* 10:311 sq.; Suicer, *Thesaurus,* s.v. νηστεία*;* Ducange, *Glossarium,* s.v. Jejunium; Ferraris, *Promta Bibliotheca,* 4:867 sq. (ed. Migne); Wesley, *Sermons,* 1:245.

Fat

for receiving wine; an old orthography for VAT *SEE VAT*(q.v.).

Fat

(prop. b l ,j e, *che'leb).* [For the use of the word as a verb, *SEE FATTED FOWL*.] The Hebrews distinguished between the suet, or pure fat of an animal (b l ,j e), and the fat which was intermixed with the lean (µyNim'v]mi, *oily pieces,* <160810>Nehemiah 8:10). Certain restrictions were imposed upon them in' reference to the former: some parts of the suet, viz. about the stomach, the entrails, the kidneys, and the tail of a sheep, which grows to an excessive size in many Eastern countries, and is a special delicacy, were forbidden to be eaten in the case of animals offered to Jehovah in sacrifice (<030303>Leviticus 3:3, 9, 17; 7:3, 23). The ground of the prohibition was that the fat was the richest part of the animal, and therefore belonged to him (<030316>Leviticus 3:16). It has been supposed that other reasons were superadded, as that the use of fat was unwholesome in the hot climate of Palestine (Maimonides, *More Nebochimn,* part 3, chapter 48). There appears, however, to be no ground for such an' assumption (Bahr, *Symbol.* 2:382). The presentation of thefat as the richest part of the animal was agreeable to the dictates of natural feeling, and to the analogy in dedicating the first-born and first-fruits to God. This was also the ordinary practice even of heathen nations, as instanced in the Homeric descriptions'of

sacrifices *(Il.* 1:460; 2:423; *Od.* 3:457), and in the customs of the Egyptians (Herod. 2:47), and Persians (Strabo, 15:732); Accordingly, Abel, who brought the first anfimal sacrifice, not only presented to the Lord "the firstlings of his flock," but "the fat thereof," which, by virtue of its being the best part, was as much the firstling of the animal itself as the animal was the firstling of the flock (<010404>Genesis 4:4); or if the word here means *the fattest* of his flock, the same idea is essentially implied. Indeed, the term *cheleb* is itself significant of the feeling on which the regulation was based, for it sometimes describes the *best* of any production (<014518>Genesis 45:18; <041812>Numbers 18:12; <198116>Psalm 81:16; 147:14; compare <100122>2 Samuel 1:22; <070329>Judges 3:29; <231016>Isaiah 10:16). With regard to the other parts of the fat of sacrifices or the fat of other animals, it might be consumed, with the exception of those dying either by a violent or a natural death (<030724>Leviticus 7:24), which might still be used in any other way. The burning of the fat of sacrifices was particularly specified in each kind of offering, whether a peace offering (<030309>Leviticus 3:9), consecration offering (<030825>Leviticus 8:25), sin offering (<030408>Leviticus 4:8), trespass offering (<030703>Leviticus 7:3), or redemption offering (<041817>Numbers 18:17). The Hebrews fully appreciated the luxury of well-fatted meat, and had their stall-fed oxen and calves (<110423>1 Kings 4:23; <244621>Jeremiah 46:21; <421523>Luke 15:23). This was, however, not a usual practice; and even at this day in the East, domestic cattle seldom undergo any preparatory feeding or fattening before being killed. Hence there is little fat in the carcase except that belonging to the parts specified in the prohibition, which is all more or less of the nature of suet. *SEE FOOD*.

The parts of the fat or suet of the victims which belong to God, and are especially to be appropriated to the altar, are given in <022913>Exodus 29:13-22, and <030303>Leviticus 3:3-5, as follows:

1. The fat which covers the entrails (brQhiAta,hSkim]jiblj,heh) = ἐπίπλους, as Josephus rightly has it *(Ant.* 3:9, 2); *the omentum*, which is only to be found in man and mammals, and is very fat in ruminants (comp. Aristot. *Hist. Anim.* 1:16; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 11:80).

2. The fat which accumulates around entrails (brQhiAl[irva}blj,heh), and is easily separated therefrom, i.e., the reticular adherings to the colon.

3. The two kidneys, with the fat on them, at the internal muscles of the loins (yTew]µylisKhil[irva}ˆj,leh}blj,heitaw]tyolKhi), as the most

fat accumulates near the kidneys (Deuteronomy 32:14; Isaiah 34:6), and to such an extent in sheep that they sometimes die of it (οἱ νεφοὶ μάλιστα τῶασπλάγχνων ἔχονσι πιμελήν, Aristot. *De Part. Animn* 3:9, and *Hist. Anim.* 3:16; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 11:81),

4. The tr,tyo*yothereth*, which is taken by the Sept and Josephus *(Ant.* 3:9, 2) to mean ὁ λοβὸς τοῦ ἥπατος, *the greater lobe of the liver*, similarly the Syriac and Chaldee (adbk l[d arxj); and is explained by the Talmud *(Chulin*, 49:6), Rashi, Kimchi, Solomon ben-Melech, etc., as aCP]r]fi= τραπεζα, whereby the Greeks, according to Hippocrates, understood the greater and thickest of the five segments of the liver (Bahr, *Symb*. 2:354). This meaning of tr,t/y is ably defended by Bochart *(Hieroz.* lib. 2, c. 45), and followed by Le Clerc, J.D. Rosenmuller, Kalisch (on Exodus 29:13), and others. But the Vulgate, Luther, Tyndale, the Bishops' Bible, the Geneva Bible, the A.V., Piscator, De Wette, Knobel, Furst, etc., take it to denote *omentum minus*, which is preferable, for the lobes have no accumulation of fat.

5. The tail (hy;lÞi*alyah'*, A.V. "rump") of a sheep (Leviticus 7:3), which, in a certain species *(ovis laticaudata)*, contains a great quantity of fat. It is for this reason that the eating of fat is forbidden (Leviticus 3:17). It affords a delicate marrowy substance much used in *pillaus* and other messes which require to be lubricated by animal juices. The Rabbinical Jews maintain that the prohibition of it is restricted to the sacrifices, while the Karaite Jews regard the eating of the tail as absolutely forbidden. *SEE SHEEP*.

One of the metaphorical senses of "fat" (in the Hebrew) is noticed above. By a natural figure,"fat" is occasionally put in Scripture for a dull and torpid state of mind, as if the heart were covered with thick fat, and therefore insensible (Psalm 17:10). *SEE OIL*.

Fatalism

the doctrine of an inevitable necessity, implying an omnipotent and arbitrary superior power. It is derived from the Latin *fatum* ("what is spoken or decreed," passive participle *offari)*. The Greeks expressed it also by the passive participle εἱμαρμένη; but their words μοῖρα *(Destiny, the Goddess of Fate)* and αἶσα *(decree, destiny, goddess who dispenses fate)* have an active meaning.

I. In Homer, *Moira* has a twofold force; it is sometimes considered as superior to Zeus, then again as inferior to him; a twofold force which Nagelsbach correctly expounds (after Delbrick and Creuzer) by saying that in Homer the monarchical will of Zeus does not appear as directly opposed to the contrary efforts of the other gods. Yet the human mind has a monotheistic tendency even among the heathen, and therefore seeks to give to the heavens one supreme ruler, and to unite all the gods into one exclusive unity. On the other hand, however, this unity is inert and dead. and this leads Homer to identify it with the highest, the living god with the "total will" of the other gods. The gradual development of Greek philosophy led to the thought of representing the supreme ruling power by *Moira:* so we find it in Herodotus, 1:91, τὴν πεπρωμένην μοῖραν ἀδὐνατά ἐστιν ἀποφυγέειν καὶ θεῷ. This agency of Fate was afterwards made to apply to the regulation of the outward life of men, and the conception of Fate as the ruling power of the universe became deeper and more spiritual: so Anaxagoras recognises Νοῦς, the spirit, as ruler of the world; and Plato does the same, especially in Philebus (31, 4, ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς φὐσει βασιλικὴν μὲν ψυχήν, βασιλικὸν δὲ νοῦν ἐγγίγνεσθαι). This same tendency towards a spiritualization of Fate is found in the tragic authors, especially in Sophocles, who has happily expressed these views in his *oEdmpus Coloneus*, 266, 267 (edition Schneidewin): ἐπεὶ τὰ γ ἔργα μυο πεπονθοὶ ἐστὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεδρακότα *(for my actions are rather to be called my destiny's than smy own).* But this fate does not exclude guilt on the part of man, for the curse rested from the first on individual sin, as is shown especially in the revelation of fearful guilt in the *(Edipus Rex,* and the possibility of pardon in the *Colonens.* The Greek tragedy is based on this very antagonism between individual being and the supreme world-power. After Sophocles, the two notions of the word Μοῖρα war's separated, and each was gradually brought out more distinctly. From Euripides down to thee Epicureans a tendency prevailed to nlake the power of fate subservient to human caprice, and to make it subordinate to Τύχη (chance), which plays an important part in Thucydides. Blind chance was made to rule the earth. The Epicureans proclaimed their gods the "essence of pure inactive self-indulgence, indifferent to the condition of mankind and the world," so that, the gods no longer interfering in human affairs; it became matter of indifference whether they were worshipped or not. On the other hand, Stoicism maintained that to live according to the laws of nature, i.e., to resign one's self to the necessary course of things, is the true wisdom of

life. In this point, as in others, the views of the Stoics and the Epicureans were directly opposed to each other, *SEE EPICUREAN PHILOSOPHY*, yet in their results they arrived at the same point, viz. that against the *inehictabile fatum,* whether the result of separate accidental chances or of the general law of nature, there is nothing to be done. The Moira, acting according to higher laws incomprehensible to humanity, is thus confounded with blind destiny.

II. The conception of fate which underlies all theories of fatalism is as follows: (1.) Destiny is a dead, blind power; (2.) human liberty is completely and irresistibly controlled by destiny. Under this twofold aspect, fatalism finds its most complete realization in Mohammedanism; but it has also been defended on scientific grounds within the sphere of Christendom. The doctrine of absolute predestination, in its hidden *absolutum decretum* (see Luther, *De servo arbitrio,* and Ullmann, *Studien u. Kritiken,* 1847, 1:2), resembles the heathen conception of fate. In its relation to spiritual and eternal life, fatalism is generally based on (1) the pantheistic view of the world, which swallows up individual freedom and responsibility, so that (as by Spinoza) all our thoughts and actions are represented as but the thoughts and actions of God manifested through us. This leads naturally to (2) the determinism of deism, which considers the world as so ruled by the immutable laws of nature that individual life and actions are but cogs of one of the wheels of the universal machinery; and to modern materialism, according to which thought is but a natural secretion of the brain.

The Christian idea of God is directly opposed to all fatalism, whether pagan or modern maaterialistic. In Christian thought, God is not blind chance, dead fate, er a dark, unknown force of nature; but God is spirit, a living Goad, a personal Being, who is love and the Father of love. And this living and personal God has endowed man with his own image,and therefore with freedom, in the exercise of which endowment man is to become himself a participant in the fulfillment of the divine decrees, a "co-worker" with God, and, as such, not only capable of aiding in the spread and consummation of the kingdom (or royal sway) of God upon the earth, but also bound to aid in it. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie,* 4:340 sq. (from which this article is chiefly a translation); Cudworth, Intellectual *System of the Universe,* book 1, chapter 1; Hamilton, *Discussions in Philosophy;* Werner, *Geschichte der apolog. Literatur* (Schaffhausen, 1867). *SEE MATERIALISM.*

Father

(בא; *ab*, a primitive word, but followilng the analogy of חבא; *to show kindness*, Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, pages 6-8; Chaldee, באי πατήρ). Compare SON.

1. This word, besides its obvious and primary sense, bears in Scripture a number of other applications, most of which have, through the use of the Bible, become more or less common in all Christian countries (see Gesenius's Hebrews and Robinson's *Greek Lex.).*

(1.) *Father* is applied to any ancestor near or remote, or to ancestors ("fathers") in general. The progenitor, or founder, or *patriarch* of a tribe or nation was also pre-eminently its father, as Abraham of the Jews. 'examples of this abound. See, for instance, <050111>Deuteronomy 1:11; <110811>1 Kings 8:11; <400309>Matthew 3:9; 23:30; <411110>Mark 11:10; <420132>Luke 1:32, 73; 6:23, 26; <430722>John 7:22, etc. So of the founder or rebuilder of a city (<130250>1 Chronicles 2:50-52, etc.).

(2.) *Father* is also applied as a title of respect to any head, chief, ruler, or elder, and especially to kings, prophets, and priests (<071710>Judges 17:10; 18:19; <090102>1 Samuel 10:12; <120202>2 Kings 2:12; 5:13; 6:21; 13:14; <200401>Proverbs 4:1; <402309>Matthew 23:9; <440702>Acts 7:2; 22:1; <460415>1 Corinthians 4:15, etc.). Also of protector or guardian (<183216>Job 29:16; <196805>Psalm 68:5; <050506>Deuteronomy 32:6). Hence of seniors, especially of Church fathers. See *below.*

(3.) The author, source, or beginner of anything is also called the father of the same, or of those who follow him. Thus Jabal is called "the father of those who dwell in tents, and have cattle;" and Jubal "the father of all — such as handle the harp and the organ" (<010421>Genesis 4:21, 22; comp. <183828>Job 38:28; <430844>John 8:44; <450402>Romans 4:12). In the Talmud the term father is used to indicate the chief; e.g. the principal of certain works are termed "fathers." Objects whose contact causes pollution are called "fathers" of defilement (Mishna, Shabb. 7:2, volume 2, page 29; *Pesach*, 1:6, volume 2, page 137, Surenh.). This use of the word is exceedingly common in the East to this day, especially as applied in the formation of proper names, in which also the most curious Hebrew examples of this usage occur. *SEE AB* —.

(4.) As an extension of all the foregoing senses, the term father is very often applied to God himself (<01449>Genesis 44:19, 20; <02042>Exodus 4:22; <05216>Deuteronomy 32:6; <10714>2 Samuel 7:14; <19827>Psalm 89:27, 28; <23616>Isaiah 63:16; 64:8). Indeed, the analogy of language would point to this, seeing that in the Old Testaments and in all the Syro-Arabian dialects, the originator of anything is constantly called its father. Without doubt, however, God is in a more especial manner, even as by covenant, the Father of the Jews (<24309>Jeremiah 31:9; <23616>Isaiah 63:16; 64:8; <43841>John 8:41; 5:45; <47618>2 Corinthians 6:18); and also of Christians, or, rather, of all pious and believing persons, emho are called "sons of God" (<43012>John 1:12; <45816>Romans 8:16, etc.). Thus Jesus, in speaking to his disciples, calls God their Father (<40604>Matthew 6:4, 8, 15, 18; 10:20, 29; 13:43, etc.). The apostles also, for themselves and other Christians, call him "Father" (<45107>Romans 1:7; <46103>1 Corinthians 1:3; <47102>2 Corinthians 1:2; <48104>Galatians 1:4; and many other places). *SEE ABBA.*

2. The position and authority of the father as the head of the family is expressly assunsed and sanctioted in Scripture, as a likeness of that of the Almighty over his creatures, an authority — as Philo remarks — intermediate between human and divine (Philo, περὶγονέων τηεῆς, § 1). It lies, of course, at the root of that so-called patriarchal government (<01316>Genesis 3:16: <46103>1 Corinthians 11:3), which was introductory to the more definite systems that followed, and that in part, but not wholly, superseded it. When, therefore, the name of "father of nations" (μhrbh) was given to Abram, he was thereby held up not only as the ancestor, but as the example of those who should come after him (<01818>Genesis 18:18, 19; <45417>Romans 4:17). The father's blessing was regarded as conferring special benefit,but his malediction special injury, on those upon whom it fell (<01025>Genesis 9:25, 27; 27:27-40; 48:15, 20; 49); and so also the sin of a parent was held to affect, in certain cases, the welfare of his descendants (<12527>2 Kings 5:27), though the law forbade the punishment of the son for his father's transgression (<05416>Deuteronomy 24:16; <12406>2 Kings 14:6; <26820>Ezekiel 18:20). The command to honor parents is noticed by the apostle Paul as the only one of the Decalogue which bore a distinct promise (<02012>Exodus 20:12; <49602>Ephesians 6:2), and direspect towards them was condemned by the law as one of the worst of crimes (<02115>Exodus 21:15, 17; <54109>1 Timothy 1:9; comp. Virgil, *AEn.* 6:609; Aristoph. *Ran.* 274-773). Instances of legal enactment in support of parental authority are found inr <02217>Exodus 22:17; <04803>Numbers 30:3,5; 12:14; <05218>Deuteronomy 21:18, 21;

<3B0209>Leviticus 20:9; 21:9; 22:12; and the spirit of the law in this direction may be seen in <200301>Proverbs 13:1; 15:5; 17:25; 19:13; 20:20; 28:24; 30:17; <234510>Isaiah 45:10; <390106>Malachi 1:6. The father, however, had not the power of death over his child under the Mosaic law (<051218>Deuteronomy 21:18-21; Philomen 1.c.).

From the patriarchal spirit also the principle of respect to age and authority in general appears to be derived. Thus Jacob is described as blessing Pharaoh (<014707>Genesis 47:7, 10; comp. <3B1932>Leviticus 19:32; <201631>Proverbs 16:31; Philomen *1.c. §* 6).

The authority of a father was thus very great in patriarchal times; and although the law of Moses required the parent to bring his cause of complaint to the public tribunals. (<051218>Deuteronomy 21:18-21), all the more real powers of parental character were not only left unimpaired, but were made in a great degree the basis of the judicial polity which that law established. The children, and even the grandchildren, continued under the roof of the father and grandfather; they labored on his account, and were the most submissive of his servants. The property of the soil, the power of judgment, the civil rights, belonged to him only, and his sons were merely his instruments and assistants. If a family be compared to a body, then the father was the head, and the sons the members, moving at his will and in his service. There were exceptions, doubtless, but this was the rule, and, with some modifications, it is still the rule throughout the East.

Filial duty and obedience were, indeed, in the eyes of the Jewish legrislator, of such high importance that great care was taken that the paternal authority should not be weakened by the withdrawal of a power so liable to fatal and barbarous abuse as that of capital punishment. Any outrage against a parent-a blow, a curse, or incorrigible profligcacy — was made a capital crime (<022113>Exodus 21:13,17; <3B0209>Leviticus 20:9). If the offense Was public, it was taken up by the witnesses as a crime against Jehovah, and the culprit was brought before the magistrates, whether the parent consented or not; and if the offense was hidden within the paternal walls, it devolved on the parents to denounce him and to require his punishment.

It is a beautiful circumstance in the law of Moses that this filial respect is exacted for the mother as well as for the father. The threats and promises of the legislator distinguish not the one from the other; and the fifth commandment associates the father and mother in a precisely equal claim

to honor from their children (see Cellerier, *Esprit de la Legislation Mosaique*, 2:69, 122-129). *SEE WOMAN*.

Among Mohaimmedans parental authority has great weight during the time of pupilage. The son is not allowed to eat, scarcely to sit, in his father's presence. Disobedience to parents is reckoned one of the most heinous of crimes' (Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* 1:355; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* 1:84; Atkinson, *Travels in Siberia*, page 559).

Father (GOD THE) was usually represented in early Christian art by a hand, which was usually extended through a cloud. The principal subjects in which God the Father is represented by a hand are the scenes from the creation: Moses receiving the law, Moses at the burning bush, the sacrifice of Abraham, and the baptism of Christ. The hand is often given as holding out wreaths or crowns to saints and inartyrs at their death, or their ascension to Paradise. As early as the fifth century, God the Father is represented as an old man. This symbol predominated during the later Middle Ages, and is the one now universally adopted by Christian artists. The figures of God in the creation by M. Angelo and Raphael, in the Sistine chapel and in the Vatican, are among the grandest conceptions in all art. God the Father is also represented as an. old man ,in the representations of the Trinity (q.v.). — Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquites Chrdtiennes*, 1865.

Father-in-law

1. µj; *cham* (from hm;j; *to join* in affinity; *SEE MOTHER-IN-LAW*), <013813>Genesis 38:13, 25; <090419>1 Samuel 4:19, 21. 2. ˆtij ,ρ*chothen'* (participle of ˆtij ,æto *marry),* one *marrying* a daugher, <020301>Exodus 3:1; 4:18; 18:1-27; <041029>Numbers 10:29; <070116>Judges 1:16; 4:11; 19:4, 7, 9. 3. πενθερός (strictly one related by marriage, like No. 1), <431813>John 18:13. *SEE AFFINITY.*

Father's Brother

d/D, *dod* (strictly one *beloved,* a friend, as in <230501>Isaiah 5:1), an *uncle* (q.v.), <043611>Numbers 36:11; <122417>2 Kings 24:17; fem. FATHER'S SISTER, hd;/D, *dodah',* <020620>Exodus 6:20, an *aunt* (q.v.).