

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Fathers of the Church - Floor

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

Fathers Of The Church

(*Patres Ecclesiae*), a name applied to certain ancient Christian writers, who have preserved in their writings, to a certain extent, the history, doctrines, and traditions of the early Church. The use of the name "father" for this purpose originated in the Oriental habit of styling the relation of teacher and pupil that of "father" and "son." So Alexander the Great called Aristotle his "father," Elisha calls Elijah his "father" (~~1~~2 Kings 2:12); the pupils of the prophets were called "sons of the prophets." At an early period in the Christian Church, this title was given to preachers and teachers; and later, the title "father" (*papa*, pope) was given to bishops especially.

The Greek Church closes the list of the "fathers," properly so called, with John of Damascus (t 754), the Latin Church with Gregory the Great (f 604). The use of the word "fathers" is by Protestants "limited to the more distinguished teachers of the first five or six centuries, excepting, of course, the apostles, who stand far above them all as the inspired organs of the Holy Ghost. It applies, therefore, to the period of the oecumenical formation of doctrines, before the separation of Eastern and Western Christendom" (Schaff, *Church History*, 1:454). The Roman theologians make the following qualities the criterion of a "Church father," viz. antiquity, orthodoxy, sanctity of life, and the approval of the Church (Fessler, *Institutiones Patrologice*, 1:26). Accordingly, the Roman Church denies the title fathers to such men as Origen, Tertullian, Lactantius, Eusebius, etc., because their writings are not held to be in all respects orthodox; they are designated, not as *patres*, but as *scriptores ecclesiastici* (ecclesiastical writers). At a later period, the title *doctores ecclesiae* (doctors of the Church) was given to writers supposed to have the qualities cited above as constituting the criterion of "a father," substituting *eminens eruditio* for *antiqgutas*. A decree of pope Boniface (A.D. 1298) assigns the title *macni ecclesice doctores* to the four Latin fathers Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great. Among the Greeks, the title *doctores ecclesiae* was given to Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom, and the Latins recognize them as such. To a few great men among the scholastics the sasme title was given, with an additional epithet to designate some special intellectual quality in gift; thus, in the 12th and 13th centuries, the following doctors of the Church were thus honored: Thomas Aquinas, Angelicus; Johannes Bonaventura, Seraphicus; Johannes Duns Scotus, Subtilis; Raimundus Lullius, Illuminatus; Alasus de Insulis

(de l'Isle), Universalis; Durandus de S. Pourcain, Resolutissimus; Gregorius de Rimini, Authenticus; Johannes Taulerus, Illuminatus; Johannes Gersonus, Christianissimus; Alexander Hales, Irrefragabilis; Roger Bacon, Admirabilis; William Occam, Singularis. Since 1830, Bernard of Clairvaux has been included among the "doctors," and, since 1852, Hilary of Poitiers. Chronologically, the fathers are divided into three classes, the apostolical, the anti-Nicene, and post-Nicene.

I. The *Apostolical Fathers* are those Christian writers (of whom any remains as yet now extant) who are supposed to have been contemporary with one or more of the apostles, that is to say, who lived and wrote before A.D. 120. There are five names usually given as those of the apostolic fathers, i.e., there are five men who lived during the age of the apostles, and who did converse, or might have conversed with them, to whom writings still extant have been ascribed, viz. Barnab's, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hermas. The following works are generally counted to these writers:

1. The epistle of Barnabas *SEE BARNABAS*;
2. Two epistles of Clement, bishop of Rome, to the Corinthians *SEE CLEMENT. OF ROME*;
3. Several epistles of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch *SEE IGNATIUS*;
4. An epistle of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, to the Philippians *SEE POLYCARP*;
5. The epistle (of an unknown author) to Diognetus *SEE DIOGNETUS*;
6. The book entitled *Pastor Hermas* *SEE HERMAS*.

Certain fragments of Papias are also commonly included among the apostolical fathers. *SEE PAPIAS*. Of the writings attributed to these fathers, some at least are of doubtful genuineness (on this point, see the individual titles referred to). *SEE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS*,

II. The *Ante-Nicene Fathers* are those whose writings date before the Council of Nicex, A.D. 325. The chief among them are (lists from Eadie, Riddle, Alzog): Justin Martyr, born probably about A.D. 100; left Palestine 132; presented his first *Apology* to Antoninus about (140 or) 148; wrote

his second *Apology* in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, probably about 162-4; has left a variety of other works, and a *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*; suffered martyrdom at Rome about 165. Hermias wrote his work, *Discursion of the Heathen Philosophers*, probably about 170. Dionysius of Corinth wrote some epistles; all lost except a very few fragments; fl. 170. Hegesippus, originally a Jew, wrote *History of the Church*, of which only a few fragments survive, about 175. Tatian wrote an *Oration against the Greeks*, which has been preserved; died probably about 176. Athenagoras wrote an *Apology* for the Christians, and also on the resurrection, both of which have been translated into English, 176. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, wrote his work on religion to Astolycus about 180; died 181. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, Gaul, in the latter part of the second century (became bishop about A.D. 177), wrote his work *Against Heresies, or A Refutation and Subversion of Knowledge falsely so called*, between A.D. 182 and 188; died about A.D. 202. Minucius Felix wrote his *Octavius*, or defense of Christianity, about 208. Clement of Alexandria succeeded Pantinus in the catechetical school of that city 188 or 199; quitted Alexandria 202; died about 217. Tertullian became a Montanist about the year 200; his *Apology* was composed (198 or) 205; his work against Marcion, 207; has left a great variety of tracts on the vices and customs of his age — as on the theater, the dress of females, idolatry, second marriages, the soldier's crown, and on flight in persecution, etc.; died about 240. Hippolytus, bishop of Port Ramsnus, wrote, besides many other pieces, *Philosophoumena*, newly discovered; died about 230. Origen, born 185; head of the catechetical school at Alexandria 204; went to Rome, and returned to Alexandria, 213; went to Caesarea, in Palestine, 215; ordained at Caesarea, and afterwards settled there, about 230; retired to Cappadocia 235; returned to Caesarea 239; a laborious scholar and critic; compiled a *Hexapla*, or Polyglot Bible; wrote commentaries on Scripture, some of which survive; a treatise on prayer; and a defense against Celsus; thrown into prison 250; died 254. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, 248; fled from Carthage 250; returned 251; banished 257; author of epistles, addresses, and tracts; advocate of Episcopacy; suffered martyrdom 258. Dionysius, surnamed the Great, bishop of Alexandria, a scholar of Origen, 247 or 248; died 265. Gregory (Thaumaturgus), bishop of Neocaesarea, flourished 245; composed a creed, an oration in praise of Origen, and a paraphrase on Ecclesiastes; died about 270. Victorinus wrote scholia on the Apocalypse; died 303. Arnobius wrote his treatise of seven books *Against the Gentiles* about 305; died probably about 325. Lactantius, finished his *Institutes*

about 320; wrote also on *The Death of Persecutors*, and on *The Wrath of God*; composed a symposium or banquet, and an itinerary, both in verse; died 325. For the literature, see each of these titles in its alphabetical place. The greater part of this period, down at least to the death of Origen, A.D. 254, may be called the apologetic period of the early Church, and many of the writers of that time belong to the class of apologists (q.v.). The last half of the period was one of construction of doctrines and of polemical discussion of them within the Church. Strife against pagans and pagan philosophy on the one hand, and against Judaic Docetism and Gnosticism on the other, characterizes the whole period (see Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Ryland's translation, 1:33 sq.). "While the so-called apostolical fathers (with few exceptions) were distinguished by a direct practico-ascetical rather than a definite doctrinal activity, the philosophizing tendency allied to Hellenism was in some measure represented by the apologists *Justin Martyr*, *Tatian*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus* of Antioch, and *Minucius Felix* in the West. On the contrary, *Irenaeus*, as well as *Tertullian*, and his disciple *Cyprian*, firmly adhered to the positive dogmatic theology of the Church, the former is a milder and more considerate, the latter in a strict and sometimes gloomy manner. *Clement* and *Origen*, both belonging to the Alexandrian school, chiefly developed the speculative aspect of theology. But these contrasts are only relative; for we find, e.g. that *Justin Martyr* manifests both a leaning towards Hellenism, and a strong Judaizing tendency; that the idealism and criticism of *Origen* are now sad then accompanied with a surprising adherence to the letter; and that *Tertullian*, notwithstanding his and Gnostic tendency, evidently strives after philosophical ideas. It was the characteristic feature of the apologetic period, that the whole system of Christianity as a religious-moral fact was considered and defended rather than particular doctrines. Still, certain doctrines become more prominent, while others receive less attention. Investigations of a theological and christological nature are certainly more numerous than those of an anthropological character. On this account the doctrine of human liberty is made more conspicuous in this period than later writers approved. Next to theology and christology, eschatology engaged most the attention of Christians at that time, and was more fully developed in the struggle with millenarianism on the one side, and with the scepticism of Grecian philosophers on the other" (Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 26, 27). A valuable literary history of the ante-Nicene fathers is furnished by Donaldson, *Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine, from the death of the Apostles to the Nicene*

Council (Lond. 1864, 3 volumes, 8vo), a work which shows industry and ability, but is not remarkable for true critical judgment. Dr. Buchanan remarks that "Donaldson argues on the erroneous principle that the teaching of the earlier fathers may be applied as a test, if not of the truth of certain doctrines, at least of their necessity and importance as articles of faith. 'If the early writers were heterodox on the Trinity — if they knew nothing of a satisfaction of divine justice, but spoke only in a vague way of the matter — if they wavered in regard to original sin, some denying it entirely, and others expressing themselves with great uncertainty — if their testimony to the inspiration of the New Testament is unsatisfactory and inconclusive, where was Christianity in those days? Did it really sleep for three long centuries? ... Or may not the evangelical school be wrong in asserting that it is necessary for a man to believe in original sin, the Trinity, the atonement, and similar dogmas, before he can be a Christian?' (volume 1, page 64). Dr. Donaldson's work — considered as a 'Critical History of Christian Literature' in the first three centuries — is highly valuable, and exhibits the results of ripe scholarship, and extensive reading and research; but considered as a 'Critical History of Christian Doctrine,' it is far from being a safe guide. His interpretation of many passages in the writings of the fathers is, to say the least, highly questionable, and at direct variance with that of such writers as Bull, and Waterland, and Faber. But, even were it more certain than it is, and did it afford proof that their writings were less in accordance with Scripture than we believe them to have been, we should still fall back on the cardinal principle that they are to be tested by the only infallible standard, the inspired Word of God. 'To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this Word, there is no light in them.' We should then be constrained to say of them, as the prophet said of ancient Israel, 'They have forsaken the word of the Lord, and what wisdom is in them?' but we should have no difficulty in answering the question, 'Where was Christianity then? for it existed then, as it exists still, in the Word of God, the Gospel of our salvation;' and it was neither dead nor asleep, but alive and active in the Church of the Catacombs" (Buchanan, *Doctrine of Justification*, Edinb. 1867, page 431).

III. *Post-Nicene.* — The principal post-Nicene fathers are as follows:

Eusebius (Pamphili), born about A.D. 270; bishop of Caesarea, in Palestine, 315; was a learned and laborious writer; wrote, besides many other things; the *Evangelical Preparation*, in fifteen books; *Evangelical Demonstration*, in twenty books — the half of which is lost — but both

works belong to Apologetics (q.v.); an *Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books; died 340. Julius Firmicus Maternus, who wrote on the error of profane religions; flourished about 340. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, born 305; banished to Phrygia 356; wrote on the Trinity, on councils, against the Arians, with a commentary on the Psalms and Matthew; died 366. Athanasius, born at Alexandria about 296; present as deacon at the Council of Nicea 325; bishop of Alexandria 326; fled to Rome 341; returned to Alexandria 346; fled to the deserts of Egypt 356; wrote a discourse against the Gentiles, on the Incarnation; against the Arians, on the Incarnation; against Apollinaris, etc.; died 373. Basil, surnamed the Great, born 329; bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, 370; wrote homilies, expositions, panegyrics, *Hexiimeron*, and letters; died 379. Ephraim the Syrian, deacon of Edessa; published a variety of commentaries, polemical treatise, and smaller works; died about 379. Cyril of Jerusalem, born 315; bishop of Jerusalem 350; wrote catechetical discourses; died 386. Gregory of Nazianzus, born 328; ordained deacon 361; bishop of Suzima 372; bishop of Constantinople 381; wrote discourses, poems, and letters; died about 390. Gregory of Nyssa, born 351; bishop of Nyssa 372; wrote a *Hexaemeron*, life of Moses, on prayer, along with orations, panegyrics, tracts, and letters; died about 395. Ambrose, born 340; archbishop of Milan 374; published annotations on Scripture, discourses, and miscellaneous treatises; died about 397. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, born about 330; wrote a *Pannarium*, or a treatise on heresies, etc.; died 403. Chrysostom, born at Antioch about 344; ordained presbyter in that church 386; bishop of Constantinople 398; deprived and restored 403; banished 404; was a most eloquent preacher and voluminous writer; wrote many commentaries, homilies, orations, with several controversial pieces; died 407. Ruffinus, presbyter of Aquileia, engaged in controversy with Jerome 394; published a great many Latin translations, as well as original works; died 410. Jerome, born 331; in Rome 363; ordained presbyter about 378; translated or revised the Latin *Vulgate*; wrote commentaries on most of the books of Scripture, controversial tracts, an *Onomasticon*, and lives and works of preceding ecclesiastical writers; died 420. Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, about 392; wrote commentaries, in which he expounded the grammatical sense; but only a few brief fragments remain; died about 428. Augustine, born 354; baptized 387; ordained presbyter at Hippo 391; coadjutor of Valerius, bishop of Hippo, 395; began his work, *De Civitate Dei*. 402; published Confessions; engaged in controversy with the Pelagians, Donatists, and Manichaeans; composed a great variety of

tracts bearing on systematic theology and prevalent errors; wrote his *Retractationes*, or reviews of his own work, 426; died 430. Cyril of Alexandria, bishop of Alexandria 513; an ambitious and turbulent defender of orthodoxy; wrote on the Pentateuch, on adoration in spirit, some commentaries on portions of the Old and New Testaments, on the Trinity, against the emperor Julian, and against Nestorius; died 444. Vincent of Lerins (Vincentius Lirinensis) wrote his *Commonitorium*, or admonition against profane novelties of heretics, 434; died about 448. Isidore of Pelusium; wrote tracts on Scripture, on doctrines, on discipline, and on monachism; died 449. Sedulius, poet, and Scotsman by birth, wrote several hymns, and a *Carmen Paschale*, in verse; flourished about 449. Theodoret, born 386 (or 393); bishop of Cyrus, in Syria, 423; deprived 449; restored 451; wrote questions on Scripture, commentaries, and a Church history, extending from 325 to 429; a religious history, and an epitome of heretical fables; died 456. Petrus Chrysologus; wrote a letter to Eutyches and some sermons; died about 456. Leo I, surnamed the Great, to whom are ascribed letters and sermons; wrote on morals, on the pastorate, and left also homilies, dialogues and letters; died 461. Vigilius, bishop of Thapsus; wrote against the heresies of Arius, Nestorius, and on the Trinity; flourished about 480. Boethius, author of the *Consolation of Philosophy*; put to death 525. Procopius of Gaza, a commentator on Scripture; flourished about 525. Aretas, a commentator on the Apocalypse; flourished about 549. Evagrius, wrote a *Church History*; died 594. Gregory, bishop of Tours; died 596. Gregory I, surnamed the Great, bishop of Rome 590; died 604. Joannes Moschus, monk, died 620. Isidore of Seville, died 636. Bede, *the Venerable*, died 735. John of Damascus, *Dogmatic Theology*, c. 775. See, each of the above names in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopaedia.

IV. *Use and Authority of the Fathers in Theology.* — On this subject there are three opinions:

(a.) The Roman and Puseyite view, which puts the "consent of the fathers" (embodying tradition) into the rule of faith, along with Scripture. *SEE FAITH, RULE OF.*

(b.) That of the High-Church writers, who, though they acknowledge the Scriptures as the only rule of faith, yet appeal to the fathers as the proper expositors of Scripture doctrine, and denounce as arrogant and

presumptuous those who attempt to oppose modern opinions to what is held to be the sentiment of Christian antiquity.

(c.) The Protestant view, according to which the fathers are to be treated, like other theological writers, with the deference and respect to which their learning and their virtues may entitle them. "In reading the fathers we must always bear in mind that the Scriptures are the only rule of faith, and that we have no right to insist upon the reception, as an article of faith, of any doctrine which is not to be found clearly revealed in Scripture, or which is not deducible from Scripture. Still, the judgment of antiquity on disputed points may be useful; and while we should not put these writers into the position of judges, they may be regarded as competent witnesses. They are also the historians of the Church, and report its customs in successive ages; we must, therefore, have recourse to their writings for information on matters of ecclesiastical antiquity, just as we refer to the writings of heathen orators, historians, and poets for information with respect to Roman or Grecian antiquities" (Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, page 56).

1. The scholastic theology (q.v.) began with comments upon citations from the fathers, considered as authoritative (sentential). When the Reformation began, the Roman divines found themselves driven anew to the fathers for authority for the doctrines and practices which Luther and his coadjutors showed to be without foundation in Scripture. More loudly than even the scholastics did the controvertists of this period proclaim the authority of patristic tradition in settling questions of faith. We have here a clear polemical reason for the view taken of the fathers in Roman theology (see it stated in Alzog, *Patrologie*, § 3; and compare the articles FAITH, RULE OF *SEE FAITH, RULE OF*; TRADITION *SEE TRADITION*). Not unnaturally, then, have the Roman theologians been the most diligent workers in this field of Christian literature. But, on the other hand, the Roman theory that questions of doctrine can only be settled by councils (or by pope and council), has not been without effect in leading Roman writers to depreciate the early writers, or, at least, to see their defects clearly. So Petavius, whose *Opus De Theologicis Dogmatibus* (Paris, 1644-50; new edit. volume 1, Romae, 1857, fol.) is a store-house of patristical learning, points out the theological errors of Atheicagoras, Tertullian, and others, with great clearness. So also J.H. Newman, in the Introduction to his *Essay on the Derelopment of Christian Doctrine* (pages 12-15, N.Y. edit.), dwells upon the "incompleteness" and even of the "errors" of the ante-Nicene theology, even in the hands of such fathers as

Irenaeus, Gregory, and Cyprian. This whole Introduction may be considered as an argument against the so-called Tractarian view of the authority of the fathers, and especially against the validity and practicability of the much-vaunted dictum of Vincentius Liainetesis (q.v.), *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus traditum est*. All the recent Roman writers who adopt the theory of "development" (q.v.) write in the same vein.

2. The Protestant theologians have, until a late period at least, been divided into two wings on this question of the "right use of the fathers." One of these wings may be represented by Milton (t 1674) and by Daille (t 1670). Milton, in his tract on *Prelatical Episcopacy*, speaks, in his strong way, of those who, "not content with the plentiful and wholesome fountains of Scripture, seek to themselves teachers, and cannot think any doubt resolved until they run to that undigested heap and fry of authors which they call antiquity. Whatsoever time, or the heedless band of blind chance hath drawn down from of old to this present in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen, those are the fathers." But yet, he adds, in another part of the same tract, "He that thinks it the part of a well-learned man to have read diligently the ancient stories of the Church, sand to be no stranger in the volumes of the fathers, shall have all judicious men consenting with him; not hereby to control and new-fangle the Scriptures, God forbid! but to mark how corruption and apostasy crept in by degrees, and to gather up, wherever we find the remaining sparks of original truth, wherewith to stop the mouths of our adversaries, and to bridle them with their own curb who willingly pass by that which is orthodoxal in them, and studiously cull out that which is commentitious and best for their turns; not weighing the fathers in the balance of Scripture, but Scripture in the balance of the fathers. If we, therefore, making first the Gospel our rule and oracle, shall take the good which we light on in the fathers, and set it to oppose the evil which other men seek from them, sin this way of skirmish we shall easily master all superstition and false doctrine; but if we turn this our discreet and wary usage of them into a blind devotion towards them, and whatsoever we find written by them, we both forsake our own grounds and reasons which led us at first to part from Rome, that is, to hold the Scriptures against all antiquity; we remove our cause into our adversaries' own court, and take up there those cast principles which will soon cause us to solder up with them again, inasmuch as, believing antiquity for itself in any one point we bring an engagement upon ourselves of assenting to all that it charges upon

us." Milton, it is plain, was writing against the Anglican admirers of antiquity as much as against the Roman Catholics.

Daille wrote a treatise, *De Vero Usu Patrum* (1636; Am. ed. *The Right Use of the Fathers*, Philadel. 1842, 12mo), which formed an epoch in the history of opinion on this subject. Warburton, in his *Introduction to Julian*, speaks of the work, its occasion and issues, as follows: "When the great defection was made from the Church of Rome back again to the Church of Christ, the Reformed, though they shook off the tyranny of the pope, could not disengage themselves from the unbounded authority of the fathers, but carried that prejudice with them, as they did some others of a worse complexion, into the Protestant religion. For in sacred matters, as novelty is suspicious and antiquity venerable, they thought it for their credit to have the fathers on their side. They seemed neither to consider antiquity in general as a thing relative, nor Christian antiquity as a thing positive; either of which would have shown them that the fathers themselves were modern compared to that authority on which the Reformation was founded, and that the Gospel was that true antiquity on which all its followers should repose themselves. The consequence of which unhappy error was that, in the long appeal to reason between Protestants and Papists, both of them going on a common principle of the decisive authority of the fathers, enabled the latter to support their credit against all the evidence of common sense and sacred Scripture. At length an excellent writer of the *Reformed* [Daille], observing that the controversy was likely to be endless; for, though the gross corruptions of Popery were certainly later than the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, to which the appeal was usually made, yet the seeds of them being sown, and beginning to pullulate, it was but too plain there was hold enough for a skillful debater to draw *the fathers* to his own side, and make them water the sprouts they had been planting: observing this, I say, he wisely projected to shift the ground, and force the disputants to vary their method both of attack and defense. In order to this, he composed a discourse of the *True Use of the Fathers*, in which, with uncommon learning and strength of argument, he showed that the fathers were incompetent deciders of the controversies now on foot, since the points in question were not formed into articles till long after the ages in which they lived. This was bringing the *fathers* from the bench to the table, degrading them from the rank of judges into the class of simple evidence; in which, too, they were not to speak, like *Irish* evidence, in every cause where they were wanted, but only to such matters as were agreed to be

within their knowledge. Had this learned critic stopped here, his book had been free from blame; but, at the same time, his purpose had in all likelihood proved very ineffectual, for the obliquity of old prejudices is not to be set straight by reducing it to that line of right which barely restores it to integrity. He went much farther; and by showing occasionally that they were absurd interpreters of Holy Writ, that they were bad reasoners in morals and very loose evidence in facts, he seemed willing to have his readers infer that, even though they had been masters of the subject, yet these other defects would have rendered them very unqualified deciders. However, the work of this famous foreigner had great consequences, and especially with us here at home. The more learned among the nobility (which at that time was of the republic of letters) were the first who emancipated themselves from the general prejudice. It brought the excellent lord Falkland to think moderately of the fathers, and to turn his theological inquiries into a more useful channel; and his great rival in arts, the famous lord Digby, found it of such use to him in his defense of the Reformation against his cousin Sir Kenelm that he has even epitomized it in his fine letter on that subject. But what it has chiefly to boast of is that it gave birth to the two best defenses ever written on the two best subjects, *religion* and *liberty* — I mean Mr. Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants*, and Dr. Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*. In a word, it may be truly said to be the store-house from whence all who have since written popularly on the character of the *fathers* have derived their materials" (cited in *Preface* to the Philadelphia edition of Daille).

3. The other Protestant wing consists of the early writers after the Reformation who sought in the fathers to find weapons against Rome, and of their successors, especially in the Church of England, who have favored what are called High-Church views. Among Continental writers, Scultetus (*Medullae Theologiae Patrum Syntagma*, Frankfort, 1598; Heidelb. 1613; Frankfort, 1634) sought to show that the ante-Nicene fathers had been corrupted and misinterpreted by Roman writers, and that Protestant doctrines were nearer to the ancient than the Roman Catholic doctrines. The Anglican divines, from an early period of the Reformation, made great use of the fathers in the controversy with Rome. Moreover, they found, or believed that they found, the fathers very serviceable in their warfare for episcopacy. Patristic studies became fashionable in the Church; the great names of Bull, Waterland, Usher, Andrews, and many others, show a list of patristical scholars hardly excelled in the Roman schools. Usher set great

store upon the study of the fathers, not simply on polemical, but also on scientific grounds. Dr. Parr says of him: "Indeed, he had so great an esteem of the ancient authors for the acquiring any solid learning, whether sacred or profane, that his advice to young students, either in divinity or antiquity, was, not to spend too much time in epitomes, but to set themselves to read the ancient authors themselves; as, to begin with the fathers, and to read them according to the ages in which they lived (which was the method he had taken himself), and together with them, carefully to peruse the Church historians that treated of that age in which those fathers lived, by which means the student would be better able to perceive the reason and meaning of divers passages in their writings (which otherwise would be obscure) when he knew the original and growth of those heresies and heterodox opinions against, which they wrote, and may also better judge what doctrines, ceremonies, and opinions prevailed in the Church in every age, and by what means introduced." Bull and Waterland made great use of the fathers in their discussions of the Trinity. Waterland writes against Daille's charges of obscurity in the fathers (*Works*, Oxford, 6 vols. 8vo); he also wrote on the use and value of ecclesiastical antiquity in general (3:601-655), and made a reply to Barbeyrac's *Morale des Peres de l'glise* (Amst. 1728). The great dissenting scholar, Dr. Lardner, applied the fathers in an apologetical way, with rare learning and skill, in his *Credibility of the Gospel History* (latest edition, in his *Works*, 10 volumes, 8vo, London, 1827). He gives brief but painstaking notices of the history and literature of each of the writers cited, and his work is to this day one of the most useful introductions to the study of the writings of antiquity.

There was much controversy in the 18th century about the fathers, generally polemical, and inspired rather by the controversial spirit than by the love of truth. So Priestley attacked the fathers in his *Corruptions of Christianity* (1782). Bishop Horsley replied to him; and a voluminous issue of tracts followed from both parties (see Horsley, *Tracts in controversy with Dr. Priestley on the belief of the first Ages with regard to our Lord's divinity* (3d ed. Dundee, 1812). Middleton's *Free Inquiry into the miraculous Powers attributed to the Early Church* (*Works*, 1755, volume 1) also gave rise to a copious controversy. John Wesley, in reply to it, says that "Middleton seeks to prove that all the primitive fathers were fools or knaves, and most of them both one and the other." He vindicates the ante-Nicene fathers from Middleton's charge that they held to all the chief "corruptions of Popery." In his summing up he says of the early fathers, "I

allow that some of these had not strong natural sense, that few of them had much learning, and none the assistances which our age enjoys in some respects above all that went before. Hence I doubt not but whoever will be at the pains of reading over their writings for that poor end will find many mistakes, many weak suppositions, and many ill-drawn conclusions. And yet I exceedingly reverence them, as well as their writings, and esteem them very highly in love. I reverence them because they were Christians; and I reverence their writings because they describe true genuine Christianity, and direct us to the strongest evidence of the Christian doctrine" (*Works*, N.Y. ed., 5:705-761).

4. A new impulse was given to the study of the fathers in England by the so-called Catholic revival in that Church in the first half of the 19th century. The old reverence for their authority, and even more, a blind following of their guidance, seemed to take possession of the leaders of that movement. One of its best fruits was the publication of the *Library of the Fathers* (see below). The movement gave rise, as is well known, to a bitter controversy, reopening the whole question of the character of the fathers, their trustworthiness as witnesses, their authority as teachers, and the general utility of studying their writings. We cite a few specimens:

Coleridge, in his *Notes on Hacket*, especially on his Sermons, remarks: "Let any competent judge read Hacket's life of archbishop Williams, and then these sermons, and so measure the stultifying, nugifying effect of a blind and uncritical study of the fathers, and the exclusive prepossession in favor of their authority in the minds of many of our Church dignitaries in the reign of Charles I" (*Works*, Harpers' ed. N.Y., 5:128).

Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, who was a hearty hater of the Tractarian movement, writes on the authority of the fathers as follows: "In fact. it would greatly help to clear this question if we understand what we mean by allowing or denying the authority of the so-called fathers. The term *authority* is ambiguous, and, according to the sense in which I use it, I should either acknowledge it or deny it. The writers of the first four or of the first seven centuries have authority just as the scholiasts and ancient commentators have; some of them, and in some points, are of weight singly; the agreement of many of them has much weight; the agreement of almost all of them would have great weight. In this sense I acknowledge their authority, and it would be against all sound principles of criticism to deny it. But if by authority is meant a decisive authority, a judgment which may

not be questioned, then the claim of authority in such a case, for any man or set of men, is either a folly or a revelation. Such an authority is not human, but divine: if any man pretends to possess it, let him show God's clear warrant for his pretension, or he must be regarded as a deceiver or a madman. But it may be said that an authority not to be questioned was conferred by the Roman law on the opinions of a certain number of great lawyers: if a judge believed that their interpretation of the law was erroneous, he yet was not at liberty to follow his own private judgment in departing from it. Why may not the same thing be allowed in the Church? or why may not the interpretations of Cyprian, or Athanasius, or Augustine, or Chrysostom be as decisive, with respect to the true sense of the Scriptures, as those of Gaius, Paulus, Modestinus, Ulpian, and Papinian were acknowledged to be with respect to the sense of the Roman law? The answer is that the emperor's edict could absolve the judge from following his own convictions about the sense of the case, because it gave to the authorized interpretation the force of law. The text, as the judge interpreted it, was a law repealed; the comment of the great lawyers was now a law in its room. As a mere literary composition, he might interpret it rightly, and Gaius or Papinian might be wrong; but if his interpretation was ever so right grammatically or critically, yet legally it was nothing to the purpose; Gaius's interpretation had superseded it, and was now the law which he was bound to obey. But in the Church, the only point to be aimed at is the discovery of the true meaning of the text of the divine law; no human power can invest the comment with equal authority. The emperor said, and might say to his judges, "You need not consider what was the meaning of the deceivers when they wrote the Twelve Tables, or of Aquillius when he drew up the Aquillian law. The law for you is not what the deceivers may have meant, but what their interpreters meant; the deceivers' meaning, if it was their meaning, is no longer the law of Rome." But who dare say to a Christian, "You need not consider what was the meaning of our Lord and his apostles; the law for you now is the meaning of Cyprian, or Ambrose, or Chrysostom; that meaning has superseded the meaning of Christ." A Christian must find out Christ's meaning, and believe that he has found it, or else he must still seek for it. It is a matter, not of outward submission, but of inward faith; and if in our inward mind we are persuaded that the interpreter has mistaken our Lord's meaning, how can we by possibility adopt that interpretation in faith?" (*Miscellaneous Works*, N.Y. 1845, page 274).

Archdeacon Hare (in his notes to the *Mission of the Comforter*) seeks to show that even the greatest of the fathers were inferior, in their understanding of Scripture, to the great divines of the Reformation. "There is much truth," he says, "though perhaps not without some exaggeration of phrase, in what Coleridge says (*Remains*, 3:276) with reference to Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin, that the least of them was not inferior to Augustine, and worth a brigade of the Cyprians, Firmilians, and the like.' Surely there is nothing surprising in this. The marvel, the contradiction to the whole course of history would be if this were not the case, unless we suppose that the special illumination which was granted to the apostles was bestowed on the chief teachers of Christianity down to the last of the fathers, was then withdrawn, and has been withheld ever since. But for such a limitation and restriction of the gifts of the Spirit no ground can be discovered, either in Scripture or in the nature of man; nor does the history of the Church present any facts to support it... It is next to a moral impossibility that men living in the decrepitude of the ancient world, under the relaxing and paralyzing influences of the Roman and Byzantine empires, when all intellectual and moral life was fast waning away, and the grand and stirring ideas and aims which had drawn forth the energies of the classical nations in their prime had been superseded by rhetorical tumor and allegorical and grammatical trifling, should have mounted to such a pitch of intellectual power as to be beyond the reach of the noblest minds in the age when all the faculties of the now world were bursting into life, and when one region of power after another was laid open to man, and called him to rise up and take possession of it... . There is no antecedent improbability that a theologian in the sixteenth century should be quite as wise and as sound an expounder of theological truth as one in the fourth or fifth. Though the earlier divines may have had certain special advantages, the advantages enjoyed by those of the later period were far greater and more important; and if they had peculiar temptations to lead them astray, so had the others. The epoch at which a man lives does not afford us a criterion for judging of the truth of what he says, except so far as his testimony may be appealed to concerning facts; in other respects the value of his writings must be determined on different grounds by candid and intelligent criticism. Nor is such criticism less needful with regard to the fathers than to any other body of writers... . To those who study the fathers critically and discerningly they still yield grains of precious gold in abundance, as we see in the excellent exegetical writings of Mr. Trench. But the superstitious and idolatrous are ever fond of displaying their dotage by picking out as the

special objects of their complacency not that which is really valuable — other men might approve of that — but that which is itself is worthless, nay, mawkishly silly or wildly absurd... . And with what exactitude is the training of some of our patrolaters who are lapsing into Romsanism here described! The issue, indeed, so far as we are at present acquainted with it, has been mainly in one direction towards Rome. This is not because the fathers of the first four or five centuries are favorable to the errors and corruptions of Rome.

The contest on this point has been waged again and again, and the victory, in the main, has always been on our side. But the very habit of looking with prostrate minds to outward human authority, and that, too, authority so remote from the special wants and yearnings of our age, and incapable of speaking to us with that intelligent fellow-feeling which elicits the responsive activity of our own spirits-to authority, therefore, which can only speak imperatively, except to the few whose understandings are mature enough to consult it critically, and to distinguish the true from the erroneous, the relevant from the irrelevant tends to breed an imbecile tone of judgment which is incapable of standing alone, and will not be content with the helps wherewith God has supplied us, but craves restlessly for some absolute authority whereby it may be enabled to walk in leading-strings all its life long. Such minds, when one prop after another gives way under them, as they find out that no father can be appealed to as an absolute authority, least of all on the particular questions which agitate our times the most, will try to save themselves from falling into infidelity by catching desperately hold of infallibility. And how long will this bear them up?" (Hare, *Vindication of Luther*, p. 76-82).

5. But some of the opponents of an undue reverence for the fathers have not been wanting in just appreciation of their historical value. Dr. W. L. Alexander (*Anglo-Catholicism not Apostolical*, Edinb. 1843, 8vo) gives the following caution against under-estimating the importance and value of the fathers: "There has been among Protestants a great deal of foolish talking and much jesting that is anything but convenient upon this subject. Men who have never read a page of the fathers, and who could not read one were they to try, have deemed themselves at liberty to speak in terms of scoffing and supercilious contempt of these venerable luminaries of the early Church. Because Clement of Rome believed in the .existence of the phoenix, and because Justin Martyr thought the sons of God who are said in Genesis to have intermarried with the daughters of men were angels,

who for the loves of earth were willing to forego the joys of heaven; and because legends and old wives' fables now are found in almost all the fathers, it has been deemed wise to reject, despise, and ridicule the whole body of their writings. The least reflection will suffice to show the unsoundness of such an inference. What should we say of one who, because lord Bacon bald many opinions which modern science has proved to be false, should treat the *Novum Organum* With contempt? or of one who should deem himself entitled to scoff at Richard Baxter because in his *Saints' Rest* that able and excellent man tries to prove the existence of Satan by quoting instances of his apparitions, and of his power over witches? There is no man, however good or great, that can get quite beyond the errors and credulities of his age. It becomes us, therefore, in dealing with the writings of a former generation, to take care that, in rejecting the bad, we do not also despise the good; and especially that we be not found availing ourselves of advantages which have reached us through the medium of these writings, while we ignorantly and ungratefully dishonor the memory of those by whom these writings were penned." In the height of the so-called Tractarian controversy in England, Isaac Taylor wrote his *Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts* (Lend. 1839, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1844; reprint of vol. i, Phila. 1840, 12mo) for the purpose of laying "pen the real condition, moral, spiritual, and ecclesiastical, of the ancient Church;" and the chief aim and tendency of the book is to lessen the authority of the fathers, especially of those of the ante-Nicene period. Yet even he devotes a chapter to show the dependence of the modern Church upon the ancient, and to deprecate a "setting at naught" of patristical learning. "It is not, we may be sure, those who possess much of this indispensable learning that in any such way set it at naught; and it is an acknowledged rule in all walks of science and literature that the scoffs and captious objections of the ignorant need not be seriously replied to know what you are speaking of, and then contemn it.' Now the mere fact of applying *any* comprehensive terms, either of admiration or contempt, to a body and series of writers, stretching through seven hundred or a thousand years, and these writers natives as they were of distant countries, some of them simple and rude, while others were erudite and accomplished, may be taken as a proof of heedlessness, regarding the matter in hand, sufficient to excuse a silent disregard of the objection it involves. These 'fathers,' thus grouped as a little band by the objectors, were some of them men of as brilliant genius as any age has produced; some commanding a flowing and vigorous eloquence, some an extensive

erudition, some conversant with the great world, some whose meditations had been ripened by years of seclusion, some of them the only historians of the times in which they lived, some the chiefs of the philosophy of their age; and if we are to speak of the whole as a series or body of writers, they are the men who, during a long aera of deepening barbarism, still held the lamp of knowledge and learning, and, in fact, afford us almost all that we can now know, intimately, of the condition of the nations surrounding the Mediterranean, from the extinction of the classic fire to the time of its rekindling in the fourteenth century. The Church was the ark of all things that had life during a deluge of seven hundred years. Such is the group which is often conveniently dismissed with a concise phrase of contempt by some! It may be suspected that very many of the delighted admirers of the *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* are little aware of the extent of Gibbon's obligations to the fathers. Were it possible to draw off from that seductive work the entire materials derived by the indefatigable author from the ecclesiastical compartment of his library, it is no small proportion of the splendor, the accuracy, the correct drawing, the vivid coloring, which are its charm and praise, that would be found wanting. Well would it have been if some of the professed champions and historians of Christianity had been as thoroughly conversant with the remains of Christian antiquity as was its most dangerous assailant. The ignorance of which we are here complaining has once endangered our faith as Christians, and it is now endangering our faith as Protestants. Nearly of the same quality, and usually advanced by the same parties, is the portentous insinuation, or the bold and appalling averment, that there was little or no genuine Christianity in the world from the times of Justin Martyr to those of Wickliffe, or of Luther! and the inference from this assumption is that we are far more likely to be led astray than edified by looking into the literature of this vast territory of religious darkness. I must leave it to those who entertain any such sombre belief as this to repel, in the best manner they are able, those fiery darts of infidelity which will not fail to be hurled at Christianity itself as often as the opinion is professed. Such persons, too, must expound as they can our Lord's parting promise to his servants. Notions of this sort, and there are many of like kind, all take their rise from some narrow and sectarian hypothesis concerning Christianity. We do not, perhaps, find, during certain cycles of the Church's history, that style or dialect which, by an intimate association of ideas, has combined itself with our religious sentiments, and therefore it is to us and our peculiar feelings as if Christianity itself had actually not been extant at

such times. If these are our feelings, it is well that we get rid of them with all speed. Christianity is absolute truth, bearing with various effect, from age to age, upon our distorted and discolored human nature, but never so powerfully pervading the foreign substance it enters as to undergo no deflections itself, or to take no stains; and as its influence varies, from age to age, in intensity, as well as in the particular direction it may take, so does it exhibit, from age to age, great variations of form and hue. But the men of any one age indulge too much the overweening temper that attaches always to human nature when they say to themselves, our Christianity is absolute Christianity, but that of such or such an age was a mere shadow of it. All mystification apart, as well as a superstitious and overweening deference to antiquity, nothing can be more simple than the facts on which rests the legitimate use and value of the ancient documents of Christianity, considered as the repositories of those practices and opinions which, obscurely or ambiguously alluded to in the canonical writings, are found, drawn forth, and illustrated in the records of the times immediately succeeding. These records contain at once a testimony in behalf of the capital articles of our faith and an exposition of minor sentiments and ecclesiastical usages, neither of which can be surrendered wit-out some serious loss and damage" (Taylor, *Ancient Christianity*, 8vo ed. p. 66-71).

6. The more recent tendency among the theologians off Germany, England, and America is to study the fathers more thoroughly than ever, but to study them in a scientific way, for historical rather than polemical and dogmatical ends; or, where dogmatic interest-s are involved, to use thee fathers historically, and not as authorities. The terms Patristics and Patrology have come into use to designate the history and literature of the fathers on the one hand, *SEE PATRISTICS*, and their theology on the other, *SEE PATROLOGY*. These branches have not yet taken fully scientific shape, but they are on the way to it (see the references below).

IV. *Collective Editions of the Fathers.*

1. The first great collection was that of De la Bigne, who formed the idea of a collection of the fathers with a view of opposing the doctrines of the French Protestants. This scheme met with the approbation of his superiors in the Sorbonne, and the first eight volumes appeared at Paris in 1575, and the 9th in 1579. It is entitled *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum et Antiquorum Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latine*, and it contained about 200 writers.

The 2d edit.,- somewhat improved, was published at Paris in 1589, 9 vols. fol. The 3d edit. (Paris, 1609, 11 vols. fol.) has the addition of an *Auctuarium*. In these editions the writers are classed according to subjects. The 4th edit., or rather a new work by the professors of Cologne, has the writers arranged in chronological order. It was printed at Cologne in 1608, in 14 vols. fol., to which in 1622 a supplement in one vol. was added. The 5th edit. (or 4th of De la Bigne) was published at Paris in 1624, in 10 vols. fol., with the addition of an *Auctuarium Graeco-Latinum* compiled by Le Duc (the Jesuit *Fronto Ducaeus*), and in 1629 a *Supplementum Latinusn-* in two vols. was added. The 6th edit. (or 5th of De la Bigne), printed at Paris in 1634, in 17 vols. fol., contains the preceding, with the *Auctuarium* and *Supplementum* incorporated. The 7th edit. in 1654 is merely a reprint of the last. 2. In 1677 appeared at Lyons (27 vols. fol.) the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, which generally and deservedly bears the name of *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum Lugdunensis*. It contains nearly all the writers found in the preceding works, together with many others (*Latin* only), chronologically arranged. 3. After this gigantic undertaking, no similar work appeared until that of Andre Galland was published, under the title of *Bibliotheca veterum Patrum antiquorensuque Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum postremam Lugdunensi multo locupletior atque accuratior*, in 14 vols. fol. (Venice, 1766-1781). The Greek texts are given, with Latin versions. Galland omits many authors given in the *Bibl. Max.*, but adds also 180 *not* given in it. 4. The most complete edition of both Greek and Latin fathers is that of Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, see Bibliotheca Universalis, integra, etc., Omnium SS. Patrum, Doctorum, Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum* (Paris, 1844-1867). This immense collection includes all the Latin writers from the apostolical age down to the time of Innocent III (A.D. 1216), and the Greeks down to the time of the Council of Florence (A.D. 1439). In most cases the Benedictine texts are followed. Ample indexes are. given, both alphabetical and analytical, of the Latin fathers; those for the Greek, unfortunately, were not all finished when Migne's establishment was burned down in 1868. The Latin fathers fill, with the indexes, two hundred and twenty-two volumes imperial octavo. The Greek writers (with Latin versions) take up one hundred and sixty-seven volumes of the same size. - The Latin version of the Greek fathers is also published separately in eighty-four volumes. For purposes of reference, there can be no question that this is the most convenient series of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers ever published. Complaints are made of many of the volumes (and justly) that sufficient care has not been taken with the

editing; and it is further charged that, in some cases, the old literary policy of the Church of Rome, of modifying, omitting, and even garbling, for polemical purposes, has been followed by Migne. For the study of special authors there are, certainly, editions to be had more accurate and trustworthy than Migne's; and no student who desires to be thorough in critical study would ever be satisfied without comparison of various editions. But with all drawbacks, the fact remains that the *Cursus Coaspletus Patrologice* is an indispensable necessity to every large theological or historical library.

Incomplete Collections and Translations. -Among these we cite, 1. A useful abridgment or analysis, in alphabetical order, viz. *Bib. Max. Patrum in Epitomen redacta* (Augsb. 1719, 2 vols. fol.); 2. Combefis, *Graeco-Lat. Patrum Bibliothecae Novena Auctuarium* (1648); also his *Bibliothecae Graecorum Patrum Auctuarium Novissimum* (2 parts, 1672); 3. Canisius, *Antiquae Lectiones seu varia veter. monumenta* (Ingolstadt, 1601), enlarged by Basnage (Amst. 1672, 4 vols. fol.); 4. Montfaucon, *Collectio Nova Patrum et Script. Graecorum* (Paris, 1706, 2 vols. fol.); 5. D'Achery, *Spicilegium sive collectio vet. aliquot Scriptorum* (Paris, 1655-77, 13 vols.; Par. 1723, 3 vols. fol.); 6. Grabe, *Spicilegium SS. Patrum ut et heretic. seculi post Christ.* I-III (2d edit. Oxon. 1714, 2 vols. 8vo); 7. Martehne et Durand, *Amp/ais/ma collectio vet. script. et monument. hist.* (Paris, 1724-33, 9 vols. fol.); 8. Routh, *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Opuscula* (2d edit. Oxford, 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); 9. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae, sive auctorum ferejam deperditorum 2 et 3 sacuhi, accedunt synodi et epist. canosa. Nicaen.* (Oxf. 1846-8, 5 vols. 8vo); 10. Angelo Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio* (Romma, 1825-38, 10 vols. 4to); 11. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum* (Romie, 1839-44, 10 vols. 8vo); 12. Mai, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca* (Rom. 1852, 7 vols. 4to); 13. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesanse* (Par. 1852 sq., 4 vols. 8vo); 14. (*Oxford Selection*), *Bib. Patr. Eccl. Catholicae, qui ante orientis et occidentis schisma floruerunt; delecta Presbyterorum quorundam Oxoniensium* (Oxf. 8vo, 1838, and following years- still issuing); 15. (*Oxford translation*), *Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the division of the East and West* (translated by members of the English Church; edited by E. B. Pusey, J. Keble, C. Marriott, Oxford, 8vo, 1839, and following years; 40 vols. issued); 16. *Bibliotheca Patrum concionatoria, hoc est, anni totius, evangelia, festa dominica, etc., homiliis atque sermonibus adornata SS. Patr. et script. eccles. qui tredecim prior. saec. flor., Opera*, et studio F.

Francisci Combefis; editio castigata, etc.; ed. A. Gonet et Ludovic. Pere (Paris, 1852 sq.; to form 30 vols. large 8vo); 17. (*Hand Editions*), Oberthur, *Opera Patrum Graecorum*, Greek et Lat. (Wirceb. 1777-92, 10 vols. 8vo); Ibid. *Op. Patrum Latinorum* (1780-91); Richter, *Bibliotheca Selecta Patrum Graecorum* (Lips. 1826 et seq., Josephus, Philo, Clemens); Thilo, *Patrum Graecorum Dogmatica* (Leipz. 1853-4, 2 vols. 8vo, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen); Gersdorf, *Patrum Eccles. Lat. selecta Bibliotheca* (Lips. 1838, 13 vols. 12mo, Clemens Rom., Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, Lactantius, Arnobius, Minucius Felix; a very correct and convenient edition); *Corpus Scriptor. Eccles. Latinorum* (edited under the direction of the Academy of Vienna, 1866, and continuing); *Corpus Apologetarum secundi saeculi* (ed. Otto, Jena, 1847, 8 vols. issued); *Corpus Haeresiologicum* (ed. Oehler, Berlin, 1856-65, 5 vols. 8vo); 18. (*German Translation*), *Simmml. Werke der Kirchenvater ins Deutsche iibersetzt.* (edit. Ziegler and Waitzmann, Kempten, 1831-1854; 39 vols. publ. up to 1854); 19. *The Ante-Nicene Christian Library; translations of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Roberts and Donaldson, an admirably conceived and executed work. Up to this date (January, 1869) the following have been issued: Vol. i, *The Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Rev. Dr. Roberts, Dr. Donaldson, and Rev. F. Crombie; vol. ii, *The Writings of Justin Martyr and Athenagoras*, translated by Rev. Marcus Dods, A.M., Rev. George Reith, A.M., and Rev. B. P. Pratten; vol. iii, *The Writings of Tatian and Theophilus, and the Clementine Recognitions*, translated by B. P. Pratten, Rev. Marcus Dods, A.M., and Rev. T. Smith, D.D.; vol. 4: *The Writings of Clement of Alexandria*, translated by Rev. W. Wilson, M.A.; vol. v, *The Writings of Ireneus*, translated by Rev. A. Roberts and Rev. W. H. Rambaut; vol. 6: *The Refutation of all Heresies by Hippolytus*, translated by Rev. J. H. Macmahon, M.A.; With Fragments from his Commentaries on various Books of Scripture, translated by Rev. S. D. F. Salmond; vol. 7: *The Five Books of Tertullian against Marcion*, translated by Peter Holmes, D.D.; vol. 8: *The Writings of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage*, vol. i, containing the Epistles and some of the Treatises, translated by Rev. E. Wallis, Ph. D.; vol. 9: *Ireneus*, vol. ii, translated by Rev. H. Roberts and Rev. W. H. Rambaut; vol. 10: *The Writings of Origen*, translated by Rev. F. Crombie, M.A. For editions of the fathers separately, see the individual names in their alphabetical places.

III. *Works on the Fathers; their literary history, their use, authority, etc.*

- 1.** Jerome (t 420), *De Viris Illustribus s. catalogus Scriptor. Eccles.* (Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* 23:602 sq., many editions and recensions; the work is the basis of Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, Hamburg, 1718, fol.);
- 2.** Photius (t 890), **Βιβλιοθήκη**. *Bibliotheca* (Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* vols. ciii, civ), containing sketches of 280 pagan and Christian writers;
- 3.** Bellarmine, *Liber de Scriptor. Ecclesiasticis* (Rom. 1613, and often);
- 4.** Cave, *Scriptorum Eccles. Historia Literaria*, ad saec. xiv (2 parts, Lond. 1688-98; Genev. 1705, 1720; Basel, 1741; Oxford [continued by Wharton], 1740-43, 2 vols. fol.);
- 5.** Dupin, *Nouv. Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques* (Paris, 1686-1698, 47 vols. 8vo; Amst. 1693-1715, 19 vols. 4to; Latin version, Paris, 1692 sq., 3 vols. 4to [up to Augustine]; English version, including 17th century, Lond. 1693-1707, 17 vols. bound in 7 or 8; Dublin, 1722-24, 3 vols. fol. [without the 17th century]; **SEE DUPIN**);
- 6.** Ceillier, *Histoire Geinrale des Auteurs Sacrs et ecclesiastiques* (Par. 172963, 23 vols. 4to; new edition, revised with additions, Paris, 1860-1865, 15 vols. imp. 8vo; **SEE CEILLIER**);
- 7.** Tillemont, *Memoires pour servir a l'histoire ecclesiastique* (Par. 1693, 16 vols.);
- 8.** Oudin, *Commentarius de Scriptor. Eccles. antiquis*, professing to fill up the gaps left by Cave, Dupin, etc. (Lips. 1722, 3 vols. fol.);
- 9.** Le Nourry, *Apparatus Criticus ad Bibl. Max. Patr.* (Paris, 1703-15, 2 vols. fol.);
- 10.** Tricalet, *Bibliothèque portative des peres de lyglise* (Paris, 1757-62, 9 vols. 8vo);
- 11.** Sprenger, *Thesaurus reipatristicce* (Wirceb. 1782-94, 3 vols. 4to);
- 12.** Lumper, *Hist. theologico-Critica de vita scriptis, etc., SS. Patrum* (Aug. Vind. 178399, 13 vols. 8vo) ;
- 13.** Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Greca*, etc. (Hamb. 1708-28, 14 vols.; ed. by Harless, 1790 to 1812, 12 vols. including Index); Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (mentioned above); Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina* **SEE FABRICIUS**;

14. Walch, *Bibliotheca Patristica* (Jena, 1770; new ed. by Danz, Jena, 1834, 8vo);

15. (*Introductions to Patristics. and Patrology*), Wilhelm (R. Cath.), *Patrologia ad usus academ.* (Freib. 1775); Engelhardt, *Leitfaden zu Vorlesungen ub. die Patristik* (Erlangen, 1823); Goldwitzer (R. C.), *Bibliographie d. Kirchen-Vdter* (Niirnberg, 1833-4, 2 vols. 8vo, not of much value); Locherer (R. C.), *Lehrbuch der Patrologie* (Mainz, 1837, 8vo); Permaneder (R. C.), *Patrologia generalis, specialis* (Landshut, 1841-43, 2 vols. 8vo); Mohler (R. C.), *Patrologie*, ed. by Reithmayr (Regensburg, 1840; only first vol. finished, covering first three centuries); Fessler (R. C.), *Institutiones Patrol.*, up to Gregory the Great (1850-51, 2 vols. 8vo); Alzog (R. C.), *Grundriss d. Patrologie* (Freib. 1866, 8vo); Donaldson, *Critical History of Christian Literature*, etc. (mentioned above, Lond. 1864, 3 vols. 8vo); 16. (*On the Use of the Fathers*), Nat. Bonaventura (R. C.), *Traite de la lecture des Peres* (Paris, 1688-97); also in Latin, *De opt. meth. legend. ecclesias. Patr.* (August. Vind. 1756, 8vo); Daille (see above), *Right Use of the Fathers* (Phil. 1842, 12mo); Goode, *Divine Rule of Faith*, etc. (Lond. 1853, 3 vols.; Phila. 2 vols.); Peck, *Appeal from Tradition* (N. York, 1844); and other works cited under FAITH, RULE OF **SEE FAITH, RULE OF** (q.v.); also Campbell, *Prelim. Diss. to Four Gospels* (diss. iv); Milton, *Prelatical Episcopacy* (*Prose Works*, vol. i); Conybeare, *Examination of the Ante Nicene Fathers* (Bampton Lect. 1839); Taylor, *Ancient Christianity* (Lond. 2 vols. 8vo); Hare, *Vindication of Luther*; Blunt, *Right Use of the Early Fathers*, against Daille and others (London, 1857, 8vo); Schaff, *Church History*, i, 453 sq.; Moses Stuart, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, i, 125 sq.; *Jahrbicher fir deutsche Theologie*, 1867, 2, 356; 1867, 4, 760; F. Nitzsch, in *Jahrbucherf. deutsche Theologie*, 10:37 sq.; Schwann, *Dogmengeschichte der patrist. Zeit.* (Munster, 1867, 8vo); Huiler, *Die Philosophie d. Kirchenviter* (Minchen, 1867, 8vo); Levestre, *Dictionaire de Patrologie* (Paris, 5 vols. 8vo). Brief sketches of the lives of the fathers may be found in Hook, *Ecclesiastical Biography* (8 vols. 12mo, London, 1845-52); Evans, *Biography of the Early Church* (2d edit. London, 1859. 2 vols. 18m1o); copious biographies of them in B6hringer, *Kirchengeschichte in Biographien* (Zurich, 9 parts, 1842-58).

Fathom

(ὄργυιά), a nautical measure of six (Greek) feet in length (strictly 6-81 Engl, feet); properly (as the word implies) the space which one can cover by extending the arms laterally (^{<44728>}Acts 27:28). *SEE MEASURE.*

Fatio De Duillers, Nicolas

a learned mathematician and an eccentric religious enthusiast, was born at Basle, in Switzerland, Feb. 16, 1664, and died in the county of Worcester, England, in 1753. He was educated in Geneva, visited and spent some time in Paris and the Hague, but finally chose England for his home. He early showed great ability in the exact sciences, and at the age of eighteen propounded a new theory of the earth and of the rings of Saturn in a letter to Cassini, to whose theory of zodiacal light he in 1685 gave new developments. He made several useful and curious applications of science to practical life, one of which was a new method of determining the speed of a vessel. In the controversy regarding the discovery of the differential calculus he was an earnest supporter of the claims of Newton. Later in life he adopted extravagant views on religious subjects, was an ardent champion of the prophets of the Cevennes, and claimed for himself inspiration and the gift of prophecy and miracles. Neither the ridicule which Shaftesbury, in his letter on enthusiasm, aimed at him, nor his public exposure with two other persons on the pillory in London (Sept. 1707) "for abetting and favoring Elias Marion in his wicked and counterfeit prophecies," had the effect to cure him of his enthusiasm. He even went to Asia in the hope of converting the world, but, not meeting with success, returned to England again, and spent his time in retirement, pursuing his scientific labors, but still cherishing his extravagant religious opinions. Many scientific works from his pen are extant, but his writings in favor of the prophets of the Cevennes are now unknown..-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biographie Generale*, 17:138.

Fatling.

1. **αἴμα** meria', a *fatted* animal, especially bullock ("calf") for slaughter, ^{<1063>}2 Samuel 6:13; ^{<2106>}Isaiah 11:6; ^{<2708>}Ezekiel 39:18.

2. **ἰμῆ** vie'ach, a marrowy sheep (q.v.), especially of the fat-tailed variety (^{<1965>}Psalms 66:15).

3. Improperly for **חַנְיָה** 'hanishne-', the *second* in rank, i.e. of inferior quality, ^{<1013>}1 Samuel 15:9.
4. (Corresponding with No. 1), **σιτιστός**, *corn fed*, i.e. stalled, fat, ^{<1024>}Matthew 22:4. **SEE FAT.**

Fatou, Nicholas

a French mystic writer, born at Arras in 1644, died at St. Omer in 1694, took the vows of the Dominican order in the convent at Arras, and subsequently entered that at St. Omer. We have from him: 1. *Le Paradis terrestre du Saint Rosaire de l'auguste Vierge, mere de Dieu*, etc., in 4 vols., of which only one vol. appeared (St. Omer et Lille, 1692, 12mo): -2. A treatise on the famous miracle of the holy candle, entitled *Discours sur les Prodiges du Saint Cierge*, etc., of which the first edition, quite rare, St. Omer, 1693; the second and third, Arras, 1696, sm. 8vo, and 1744, 12mo. Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.*

Fatted Fowl

Picture for Fatted Fowl

מִיֶּסֶבַע **מִיֶּרֶבֶבִי** *barbu-nim' abusim'*, Sept. **ὀρνίθων ἐκλεκτῶν στυτά**, Vulg. *aves altilies*) are included in ^{<1023>}1 Kings 4:23 [5:3], among the daily provisions for Solomon's table. Gesenius (*Theb. Heb.* p. 246) prefers to translate this "fatted geese," referring the word to the root **ררב**; "to be pure," because of the pure whiteness of the bird. He gives reasons for believing that the same word in the cognate languages included also the meaning of *swan* (comp. Bochart, *Hieroz.* ii, 127). Michaelis (*Supplem.* p. 226) less aptly interprets *field* animals (from the Chald. **רביא** *field*).

Whether domestic poultry was much raised by the Hebrews has been a matter of dispute; but no good reason can be assigned why they should not in this respect have been as well supplied as their neighbor's the Egyptians, who gave great attention to them. **SEE HEN.** As it is pretty generally conceded that some kind of *bird* is intended by the *barbur* here designated, none can in this particular compete' with the dung-hill fowl; and the *fattening* implies their domestication, while the fact of their *daily* consumption at the royal table argues their extensive cultivation and common use. Geese, however, may very probably be intended. as they were an esteemed article of food anciently, especially among the Egyptians,

whose monuments abound with illustrations of their rearing and culinary application. *SEE FOWL.*

Faucher, Denis

a French theologian, was born at Aries, A.D. 1487, and died at the abbey of Lerins in 1562. In 1508 he entered the Benedictine order at the convent of Polinore, near Mantua, and in 1515 was sent to the monastery of Lerins, of which he in advanced years became prior. His works are found in Vincent Barrale's (of Salerno) *Chronologia Sanctorum et Aliorum virorum illustrium ac Abbatum Sacrae insulae Lerinensis* (Lyon, 1613, 4to).-Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.*

Faucher, Jean

a French Protestant preacher and controversialist, died at Nismes in 1628. He was minister at Uzes, when he was 'sent in 1611 by the Protestant churches of Lower Languedoc as deputy to the Assembly at Sommieres, and in 1615 to that at Grenoble. When this latter assembly was in the following year transferred to Nismes, Faucher was chosen pastor and professor of theology in that city. He, however, followed the assembly to Rochelle, and did not return to Nismes until 1617, after the conclusion of a peace. He was a man of great energy of character, and agreed in opinion with those Huguenots who hoped by force of arms to secure liberty of conscience, if not the triumph of the Protestant cause in France. He persistently advocated a policy in consonance with such views in the assembly from 1615 to 1617, as indeed also in that convoked by the duke of Rohan in August, 1622, to agree upon terms of peace with the king, declaring that to open their cities to him would prove thee sacrifice of their liberties. Only two works from his pen are known, viz., *Exorcismes divins, ou propositions Chretiennes pour chasser hes dimons et les esprits abuseurs qui troublent les royaumes*

(Nismes, 1626, sm. 8vo), and *Zacharie, ou la Saint/tg dn Mariage et particulièrement du Mariage des ecclisiastiques, contra l'usage des sous-introduites et autres impuretes des consciences cauterizees* (Nismes, 1627, sm. 8vo).-Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*; Haag, *La France protestante.* (J. W.M.)

Fauchet, Claude

commonly known as the abbe' Fauchet, and a prominent Girondist in the French Revolution, was born at Dornes, in the department of Nièvre, Sept. 22, 1744, and was guillotined at Paris Oct. 31, 1793. After his ordination he became one of the priests of St. Roch, at Paris. When scarcely 30 years of age he delivered a panegyric on St. Louis before the French Academy, and was soon thereafter appointed grand vicar to the archbishop of Bourges then one of the court preachers, and abbot of Montfort Lacarre in Brittany. In a sermon delivered -in 1788 at the *fete da la Rosiaire* at Surenes, he manifested so strongly his sympathy with the revolutionary tendency that his name was stricken from the list of court preachers. Thenceforth an outspoken and zealous champion of the new political doctrines, he was active in the popular meetings in Paris, a participant in the movements against the Bastille, was named a member of the *Commune de Paris*, and assisted in the reorganization of the Church by composing the treatise entitled *Religion Nationale*, and was one of the editors of the *Bouche de Fer* (Iron Mouth). In 1791 he was made constitutional bishop of Calvados, from which department he was chosen a deputy to the Assembly and the Convention, where, though a zealous Republican, he opposed the extreme measures taken in regard to the king and the Church, supporting by his pen in the *Journal des Amis* the positions maintained by him in the Legislature. He consequently incurred the hatred of the Jacobins, and was included in the list of 21 Girondists proscribed by that party; was accused of federalism and complicity in the crime of Charlotte Corday, though the only ground on which this last charge was based was the accidental fact that Corday, coming to Paris an entire stranger, had applied to him, as the bishop of her province, for an introduction to the tribunes. He was, however, adjudged guilty, and executed with his fellow-Girondist deputies. The statements as to his repentance and recantation of Republican doctrines in prison, made by the. abbe Lothringer (letter in vol. iv of *Annales Catholiques*), and of his venality by De Molleville (*Memoires*, ii, 355-6), rest upon too questionable grounds to be accepted as true. In addition to the discourses and writings above mentioned, he published funeral orations in honor-of the duke of Orleans, the archbishop of Bourges, and the abbe de l'Epee; a eulogium of Franklin, three discourses on liberty, and one on the agreement of religion and liberty, a treatise in favor of the agrarian law, and a portion of the text of the *Tableau de la Revolution.*-*Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener.* xviii 163L5;

Lamartine, *History of the Girondists*; Jarry (l'abbe Valmeron), *L'Abbe Fauchet peint par luimeme*, etc. (Jersey, 1791); *Vie de l'Abbe Fauchet* (Paris, 1791); Alison, *History of Europe*. (J. W. M.)

Faucheur, Michel Le

a French Protestant divine of great talent as a preacher, was successively minister at Montpellier, Charenton, and Paris. He died in 1657. It is related of him that on one occasion he preached so forcibly against duels that marechal De la Force, who heard him, remarked to some officers in the audience that, should a challenge be sent to him, he would decline it. He wrote, *Sermons sur les onze premiers chapitres des Actes des Apotres* (Genesis 1664, 4 vols. 12mo):-*Traite de l'action de l'orateur, ou de la prononciation et du geste* (Par. 1657, 12mo):-*Sermon, Rom. 6:23: The wages of sin and the reward of grace* (translated in Cobbin's *French Preacher*):-*Traiti sur l'Eucharistie* (Genesis 1635), etc.-Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, s.v.

Fauchion,

Picture for Fauchion

i.e. FALCHION, is the rendering (Judith 13:6; 16:9) of the Greek **ἀκινάκης**; (which the Romans also Latinized *acinaces*), a Persian term for the short sword, usually represented as a straight, thick poniard on the Persepolitan figures (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. *Acinaces*), and therefore appropriately employed in the apocryphal account of the decapitation of Holofernes by the Hebrewess. **SEE SWORD.**

Faukelius, Hermannus

was born at Bruges about the year 1560. His parents were warmly attached to the Protestant cause. At twenty we find him in a theological seminary at Ghent. Here he enjoyed the instructions of able professors, among whom was Danaeus (q.v.). After leaving Ghent, where he distinguished himself as a student, he spent a short time at the University of Leyden. In 1585. he was called to serve a Protestant church at Cologne, where he labored for fourteen years amid many discouragements. On June 27, 1599, he was installed over the Reformed church in Middelburg, the chief city of Zealand, where he spent the remainder of his life. He had great reputation as a preacher. His learning was profound, his exhortations earnest and

impressive, and his deportment exemplary. In ecclesiastical affairs he acted a conspicuous part. He was member and assessor of the Provincial Synod held at Tholen in 1602, and was delegated in 1607 to the *Conventus praeparatorius* at the Hague, where his opposition to the Arminian tendency was strongly exhibited. He assured the Convention that the churches of Zealand desired no revision of the Catechism and Confession. In 1616 the task was assigned to him, in conjunction with Bucerus and Walaeus, to make known to the scholars and to universities in other lands the condition of ecclesiastical affairs in Holland. At the organization of the Synod of Dort he was chosen one of the assessors of that famous body. At its forty-third session he was selected as one of the deputation sent to the Hague to report the proceedings of synod to the States General. During its thirteenth session he was appointed one of the translators of the New Testament. For this work he was eminently fitted. Of this he had given previous evidence in his translation of the N.T., published in 1617 at Middelburg, entitled, *Het Nieuwe Testament onses Heeren Jesu Christi, uit den griekschen overgheset, neerstelick nu oversien na de beste oversettingen, ende van veel druckfouten ghesuyvert; met nieuwe sommatien ende afdeelinghen der capittelen, midtsgaders annotatien aan den Rant tot verclaringhe van den text*. In his knowledge of the Hebrew he is said to have surpassed most of his contemporaries. The historical books of the O.T. were translated by him, and neatly written out in two folio volumes, which are still preserved in the vestry of the Reformed church in Middelburg. Other important labors were also assigned him by the Synod. He was appointed one of a committee to compare the Latin, Dutch, and French copies of the Confession, in order to obtain as accurate a copy as possible. He was also a member of the committee appointed to draft articles on the five disputed points known as the *Canons of the Synod of Dort*. **SEE DORT**. He was also requested to prepare two catechetical works. *Het Kort begrip der Christelijke Religie* (Compendium of the Christian Religion) is due to his pen. This may still be found in company with the Heidelberg Catechism, Confession of Faith, etc., in the book of praise used by the Reformed Church in this country. He published a work on the Anabaptists in 1621. After his death, an exposition of the 45th Psalm, and a volume of sermons on the incarnation, circumcision, death, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus were issued. Various other important trusts, besides those already mentioned, were discharged by him with exemplary zeal. We find nothing alleged against him, even by Brandt, save his strenuous opposition to the Remonstrants; and even in this matter he is

not charged with anything inconsistent with the dignity of his position. If he lacked in Christian charity and forbearance, it was a fault in which he does not seem to have shared more deeply than most of his contemporaries. He died May 9, 1625, and was buried under the old church in Middelburg. See Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, I Deel, blz. 455 en very; G. Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie, en andere kerkelijke Geschiedenissen in en omtrent de Nederlanden*, III Deel, blz. 27, 53, 226, 227, 233, 544, 627, 645, 648. (J. P.W.)

Faunt, Arthur, Or Laurence, Arthur

an English Jesuit, was born at Foston, Leicestershire, in 1544, and died at Ulna, in Lithuania, in 1591. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and thence went successively to the Jesuits' College at Louvain, to Paris, Munich, and Rome, where he was appointed divinity reader in the English Jesuits' College. He wrote several theological treatises, for an account of which, see Watts, *Bib. Brit.-Rose, New Genesis Biog. Dict.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*.

Faure, Charles

a French Roman Catholic theologian, born at Luciennes, near Paris, in 1594; died Nov. 4, 1644. He was the first superior-general of the regular canons of the Congregation of France, and devoted his life to the reform of the religious orders. He is the author of several religious works, among which is the *Dictionnaire des Novices* (Paris, 1711, 4to). -Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*.

Faure, Francois

a French prelate, born Nov. 8, 1612; died May 11, 1687. He entered the Franciscan order at the age of seventeen, and rose to the highest positions therein; was appointed sub-preceptor of Louis XIV, and finally bishop of Amiens. We have from him a condemnation of the *Lettres Provinciales*; an *Ordonnance contre le Nouveau Testament de Mons* (1673); a *Panegyrique de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1680, 4to); an *Oraison funebre de la reine Anne d'Autriche* (died 1666); and an *Oraison funebre de Henriette-Marie de France, reine de la Grande-Bretagne* (Paris, 1670, 4to). -. Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*.

Faust, DR.

according to tradition, a celebrated dealer in the black art. (The following account, chiefly translated from Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, is taken from Chambers, *Encyclopaedia*, s.v.) He was born probably about A.D. 1480, at Knittlingen (or Kundlingen), in Wurtemberg, or, as some say, at Roda, near Weimar. He is said to have studied magic at Cracow. "After having spent a rich inheritance left him by his uncle, Faust is alleged to have made use of his 'power' to raise or conjure up the devil, with whom he entered into a contract for twenty-four years, obtaining during that time his fill of earthly pleasure, but at its termination surrendering body and soul into the hands of the great enemy. The devil gave him an attendant spirit or daemon, called Mephistopheles, though other names are given him by the later traditionists, with whom he travelled about, enjoying life in all its forms, and astonishing people by working wonders, till he was finally carried off by the Evil One, who appeared in terrible guise between twelve and one o'clock at night, at the village of Rimlich, near Wittenberg, though several other places lay claim to that very questionable honor. Some have doubted, considering the monstrosly mythical form in which his career has come down to us, whether such an individual as Faust ever existed; but it is now generally believed that there was a basis of fact, on which tradition has built its grotesque superstructure. Gorres, indeed, asserts that one George Sabellicus, who disappeared about the year 1517, is the real Faust; but Philip Melancthon the man of all the reformers- whose word in regard to a matter of fact would most readily be trusted-says that he had himself conversed with Dr. Faustus. Conrad Gesner (1561) is equally positive; and Luther, in his *Table Talk*, speaks of Dr. Faust as a man lost beyond all hope. The opinion that prevails, and which is reckoned to be intrinsically the more probable, is that some man of this name, possessed of varied knowledge, may possibly have practised jugglery (for the wandering savans of the Middle Ages had all a touch of the quack about them), and thus have been taken by time ignorant people for a dealer in the black art, and one' who maintained a secret and intimate relation with evil spirits. His widely diffused celebrity not only occasioned the wonders worked by other so-called necromancers of an earlier age Albertus Magnus, Simon Magus, and Paracelsus to be attributed to him, but likewise many ancient tales and legends of a marvellous character were gradually transferred to him, till he finally appears as the very hero of magicians. But while, on the one hand, the narrative of Faust's marvels afforded amusement to the people, on the

other they were made use of for instruction by the clergy, who pointed out, in the frightful fate of Faust, the danger of tampering with the 'black art,' and the abominableness of a life sunk in sensuality and vice. The myth of Faust has received a manifold literary treatment. First come the *Volksbücher* (or people's books), which record Faust's enterprises and feats. The oldest of these now known appeared at Frankfort in 1588. Then came an 'improved' edition of the same, by Widmann, entitled *Wahrhaftige Historien von denen graulichen Sunden Dr. Joh. Faust's* (True History of the Horrible Crimes of Dr. John Faust, Hamb. 3 vols. 1599); and in 1695, a work was published at Nurnberg by Pfitzer, based upon that of Widmann. The oldest of these books was translated into all the civilized languages of Europe. Impostor-s also published books of magic under the name of Faust, such as *Faust's grosser und gewaltiger Hollenzwang* (Faust's Great and Potent Book of Spells), *Fausten's Mirakelkunst* (Faust's Art of Performing Miracles), and *Dreifache Hollenzwang* (The Threefold Book of Spells). These wretched productions are filled throughout with meaningless scrawls and figures, interspersed with texts from the Bible scandalously misapplied; but in the belief of the vulgar, they were supposed capable, when properly understood, of accomplishing prodigies. That the poetical art should in due time have seized on a subject affording so much material for the fancy to work upon was inevitable and consequently German literature abounds in elegies, pantomimes, tragedies, and comedies on Faust. Since the end of the 17th century, the *Puppenspiel* (Puppet-show) of Dr. Faust (published at Leipsic in 1850) has been one of the most popular pieces in Germany. It forms the transition from the rude, magic tales concerning Faust to the later philosophic conception of the Faust-myth, which has become the most perfect poetical expression of the eternal strife between good and evil in the soul of man. The first writer who treated the story of Faust dramatically was the English writer Christopher Marlowe, about the year 1600 (German translation by W. Muller, Berlin, 1818): but the grandest work on the subject is Goethe's Faust, the first part of which appeared under the title of *Dr. Faust, ein Trauerspiel* (Leip. 1790), and afterwards in a remodelled form, under the title of *Faust, eine Tragodie* (Tubingen, 1808). The second part was published after the author's death, at Stuttgart, in 1833. Besides Goethe's drama may be mentioned Lessing's masterly fragment, *Faust und die Sieben Geister* (Faust and the Seven Spirits), G. F. L. Muller's *Dr. Faust's Leben* (Dr. Faust's Life, Mannh. 1778), and Klinger's *Faust's Leben, Thaten, und Hollenfahrt* (Faust's Life, Doings, and Descent into Hell;

Petersburg and Leip. 1791). The plastic art has also found a fit subject in Faust. In Auerbach's cellar at Leipsic, where Faust is said to have performed many of his feats, are two rude daubs of the year 1525, representing Faust and Mephistopheles riding out of the cellar on a wine-barrel. Rembrandt and Christoph von Sichem have also illustrated the story of Faust, and, in modern times, Cornelius and Retzsch have done the same. See Peter, *Die Literatur der Faustsage* (The Literature of the Faust Myth), 2d edit. Leip. 1851."

Fausta, Flavia Maximiana

daughter of the emperor Maximianus Herculus and Eutropia, was the second wife of Constantine the Great, to whom she bore three sons, Constantinus, Constantius, and Constans, and two daughters, Constantina and Helena. She was born about A.D. 289, was married in 307, and put to death in 326, if the general opinion in regard to her end be correct. She gained great influence over the mind of her husband by her devotion in revealing to him a plot, formed by her own father; to assassinate him, though with filial tenderness she covenanted for the life of her parent, who was notwithstanding put to death. This confidence and affection as is alleged by some, she abused so as to instigate the death of Crispus, Constantine's son by his first wife Minervina, a youth of rare promise and great popularity, because, as some say, he stood in the way of her own sons, or, according to others, of his refusal to reciprocate her illicit love. Helena, the mother of the emperor, however, avenged the fate of her grandson, and Fausta, whose perfidy and infidelity were made known, was suffocated in a hot bath. Other accounts, however, hold Fausta innocent of the death of Crispus, which, together with her own and that of the Caesar Licinius, is attributed to the cruel suspiciousness of Constantine, engendered by success—that *insolentia rerum secundarum*, as Eutropius styles it, which perverted his nature and led to deeds of cruelty. The vague and contradictory statements in regard to her conduct, and to the time, cause, and manner of her death, leave the whole matter in doubt. In one account she is made to survive the death of her son Constantine, who was slain three years after his father's death, and in another is represented as the "most pious of queens." Her conversion to Christianity is also a matter of doubt, though she probably followed her husband in that respect.—Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, s.v.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ii, 162-3 (N. Y. Harpers', 1852, 6 vols. 12mo); Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vol. 4:art. lxii, p. 224, and *Notes sur Constantin*, xvii; Eckhel, *Doctrina Nummorum*, 8:98;

Eutropius, 10:6; Lactantius, *De Morte Persecut.* 27; Julian, *Orat. i.*; Zosimus, ii, 10, 29; Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* ii, 4. (J. W. M.)

Faustinus

bishop of Lyons, lived in the second part of the third century. He became bishop about the year 250, and distinguished himself by his zeal for the faith, and the ardor with which he attacked Marcianus, bishop of Arles, the only Gallic bishop who had embraced Novatianism. Unable to accomplish anything by himself, he made sure of the aid of the bishops of the Narbonnaise, and wrote to the pope, Stephen, to obtain the deposition of Marcianus. The pope hesitated, and Faustinus, in order to hasten matters, wrote to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage. The two letters which he wrote no longer exist, but they form the material of the sixty-seventh letter of Cyprian to pope Stephen, which gives a curious picture of the Gallic Church at that period. Marcianus persisted in his schism, and the result of the affair is uncertain, but it is probable that he was deposed, since his name is not found in the list of the bishops of Arles.-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:199.

Faustinus

a priest of the sect of the Luciferians (q.v.) in the fourth century. He shared in the persecution they experienced, but was set free by the intervention of the emperor Theodosius, to whom he presented a petition praying for protection to be extended to himself and others who associated with him; this the emperor granted, and Damasus's papal persecutions were stayed. He wrote a treatise, *De Trinitate sive de Fide contra Arianes* (Concerning the Faith, against the Arians). The discourse is dedicated to the empress Flacilla, and divided into seven chapters. He begins by stating the heresies of the Arians, and then combats them from Scripture. In chap. ii he proves that the word *Son* belongs to our Saviour, but leaves untouched the question whether the word applies to him as God or man, taking for granted the former; in chap. 3 he shows the omnipotence and perpetual endurance of Christ; explains in chap. iv ³¹⁴³John 14:28; in chap. 5, the qualifications implied in ⁴¹²⁶Acts 2:36 are pointed out as belonging only to God; and chap. 7 is a short dissertation on the Holy Spirit. He wrote also *Fides Theodosio imp. oblata* (according to Mabillon, about A.D. 380):-*Libellus Precum*, a petition addressed to the emperors Valentinian and Theodosius, relating and requesting to be freed from the persecutions

which he, Marcellinus, and others were suffering in consequence of being Luciferians. A short account of this sect is prefixed by Faustinus to the petition. His remains will be found in Galland, *Bib. Max. Patr.* 7:441, and in Migne, *Patrol. Curses*, 13:38 sq.-Clarke, *Success. Sac. Lit.*; Lardner, *Works*, 4:250.

Faustinus

who lived towards the close of the sixth century after Christ-, was appointed bishop of Dax, France, by authority of Gondowald, who, claiming to be a natural son of Clothaire I, aspired to the throne of Aquitaine, but was vanquished, betrayed, and slain. Faustinus was then deposed by a council held at Macon, which, curiously enough, also condemned the bishops who had ordained him to provide for him in turn, and pay him 100 solidi annually. Gregory of Tours, *Epitome historia Francorum*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* (J. W. M.)

Faustus, Dr

SEE FAUST

Dr. Faustus Reiensis Or Rhegiensis

(of Rhegium, or Riez, in Provence), so called from the diocese over which he presided, a pious and self-sacrificing prelate, although doctrinally he favored Semi-Pelagianism. He was boric in Britain about the beginning of the fifth century, and became a monk of Lerins. When Maximus was made bishop of Rhegium, Faustus succeeded him in his abbacy of Lerins, and succeeded him again as bishop on his death, A.D. 454. He was present at the Council held under Hilary at Rome, 462, and returned in 484 to his diocese, where he died about 485. He wrote

(1) *De Gratia Dei et humanae mentis libero arbitrio* (On Grace and Free-will) (*Bib. Max. Patr.*, viii). In this treatise he opposes absolute predestination, but admits original sin and the necessity of grace to assist man's nature, but denies that grace is confined in its saving influences to a few, or that original sin is entirely destructive of every good, so as to leave man "a mass of corruption." He also shows that God's foreknowledge does not affect the -salvation or condemnation of any, and interprets the various texts of Scripture Which refer to the matter.

(2) *Professio Fidei* (A Confession of Faith) (*Bib. Max. Patr.* viii), directed against the doctrines of predestination and fate, addressed to Leontius bishop of Arles. This is a recapitulation of his treatise *De Gratia*.

(3) *Epistola ad Lucidum Presbyterum*, against the Predestinarians of the monastery of Adrumetum. Lucidus was convinced by this letter, and subscribed to the points condemned in it (Mansi, *Concil.* 7:1007). This and other *Epistolae*, to Ruricius and others, are in *Canisii Lect. Antiq.* i, 352 (Antw. 1725, fol.), and in the *Biblioth. Max. Patr.* viii; also several *Sermons*. The treatise *De Gratia*, is also, in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* lviii, 775 sq., together With the *Epistolae* and *Sermones*. Angelo Mai, in his *Spicilegium Romanum*, gives three discourses of Faustus never before printed. Neander gives the following judicious statement of the doctrines of Faustus: "Although Faustus adopted the Semi-Pelagian mode of exposition with regard to the relation of the free-will to grace, yet he unfolded this scheme in a way peculiar to himself. If he did not express himself so distinctly as to satisfy the acute and clear-headed theologian, yet we see presented in him, in a beautiful manner, such a harmonious tendency of Christian feeling, keeping aloof from all partial and exaggerated views, as prevented him from giving undue prominence either to the work of redemption, so as to infringe on that of the creation, or to the work of creation, so as to infringe on that of the redemption. 'As the same Being,' says he, 'is both Creator and Redeemer, so one and the same Being is to be adored both in the work of creation and of redemption.' Among the attributes which, as expressing the image of God, could not be destroyed in human nature, he reckons pre-eminently the free-will. But even before the fall the free-will was insufficient without the aid of grace, and still less can it at present, since sin has entered, suffice by its own strength for the attainment of salvation. It has now lost its original power, yet it is not in itself destroyed; it is not altogether shut out from the divine gifts, but only it must strive once more to obtain them by intense efforts and the divine assistance. Like the author of the work *De vocatione gentium*, he makes a distinction between general grace (*gratia generalis*), a term by which he designates the religioso-moral capability which God has furnished to man's nature, and which, too, has not been wholly supplanted by sin, as well as the universal inward revelation of God by means of this universal religioso-moral sense; between general grace so understood, and special grace, by which he means all that was first bestowed on mankind through Christianity. But the relation of these two kinds of grace to each other is

defined by him quite otherwise than it is in the work above mentioned. Although, as a general thing, the grace of redemption, and in many cases, also, the calling, is antecedent to all human merit, still the operation of that special grace in man is dependent on the manner in which he has used that general grace; and in many cases the striving and seeking of the man which proceeds from the former, the self-active bent of, the free-will, is antecedent to that which is imparted to the man by this special grace; a thing which Faustus endeavors to show by examples similar to those which the Semi-Pelagians had been accustomed to adduce since the time of Cassian. He denominates the imperishable germ of good in human nature a spark of fire implanted within by the divine hand, which, cherished by man, with the assistance of divine grace, would become operative. He recognises, therefore, a preparatory development of the religious and moral nature even among the heathen, and controverts those who are unwilling to allow that, by a faithful use of that general grace, the heathen might have attained to the true service of God. From this it might also be inferred that Faustus was an opponent of the doctrine which taught that all the heathen would be unconditionally condemned; and that it' was his opinion that the worthy among them would still be led, after the present life, to faith in the Saviour, and thereby to salvation; but on these points he does not express himself more distinctly. There is much good sense in the remarks of Faustus where he compares the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the relation of grace to free-will with the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. As in the doctrine concerning Christ's person some gave undue prominence to the divine, others to the human element, and, as the result of so doing, were led into errors which, on opposite sides, injured the doctrine of redemption, so he says it was also with the doctrine concerning human nature. Faustus deserves notice also on account of his dispute concerning the corporeality of the soul. He affirmed, as others before him had already done (e.g. Hilary of Poitiers, *On Matthew* v, 8, and even Didymus, in his work *De Trinitate*, bk. ii, ch..4: Ἅγιος πνεύματι, καθὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀσώματα, σώματα ἐπουράνια διὰ τὸ ἀπείρως ἀπέχειν τοῦ ἀκτίστου πνεύματος), that God alone is a pure spirit; in the essential nature of finitude is grounded limitation as by tim³ (a beginning of existence), so also by space; and hence all creatures are corporeal beings, the higher spirits as well as souls. He was led by his controversies with the Arians of the German tribes, who were then spreading themselves in these countries, to unfold these views still farther; for he supposed he could

demonstrate that if equality of essence with the Father was not ascribed to the Logos, it would be necessary to regard him as a corporeal being. He found an opponent who surpassed him in philosophical spirit in the presbyter Claudianus Mamertus of Vienna, a man on whom the speculative spirit of Augustine had exerted a great influence. He wrote against Faustus his work *De statu animae*" (Neander, *Church History*, Torrey, ii, 645).- Clarke, *Succession of Sac. Lit.* ii, 255; Neander, *History of Dogmas*, Ryland, ii, 383; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. v, pt. ii, ch. v, § 26, n. 55; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Paris, 1861), 10:420-436. **SEE SEMI-PELAGIANS; SEE MASSILIANS.**

Faustus, Socinus

SEE SOCINUS

Faustus, St.

(*d'Agaune* was born about A.D. 460, but the date of his death is unknown.: He became a monk in the convent of Agaune, in Valois, and in 505 went to Paris with Severinus, his abbot, who was called thither by Clovis I to employ his medical skill in treating him for a chronic fever. On his return journey Severinus died, and Faustus, who had remained in France, was commissioned by Childebert to write his life. This work is commendable for its simplicity, exactness, and scant mention of miracles as wrought by its subject, in an age whose literature is replete with such marvels. The best edition is that by Mabillon in the *Acta Sanctorum Ord. Sancti Benedicti* (Paris, 1668-1710, 9 vols. fol.; reprinted at Venice, 1733, 9 vols. fol.). The *Acta Sanctorum* assigns the 11th of February to St. Faustus d'Agaune.- Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 17:202.

Faustus, St.

(*de Glanfeuil*). was one of the Benedictine monks who came with St. Maurus to France, A.D. 543, and assisted in founding the first monastery of his order in that country at Glanfeuil (Glannafolium), in Anjou. In 585, after the death of Maurus, he returned to Italy, and became an inmate of the monastery of Lateran at Rome, where, at the instance of his brother monks, he wrote a life of St. Maurus, and presented it to pope Boniface IV, who approved it about 607. Faustus died some time after this (on a 15th of February, according to the Bollandists), and was buried in the monastery of Lateran. His life of St. Maurus reflects the spirit of the age, a

credulous faith in the marvellous, and abounds in uninteresting and prolix details. Surius (*Vitae Sanctorum*, etc.), Du Breul (*Supplem. Antiq.* etc.), and Mabillon (*Acta Sanct. Ord. Sancti Benedicti*) have edited it.-Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:202-3.

Faustus, The Manichaeon

a prominent bishop of the Manichaeon, was a native of Mileve, in Numidia. Our knowledge of him is almost exclusively derived from the writings of Augustine. When beginning to doubt the truth of the Manichaeon doctrines which he had adopted during his stay at Carthage, Augustine was referred by his Manichaeon teachers whom he consulted, and who were unable to solve his doubts, to Faustus, as the ablest man of the sect. Augustine did not, however, find in Faustus what he had expected; his knowledge was by no means so extensive and so profound as the Manichaeons generally believed. Of Latin literature he had only read some orations of Cicero, a part of Seneca's works, a few -poets, and the Latin works of Manichaeon authors. He confessed an entire ignorance of natural sciences. He was, however, possessed of a great readiness of speech and dexterity 'in argument. Faustus subsequently wrote a work against the doctrines of the Christian Church and in defence of the Manichaeons, in which the objections of his sect to the Scriptures, and in particular to the Old Testament, are presented with some keenness and wit. Augustine, induced by his friends, wrote against Faustus his work *Contra Faustum Manichaeum Libri xxxiii* (compiled about 400; sent to Jerome 404), in which nearly the whole of the work of Faustus is quoted. Augustine relates of him that he led a life of luxurious ease, regarded himself as the Incarnate Wisdom, was for a time exiled for his Manichaeon opinions to an island, but subsequently released. The work of Augustine against Faustus is in the 8th volume of his works in the Maurine and Migne editions. **SEE AUGUSTINE., MANICHAEANS.**-Herzog. *Real-Encyklop.* lv, 342; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* . iii, 927. (A. J. S.)

Favor

SEE GRACE.

Favre

SEE FABER.

Fawcett, Benjamin

an English dissenting minister, was born at Sleaford, Lincolnshire, in 1715, and died in 1780. He was a pupil of Dr. Doddridge at Northampton, and preached first at Taunton, and then at Kidderminster, where he was pastor of a congregation of Dissenters for 35 years. He was a strict economist of time, and attributed his uninterrupted good health to his temperate mode of life and the habit of early rising. His works are, *Sermons* (1756-80), an abridgment of Baxter's *Saints' Everlasting Rest*, and *Religious Melancholy* (1780, 8eo).-Rose, *New Gen. Biog. Dict.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*.

Fawcett, John, D.D.

an eminent Baptist minister, was born in Yorkshire Jan. 6, 1739, joined a Baptist church in 1758, and was ordained minister at Wainsgate in 1764. Here he opened an academy, at which many ministers were educated, among them Ward of Serampore. He was a self-taught, but well informed man; in theology he was a moderate Calvinist. He died July 25, 1819. He published *The Sick Man's Friend* (1774) :-*Hymns* (Leeds, 1781, 12mo) *Essay on Anger* (Leeds, 1787, 12mo):-*Devotional Family Bible* (1807-11, 2 vols. 4to).-Jones, *Christian Biography*, s.v.; Jamieson, *Cyclop. of Biography*, p. 194.

Fawcett, Joseph

minister of an Independent church at Walthamstow, died 1804. He was a very popular preacher, and published *Sermons delivered at the Old Jewry* (Lond. 1795, 2 vols. 8vo). :

Fawkes, Guy

(properly GUIDO), the head of the conspiracy known by the name of the Gunpowder Plot, was born of a Protestant family in Yorkshire in the year 1570. He became a Roman Catholic at an early age, and served in the Spanish army in the Netherlands. Inspired with fanatical zeal for his new religion, on his return to England he entered into a plot with several Catholic gentlemen for blowing up the king, his ministers, and the members of both houses at the opening of Parliament, November 5, 1605. Guy Fawkes was taken with the burning match in his hand, tried, and, after being put to the torture, was publicly executed January 31, 1606. In remembrance of this event, in most English towns, but particularly in

London, a grotesque figure, stuffed with straw, is carried about the streets on the 5th of November, and finally committed to the flames. A political and religious signification was again imparted to this custom by what was, called the papal aggression' in the year 1850, when the figure of cardinal Wiseman (q.v.) was substituted for that of Guy Fawkes." *SEE GUNPOWDER PLOT.*

Faydit, Pierre

a priest of the French Oratory, was born at Riom, in the Auvergne, in the first half of the 17th century. He was in 1671 excluded from the Oratory for having published, in spite of the prohibition of his superiors, from the Cartesian point of view, a work *On the Human Mind (De Mente Humana)*. While pope Innocent XI was quarrelling with the French government, Faydit, in a sermon on St. Polycarp, preached against the pope, whose conduct he compared with that of pope Victor toward the Asiatic bishops. The view expressed in these sermons he refuted himself in another sermon published at Liege; but in 1687 he again published at Maestricht an extract from his first sermon, with proofs for the facts quoted in it. In consequence of an *Essay on the Trinity* in which he seemed. to favor Tritheism, he was imprisoned in 1696 at St. Lazarus. Subsequently he was ordered to withdraw to his native city where he continued to compile quarrelsome works, attacking with ridiculous arguments some of the best works of his age, such as Fenelon's *Telemaque* and Tillemont's *Memoires Ecclesiastiques*. He died in 1709. -Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 16:229.

Fear Of God.

I. Old Testament. -There is no mention in the Scriptures of the sentiment of fear in the relations between man and God before the fall of Adam. After the transgression, Adam says, "I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid" (^(C1810)Genesis 3:10). Fear of God (**(h/j y|tarj)s**) stands thus in close connection with conscience, and with the fact of actual or possible sin. We are probably justified in inferring from the narrative in Genesis that the sentiment of fear, in relation to God, is one of the consequences of Adam's sin. Since the Fall, fear is a natural and proper feeling on the part of dependent man with regard to the infinite God whom he has offended. Dependence alone, without the consciousness of sin, or of sinful tendencies and possibilities, would not engender fear. In sinful beings, however,. fear is useful and necessary as a preventive and safeguard against transgression.

As such it is enjoined in the O.T. especially. (Compare ^{<0100>}Exodus 1:1, 17; ^{<0800>}Deuteronomy 6:2; ^{<2100>}Proverbs 3:7 14:2.) So in O.T. we find practical piety generally described as the fear of God: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge" (^{<2100>}Proverbs 1:7); ^{<1830>}Job 28:8, "Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding ;" "The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever" (^{<1900>}Psalms 19:9). Fear, thus coming to be almost, if not quite, synonymous with piety, did not (under the old covenant) exclude filial and even cheerful trust in God, and delight in his law and in his worship; the Psalms abound in illustrations of this. Under this covenant, too, the law of love prevailed (^{<0800>}Deuteronomy 6:5, "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might"). The promise of a new covenant, also, added the grace of *hope* to the experience of O.T. believers (^{<2830>}Jeremiah 31:31-34). But a fear which is conjoined with love and hope is not a slavish fear, but rather filial fear, veneration (compare ^{<0510>}Deuteronomy 32:6; ^{<2800>}Hosea 11:1; ^{<2100>}Isaiah 1:2; 63:16; 64:8). Nevertheless, the sense of the filial relation to God through Christ, such as appears in the N.T., was wanting in the old covenant, and fear was, perhaps, under that covenant, the prevailing element in the consciousness of believers, so far as their relation to God was concerned.

II. In the sphere of the N.T., the fear of God, in the sense of slavish or untrusting dread, is completely dispelled. True, in the economy of salvation through Christ fear finds a useful place as a preventive of negligence and carelessness in religion, and as an inducement to penitence (^{<4051>}2 Corinthians 5:11; 7:1; ^{<1850>}Philippians 2:12 ^{<4051>}Ephesians 5:21; ^{<3120>}Hebrews 12:28, 29), and is enforced in this sense by Christ himself (^{<4000>}Matthew 10:28). But as Christian experience deepens, and the soul is consecrated to God, the sense of fear vanishes, and love takes its place (^{<0815>}Romans 8:15; ^{<5002>}2 Timothy 1:7; ^{<0418>}1 John 4:18). On the other hand, where, there is nothing more than the form of Christian life, without its inward power, the old Jewish and even pagan fear springs up. So the Romish Church does not admit a free and direct approach to God, but demands the intercession of saints, etc., and makes of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in which Christians are lovingly to surround his table, a tremendous and fearful mystery. In Protestant theology, on the contrary, the fear to approach God is considered as a consequence of the Fall, and free access to him is held to be an essential element of true Christian life. Edwards, in his *Treatise on Religious Affections*, remarks as follows on the relations of fear and sin:

"For so hath God contrived and constituted things, in his dispensations towards his own people, that when their love decays, and the exercises of it fail or become weak, fear should arise; for then they need it to restrain them from sin, and to excite them to care for the good of their souls, and so to stir them up to watchfulness and diligence in religion; but God hath so ordered that, when love rises and is in vigorous exercise, then fear should vanish and be driven away; for then they need it not, having a higher and more excellent principle in exercise to restrain them from sin, and stir them up to their duty. There are no other principles which human nature is under the influence of that will ever make men conscientious but one of these two *fear* or *love*; and therefore, if one of these should not prevail as the other decays, God's people, when fallen into dead and carnal frames, when love is asleep, would be lamentably exposed indeed; and therefore God has wisely ordained that these two opposite principles of love and fear should rise and fall like the two opposite scales of a balance; when one rises, the other sinks. Love is the spirit of adoption, or the childlike principle; if that slumbers, men fall under fear, which is the spirit of bondage, or the servile principle; and so on the contrary. And if it be so that love, or the spirit of adoption, be carried to a great height, it quite drives away all fear, and gives full assurance; agreeable to that of the apostle, ⁴¹⁸1 John 4:18, "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear." These two opposite principles of lust and holy love bring hope and fear into the hearts of God's children in proportion as they prevail, that is, when left to their own natural influence, without something adventitious or accidental intervening, as the distemper of melancholy, doctrinal ignorance, prejudices of education, wrong instruction, false principles, peculiar temptations, etc. Fear is cast out by the Spirit of God no other way than by the prevailing of love; nor is it ever maintained by his Spirit but when love is asleep" (Edwards, *Works*, N. Y. edit., iii, 56). See, on the different dispensations of grace, Fletcher, *Works*, iii, 175 sq.; Stowell, *On Nehemiah*, lect. i; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, v, 280.

Feast

(properly ⁴¹⁹חגיגה *hagigah*, *mishteh'*, *δοχή*, when a hospitable *entertainment*; and ⁴²⁰חג *chag*, *ἑορτή*), when a *religious festival*). To what an early date the practices of hospitality are referable may be seen in ^{419B}Genesis 19:3, where we find Lot inviting the two angels "Turn in, I pray you, into your servant's house and tarry all night, and wash your feet; and he pressed upon them

greatly, and they entered into his house; and he made them a feast;" which was obviously of an impromptu nature, since it is added, " and did bake *unleavened* bread, and they did eat" (^{<0769>}Judges 6:19). It was usual not only thus to receive persons with choice viands, but also to dismiss them in a similar manner; accordingly Laban, when he had overtaken the fleeing Jacob, complains (^{<0327>}Genesis 31:27), "Wherefore didst thou steal away from me and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth, and with songs, and with tabret, and with harp ?" See also ^{<0083>}2 Samuel 3:20; ^{<1163>}2 Kings 6:23; ^{<8883>}Job 8:20; 1 Macc. 16:15. This practice explains the reason why the prodigal, on his return, was welcomed by a feast (^{<0153>}Luke 15:23). Occasions of domestic joy were hailed with feasting; thus, in ^{<0208>}Genesis 21:8, Abraham "made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned." Birthdays were thus celebrated (^{<0440>}Genesis 40:20): " Pharaoh, on his birthday, made a feast unto all his servants" (^{<8004>}Job 1:4; ^{<0146>}Matthew 14:6; compare Herod. i, 133). Marriage feasts were also common. Samson (^{<0740>}Judges 14:10) on such an occasion "made a feast," and it is added, " for so used the young men to do." So Laban, when he gave his daughter Leah to Jacob (^{<0322>}Genesis 29:22), " gathered together all the men of the place, and made a feast." These festive occasions seem originally to have answered the important purpose of serving as evidence and attestation of the events which they celebrated, on which account relatives and neighbors were invited to be present (^{<0840>}Ruth 4:10; ^{<881>}John 2:1). Those processes in rural occupations by which the divine bounties are gathered into the hands of man have in all ages been made seasons of festivity; accordingly, in ^{<0083>}2 Samuel 13:23, Absalom invites all the king's sons, and even David himself, to a sheep-shearing feast, on which occasion the guests became "merry with wine" (^{<0282>}1 Samuel 25:2 sq.). The vintage was also celebrated with festive eating and drinking (^{<0727>}Judges 9:27). Feasting at funerals existed among the Jews (^{<0083>}2 Samuel 3:33). In ^{<2447>}Jeremiah 16:7, among other funeral customs, mention is made of "the cup of consolation, to drink for their father or their mother," which brings to mind the indulgence in spirituous liquors to which our ancestors were given at interments, and which has not yet entirely disappeared in Lancashire, nor probably in Ireland (Carleton's *Irish Peasantry; England in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. ii). To what an extent expense was sometimes carried on these occasions may be learned from Josephus (*War*, 4:1, 1), who, having remarked that Archelaus "mourned for his father seven days, and had given a very expensive funeral feast to the multitude," states, " which custom is the occasion of poverty to many of the Jews;" adding,

"because they are forced to feast the multitude; for if any one omits it he is not esteemed a holy person." *SEE ENTERTAINMENT.*

As among heathen nations, so also among the Hebrews. feasting made a part of the observances which took place on occasion of animal sacrifices. In ⁽⁶¹²⁶⁾Deuteronomy 12:6, 7, after the Israelites are enjoined to bring to the place chosen of God their burnt offerings, tithes, heave offerings, vows, free-will offerings, and the firstlings of their herds and flocks, they are told, "There shall ye eat before the Lord your God, and ye shall rejoice in all' ye put your hand unto, ye and your households, wherein the Lord thy God hath blessed thee" (⁽⁶⁰⁹⁹⁾1 Samuel 9:19; 16:3, 5; ⁽⁶⁰⁶⁹⁾2 Samuel 6:19). These sacrificial meals were enjoyed in connection with peace offerings, whether eucharistic or votive. The kidneys, and all the inward fat, and the tail of the lamb, were burnt with the daily sacrifice; the breast and right shoulder fell to the priest, and the rest was to be eaten by the offerer and his friends, on the same day if the offering were eucharistic, on that and the next day if it were votive (⁽⁶¹⁰¹⁾Leviticus 3:1-17; 7:11-21; 29-36; 19:58; 20:29, 30). To the feast at the second tithe of the produce of the land, which was to be made every year, and eaten at the annual festivals before Jehovah, not only friends, but strangers, Widows, orphans, and Levites were to be invited, as well as the slaves. If the tabernacle was so distant as to make it inconvenient to carry thither the tithe, it was to be turned into money, which was to be spent in providing feasts at the place at which the festivals were held (⁽⁶¹⁴²⁾Deuteronomy 14:22-27; 12:14;. Tobit i. 6). Charitable entertainments were also provided, at the end of three years, from the tithe of the increase. The Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow were to be present (⁽⁶¹²⁷⁾Deuteronomy 12:17-19; 14:28, 29; 26:12-15). At the feast of Pentecost the command is very express (⁽⁶¹⁶¹⁾Deuteronomy 16:11), "Thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow that are among you." Accordingly, Tobit (ii, 1, 2) affirms, "Now when I was come home again, in the feast of Pentecost, when I saw abundance of meat, I said to my son, go and bring what poor man soever thou shalt find out of our brethren, who is mindful of the Lord." The Israelites were forbidden to partake of food offered in sacrifice to idols (⁽⁶³⁴⁵⁾Exodus 34:15), lest they should be thereby enticed into idolatry, or appear to give a sanction to idolatrous observances (⁽⁶¹⁰⁸⁾1 Corinthians 10:28). *SEE ALISGEMA.*

For further particulars as to social entertainments, *SEE BANQUET*; and as to sacred occasions, *SEE FESTIVAL*.

Feasts, Or Festivals

in the Christian Church, certain days set apart for the more particular remembrance of the prominent transactions connected with our Lord in his redemption of mankind, and also for the commemoration of the labors and sufferings of his apostles.

I. *History and Theory of their Observance.*

(1.) "Some Protestants object to the observance of these feasts on the ground that such observance is contrary to the injunction of the apostle Paul (⁵¹²⁶Colossians 2:16), forgetting that in this passage the apostle alludes exclusively to Jewish feasts; others object to all such festivals as being popish, forgetting that they have been observed from the earliest ages of the Church. If a Church has power to ordain rites and ceremonies which are not contrary to Scripture, she has the power to set apart certain days in commemoration of the most important events and persons connected With the first promulgation of the Gospel to sinners" (Eden).

(2.) Festival days were hallowed in the Church long before the rise of the papacy. At first the religious festivals of the Church. were observed voluntarily, and never by formal obligation; but in the 4th century various decrees of councils were passed, enjoining the observance of them as a duty. The number of festivals was originally small, consisting, besides Sunday, of Easter, Pentecost. and Ascension, and to these the Epiphany and Christmas were added at a later period. "The end designed by the observance of these festivals was to call to mind the benefits of the Christian dispensation, to excite Christians to holy living, to offer thanks for providential mercies, and to aid in the cultivation of Christian graces. The discourses which s-ere delivered on these occasions always referred to the most important topics of the Christian religion. Even the Lord's day, according to Eusebius, was said to have had a threefold origin, emblematic of the sacred Trinity--the creation of the world, the resurrection of Christ, and the effusion of the Holy Spirit" (Bingham, bk. 20:ch. iv; Neander, *Church History*, i, 301). "The primitive Church were not careful to prescribe a specific time or place for the celebration of their religious festivals. The apostles and their immediate successors proceeded on the principle that these should be observed at stated times, which might still be

varied as circumstances should direct. These seasons were regarded as *sacred*, not for any peculiar sanctity belonging to the day or hour in which they were solemnized, in itself considered, but merely as being set apart from a common to a religious use. Some, however, have maintained that these festive days should be observed as *holy time*" (Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*, ch. xxi). After the 4th century festivals were so greatly multiplied in the Church that later times bear no resemblance in this respect to the first ages. "Many causes contributed to this multiplication of festivals, among which may be mentioned as the chief,

- 1.** The commemorations of martyrs and confessors already introduced, which led to the establishment of numerous festivals in honor of saints, and to the superstitious use of relics, invocations, pilgrimages, and the like;
- 2.** The errors of some sects respecting existing festivals, to correct which the Catholic Church introduced new observances;
- 3.** Several laws of Constantine relating to the celebration of Easter, the religious observance of Friday in every week, and the feasts of martyrs;
- 4.** The celebration of Christmas, which was introduced in the 4th century, led the way to the establishment of other festivals in connection with itself, such as those in honor of the Virgin Mary.
- 5.** The propensity of many Christians to partake in the celebration of heathen festivals and in Jewish observances had become a serious evil in the Church during the third and fourth centuries. In Homilies and decrees of councils of that date we find earnest protests against the amalgamation of Christian worship with Jewish and heathen rites, and a description of the dangers which threatened Christianity from this practice, which had begun to gain ground (see Chrysostom *Hoss.* 1, 6, 52, and elsewhere; *Conc. Laod.* c. 29, 37, 39; *Conc. Illiber.* c. 49, 50). This perverse attachment to forms and ceremonies altogether foreign to the Christian religion appears to have been a leading cause of the multiplication of festivals within the Church. The original simplicity of Christian worship had become unsatisfactory to the multitude, and it was deemed necessary to give splendor and external attraction to the religion of the Gospel by the establishment of new festivals, or by converting Jewish and heathen ceremonies into Christian solemnities. It was thought that this might be done with safety, inasmuch as there was no longer occasion to fear that the people would return to Judaism or heathenism. And accordingly, in the

time of Gregory the Great, many observances were adopted into the course of Christian worship from the Jewish and heathen ritual, without fear of those evil consequences which were formerly apprehended from such a combination. See Gregor. M. *Reg.* 9:Ep. 71; Theodoret, *De Mart.* i, viii" (Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 648).

(3.) Those who vindicate the observance of festivals in the Church maintain that "this sanctification or setting apart of festival days is a token of that thankfulness, and a part of that public honor which we owe to God for his admirable benefits; and these days or feasts set apart are of excellent use, being, as Hooker observes, the,

1. Splendor and outward dignity of our religion;
2. Forcible witnesses of ancient truth;
3. Provocations to the exercise of all piety;
4. Shadows of our endless felicity in heaven;

5. Records teaching the facts of Christianity in the most obvious way. The Church begins her ecclesiastical year with the Sundays in Advent, to remind us of the coming of Christ in the flesh. After these, we are brought to contemplate the mystery of the incarnation; and so, step by step, we follow the Church through all the events of our Saviour's pilgrimage to his ascension into heaven. In all this the grand object is to keep Christ perpetually before us, to make him and his doctrine the chief object in all our varied services. Every Sunday has its peculiar character, and has reference to some act or scene in the life of our Lord, or the redemption achieved by him, or the mystery of mercy carried on by the blessed Trinity. Thus every year brings the whole Gospel history to view; and it will be found,-as a general rule, that the appointed portions of Scripture in each day's service are mutually illustrative; the New Testament casting light on the Old, prophecy being admirably brought in contact with its accomplishment, so that no plan could be devised for a more profitable course of Scripture reading than that presented by the Church on her holy days"- (Sparrow, *Rationale of the Common Prayer*).

II. *Number and Classes of Feasts.*

(1.) Besides the days observed by the whole Church as memorials of the acts of Christ's life and death, other festivals were also introduced

commemorative of the apostles and martyrs. Bingham states that these may be traced up to the 2d century (*Orig. Eccl. 20:7*), and Mosheim agrees with him (cent. i, pt. ii, chap. 4:§ 4). It is to be observed that while Christmas is celebrated as the *birthday* of Christ, the martyrs' festivals we held on the days of their deaths—still, however, called birthdays (*natales*), as on these days they were transferred to endless life. On the number of these festivals in the early Church, and the modes in which they were observed, see Bingham (*l. c.*; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i, 300 sq.).

(2.) The *Roman Catholic Church* has retained all the early festivals, with the later ones of the apostles and martyrs, and has added largely to the number. She retains the right to enact festal days, and to fix the mode of their observance. The following list embraces the feasts of the American calendar:

Movable Feasts and Holydays. — Feast of the Holy Name of Jesus; Septuagesima Sunday; Ash Wednesday; Office of the Passion of our Lord; Office of the Most Sacred Crown; Office of the Spear and Nails; Office of the Five Wounds; Office of the Most Precious Blood; Sorrows of the B. V. Mary; Easter Day; Patronage of St. Joseph; Ascension of our Lord; Whit Sunday; Trinity Sunday; Corpus Christi; Feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; Feast of the Most Precious Blood of our Lord; Feast of the Holy Name of Mary; Feast of the Seven Dolours of B. V. M.; Feast of the Holy Rosary; Feast of the Maternity of B. V. M.; Feast of the Patronage of B. V. M.; Sundays after Pentecost; First Sunday of Advent.

Immovable Feasts and Saints' Days. -Abdon and Sennen, MM., July 30; Aegidius, Ab., Sept. 1; Agatha, V. M., Feb. 5; Agnes, V. M., Jan. 21; Alexius, C., July 17; All Saints, Nov. 1; All Saints, Octave, of, Nov. 8; All Souls, Nov. 2; Aloysius Gonzaga, C., June 21; Alphonsus Liguori, B. C., Aug. 2; Ambrose, B. C. D., Dec. 7; Anacletus, Pope, M., July 13; Andrew, Apostle, Nov. 30; Andrew Avellino, C., Nov. 10; Andrew Corsini, B. C., Feb. 4; Anicetus, Pope, M., April 17; Ann, Mother of B. V. M., July 26; Anselm, B. C. D., April 21; Anthony, Ab., Jan. 17; Anthony of Padua, C., June 13; Antoninus, B. C., May 10; Apollinaris, B. M., July 23; Apollonia, V. M., Feb. 9; Athanasius, B. C. D., May 2; Augustine, B. C. D., Aug. 28; Barnabas, Apostle, June 11; Bartholomew, Apostle, April 24; Basil, B. C. D., June 14; Benedict, Ab. C., Mar. 21; Bernard, Ab. D., Aug. 20; Bernardinus, C., May 20; Bibiana, V. M., Dec. 2; Blase, B. M., Feb. 3; Bonaventure, B. C. D., July 14; Boniface, M., May 14; Bridget, Widow,

Oct. 8; Bruno, C., Oct. 6; Cajetan, C., Aug. 7; Callistus, Pope, M., Oct. 14; Camillus de Lellis, C., July 18; Canute, M., Jan. 19; Casimir, C., Mar. 4; Catharine, V. M., Nov. 25; Catharine of Sienna, V, April 30; Cecilia, V. M., Nov. 22; Chas. Borromeo, B. C., Nov. 4; Christmas Day, Dec. 25; Chrysanthus and Daria, Oct. 25; Circumcision of our Lord, Jan. 1; Clare, V., Aug. 12; Clement, Pope, M., Nov. 23; Cletus and Marcel. PP. MM., April 26; Cornelius and Cyprian, MM., Sept. 16; Cosmas and Damian, MM., Sept. 27; Cyprian and Justina, MM., Sept. 26; Cyriacus, etc. MM., Aug. 8; Damasus, Pope, C., Dec. 11; Didacus, C., Nov. 13; Dionysius, etc. MM., Oct. 9; Dominic, C., Aug. 4; Dorothy, V. M., Feb. 6; Edward, King, C., Oct. 13; Elizabeth, Widow, July 8; Elizabeth of Hungary, Widow, Nov. 19; Epiphany of our Lord, Jan. 6; Epiphany, Octave of, Jan. 13; Eusebius, B. M., Dec. 16; Eustachius, etc. MM., Sept. 20; Evaristus, Pope, M., Oct. 26; Exaltation of the Holy Cross, Sept. 14; Fabian and Sebastian, MM.; Jan. 20; Faustinus and Jovita, MM., Feb. 15; Felix, P. M., Mar. 30; Felix of Valois, C., Nov. 20; Fidelis, M., April 24; Finding of the Holy Cross, May 3; Frances, Widow, Mar. 9; Francis of Assisium, C., Oct. 4; Francis, Stigmas of, Sept. 17; Francis Borgia, C., Oct. 10; Francis Caracciolo, C., June 4; Francis of Paula, C., April 4; Francis of Sales, B. C., Jan. 29; Francis Xavier, C., Dec. 3; Gabriel, Archangel, Mar. 18; George, M., April 23; Gertrude, V., Nov. 15; Gregory the Great, P. C. D., Mar. 12; Gregory Nazianzen, B. C. D., May 9; Gregory Thaumaturgus, B. C., Nov. 17; Gregory VII, P. C., May 25; Guardian Angels, Oct. 2; Hedwigis, Widow, Oct. 17; Henry, Emperor, C., July 15; Hermenegild, M., April 13; Hilarion, Ab., Oct. 21; Hilary, B. C., Jan. 14; Hyacinth, C., Aug. 16; Ignatius, B. M., Feb. 1; Ignatius of Loyola, C., July 31; Innocents, Holy, Dec. 28; Innocents, Holy, Octave of, Jan. 4; Ireneus, B. M., June 28; Isidore, B. C. D., April 4; James, Apostle, July 25; Jane Frances de Chantal, Aug. 21; Januarius, etc. MM., Sept. 19; Jerome, C. D., Sept. 30; Jerome AEmilian, C., July 20; John, Apostle and Evangelist, Dec. 27; John, Octave of, Jan. 3; John before Lat. Gate, May 6; John the Baptist, Beheading of, Aug. 29; John the Baptist, Nativity of, June 24; John the Baptist, Octave of, July 1; John Cantius, C., Oct. 20; John Chrysostom, B. C. D., Jan. 27; John of the Cross, C., Nov. 24; John of God, C., Mar. 8; John Lateran, Dedication of, Nov. 9; John A. S. Facundo, C., June 12; John Francis Regis, C., June 18; John of Matha, C., Feb. 8; John Gualbert, A. C., July 12; John Nepomucen, M., May 22; John and Paul, MM., June 26; Joseph, C., Spouse of B. V. M., Mar. 19; Joseph Calasanctius, C., Aug. 27; Joseph Cupertino, C., Sept. 18; Juliana Falconieri, V., June 19; Lady of Mercy,

Our Blessed, Sept. 24; Lady ad Nives, Our, Aug. 5; Laurence, M., Aug. 10; Laurence, Octave of, Aug. 17; Laurence Justinian, B. C., Sept. 5; Leo the Great, P. C. D., April 11; Leo, Pope, C., July 7; Lewis, King, C., Aug. 25; Linus, Pope, M., Sept. 23; Lucy, V. M., Dec. 13; Luke, Evangelist, Oct. 18; Magdalen, Mary, Pen, July 22; Magdalen of Pazzi, V., May 27; Marcellinus, etc. MM., June 2; Marcellus, P. M., Jan. 16; Marcus, etc. MM., June 18; Margaret, Queen, Widow, June 10; Marl, Evangelist, April 25; Mark, Pope, C., Oct. 7; Martha, V., July 29; Martin, B. C., Nov. 11; Martin, Pope, M., Nov. 12; Martina, V. M., Jan. 30; Martyrs, Forty, Mar: 10; Mary, B. V. of Mt. Carmel, July 16; Mary, B. V., Annunciation of, Mar. 25; Mary, B. V., Assumption of, Aug. 15; Mary, B. V., Octave of, Aug. 22; Mary, B. Y., Conception of, Dec. 8; Mary, B. V., Octave of, Dec. 15; Mary, B. V., Espousals of, Jan. 23; Mary, B. V., Expected Deliverance of, Dec. 18; Mary, B. V., Help of Christ, May 24; Mary, B. V., Nativity of, Sept. 8; Mary, B. V., Octave of, Sept. 15; Mary, B. V., Presentation of, Nov. 21; Mary, B. V., Purification of, Feb. 2; Mary, B. V., Visitation of, July 2; Mathias, Apostle, Feb. 24; Matthias, Apostle, leap year, Feb. 25; Matthew, Apostle and Evangelist, Sept. 21; Michael, Archangel, Dedication of the Church of, Sept. 29; Michael, Apparition of, May 8; Monica, Widow, May 4; Nazarius, etc. MM., July 28; Nereus, etc. MM., May 12; Nicholas of Tolent., C., Sept. 10; Nicholas of Myra, B. C., Dec. 6; Norbert, B. C., June 6; Pantaleon, M., July 27; Paschal Baylon, C., May 17; Patrick, B. C., Mar. 17; Paul, Conversion of, Jan. 25; Paul, Commemoration of, June 30; Paul, First Hermit, C., Jan. 15; Paulinus, B. C., June 22; Peter's Chains, Aug. 1; Peter's Chair at Antioch, Feb. 22; Peter's Chair at Rome, Jan. 18; Peter, Martyr, April 29; Peter of Alcantara, C., Oct. 19; Peter Celestinus, P. C., May 19; Peter Chrysologus, B. C. D., Dec. 4; Peter Damian, B. C. D., Feb. 23; Peter Nolasco, C., Jan. 31; Peter and Paul, Apostles, June 29; Peter and Paul, Octave of, July 6; Peter and Paul, Dedication of the Church of, Nov. 18; Philip Beniti, C., Aug. 23; Philip Neri, C., May 26; Philip and James, Apostles, May 1; Pius V, Pope, C., May 5; Pius, Pope, M., July 11-; Placidus, etc. MM., Oct. 5; Polycarp, B. M., Jan. 26; Praxedes, V., July 21; Primus and Felicianus, MM., June 9; Raphael, Arch., Oct. 24; Raymund of Pennafort, Jan. 29; Raymund of Nonnatus, C., Aug. 31; Remigius, B. C., Oct. 1; Romuald, Ab., Feb. 7; Rose of Lima, V., Aug. 30; Sabbas, Ab., Dec. 5; Saviour's Church, Dedication of the, Nov. 9; Scholastica, V., Feb. 10; Seven Brothers, MM., July 10; Silvester, Pope, C., Dec. 21; Silverius, Pope, M., June 20; Simeon, B. M., Feb. 18; Simon and Jude, Apostles, Oct. 28; Soter and Caius, PP.

MM., April 22; Stanislaus Kostka, C., Nov. 14; Stanislaus, B. M., May 7; Stephen, Proto Martyr, Dec. 26; Stephen, Octave of, Jan. 2; Stephen Finding of Relics of, Aug. 3; Stephen, Pope, M., Aug. 2; Stephen, King, C., Sept. 2; Theresa, V., Oct. 15; Thomas, Ap., Dec. 21; Thomas of Aquin, C. D., Mar. 7; Thomas of Canterbury, B. M., Dec. 29; Thomas of Villanomma, B. C., Sept. 22; Tiburtius, etc. MM., April 14; Timothy, B. M., Jan. 24; Transfiguration of our Lord, Aug. 6; Ubaldus, B. C., May 16; Valentine, M., Feb. 14; Venantius, M., May 18; Vincent of Paul, C., July 19; Vincent Ferrier, C., April 5; Vincent and Anastasius, MM., Jan. 22; Vitalis, M., April 28; Vitus, Modestus, etc. MM., June 15; Wenceslaus, M., Sept. 28; 'William, Nb. C., June 25; Zephyrinus, Pope, M., Aug. 26.'

(3.) The *Church of England* retains the following; the history will be found under the particular name of each festival.

Movable Feasts and Holy Days.—Advent; Septuagesima; Sexagesima; Quinquagesima; Ash Wednesday; Quadragesima, and the four following Sundays; Palms Sunday; Maundy Thursday; Good Friday; Easter Eve (*Sabbatum Magnum*); Easter Day; Sundays after Easter; Ascension Day; Whit Sunday; Trinity Sunday.

Immovable Feasts and Holy Days. — Jan. 1, the Circumcision of our Lord; Jan. 6, the Epiphany; Jan. 25, the Conversion of St. Paul; Feb. 2, the Presentation of Christ in the Temple, or the Purification of the Virgin; Feb. 24, St. Matthias's Day; March 25, the Annunciation b-f the Blessed Virgin Mary; April. 25, St. Mark's Day; May 1, St. Philip and St. James's Day; June 11, St. Barnabas the Apostle; June 24, St. John the Baptist's Day; June 29, St. Peter and St. Paul's Day; July 25, St. James the Apostle; Aug. 24, St. Bartholomew the Apostle.; Sept., 21, St. Matthew the Apostle; Sept. 29, St. Michael and all Angels; Oct. 18,xSt. Luke the Evangelist; Oct. 28, St. Simon and St. Jude, Apostles; Nov. 1, All Saints' Day; Nov. 30, St. Andrew's Day; Dec. 21, St. Thomas the Apostle; Dec. 25, Nativity of our Lord; Dec. 26, St. Stephen's Day; Dec. 27, St. John the Evangelist; Dec. 28, the Innocents' Day.

See, besides the works already cited, Zyliegan, *die alte end neue Festen alter Christl. Confessionen* (Dantzic, 1825, 8vo); Augusti, *Christl. Archceologie*, i, 469 sq.; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity exemplified*, ch. xxvi; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles. Uk.* 20:ch. iv; Butler, *Feasts and Fasts of the Catholic Church* (N.Y. 1856, 12mo); Nelson, *Festivals and Fasts of the Church of England*; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* bk. v, ch. i; Barrow,

Sermons (serm. 77); *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 4:650; Neander, *Planting and Training*, i, 158; Lewis, *Bible, Missal, and Breviary* (Edinb. 1853), ch. i; Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, i, 128, 372; Lamson, *Church of the first three Centuries*, p. 321 sq.; Siegel, *Christl.-Kischl. Alterthumer*, ii, 81, and references there.

Feast Of Asses

a ridiculous festival of the Roman Catholic Church, celebrated in Rouen and some other cities of France, to commemorate the flight into Egypt. It was not uniformly observed, but the following were generally among the ceremonies, especially at Beauvais. A young woman with a child in her arms was made to ride on an ass. Followed by the bishop and clergy, she was conducted to the church, and a sermon was preached, in which the high qualities of the animal that enabled the Virgin and child to escape from Herod were lauded. During the ceremony, a ludicrous composition, half Latin, half French, was sung with great vociferation, in praise of the ass, of which the last stanza may serve as a specimen:

*"Amen dicas asine
Jam satur de gramine
Amen, amen itera
Aspernare vetera.
Hez va! Hez va! Hez va! Hez!
Bialx sire asnez, car allez,
Belle bonche car chantez"*

In Rouen it was celebrated about Christmas; in other places, as, for instance, at Beauvais, on the 14th of June. Several popes, papal legates, and bishops endeavored to suppress it, but it maintained itself until the 15th century, when Nicholas de Clemangis, by his work *Dae novis celebritatibus non instituendis*, and especially the Council of Basle by a decree, caused the suppression of this and a number of similar festivals.-- Ducange, s.v. Festum Asinorum; Moreri, s.v. Fete; Schrockh, *Kirchen-Geschichte*, vol. 28; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 4:710.

Feast Of Charity, Or Love

SEE AGAPAE; SEE LOVE-FEAST

Feast Of Fools

a festival celebrated during the Middle Ages in many countries of Europe, especially in France, with grotesque, ceremonies. It was an imitation of the *Saturnalia*, and, like that festival, was celebrated in December. The chief celebration, fell on New Year's or Innocents' Day; but the feast continued from Christmas to the last Sunday of Epiphany. At first only the young boys of the choir and young sacristans played the principal parts in it, but afterwards all the inferior servants of the Church were engaged, the bishop and three superior clergymen, with the canons, forming the audience. The young people who played the chief parts chose from their own number a bishop or archbishop of fools, as he was called, and consecrated him, in the principal church of the place, with many absurd ceremonies. This mock bishop then took the seat usually occupied by the bishop, and caused high mass to be said. During the performance, the others who took part in the play, dressed in masks and different disguises, engaged in indecent songs and dances, and practised all kinds of follies. It fell into disuse in the 15th century, but some of its features yet remain in the Carnival (q.v.).-Tilliot, *Memoires pour servir 'a l'histoire de la fete des foux* (Lausanne, 1751); Schrockh *Kirchengeschichte*, 28:271; 32:55; Siegel, *Christl.-Kirchl. Alterthumer*, 4:115. **SEE BOY-BISHOP.**

Feather

1. **hx/n** or **hxno** *notsah'* (from **txn**; to fly), a *pinion* or wing-feather, ^{<3170>}Ezekiel 17:3, 7 (falsely "ostrich" in ^{<3913>}Job 39:13; but it means the excrement of the crop in ^{<1016>}Leviticus 1:16).
2. **hrbā**, ebrah' (fem. of **rba**, ^{<3421>}Isaiah 40:21, which has the same meaning), likewise a *pinion* or wing-feather, ^{<3983>}Psalms 68:13; 91:4 (inexactly "wing," ^{<1321>}Deuteronomy 32:11; ^{<3913>}Job 39:13).
3. Incorrectly for **hrysbā** *chasideh'*, ^{<3913>}Job 39:13, the *stork*, as elsewhere rendered. **SEE WING.**

Feathering, Or Foliation

an arrangement of small arcs, separated by projecting points or cusps, to ornament the inside of larger arches, or triangular or circular openings in Gothic architecture. Feathering was first introduced at the close of the early English style, and continued till the supplanting of the Gothic by the

Renaissance architecture. When smaller arcs are added to ornament these small arcs, the feathering is said to be double. It is' also sometimes made triple in the latest decadence of the Gothic architecture.--Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*.

Feathers' Tavern Association

a society of Englishmen, clergymen and laymen, formed to secure a reformation of the English liturgy in the latter part of the 18th century. The name is derived from the "Feathers' Tavern," in London, where their meetings were held. The number of clergymen in the body was nearly 300. Gilbert Wakefield (q.v.) was a leading spirit in the association. "They signed a petition requesting the excision of the damnatory clauses in the Athanasiaum Creed, and the relief of their consciences in the matter of subscription; and with this, no doubt, many of them would have been satisfied. But the laity went much further. In the war of pamphlets which this affair created, some of them spoke of the Reformation, the doctrine of the Trinity, and the Thirty-nine Articles with ridicule. 'When the matter was debated in the House of Commons, the doctrines of the Church of England were treated with contempt. 'I would gladly exchange all the Thirty-nine Articles,' said one of the speakers, 'for a fortieth, of which the subject should be the peace of the Church.' The doctrine of the Trinity was denounced by one of the writers of the association as 'an imposition-a deception of a much later date than Athanasius-a deception, too, on which an article of faith is rested.' The whole system of Christian doctrine, as taught by the Church of England, was assailed. The same writer affirms, with a degree of effrontery that might well rouse the indignation of the clergy, 'that certain parts in the public service and doctrine of the Church are acknowledged by every clergyman of learning and candor to be unscriptural and unfounded; no man of sense and learning can maintain them' (*Hints submitted to; the Association*, etc., etc., by a Layman, 1789). Bishop Horsley answered with force, but with the unbecoming asperity which defaces all his controversial writings." The society was not long-lived, and, for many years after, any voice raised in the Church of England in favor of liturgical revision was silenced by 'the mention of "the Feathers' Tavern.'"--Marsdeen, *Churches and Sects*, i, 314; Baxter, *Church History of England* (London, 1849), p. 668.

Featly, Daniel, D.D.

a learned divine, was born at Charlton, near Oxford, in 1582. His' father was cook at Corpus Christi College, where the son received his education. In 1610, Sir Thomas Edmunds, ambassador of king James to France, chose him as his chaplain at Paris, where he spent three years, and did great honor to the English nation and the Protestant cause. After his return he became successively rector of Northill in Cornwall, of Lambeth in Surrey, and of All-hallows in London. This last he soon changed for Acton in Middlesex, and then became provost of Chelsea College. In 1626 he published his *Ancilla Pietatis*, or "The Handmaid to Private Devotion," which went through many editions. In 1643 he was appointed one of the assembly of divines, and was a witness against archbishop Laud. Heylin said of him that he always was a Calvinist in his heart, but he never showed it openly till then. But the Parliamentary party soon took offence at him, and he was thrown into prison, where he remained six months, and where he chiefly composed his celebrated answer to the Jesuit's challenge published under the name of *Roma Ruens*. Nearly at the same time he wrote a book against the Baptists, called *The Dipper Dipt*. His sufferings in prison brought on the dropsy, of which he died, April 17, 1645. Among his many writings (a list of which may be found in Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*) are *Clavis Mystica, a key opening divers mysterious texts of Scripture*, in 70 sermons (Lond. 1636, fol.): — *Heratexium, or sir cordials against the terrors of death* (London, 1637, fol.).-Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 59; Middleton, *Biog. Evangel.* vol. iii; Neal, *History of the Puritans*-, Harper's edit., i, 473; ii, 20 sq.

Febronius

SEE HONTHEIM.

Fecht, Johann

a German theologian, was born at Salzburg December 26, 1636, and studied at several German universities, especially Tübingen and Heidelberg. In 1666 he became pastor of Langendenzlingen, and court preacher at Durlach in 1668. He afterwards became professor of theology at Rostock, where he died May 5, 1716. He was a voluminous writer, delighted in controversy, and was especially bitter against the Pietists. Among his publications are, *Lectiones Theologicae* (Rostock, 1722): - *Compendium Universae Theologiae* (Leips. 1744): — *Apparatus ad suppl. hist. eccles.*

sxc. xvi. Gass calls him a "most learned and fruitful divine, and much read, long after his death."-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:246; Gass, *Geschichte der Prot. Dogmatik* (Berlin, 1862, iii, 148).

Feder, Johann Michael

a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Oellingen, near Wurzburg, in Bavaria. In 1785 he was appointed extraordinary, and in 1786 ordinary professor at the university. From 1804 to 1811 he was first librarian of the university library. He died in 1824. Feder was one of the most prolific writers in the Roman Catholic Church of Germany, though none of his works are of special importance. They are chiefly translations from the Greek (Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret), Latin (works of Cicero, Cornelius Nepos, Vincent of Lerin), and French. He revised the translation of the Bible by Braun, and; contributed to a number of the Roman :Catholic periodicals of Germany. A complete list of his publications is given in the *Thesaurus librorum rei catholicae* (Wurzb. 1848).-Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:344; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* iii, 928. (A. J. S.)

Federal Theology

(Lat.*faedus*, a compact; adj. *federalis*), a method of stating divine truth, according to which all the doctrines of religion are arranged under the heads of certain covenants God has made with men. We set forth (I.) the doctrine, as stated by its advocates; (II.) its history.

I. Doctrine. — The fundamental idea of the system is that man has always stood towards God in the relation of a covenant, though a covenant of a peculiar character. The ordinary idea of a covenant, which is that of a mutual compact between one or more parties, each bound to render some benefit to the other, is obviously excluded by the nature of the case. Where God and man are the parties, the benefits must be all on one side and the obligations on the other. The relationship. must be determined and be imposed upon man by God in his right of a sovereign ruler. And yet it is something more than a mere law or promise. It involves, indeed, a law which man has no right to disobey; but superadded to this is a promise of benefits vastly disproportioned to the merit of obedience, a limitation of the time and circumstances of the probation on which all is made to depend, and the representation of many by some one as their natural head. There is even a virtual implication of mutual consent and obligations, for on the one hand God graciously binds himself to the performance of certain

engagements with the view of securing results that shall manifest his glory; and man freely consents when, with this understanding, he enters upon a course of obedience., Such a promise on God's part, suspended upon the performance of a condition on man's, is a covenant; The advocates of this system have usually made but two such covenants: viz. 1, that of nature or of works and, 2, that of grace. These have been successive in their revelation to man, since the former was an arrangement before the Fall, and the latter was not made known until after that event; and yet the latter must have been agreed upon before all worlds, whereas the former could not have been formed until the creation of man; and some contend that those who refuse their consent to the covenant of grace must necessarily remain, even now, under the obligations and penalties of the covenant of works. In both we have the same contracting parties, God and man; the same blessing to be attained, eternal life; and the same requirement of perfect obedience; but they differ, inasmuch as the covenant of grace is a dispensation of mercy to sinners, is through a divine Mediator, and secures the blessings of eternal life without the possibility of-a failure.

1. *The covenant of nature, or of corks*, is nowhere spoken of under that name, but is supposed' to, be. more than once alluded to in the Scriptures: Some have thought they had discovered an express mention of it in ^{<8167>}Hosea 6:7: "They, like Adam, have transgressed the covenant" (compare ^{<8313>}Job 31:33; ^{<8317>}Psalms 82:7). The apostle often speaks of. the law of works in contrast with the law of faith, of the two covenants (^{<8104>}Galatians 4:24), and not unfrequently of an old and a new covenant. It is not denied that by these expressions he usually meant the Mosaic or Sinaitic dispensation, in distinction from the evangelical, but, it is thought that such a dispensation could be designated a covenant of works only because it was a republication of a moral law to be a rule of conduct, but not a covenant of life, for a particular nation. The contrast and resemblance which Paul also draws between the first and the second Adam (^{<8162>}Romans 5:12-21; ^{<8155>}1 Corinthians 15:45) would seem to have no meaning without the understanding of a covenant with our great progenitor. All the essentials of a covenant, too, are discoverable in the constitution under which Adam was placed by his Maker. Not only was he, as a moral being, under obligation to conform to the law written upon his heart, and to obey the positive precept given to test his confidence in God, but eternal life was promised him on condition of his obedience. He was constituted the representative of his race, and a limited period was assigned him in which

the destiny of all was to be decided. That this is a true statement of the case was inferred from that which actually followed the transgression of our first parents, and must have been more or less clearly known to them. To such an arrangement those who had been created in the image of God could do no otherwise than yield a cheerful assent, inasmuch as far higher blessings were proposed by it than by any merely legal relation. We have reason to suppose, also, that their powers were quite ample for the performance of the condition. Many have thought that before the Fall they were endowed with such supernatural gifts as secured to them the possession of their original righteousness; but, as nothing is said of these in the sacred history, and as they appeared to many inconsistent with the possibility of man's fall, most writers contend that the divine image consisted wholly in the knowledge and moral excellence which Adam had within himself. That he would have secured eternal life for himself and his descendants had he continued faithful for a prescribed period is inferred from the fact that he fell for himself and them; and we have no reason to think that a benevolent God would have made the penalty more extensive in its influence than the promise. The penalty for disobedience was death, corporeal, spiritual, and eternal, for each of these necessarily followed a forfeiture of a divine life. The seal by which this covenant was ratified and signified was at least the tree of life, lent a sacramental character has been attributed to almost everything mentioned in the scriptural account of Paradise.

After an indefinite period this covenant was violated on man's part. This result was not the effect of any action on God's part either positive or privative, but in the exercise of man's-own freedom. No intellectual knowledge, or upright purposes, or pure affections could give the creature absolute immutability; and hence, with the highest and best gifts, man "being left to the freedom of his own will, fell from the estate in which he was created." The friends of the federal system allege that this was the only proper period of man's probation, since only then was his destiny dependent upon a contingency. Ever since that event, if any are saved it must be by an unconditional grant through Jesus Christ. The whole race sinned in Adam and fell with him—a not because of any confusion of personal or moral identity, not because of any transference of character from one man to another but simply because all were represented in him. As a representative, he was in no sense numerically one and the same with those he represents, for no one can represent himself. He simply acted in behalf

of them, as a parent, or guardian, or agent often does. There was a reason on account of which he was thus chosen to act in their stead. This was the unity of their nature with his, and his peculiar, position as the natural head of the race; but their representation was something additional to all: that. A natural head of a family might be so situated that many consequences might flow to them from his action, and yet he might not stand as their covenant or legal representative. Adam stood in our place, not directly, because he was our natural head, but because God chose him to stand thus. Thee natural relation might have been, and doubtless was, the reason for his being chosen to such an office, but the legal or covenant unity was constituted by the divine designation and choice. The consequence was that all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, were henceforth to be treated as guilty and fallen creatures. Only his first sin was thus imputed to them because the original covenant was broken by that alone, and Adam must afterwards have stood as a single person, and not as a public representative. Personally he lost the moral image of God, communion with God, corporeal life, a place in Paradise, and the hope of a blessed immortality. His posterity fell under the imputation of his guilt, were destitute of original righteousness, and became corrupt in their whole nature. As a method sanctioned by God for attaining eternal life, the covenant of works was henceforth abolished and forbidden and yet all men are under obligation to obey the law, and on their own disobedience they must endure its penalty, unless they are redeemed by Jesus Christ. God has encouraged no expectation of salvation by an obedience to the law, for, even if such an obedience were possible, no one has ever realized it, and God has provided no promises for a merely hypothetical case. If, therefore, no other scheme had been proposed to man, each individual of our race had lain under the penalty of a broken covenant, which subjected him to a hopeless abandonment by his Maker, to all the evils of a dying state in this world, to final death itself, and to an everlasting banishment from God in the world to come. Not that each person s-as judicially condemned to all these evils exclusively on account of the first sin, but such were the consequences which would certainly follow that act. It is conceded that in the last day none will be condemned for any but their own personal sin, and yet it is contended that in the first sin all are rendered liable to both the sinfulness and the misery of the present state.

2. *The covenant of grace* is that glorious scheme of wisdom and goodness by which eternal life and salvation have been provided for men in a way of

free grace and mercy. It is sometimes distinguished from the covenant of redemption, in as much as the latter phrase may be confined to the arrangement in eternity between the persons of the Trinity, and the former to the engagement into which God enters in time with believers. On the other hand, some have contended that the covenant of redemption is that stricter arrangement according to which believers are delivered from all sin, while that of grace is that wider one according to which a sufficient atonement was provided for all men. It has, however, been most common to speak of all God's arrangements for the salvation of men as under a single covenant, which, however, may have various modes of dispensation. One may conceive of the whole race as fallen, and then of a scheme of mercy which provides first a door of mercy sufficiently open for all mankind to enter, and finally a system of means which should secure the actual salvation of a limited number; or he may conceive of the eye of God being fixed first upon a limited number of our fallen race, and for their sake alone providing an atonement sufficient indeed for all men, but designed and efficient for the salvation of only a definite number. The latter was the aspect in which the covenant of grace has usually been presented by its advocates. They have supposed that God originally anticipated the temporary character of the covenant of works, and determined upon another arrangement, by which a portion of mankind might be saved from the ruins of the apostasy. Why he did not include the whole or a larger portion of mankind within the scope of his saving mercy, they prefer to leave out of discussion as an unapproachable mystery. That he had sufficient reasons without implying a want of benevolence they assert without hesitation. but they think it best never to attempt a definition of them. Negatively they contend that the favored ones could have had no pre-eminence in natural goodness, since many of them confess themselves to be the chief of sinners. The effort to find a sufficient reason in the anticipated circumstances of men has usually proved so confusing to the finite intellect, that most thinkers have concluded to leave the origin of discriminating grace where the Scriptures have left it, in the mere good pleasure (*beneplicitum*) of God. As we read of some who were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, it has been inferred that there must have been in eternity an agreement or covenant between the persons of the sacred Trinity, according to which a seed was given to the Son to serve him, and that he became their surety to satisfy the claims of justice upon them, to give them a title to eternal life, and to bring them to everlasting glory. The Father (who in this transaction is usually regarded as

personating the Deity as such) engaged to spare his beloved Son, to furnish him with all suitable endowments and preparations for his work, to support him in it, to deliver into his hands all power in heaven and on earth, to pardon and accept all who should come unto God by him, and to confer upon him a glorious reward forever and ever. The Holy Spirit, who must also be looked upon as having a part in this covenant, also engaged to become the efficient agent in the regeneration, sanctification, and glorification of the holy seed. Without ascribing to this transaction the technicalities of a human compact, and conceding that the whole mode of viewing it is anthropomorphic, it is contended that something equivalent to this, and amounting to such a mutual understanding, must have existed in the sacred Trinity. An equal love towards men is supposed to have existed in each of the divine persons. But as man was under condemnation, and could not therefore act for himself, the Son of God acted in behalf of all of whom he was to be the spiritual head. To constitute a natural ground for this headship, he was to become a man, uniting divinity in one person with humanity. He thus became a new federal head for his spiritual seed, similar to that which Adam had sustained to his natural descendants. In this relation he was to act in all he did as their representative. He was to share with them in the actual curse which the first sin had brought on the human race, not shrinking even from death in its most terrific form. Though this endurance was not the same with that which they would have endured in its spiritual results or in eternal duration, it was supposed to be infinite in value on account of the infinite dignity of his person. It was indeed sufficient in objective worth to expiate for any amount of sin in any number of worlds. It has actually conferred innumerable benefits upon all men. Pardon and salvation is offered to every one who hears the Gospel; time, opportunity, and some means of grace are afforded to all, and sufficient is done to leave those inexcusable who deny the Lord that bought them. But confessedly all are not made partakers of salvation, and only a portion of men were eternally given to Christ by the Father. Obviously it was not left to an uncertainty whether his work would be in vain or not. A seed was secured to him by covenant and it was with an ultimate reference to these that he entered upon his work. Adapted to all, and sufficient for all as his work may be, it must have been specially designed to effect the salvation only of the covenant people. Of these alone can he be regarded as the proper head and representative, since they alone are ingrafted into him by a living and active faith. To them alone is his perfect righteousness imputed, as if he had suffered and obeyed in their stead. By his sufferings he has

satisfied for their guilt, and by his perfect obedience to the law he has obtained for them a title to eternal life. He thus becomes their surety, not merely to make them inherently holy, but to perform what is required of them. He satisfies in this way both the penalty and the precept of the broken covenant. That covenant required obedience only for a limited period, and he has fulfilled the law during the time allotted him by the Father. The whole person of the Redeemer in both natures was subject to the law, and as such an obedience (at least in this special form of it) was not obligatory, but voluntary on his part, it became available for an infinite righteousness.

Such was the covenant of grace as formed in eternity. To this must be added its actual administration in time. Of course the only administrator of it was the Son of God himself, the mediator between God and man. He has power over all flesh, in order to give eternal life to as many as had been given him. He it was who represented the divine Ruler in all those dispensations of mercy of which the sacred history informs us. Although at different periods of human history the outward forms of religion have been changed, the covenant of grace, which lay at the basis of them all, was always the same. Salvation has in all cases been by Christ, even where the subjects of it knew little or nothing respecting him. None have ever been saved by the law of works, and none have had their hopes bounded by promises of an earthly home. The antediluvians, the patriarchs, Job and his friends, the Israelites in Egypt and under the Mosaic dispensation, looked for forgiveness under certain prescribed conditions, and for a city beyond the present world whose builder and maker is God. " The only difference between them was that salvation was presented with greater obscurity, under more symbolical forms, with narrower restrictions to families and nations, and with less enlarged measures of the divine Spirit at some periods than at others. Ordinarily there have been reckoned but two principal economies or dispensations, viz. that under the Old and that under the New Testament. Although the same word in the original languages of the Bible is applied to all covenants between God and man, the advocates of the federal system have translated them differently when applied on the one hand to the great covenants of nature and of grace, and on the other to the different economies under the covenant of grace. Availing themselves of the double meaning, especially of the Greek word (*διαθήκη*), they have usually designated these latter economies by the name of testaments, to indicate that they were that peculiar kind of

arrangements which acquire validity only after the decease of him who makes them. Though the Redeemer had not, in fact, died before the earlier dispensation, he was looked upon as slain from the foundation of the world, and the dispensations of mercy were even then constituted in anticipation of his death. Hence, when speaking of the communication of benefits to men, no mutual conditions are implied, but Jesus Christ is said to bequeath them by testament. The death of the testator is indispensable to render the grant valid, and to make the promises sure (~~<3096>~~ Hebrews 9:16-17). Conditions, in the proper sense of the word, on the part of God's people, are not required, but benefits are supposed to be bestowed absolutely, by free donation, and by an irrevocable will. Men are indeed to believe, to be holy, and to persevere faithfully unto the end, but all this is supposed to be secured by the free grace of God in Christ.'

The Christian dispensation is the ultimate form in which the covenant of grace will be administered; for, since all national restrictions have been removed, and the Holy Spirit is given in his plenitude, no other is conceivable. Jesus Christ will continue to administer it until the whole world shall be subdued unto him. Finally, the present economy of things shall cease, the dead shall be raised, the living shall be changed, every human being shall be judged at Christ's bar for sins, not only against God as a moral ruler, but against himself as the mediatorial king, and sentence shall be passed upon each according to his works. Christ will claim the right to do this even with respect to such as are not under his spiritual headship, inasmuch as they too are in one sense purchased by him (~~<3001>~~ 2 Peter 2:1), and hence power over all flesh has been given him by the Father (~~<3170>~~ John 17:2). Then, having obtained full possession of his kingdom, he will present it to the Father as the economical representative of the Godhead, either in token of the completeness of his work, or as indicating the close of his mediatorship. But, whether he demits his peculiar office (~~<4528>~~ 1 Corinthians 15:28), or only brings his mediatorial kingdom into some new relation, he will then complete the scheme of the covenant of grace, and receive his eternally betrothed Church into an everlasting union with himself.

II. History. — The words rendered covenant are frequently used in the original Scriptures in application to God's dealings with his creatures. The Hebrew **tyr** ~~ב~~ signifies undoubtedly in its primary meaning a mutual compact (Robinson's Gesenius's *Lexicon*), and yet it is not unfrequently

applied to transactions in which such an idea in its strictness is impossible (^{<0030>}Genesis 9:9-18; ^{<2430>}Jeremiah 33:20-21). With a true sense of its usage and idea, if not strictly according to its etymological signification, the LXX have translated this word by the Greek **διαθήκη**, the generic meaning of which is a disposition or arrangement, and lapses into the idea of a mutual compact or testament only when the author or authors of it happened to be mutual stipulators or testators. But neither in the Septuagint nor in the New Testament is the word ever applied to the relation in which man stood before the Fall, but always to some transaction or dispensation under the covenant of grace (^{<2430>}Hosea 6:7, with this signification, is doubtful). Nor has any clear instance of such an application of the word to man's primeval state been found in any theological writer before the commencement of the 17th century. (See, however, Bede on ^{<0174>}Genesis 17:14.) Certainly no one had attempted to arrange all the materials of a systematic theology under the general heads of divine covenants. And yet there was an obvious tendency in that direction among the Reformed churches of the Calvinistic school. These had become familiar with the word in relation to Christ and his people, and with all the principles involved in a covenant with Adam. They had seen that Adam's original position was not that of a mere subject of law, but that promises had been made to him with a condition, and that the whole race were represented on a limited probation in him. It is generally conceded that the federal system had its origin with Kloppenburg, a professor of theology at Franeker (died in 1652). The first, however, who had the genius and boldness to give definiteness and completeness to the system was John Koch (Cocceius), a pupil of his, and a successor in the same chair. In his *Summa doctrinae de faedere et testamento Dei* (1648), and still further in his more enlarged *Summa Theologiae* (2d edit. 1665), he comprises all the doctrines of the Christian religion under the two great categories of the covenants of nature and of grace. The method he pursued has gained for him the appellation of the Father of Biblical Theology and, laying aside the practice usual with his predecessors, of viewing divine truth in its subjective form, either as logically constructed by a human mind, or as it was supposed to lie in the divine mind around the great central doctrine of predestination, he professed to come to the Scriptures, reverently to read them, and derive his system from the inspired historical arrangement. The events of human history were regarded in their anthropological aspect as well as related to the divine efficiency. The final cause of salvation he can indeed find nowhere else than in the divine mind, and he has no occasion to impinge against the highest style of

contemporary orthodoxy, and yet he succeeded in giving to theology a more practical character. Although under all dispensations he conceived of man as receptive and God alone as communicative, he still represented man as coming under an obligation to perform certain duties which were looked upon as a virtual condition of the divine promises. This fidelity to the scriptural representation compelled him to develop his system according to the successive periods of the sacred history (Ebrard, *Dogmen*. § 40; D. Schenkel, *Christ.-Dogmen*. § 129, note).

As often occurs when great changes are introduced in formal statements of truth, this system was as bitterly opposed as if it had been an essential error. Other principles, on which the author was more vulnerable, were introduced into the controversy; but the main features of his system soon obtained a remarkable degree of acceptance in all the Reformed churches of France, Switzerland, Holland, Scotland, and among the English Puritans. The orthodox Roman Catholics have always regarded it with aversion, and the Jansenists oppose the whole conception of a covenant with Adam as an innovation upon Augustinism, and needless to explain the natural effects of the first-sin (Father Paul's *Hist. of the Council of Trent*, p. 177-201; Jansenius, *August.* ii, 208-11). The Lutheran divines have in general rejected it on account of the prominence it still gave to the doctrine of predestination, and because, when the word covenant was divested of the idea of a mutual compact, it offered no advantages over the words which had long been in use (Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk*, § 28). The Arminians of Holland were partially conciliated by those juridical considerations by which the advocates of the system defended it, and many of them accepted of it with some important modifications. The object of these was to limit the direct consequences of Adam's sin to a privation of original righteousness, or the loss of those aids of the divine spirit on which they made the original moral image to depend, to temporal evils, and to bodily death, together with such a depravation of our mental and moral state as renders us incapable of obedience, and so to extend the benefits of Christ's death, that he should not only be regarded as dying for all men alike, but as actually restoring to them such supernatural aids as, if properly used, would enable them to lay hold upon the great salvation (Nichol's *Calvinism and Arminianism in Watson's Theol. Instit.* ii, 45). Notwithstanding the objections raised against the federal system, its principles were carried still further forward with fearless and logical consistency by Francis Burmann, a pupil of Koch, and a professor in the

University of Utrecht. In his *Synopsis of Theology, and especially of the Economy of the Covenants* (1671), he, endeavored to show that all the details of the covenant of nature were fairly to be inferred from the idea of the divine image in man in connection with what- we know of the divine goodness, since that goodness would of course desire to bring man into the highest communion with itself; and Would not he satisfied with the prescriptions of a mere natural justice. The difficulties, however, with which the system was pressed by its opponents were sought to be removed by Hermann Witsius, a successor and former pupil of Burmann in the theological chair of the University of Utrecht. In his *Economy of the Covenants*, the first edition of which appeared in .1685, some important distinctions maintained by his predecessors were given up (as, e.g. that between the **πάρεσις** of the Old and the **ἄφεσις** of the New Testament, as shown in ~~ROMS~~ Romans 3:25, 26, and the three dispensations or economies of the covenant of grace); a minute parallel is drawn between the two covenants by the introduction of four sacraments into Paradise (the tree of life, the tree of knowledge, the Sabbath, and Paradise itself); and a sacramental character is given to a multitude of things under the economy before the law (the coats of skins, the ark, the rainbow, etc. bk. ii, chap. 8:§ 10; bk. 4:chap. vii). In 1688 a further attempt was made to complete the federal system by Melchior Leydecker, another professor in Utrecht, who, though not in the strictest sense a Federalist, professedly wrote under its spirit and tendency. In his *Seven Books upon the Truth of the Christian Religion*, he endeavors to trace the economy of the covenant of grace to the several Persons of the sacred Trinity, by showing that the Father reveals himself, especially in the Old Testament, as the universal Ruler maintaining the cause of justice; the Son, especially during his life 'on earth, as the: Mediator dispensing mercy; and the Holy Ghost, especially since the day of Pentecost, as the Comforter exercising divine and saving power. This arbitrary assignment of the divine attributes, however, has never been acceptable. Though the Heidelberg Catechism was composed before the federal theory was distinctly broached, most of the great commentaries which have been written upon it were written by Federalists. The maturest fruit of that system may be seen in the writings of Solomon van Til (Tilenus), a professor in Dort and Leyden, whose *Compend (Compend of Nat. and Rev. Theol.* Leyden, 1704, and *Compend of Theology*, Berne, 1703) were the organic union of the three great tendencies of Scholasticism, Federalism, and Cartesianism, and have obtained general acceptance in the schools of Holland; and in those of F. A. Lampe, the

pastor of several influential congregations and a professor in Utrecht (1720-27), whose doctrinal and practical works in the German vernacular have had the honor of reconciling Pietism to the orthodox Church, and have sometimes had a popularity scarcely inferior to the authorized Catechism of the national Church. It does not appear that the Federal system has at any time found universal acceptance in the Reformed churches. It has never been either condemned or sanctioned by the public synod, and such has been the balance of parties that, by right of long-established custom, one Federalist must be appointed in each of the universities of Holland (Ebrard, *Christ. Dogm.* § 41).

A modification both of the Scholastic and Federal theology made its appearance among the Protestants of France. The rival theological schools of Saumur and Montauban zealously adopted the federal system. But John Cameron, a Scotchman, who at different times was a professor in both institutions *SEE CAMERON*, and his pupils, Moise Amyraut (Amyraldus) and Joshua de la Place (Placaeus), who were associated as professors at Saumur (1633-64), proposed, and for many years maintained, a peculiar system, which attempted to reconcile it with the doctrine of a universal redemption. *SEE AMYRAUT AND LA PLACE*. The result was a crude syncretism of an ideal or hypothetical Universalism with a rigid and real Particularism. Amyraut maintained that there were three instead of two general covenants with man—the *natural*, with a positive prohibition and a promise of a blessed life in Paradise; a *legal*, promising the land of Canaan on condition of a life of faith; and the *gracious*, promising eternal life on the condition of faith in Christ. La Place also drew a distinction between a mediate and an immediate imputation, according to which Adam's sin might be imputed to his posterity, either mediately, on account of a previously recognised inherent depravity in them; or it might be imputed to them immediately, simply on account of their federal representation in Adam. This whole system was strenuously opposed by the elder Spanheim, of Geneva and Leyden; J. H. Heidegger, of Zurich; and Francis Turretin, of Geneva. At the two last national synods ever held in France (Charenton, in 1645, and Loudun, in 1659) the authors successfully defended themselves from the charge of heresy, and maintained that their views were only a more distinct statement of doctrines which had been universally held 'by the orthodox Church since primitive times, and especially by Augustine and Calvin; but a statement of opinions imputed to them (incorrectly, as they maintained) was condemned :at a synod at Charenton(1642), and the

Formula Consensus Helvetica was composed principally by Heidegger (1675), and was adopted and sent forth to guard the churches against such views. Although this is one of the most scientific and highly esteemed of the Calvinistic confessions, and is the only one among the Continental confessions which is constructed expressly upon the basis of the federal system, its authority has never been acknowledged in France, and it was received by only five of the Swiss cantons (and there mainly through the support of the civil magistrates), and finally lost all public sanction within fifty years from its promulgation (Ebrard's *Christ. Dogm.* § 43; L. Noack's *Christ. Dogmengesch.* § 74; Shedd's *Hist. of Chr. Doct.* ii, 412).

In the British Islands, and especially in those churches which adhere to the confession of faith put forth by the Synod of Westminster (1643-8), we have the stronghold of the federal system. The representatives of the English Church at the Synod of Dort (1618-19), and especially bishop Davenant, had maintained a system similar to that of Amyraut, and a large party in that Church have always held views based upon the federal theology. Even Jeremy Taylor maintained it (1654), with some Arminian, and even Pelagian modifications, in one of his treatises (*On Repentance*, ch. i, § 1). The celebrated Richard Baxter, though he "subscribed to the Synod of Dort without any exception, limitations or exposition of any word," was an ardent admirer of the federal theology, as qualified by Amyraut (Preface to *The Saints' Rest*, 1650; *Cath. Theol.* 1675; *Univ. Redemp.* 1657; Orme's *Life of Baxter*, vol. ii, ch. ii). The assembly of divines at Westminster was, in fact, contemporary with the first publication of Koch's principal work on the covenants (1648), and deserves a credit, perhaps, equal to his for the origination and precise statement of the doctrine. The national Scotch Church, with its affiliated branches in Scotland and Ireland, has always upheld the system in its utmost consistency and extremest form. The United Presbyterian Church alone is said to maintain it, with some modifications connected with the theory of a general atonement (Wardlaw, *On the Extent of the Atonement*, § 13-15). Among the orthodox dissenters of England it has also been accepted, and found some of its most able defenders. The Wesleyans of England and America claim that they are enabled, by their peculiar modifications of it, to "carry through the system with greater consistency than the Calvinists themselves, inasmuch as they more easily account for certain good dispositions and occasional religious inclinations in those who never give evidence of actual conversion." By their doctrine of a general redemption,

they maintain that in spite of the loss of the supernatural aids through the Fall, and the consequent incapacity of unassisted man to have such good dispositions, there is given to every one, through Christ, those gracious influences which, if not resisted, would lead on to a saving conversion (Watson's *Theol. Instit.* ii, 48-52; Porter's *Comp. of Methodism*, pt. ii, ch. iv). The reason that these gracious influences are not resisted they can only refer to the doctrine of free-will, and from the nature of the case they can give no farther account of it. The orthodox Congregationalists and the New-school Presbyterians of the United States usually object to the phrase "*universal redemption*" as used by the Amyraldists of France, the Baxterians of England, and the Arminians generally, inasmuch as the word redemption properly signifies more than what is obtained simply by the expiatory work of Christ, and includes an entire deliverance *from* sin. They therefore use the word atonement to signify the objective or expiatory work of Christ, and contend that this is *for* sin, *and for* all men, while redemption implies the salvation of men, and must, of course, be confined to such as shall be saved (Dr. W. R. Weeks, in Parks's *Collections on the Atonement*, p. 579). Such an atonement is not merely hypothetical, but really opens the door of salvation to all men, who are supposed, even since the Fall, to possess all those faculties and powers which render them responsible for a compliance with the terms of salvation. And yet, so certain are all men to use their powers, and the best external means of grace, to their perdition, that no reason can be assigned for the repentance and faith of any but the covenant of grace formed in Christ before the world was (Dwight's *Theol.* ser. xliiii; Barnes, *On the Atonement*, chap. ix; *Presb. Quart. Rev.* iii, 218 7252, 630-648). Other classes of Presbyterians and Calvinistic Baptists in this country use the word redemption, and even atonement, in the sense of an entire deliverance from sin; and they, of course, confine its application to the elect. They speak in the largest terms of the sufficiency of the work of Christ for the pardon of all sin, but regard it as limited in the purpose and design of God to such as are effectually called of the Spirit, and are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation (*Princeton Theol. Essays*, vol. v, iii, and xiv; A. Fuller's *Gospel*, etc., in *Works*, i, 312-340, vol. i, att. viii and xiv).

III. Literature.-On the general system and history: Turretin's *Inst. Theol. Elench.* loc. viii and xii; Hill's *Lect. is Divinity*, bk. v, ch. v; Dick's *Lect. on Theol.* Lect. xlvi; Witsius, *aEcon. of the Cov.* 3 vols.; Buck's, Simith's, and Kitto's *Dictionaries*, art. Covenants; Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* arts.

Cocceius, Burmanan, Witsius, and Voetius; Ebrard's *Chr. Dogm.* § 37-44; Vincenst's and Fisher's *Catechisms*; Hagenbach's *Hist. of Doctr.* § 224; *New Englander*, 27:469-516; *Bibl. Repeat.* for 1868; L. Noack's *Chr. Dogmengesch.* § 74; Knapp's *Christ. Theol.* § 76, 113; Hopkins's *System*, i, 240-250; *Mercersburg Review*, 10:63; Kelly, *On the Covenants*; *Jahrb. Deutsch. Theolog.* 10:209; Fletcher's *Works*, i, 452; Gass, *Protest. Theol.* ii, 276, 318; Isaac Watts's *Ruin and Recovery*, p. 324-347; Ridgley's *Body of Divinity*, p. 11; Dr. E. A. Park's *Discourses and Treatises by Edwards, Smalley, Maxey, Emmons, Griffin, Burge. and Weeks, on the Atonement*; Neander, *Dogmengesch.* per. iii, bk. ii, c-f; Max Goebel, *Gesch. d. chr. Lebens*, etc., Vol. ii, A, § 7-10, p. 153; Cunningham's *Hist. Theol.* ch. xxv; Schweitzer, *Ref. Dogm.* p. 103 sq. (C. P.'W.)

Feejee Islands

SEE FIJI

Feeling

The relation of feeling to religion is a subject of importance both from a religious and philosophical point of view. It has been viewed in very different ways, and has led to long and animated controversies.

In Greek, the word **αἴσθησις** denoted every kind of perception, sensuous and spiritual, mediate and immediate; consequently, also what we call feeling. Plato referred to a sensuous spiritual feeling, though he did not call it by this name; for, according to his-a, the understanding (**νοῦς**) communes with the affections (**ἐπιθυμητικόν**), and the seat of this communion is the liver, from which proceed the power of divination (**μαντεία**) and enthusiasm (**ἐνθουσιασμός**). Connected with this view is the opinion of Plato, that virtue cannot be taught, and that what is substantially good breaks forth in the soul as an immediate light.

The extensive -usage of the Latin word *sensus* embraces also the natural moral feeling, *senses communis*, *senses hominum*.

In the Septuagint the word **αἴσθησις** frequently occurs, and is generally rendered by "knowledge" or "wisdom," as ^{<3000>}Proverbs 1:7; 12:23. In the New Testament it occurs only once, ^{<3000>}Philippians 1:9, where it is coupled with **ἐπίγνωσις** (English version: and this I pray that your love may abound yet more and score in knowledge and in all judgment).

The psychological meaning of the words **αἴσθησις** and *sensus* in the Greek and Latin fathers is not fully settled, but in general they use them to denote a knowledge, or insight obtained by means of feeling. Origen (*contra Celsum*, i, 48) speaks of a "divine insight" (**θεία αἴσθησις**) of the soul by means of which enlightened men perceive supernatural things just as others perceive natural objects by means of their senses. Clement (Stromat. iv, p. 333, ed. Potter) ascribes to the scientific man a **συναίσθησις**, a faculty of inventing and understanding, analogous to the faculty of taste possessed by the sculptor, and the sense of hearing possessed by the musician. To denote a feeling accompanying the will, the Latin fathers used the word *mcivsace*. Among the Latin fathers, Tertullian (*De anima*, chap. ii) spoke of a *publicus sensus* which leads the soul to a knowledge of God. Augustin introduced the expression *inner sense* (*interior sensus*), which become of great importance in the writings of the mystics. The common expressions in the mystics to denote subjective and objective feeling are *sensus*, *sentimentum affectus*, *gustus*. *Affectus* always embraces a practical impulse. *Gustus*, which is identified with *senses*, does not exclude the practical impulse, but properly denotes feeling viewed in its relation to its own contents, and therefore designated as a *modes cognoscendi*, a kind of cognition. The immediateness of this *sensus*, which words cannot fully express, is therefore, in the opinion of the mystics, greatly superior to an intellectual insight. Mystic theology, according to Gerson, because it rests on feeling, is widely different from all other sciences. Thomas Aquinas regards not only mystical theology, but theology and faith in general, as founded in the *pia affectio* (pious or religious feeling), because faith supposes a movement of the will towards the first truth and the highest good which produces assent (*Summa Theol.* ii, 2, 9, 4, 5).

The mystical writers of Germany in the Middle Ages, writing on practical more than speculative subjects, spoke of feeling in particulars as a subjective consciousness, and demanded its renunciation. The spiritual man, they urged, should emancipate himself from all emotions and sever his connection with everything created, that God might become present to him, and eternity might be felt by him and tasted. The objective feeling of the supernatural God appears to these writers as the final result of the renunciation of the subjective feeling of personal and individual existence.

Luther warned against a reliance upon "feeling" instead of clinging to the "word." At the same time, however, he demands that the soul feel the call of

the Lord, and the "spirit of adoption, whereby "we cry Abba, father" (~~4815~~ Romans 8:15), he defines as a feeling of the fatherly love of God. The testimony of the Holy Ghost he finds in the religious experience, and this experience he identifies with the religious feeling. Similar are the views of the other reformers and the early writers of the Reformed churches.

A greater stress was laid on feeling as an element of religion by the Pietists, who regarded its very inexpressibility as an argument for its truth. The same was done by the Moravians, who reduced religion to the feeling of truth. Opposition to the Pietists made most of the later dogmatic writers of the Lutheran Church suspicious of feeling as an element of religion; but some recognised its importance, as M. Pfaff (*Instit. Theol. and Moral.*), who did not hesitate to apply (like the society of Friends) to the "spiritual feeling" (*sensus or gustus spiritualis*) the expression "spiritual light" (*lumen spirituale*).

About the middle of the 18th century arose the system of Utilitarianism. Bread and butter were now more valuable than metaphysics. In the same proportion as confidence in the truth of *thought* vanished, confidence in - the objective contents of feeling was also weakened. But gradually philosophy prepared the way for a more correct appreciation of feeling. Until Wolf, philosophy had only recognised two faculties of the soul, intellect and will (or desire). Tetens added feeling as "the inner sense for the pleasant and the unpleasant." Kant, also, in his *Kritik der Urtheilskraft*, reduced all faculties of the soul to three, one of which was the *Gefühl der Lust und Unlust* (feeling of the pleasant and unpleasant). Kant also called attention to the fact that in aesthetics the beautiful and sublime is felt, and the infinite is seen in the finite appearance. Here, therefore, an objective feeling was found. This idea of Kant's aesthetics was further developed by Fries, who based upon feeling an aesthetico-religious system which taught that the highest ideas must be divined by faith. Jacobi taught an immediate faculty of the divine, which he first called the faculty of faith; later, of reason; finally-adopting the terms of Fries--of feeling.

These philosophical speculations greatly influenced the various systems of Rationalism. After the times of Wolf, only a few, as Rohr, adhered to an exclusive intellectualism. Most of the important representatives of Rationalism accept the theories of Fries and Jacobi. Thus Wegscheider refers chiefly to the philosophical works of-the disciples of Jacobi-Gerlach,

Bouterweck, and Salat. And Gabler, one of the keenest of the early Rationalists, defines religion as a ' feeling of dependence upon the infinite."

Among the adherents of Supranaturalism, Bretschneider and Reinhard recognised only a subjective feeling, but De Wette introduced the theory of Fries into systematic theology. Unlike Fries, however, in whose system there still was some obscurity as regards the relation of feeling and will to religion, De Wette based religion altogether on feeling or an esthetic view of the world, in which all difference between religion and art disappeared.

The system of Jacobi and of Spinoza, together with the spirit prevailing among the Moravians, worked together to produce the new doctrine of feeling which constituted the basis of the theology of Schleiermacher, and which still influences most theological systems of modern times. For Schleiermacher, religion is "the feeling of absolute dependence ;" that to which our reflection traces our individual existence is called God; and thus, in feeling, God is given to us in an original manner. *SEE SCHLEIERMACHER*. This theory of feeling was defended and keenly developed by Twesten, and in particular by Nitzsch. Hegel severely attacked the views of Schleiermacher, but his own views considerably changed with the gradual development of his system. See Tholuck, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopadie*, 4:703.

Feet

SEE FOOT

Feith, Rhijnvis

was born at Zwolle Feb. 7, 1753. He received a careful Christian training. At fifteen he entered the University of Leyden. In 1781 he competed with Lannoy in celebrating De Ruyter. His epic received the gold, and his lyric the silver medal. As a poet, he enjoyed a high reputation through life. He excelled chiefly as a didactic poet, though he also tried his hand at lyric and dramatic poetry. His lyric on Immortality (*De Onsterfelijkheid*) is beautiful and sublime. His didactic poem on the Grave (*Het Graf*) is his longest, and is regarded as one of his best. productions, abounding in the beautiful, the striking, and the sublime. His poetic writings are very numerous; and he also wrote several volumes of prose. He was appointed one of a commission to prepare a book of hymns for the use of the Reformed Church in Holland. This duty he discharged with great zeal and fidelity. To

this collection he contributed himself a large number of beautiful and appropriate hymns, most of them original, and a few translated from the German. Though a layman, he was a successful cultivator of theology. Two essays or treatises of his on important questions received the premium from Teyler's Theological Society, and another was crowned by the Hague Society. He died February 8, 1824, at his villa near Zwolle. See Siegenbeek's *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Letterkunde* (Haarlem, 1826); Hofdijk's *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Letterkunde*, bl. 415 en very. (Amsterd. 1864); Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, blz. 460 en very.; *Ge. schiedenis der Christelijke Kerk in Nederland door B. ter Haar, W. Moll, E. P. Swalve*, etc., ii Deel, blz. 593 en verv. (Amsterd. 1860); *Evangelische Gezangen*, introduced in 1807. (J. P. W.)

Felgenhauer, Paul

a Protestant theosophist and mystic, was the son of a Lutheran clergyman in Bohemia. He was born at Putschwiz, in Bohemia, in 1620. He studied medicine at the University of Wittenberg, but soon after returning to his native country appeared (1620) in public as a writer on theological subjects. In his *Chronology* he maintained that Christ was born in the year 4235 after the creation of the world, and as the world was not to last more than 6000 years, it ought to come to an end in A.D. 1765. As, however, the time was to be shortened on account of the elect, he assumed that the end of the world would occur before that year, although he claimed no special revelations on the subject. In his *Zeitspiegel* he denounced the corruption of the Church and of the Lutheran clergy. The persecution of Protestantism in Bohemia compelled him to leave his country. He first (1623) went to Amsterdam, where he published a number of mystic and alchemic writings, the theological views of which may be reduced to Sabellianism and Monophysitism, resting on a pantheistic and cabalistic basis. The large circulation of some of his works alarmed the Lutheran clergy, and many wrote against him. Not satisfied with this, the clergy of Hamburg, Lubeck, and Lineburg requested the ministry at Amsterdam to arrest the circulation of the works of Felgenhauer, and the spreading of his views, if necessary, by force. From 1635 to 1639 he lived at Bederkesa, near Bremen, where he held meetings of his adherents. Expelled from Bremen, he returned to Holland, where he, however, soon left again for Northern Germany. In 1657 he was arrested by order of the governments of Zelle and Hanover, and imprisoned at Syke. The efforts of several Lutheran clergymen to convert him to the Lutheran creed failed. About

1659 he lived in Hamburg. The year of his death is not known. A complete list of his works (forty-six in number) is given in Adelung, *Gesch. der menschl. Narrheit*, 4:400. -Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* iii, 348; Arnold, *Kirch.-u. Ketzerhistorie*, vol. iii, ch. v. (A. J. S.)

Felibien, Jacques

a. Roman Catholic divine, was born at Chartres in 1636, and distinguished himself in youth by success in study, especially of the Scripture. In 1668 he became pastor at Vineuil; in 1669, canon of Chartres; in 1695, archdeacon of Vendome. He died at Chartres Nov. 23, 1716. Besides various practical works, he wrote *Le Symbole des Apotres ex plque par l'ecriture Sainte* (Blois, 1696, 12mo) :-*Comment. in Oseam* (Chartres, 1702, 4to) :-*Pentateuchus Historicus ex fonte Hebraico*, etc. (Chartres, 1703, 4to). This book gave rise to much clamor, and Felibien was obliged to suppress various passages in which he was supposed to have departed from the orthodox interpretations. Moreover, as it had been printed with the permission only of the bishop, and without that of the royal censor, the book was suppressed by the government, and all the printed copies confiscated.-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:274.

Felicissimus

the author of a schism in the Church of Carthage in the 3d century, was appointed deacon in Carthage by the presbyter Novatus, without a previous understanding with Cyprian, who, a short time before, had been elected bishop. Cyprian declared his appointment to be an encroachment upon his episcopal prerogatives, but did not depose him. During the Decian persecution Cyprian was for some time absent from Carthage, and some of the presbyters, who claimed greater rights than Cyprian was willing to concede to them, began to readmit the *lapsi* to the communion of the Church in consequence of the *libelli pacis* given by the martyrs, without having an understanding on the subject with Cyprian. The latter reproached the presbyters with too great laxity, and sent a commission to Carthage which was to investigate the conduct of the *lapsi*, and to regulate the support which the treasury of the Church granted in certain cases. Felicissimus denounced the conduct of Cyprian as an encroachment upon his rights as deacon, among which belonged, in the Church of Africa, the administration of the treasury of the Church; and he even went so far as to exclude from the communion of his church those who should appear before

the episcopal commission. He was joined in his opposition by five - Presbyters and a number of confessors, and his church became the centre of all the *lapsi* who wished to have their cases decided before the return of Cyprian. After the return of Cyprian to Carthage in 251, a synod regulated the affair of the *lapsi*, and excluded Felicissimus and the presbyters acting with him from the Church. Felicissimus, however, not only persisted in his opposition, but his party, strengthened by the accession of several African bishops, elected Fortunatus, one of the five presbyters siding with Felicissimus, bishop of Carthage, and sent Felicissimus himself to Rome - where, in the mean while, the Novatian controversy had broken out for the purpose of gaining the Roman bishop Cornelius over to their side. The mission was, however, unsuccessful, and the schism of Felicissimus seems soon after to have become extinct. - Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:349; Schaf, *Church History.* (A. J. S.)

Felicitas

a saint of the Roman calendar, supposed to have suffered martyrdom A.D. 164. According to the legend, she was a woman of high birth, who embraced Christianity and brought up her seven sons in the faith. She was denounced to Marcus Aurelius, who ordered an inquiry. The prefect ordered her to sacrifice to the gods; she refused, as did her children. After vain efforts to break their constancy, the prefect reported the case anew to the emperor, who ordered a trial before special judges. The lady and her children were all put to death. The story is plainly of comparatively modern invention. Felicitas is commemorated in the Church of Rome Nov. 13, and her seven sons July 16. The bones of two of her sons are said to be preserved in Germany! - Bolland, *Acta Sanctor.* July 10; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, July 10.

Felicitas

an African slave who suffered martyrdom at Carthage along with Perpetua (q.v.), in the time of Severus, A.D. 202. They are both said by Irenaeus to have been Montanists, but cardinal Orsi seems to have disproved this in his *Dissert. Apol. pro SS. Perpetua et Felicitate.* They were arrested at Carthage while still catechumens, and were baptized in prisons. All efforts were tried in vain to induce them to abandon their faith; they were condemned to be thrown to the wild beasts at a festival in honor of the anniversary of Geta's nomination (*Annales Caesaris*). After this judgment

they were- remanded to prison to await the fatal day. For the account of Perpetua, *SEE PERPETUA*. "As to Felicitas, on her return to the dungeon she was seized with the pains of labor. The jailer said to her, 'If thy present sufferings are so great, what wilt thou do when thou art thrown to the wild beasts? This thou didst not consider when thou refusedst to sacrifice. She answered, ' I now suffer *myself* all that I suffer; but then there will be *another* who shall suffer for *me*, because I also will suffer for him. A custom which had come down from the times of human sacrifices, under the bloody Baal-worship of the Carthaginians, still prevailed of dressing those criminals who were condemned to die by wild beasts in priestly raiment. It was therefore proposed, in the present case, that the men should be clothed; as the priests of Saturn, and the women as the priestesses of Ceres. Nobly did their free, Christian spirit protest against such a proceeding. We have come here, said they, of our own will, that we may not suffer our freedom to be taken from us. We have given up our lives that we may not be forced to such abominations. The pagans themselves acknowledged the justice of their demand, and yielded. After they had been torn by the wild beasts, and were about to receive thee merciful stroke which was to end their sufferings, they took leave of each other for the last time with the mutual kiss of Christian love." Felicitas is commemorated in the Church of Rome March 7.-Neander, *Ch. Hist.* Torrey. i, 123; Butler, *Lives of Saints*, March 7.

Felix

(happy, Graecized Φῆλιξ, Acts 23-24 in Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 9, called ANTONIUS FELIX; in Suidas, CLAUDIUS FELIX; in Josephus and Acts, simply FELIX: so also in Tacitus, *Ann.* 12:54), the Roman procurator of Judaea, before whom Paul so "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come," that the judge trembled, saying, " Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee" (⁴⁴²⁵Acts 24:25; see Abicht, *De Claudio Felice*, Viteb. 1732; Eckhard, *Paulli oratio ad Felicem*, Isen. 1779). The context states that Felix had expected a bribe from Paul; and, in order to procure this bribe, he appears to have had several interviews with the apostle. The depravity which such an expectation implies is in agreement with the idea which the historical fragments preserved respecting Felix would lead the student to form of the man.

The year in which Felix entered on his office cannot be strictly determined. He was appointed by the emperor Claudius, whose freedman he was, on the banishment of Velatidius Cumanus, probably A.D. 53. Tacitus (*Ann.* 12:54) states that Felix and Cumanus were joint procurators, Cumanus heaving Galilee, and Felix Samaria. In this account Tacitus is directly at issue with Josephus (*Ant.* 20:6, 2), and is generally supposed to be in error; but his account is very circumstantial, and by adopting it we should gain greater justification for the expression of Paul (~~40:10~~ Acts 24:10) that Felix had been judge of the nation "for many years." Those words, however, must not even thus be closely pressed; for Cumanus himself only went to Judea in the eighth year of Claudius (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:5, 2). From the words of Josephus (*Ant.* 20:7, 1), it appears that his appointment took place before the twelfth year of the emperor Claudius. Eusebius fixes the time of his actually undertaking his duties in the eleventh year of that monarch. The question is fully discussed under *SEE CHRONOLOGY*, vol. ii, 311, 312.

Felix was a remarkable instance of the elevation to distinguished station of persons born and bred in the lowest condition. Originally a slave, he rose to little less than kingly power. For some unknown but probably not very creditable services, he was manumitted by Claudius Caesar (Suetonius, *Claudius*, 28; Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 9), on which account he is said to have taken the praenomen of Claudius. In Tacitus, however (*l. c.*), he is surnamed Antonius, probably because he was also a freedman of Antonia, the emperor's mother. Felix was the brother of Claudius's powerful freedman Pallas (Josephus, *War*, ii, 12, 8; *Ant.* 20:7, 1); and it was to the circumstance of Pallas's influence surviving his master's death (Tacitus, *Ann.* xiv, 65) that Felix was retained in his procuratorship by Nero. In speaking of Pallas in conjunction with another freedman, namely, Narcissus, the imperial private secretary, Suetonius (*Claudius*, 28) says that the emperor was eager in heaping upon them the highest honors that a subject could enjoy, and suffered them to carry on a system of plunder and gain to such an extent that, on complaining of the poverty of his exchequer, some one had the boldness to remark that he would abound in wealth if he were taken into partnership by his two favorite freedmen. ,

The character which the ancients have left of Felix is of a very dark complexion. Suetonius speaks of the military honors which the emperor loaded him with, and specifies his appointment as governor of the province of Judaea (*Claudius*, 28), adding an innuendo, which loses nothing by its

brevity, namely, that he was the husband of three queens or royal ladies ("trium reginarum maritum"). Tacitus, in his *History* (v, 9), declares that, during his governorship in Judaea, he indulged in all kinds of cruelty and lust, exercising regal power with the disposition of a slave; and, in his *Annals* (xii, 54), he represents Felix as considering himself licensed to commit any crime, relying on the influence which he possessed at court. The country was ready for rebellion, and the unsuitable remedies which Felix applied served only to inflame the passions and to incite to crime. The contempt which he and Cumanus (who, according to Tacitus, governed Galilee while Felix ruled Samaria; but see Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 7, 1) excited in the minds of the people, encouraged them to give free scope to the passions which arose from the old enmity between the Jews and Samaritans, while the two wily and base procurators were enriched by booty as if it had been spoils of war. This so far was a pleasant game to these men, but in the prosecution of it Roman soldiers lost their lives, and but for the intervention of Quadratus, governor of Syria, a rebellion would have been inevitable. A court-martial was held to inquire into the causes of this disaffection, when Felix, one of the accused, was seen by the injured Jews among the judges, and even seated on the judgment-seat, placed there by the president Quadratus expressly to outface and deter the accusers and witnesses. Josephus (*Ant.* 20:8, 5) reports that under Felix the affairs of the country grew worse and worse. The land was filled with robbers and impostors who deluded the multitude. Felix used his power to repress these disorders to little purpose, since his own example gave no sanction to justice. Thus, having got one Dineas, leader of a band of assassins, into his hands by a promise of impunity, he sent him to Rome to receive his punishment. Having a grudge against Jonathan, the high-priest, who had expostulated with him on his misrule, he made use of Doras, an intimate friend of Jonathan, in order to get him assassinated by a gang of villains, who joined the crowds that were going up to the Temple worship—a crime which led subsequently to countless evils, by the encouragement which it gave to the Sicarii, or leagued assassins of the day, to whose excesses Josephus ascribes, under Providence, the overthrow of the Jewish state. Among other crimes, some of these villains misled the people under the promise of performing miracles, and were punished by Felix. An Egyptian impostor, who escaped himself, was the occasion of the loss of life to four hundred followers, and of the loss of liberty to two hundred more, thus severely dealt with by Felix (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:8, 6; *War*, ii, 13, 5; comp. ~~Acts~~ Acts 21:38). A serious misunderstanding having arisen between the

Jewish and the Syrian inhabitants of Caesarea, Felix employed his troops, and slew and plundered -till prevailed on to desist. His cruelty in this affair brought on him, after he was superseded by Festus, an accusation at Rome, which, however, he was enabled to render nugatory by the influence which his brother Pallas had, and exercised to the utmost, with the emperor Nero. Josephus, in his *Life* (§ 3), reports that, "at the time when Felix was procurator of Judaea, there were certain priests of my acquaintance, and very excellent persons they were, whom, on a small and trifling occasion, he had put into bonds and sent to Rome to plead their cause before Caesar." At the end of a two years' term Porcius Festus was appointed to supersede Felix, who, on his return to Rome, was accused by the Jews in Caesarea, as above noticed (*Ant.* 20:8, 9). This was in A.D. 55 (not in the year 60, as Anger, *De temporum in Act. Apost. ratione*, p. 100; Wieseler, *Chronologie der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 66-82).

While in his office, being inflamed by a passion for the beautiful Drusilla, a daughter of king Herod Agrippa, who was married to Azizus, king of Emesa, he employed one Simon, a magician, to use his arts in order to persuade her to forsake her husband and marry him, promising that if she would comply with his suit he would make her a happy woman. Drusilla, partly impelled by a desire to avoid the envy of her sister Berenice, was prevailed on to transgress the laws of her forefathers, and consented to a union with Felix. In this marriage a son was born, who was named Agrippa: both mother and son perished in an eruption of Mount Vesuvius; which took place in the days of Titus Caesar (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:7, 2). With this adulteress was Felix seated when Paul reasoned before the judge, as already -stated (~~423~~ Acts 24:24). Another Drusilla is mentioned by Tacitus as being the wife (the *first* wife) of Felix. This woman was niece of Cleopatra and Antony. **SEE DRUSILLA.** By this marriage Felix was connected with Claudius. Of his third wife nothing is known. (See Salden, *De Felice et Drusilla*, Amst. 1684).

Paul, being apprehended in Jerusalem, was sent by a letter from Claudius Lysias to Felix at Caesarea, where he was at first confined in Herod's judgment-hall till his accusers came. They arrived. Tertullus appeared as their spokesman, and had the audacity, in order to conciliate the good-will of Felix, to express gratitude on the part of the Jews, "seeing that by thee we enjoy great quietness, and that very worthy deeds are done unto this nation by thy providence" (Acts 23, 24). Paul pleaded his cause in a worthy speech; and Felix, consigning the apostle to the custody of a centurion,

ordered that he should have such liberty as the circumstances admitted, with permission that his acquaintance might see him and minister to his wants. This imprisonment the apostle suffered for a short period (not two years, as ordinarily supposed, that expression having reference to Felix's whole term of sole office), being left bound when Felix gave place to Festus (q.v.), as that unjust judge "was willing," not to do what was right, but "to show the Jews a pleasure" (Walch, *De Felice procuratore*, Jena, 1747; also in his *Dissertt. in Act.* iii, 29; Smith's *Dictionary of Classical Biography*, s.v.).

Felix, Martyr

and his companion Regula, were, according to tradition, the first Christian missionaries in the city of Zurich, which, before the Reformation, venerated them as patrons, and still has their names in the town seals. They are said to have been executed by order of the emperor Maximian. Nothing certain is known about their history.-- Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:351.

Felix Of Nola

was a native and presbyter of Nola. After his property had been confiscated during the persecution of Decius, he supported himself by cultivating a garden and some rented land. According to a legend, he concealed himself during the persecution in the fissures of an old building, and a spider saved him from the search of the messengers by drawing her web over him. His sufferings and alleged miracles were celebrated by Paulinus, bishop of Nola, and many pilgrims visited his grave.-Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:355.

Felix The Manichaeon

was a contemporary of Augustine. He was an elder or elect of the Manichaeans, and had gone to Hippo to gain converts for his sect. Augustine had a discussion with him in the church of Hippo in the presence of the congregation which lasted two days. The proceedings were taken down by notaries, and are still extant (vol. viii of the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works: *De actis cum Felice Manichezo*, libri ii). On the day before the disputation, Felix declared his readiness to be burned with his books if anything wrong could be found in them; but during the disputation he is reported to have been timid, weak, evasive, and it was thought that he wished to flee. Before the disputation began, his books were taken from him, and placed under the public seal. Felix undertook to prove that Mani

was the Paraclete who had been promised by Christ, and he used as an argument the information given by Mani on the construction of the world, on which nothing could be found in Paul and the writings of the other apostles. Augustine replied that the Paraclete had the mission to teach the truths of religion, but not to expound mathematics. The result of the disputation was that Felix declared himself refuted, and publicly renounced and cursed Mani. The protocol of the disputation was signed by both Augustine and Felix. Posidius, in the *Life of Augustine*, also states that Felix, after the third meeting, acknowledged his error, and accepted the faith of the Church.-Herzog, *Real Encykl.* 4:350.

Felix

(*Pratensis*), an eminent Jewish scholar of the 16th century, was born in Prato, Tuscany. He was the son of a rabbi, who taught him the Oriental languages. He travelled in Italy after the death of his father, and, becoming convinced of the truth of Christianity, was baptized, and shortly after entered the order of St. Augustine. The date of his profession of Christianity is uncertain, but it probably took place before 1506. He translated the Psalms into Latin, dedicating the work to Leo X, and received authority from the pope to translate the other books of the Old Testament. v He revised the text of the two first Hebrew editions of the Bible published by Bomberg, carefully correcting the proofs himself. He died in 1557. His works are,

1. *Psalterium ex hebraeo ad verbum fere tralatam adjectis notationibus* (Venice, 1515, 4to): this version has been inserted in the *Psalterium Sextuplex* (Lyons, 15030, 830m):

2. *Biblia sacra hebraea, cum utraque masora et targum, item cum Cossmentariis rabbinorum; cura et studio Felicis Pratensis, cum prafatione latina Leoni Anuncupata'* (Venice, 1518, 4 vols. fol.). There are- said to be versions of Job and other-books of the Bible by Felix, but they have never been published..-*Biographie Universelle*, 14:273.

Felix

bishop of Urgel (Urgelis), in Spain, 9th century. Of his early life little is known. He became bishop of Urgel in 791. Elipandus of Toledo, who had been -his pupil, consulted him as to the doctrine of the person of. Christ, with regard to which he seems to have already embraced the so-called

Adoptian doctrine. *SEE ELIPANDUS.* " The answer of Felix was that Christ, with respect to his divine nature, was truly and properly the Son of God, begotten of the Father and hence he was the true God, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, in the unity of the Godhead. But that, with respect to his humanity Christ was the Son of God by adoption, born of the Virgin by the will of the Father, and thus he was nominally God. Hence, according to the opponents of the Felicians, it followed that there was a twofold Sonship in Christ, and that he must consist of two persons. The opinion of Felix was considered by the orthodox as nothing more than a development of the Nestorian heresy. The doctrine of Felix was adopted by Elipandus, who, being the primate of Spain, propagated it through the different provinces of Spain, while Felix himself contributed to spread it throughout Narbonne and other parts of Gaul" (Carwithen, *Church History*, p. 179). It appears to be clear that Felix had read some of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia (q.v.), in which a similar doctrine is taught. Felix seems, moreover, to have engaged in controversy with the Mohammedans, and, according to Alcuin, he wrote a *Dialogue* against them; and it is not unlikely that he was led to the Adoptian view by his desire to render the doctrine of the Incarnation less offensive to the Mohammedans. Alcuin (q.v.) entered into controversy with Felix, and we learn from him a large part of what is known about the controversy (Alcuin, *Opera*, ii, 760 sq.). Neander gives the following statement: "Felix distinguished between how far Christ was the Son of God and God according to nature (*natura, genere*), and how far he was so by virtue of grace, by an act of the divine will (*gratia, voluntate*), by the divine choice and good pleasure (*elections, placito*); and the name Son of God was given to him only in consequence of connection with God (*nuncupative*); and hence the expressions for this distinction, *secundum naturam* and *secundum adoptionem*. Felix appealed to the fact that, though the name of Son by adoption ($\delta\iota\ \upsilon\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$) is not applied in the Bible to Christ, yet there are other designations which express the same idea. He adduces ~~John~~ John 10:34, when Jesus disputed with the Jews. ($\kappa\alpha\tau\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$), and referred to the passage in the Old Testament, in which men are called *Elohim*, where Christ placed himself as a man in the category of those who were called 'gods' *nuncupative*, and not in a strict sense. Then as to the passage, 'None is good save one, that is God,' from this it appears that as man he was not to be called good in the Same sense as God, and that only the divine nature in him was the source of goodness. He would allow an interchange of the divine and human predicates only in the same manner as

Theodore; it could not be made without limitation, but the different senses must be observed according as they were attributed to the divine or human natures. He charged his opponents with so confounding the two natures by their doctrine of the *singularitas personae* that they left no distinction between the *suscipiens* and the *susceptum*. Expressions that were then in common use, such as *God was born and died*, never occur in Scripture, which also never says that the Son of God, but that the Son of man was given for us. On the latter point Alcuin could easily have confuted Felix by other passages, but both were wrong in not distinguishing the various Biblical applications of the term Son of God from the Church use of it- and in taking the idea everywhere in a Church sense. Like Theodore, Felix asserted Agnoetism of Christ. It is also a point of resemblance between them that both sought for an analogy between the union of the man Christ with the divine Being and the relation of believers to God. Felix says .that Christ in as- improper sense (*nuncupative*) was called the Son of God conjointly with all who are not God according to their nature, but by the grace of God in Christ have been taken' into communion with God (*deificati*). In this order also the Son of God is, in respect of his humanity, both according to nature and grace. He maintained that, as far as Christ as man is reckoned among the sons of God, all believers are his members; considered according to his divine nature, believers are the temple in which he dwells. He did not wish by that to deny the specific difference between Christ and believers; whatever resemblance existed between them belonged to him in a far higher sense; he was united to God by generation, and was the medium of the communion of the rest with God. Felix also perfectly agreed with Theodore in the thought that the communion with God into which Christ was received as a man might be represented as a revelation of the divine being according to the measure of the various stages of the development of his human nature, and thus supposed various degrees of it up to the highest revelation after the glorification of Christ. It might be peculiarly offensive that he should compare the baptism of Christ with the regeneration of believers; but he certainly did not mean to say that Christ thus became partaker of communion with the divine nature, but only to point out an analogy so far, as baptism marked a distinct stage in Christ's life, after which the operation of the divine life in him was peculiarly conspicuous. It is therefore evident that the doctrine of Felix was altogether that of Theodore, excepting that the latter could express himself more freely in an age when the doctrines of the Church were less rigorously defined, while Felix was obliged to use a terminology which was

opposed to his own system. The great importance of the antagonism in which he stood: to the Church doctrine is likewise manifest; it included not merely Christology, but also Anthropology; for the doctrine of the revelation of the Divine Being in Christ, conditioned by various stages of development, was connected with one of special importance the principle of free self-determination. It is uncertain how far Felix consciously developed his principles; but there is no question that these were throughout contradictory to the prevalent Augustinian doctrine. As Felix lived in the Frankish territory, the Frankish Church was drawn into the controversy. In A.D. 792, Charlemagne convoked an assembly at Ratisbon, at which Felix appeared, and was induced to recant. He was then sent to Rome, where he made similar explanations (Alcuinus *adv. Elipandum*, i, c. 16; Mansi, *Concil. 13*:1031). But, on being permitted to return home, he repented of the steps he had taken, took refuge in Saracenic Spain, and again promulgated his doctrine. Alcuin, who had been summoned to take a part in the controversy, endeavored to win him over by a friendly epistle; but Felix regarded the subject of the controversy as too important, and thus it was carried on in his writings (Alcuini *Libellus adv. licesin Felicis, Opp. A lc. i, pars ii, 759*). The Spanish bishops interceded for Felix with the emperor, and applied for a new investigation (Alcuin, *Opera*, ii, 567). In consequence, Charles called a second synod at Frankfort-on-the-Maine in A.D. 794, which again decided against Felix (*Mansi, 13*:863); and since the Adoptianists had spread themselves even as far as France, the emperor sent a commission of three persons into those parts in order to oppose them. Felix came with them, and was prevailed upon to appear before the synod at Aix-la-Chapelle (Aix), A.D. 799. After Alcuin had disputed with him for a long time, Felix declared himself: to be convinced. He made a recantation in Spain; yet he was not altogether trusted, and was placed under the oversight of Leidrad, bishop of Lyons. He could not at once give up a dogmatic tendency which was so deeply rooted; he still was always inclined to Agnoetism, and after his death a series of questions was found which showed that he firmly adhered to his fundamental views" (*Hist. of Dogmas*, tr. by Ryland, p. 444 sq.). Felix was deposed A.D. 799, and died about A.D. 818. His writings, whether in apology or retraction of his views, remain only in fragments; but his *Profession of Faith*, made at Aix-la-Chapelle in 799, is given in Alcuini *Opera* (Paris, 1617, fol.); in Mansi, *Concil. 13*:1035; in Labbe, *Concil.* p. 1171. See Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. viii; Neander, *Ch. History*, iii, 156, 158; Mosheim, *Ch. ITistory*, cent. 8:ch. v, § 3; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 179;

Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl. div. ii, vol. i, 248 sq. *SEE ADOPTIANS*; *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*.

Felix I

bishop of Rome. According to the *Acta Sanctorum*, he succeeded Dionysius in 269, and died in 274. He was declared a "martyr" by the Council of Ephesus on "account of his sufferings for Christ," but he did not die by violence. There is extant a letter of his against the Sabellians and Paul of Samosata. Other writings, not believed to be his, are to be found in Migne, *Patrolog. Lat.* vol. v, and in Galland, *Bibl. Pat.* iii, 542.-Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 7:30; Baronius, *Annales*, p. 272-275; Bower, *History of the Popes*, i, 78.

Felix II

Anti-pope, was placed in the episcopal chair of Rome A.D. 355, by the Arian emperor Constantius, in place of Liberius (q.v.), who was exiled by the emperor. The clergy refused to acknowledge Felix, and Constantius recalled Liberius to hold the see conjointly with Felix but when the decree was read in the circus, the people rejected it with the cry, "One God, one Christ, one bishop." But Sozomen says that Felix was an adherent of the Nicene faith, and a "blameless" man. Nevertheless, Felix had to retire from Rome, and is said to have died A.D. 365; but the accounts vary very much. His name is found in the Roman Martyrology, July 29; but Baronius decides against his claims (*Annal.* A.D. 357). Nevertheless, Gregory XIII confirmed his saintship in 1582, -Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* 4:11; Tillemont, *Mem. poul Servir*, etc., vol. vi; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, vol. xvii; Bower, *History of the Popes*, i, 134. *SEE LIBERIUS*.

Felix III

(II?) was elected successor of Simplicius A.D. 483, under the influence of the Gothic emperor Odoacer. He and Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, mutually excommunicated each other, and thus gave occasion to the first schism between the Greek and Latin churches. He died Feb. 24 or 25, 492. He is commemorated by the Roman Church as a saint (Feb. 25).-Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. v, pt. ii, ch. v, § 18, 21; Bower, *History of the Popes*, ii, 193 sq. *SEE MONOPHYSITES*.

Felix (III Or) IV

Pope, succeeded John I A.D. 526, by the influence of the Arian emperor Theodoric. Little is known of him, but that little is creditable. He died 530.-Baronius, *Annal.* cent. vi; Dupin, *Eccles. Writers*, cent. vi.

Felix V

AMADEUS (of Savoy), Pope or Anti-pope, was born Sept. 4, 1383. He succeeded his father, Amadeus VII, in the earldom of Savoy, which the emperor Sigismund raised into a duchy. In his eighteenth year he was married to Maria of Burgundy, and in those times of bloody excess was accounted a wise and just prince. He participated through an envoy in the Council of Constance, and in 1422 shared in the crusade against the Hussites. His naturally strong religious tendencies having been strengthened by his wife's death, he built a hermitage at Ripaille, on Lake Lemman, in 1434, and retired to it with the intention of spending the rest of his days in retirement. After the councils of Pisa and Constance had deposed Eugenius IV, another was assembled at Basle, and Amadeus was elected pope. He accepted the nomination, adopted the title of Felix V and as such entered Rome June 24, 1440. Finally he made terms with Nicolas V, Eugenius IV's successor, and, having thus ended the schism, Felix V retired to his hermitage at Ripaille, with the rank of cardinal-legate and permanent vicar general of the papal see in Savoy, Basle, Strasburg, etc. He died at Geneva January 7, 1451. See Guichenon, *Histoire generale de la roy. maisbn de Savoye'* (1660); AEn. Sylvii *Commentar. de gestis Concil.* (Basle. 1577). **SEE BASLE, COUNCIL OF.**

Fell, John, D.D.

bishop of Oxford, a learned theologian, was born at Longworth, in Berks, June 23, 1625, and graduated M.A. in 1643. As a devoted friend of the Stuarts, for whom he had been in arms, he was deprived of his studentship in Christ Church by the parliamentary visitors, and during the Protectorate he continued in obscurity. After the Restoration he obtained a stall at Chichester, whence he was preferred to a more valuable one at Christ Church, and soon after became dean of Christ Church. In 1666 he became vice-chancellor of the university, and in 1676 bishop of Oxford, retaining his deanery. He. was a great benefactor to the university, and as a .prelate was distinguished by learning and munificence; but his conduct in the matter of John Locke's. illegal removal from his studentship in Christ

Church is a great stain upon his memory (see *Edinburgh Review*, 1829, 1, 16). Among his writings are a Latin translation of Wood's *History and Antiquities of Oxford* (2 vols. fol.): -*A Life of Dr. Hammond* (1660, prefixed to Hammond's *Works*): -*St. Clement's Two Epistles to the Corinthians* (Oxford, 1669, 12mo, Gr. and Lat.): -*Artis Logicae Compendium: — Epistle of Barnabas* (Oxford, 1685, 12mo): -*Cyparini Opera* (Oxford, 1677) :-also Athenagoras, Hermes, and Justin's *Apologia: Novi Testamenti Libri Omnes; accesserunt Parellela Script. loc. necnon variae lectiones*, etc. (London, 1675; Leips. 1697, and again edited by A. H. Francke, 1702; Oxford, ed. by Gregory, fol. 1703; Oxford, ed. by Jacobson, 1852, 8vo) :-*Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Epistles of St. Paul* (Lond. 1675, 8vo; but from the edition of 1708 it appears that this book was the work of A. Woodhead, R. Allestree, and O. Walker, "corrected and improved" by Fell). His edition of the N.T. gave a new impulse to critical science, which he farther aided by the assistance he furnished, in money and otherwise, to the critical labors of John Mill (q.v.). Indeed, bishop Fell is said to have devoted his "whole substance" to works of piety and charity. He died July 10, 1686.-Hook, *Eccls. Biog.* v, 74; Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses; Biog. Britannica*, s.v.

Fell, John

an English Independent minister, was born at Cockermouth, 1735, and became pastor at Thaxted Essex. His early opportunities were great, but by his talents and industry he became a very respectable scholar. He was made tutor in the ancient languages in the Dissenters' seminary at Homerton. He is said to have "been dismissed from his office there for reading newspapers on Sunday." His friends got him an annuity of 4100,-and he was "asked to deliver lectures on the Evidences at the Scots' Church, London Wall." He had only delivered four when he died, Sept. 6, 1797. He published (in controversy with Dr. Hugh Farmer- q.v.) *Demosniacs*, an *Inquiry into the Heathen and Scriptere Doctrine of Demons* (London, 1779, 8vo) :-*The Idolatry of Greece and Rome distinguished from that of other Heathen Nations* (Lond. 1785, 8vo). After his death Dr. Hunter published his *Lectures on the Evidences* (Lond. 1798, 8vo).-Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of Dissenters*, ii, 518; Kitto, *Cyclopedia*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 1125.

Fellenberg, Philippe-Emanuel De

a philanthropist and earnest laborer in the cause of education, was born at Berne, Switzerland, June 27, 1771. His father, who was a member of the government of Berne, laid the foundation of his intellectual culture, but he received his moral bent and self-sacrificing spirit from -his mother, a great granddaughter of the Dutch admiral Van Tromp. After some time spent at the University of Tubingen in the study of civil law, he devoted himself especially to politics and philosophy. "In order to acquaint himself with the moral state of his countrymen, he spent much of his time in travelling through Switzerland, France, and Germany, usually on foot, with his knapsack on his back, residing in the villages and farm-houses, mingling in the labors and occupations, and partaking of the rude lodging and fare of the peasants and mechanics, and often extending his journey to the adjacent countries." On his return to Berne in 1798 he rendered important service as "commandant of the quarter" in the revolutionary troubles. In 1799 he purchased the estate called *Hofwyl*, two leagues from Berne, and founded there, successively;, a school of agriculture, a manufactory of agricultural implements, schools for the poor, for the better classes, and a normal school. He devoted the remainder of his life to education with great success, but not without opposition. He died Nov. 21, 1844. See Vericourt, *Rapport sur les Instituts de Hofwyl*; Haam, *Fellenberg's Leben und Wirken* (Berne, 1845); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:307.

Feller, Francois, Xavier

a Flemish Jesuit, was born at Brussels, Aug. 18,1735, entered the; order of Jesuits in 1754, and died May 23, 1802. - He was a very learned and voluminous writer, his publications amounting to 120 volumes. Among them are *Reply to Febronius* **SEE HONTHEIM**, 1771:-*Observat.- Philos. sur le systeme de Newton* (3d edit. Liege, 1778): *Catechisme Philosophique*-Evidences of Christianity (5th edit. Lyons, 1819; 2 vols. 8vo):-*Dictionnaire histarique* (Liege, 1818, 8 vols.; 7th ed. Paris, 1829, 17 vols. 8vo): -*Cours de Morale Chretienne* (Paris, 1825, 5 vols. 8vo). - Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Genenrale*, 17:309.

Felloes

𐌲𐌿𐌺𐌹𐌸𐌰 *chishshukim'*, joinings, ^{<1073>}1 Kings 7:33) probably denotes rather the *spokes* that connect the rim with the hub of a wheel, being a kindred

term with that used to denote the *coupling-rods* of the tabernacle (^{<1270>}Exodus 27:10). *SEE CHARIOT*.

Fellow

besides its contemptuous use (as a rendering of *vyaa* *man*, etc.), and its frequent employment (usually as a rendering of [*rea* *friend* or equal), in the sense of *companion*, stands in one remarkable passage (^{<3117>}Zechariah 13:7) as the rendering of *tymæ* *society*, in the phrase *ytymærbg*, *man of my association*, i.e. *my associate*; corresponding with *y[æ]* *my shepherd* in the parallel member, and referred to himself by our Saviour (^{<4171>}Matthew 26:31) as the great Pastor and Sacrifice for his people; not so much in the sense of simple equality of nature with the Father, as of-copartnership with him in the great work of caring for and redeeming mankind. *SEE NEIGHBOR*.

Fellow Of A College

SEE FELLOWSHIP

Fellowes, Robert

was born in Norfolk, England, in 1770; studied at St. Mary's Hall,, Oxford, took holy orders in 1795, and died in 1847. His theological speculations gradually led him to reject the doctrines of the Established Church, and to adopt the opinions found in his *Religion of the Universe*, published in London in 1836. He was an intimate friend of Dr. Parr and baron Maseres, the latter of whom left him the greater part of his large fortune, to be dispensed in literary and benevolent enterprises. He was for some time editor of the *London Critical Review*. He was an early advocate of the establishment of the University of London, of which hue was a liberal benefactor. Among his works are *Christian Philosophy* (1798, 2d ed. 1799, 8vo) :-*Supplement to do: — Religion without Cant* (1801, 8vo) :-*Guide to Immortality* (1804, 3 vols.- 8vo):-*Manual of Piety* (1807, 8vo):-*A Body of Theology* (1807, 2 vols. 8vo).-Appleton, *Cyclopcedia*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 534.

Fellowship

in a college,- a station of privilege and emolument enjoyed by one who is elect-d a member of any of those endowed societies which in the English

universities are; called colleges. The person so elected shares the benefits of the foundation in common with the other, members, and from such participation derives the name of fellow, the Latins name for which in the statutes of most of the colleges is *socius*. **SEE UNIVERSITY**. In Oxford and Cambridge " the fellowships Were either constituted by the original founders of the colleges to which they belong, or they have been since endowed. In almost all cases their holders must have taken at least the first degree of bachelor of arts or student in the civil law. One of the greatest changes introduced by the commissioners under the University Act of 1854 was the throwing open of the fellowships to all members of the university of requisite standing, by removing the old restrictions by which many of them were confined to founder's kin, or to the inhabitants of certain dioceses, archdeaconries, or other districts. Fellowships vary greatly in value. Some of the best at Oxford, in good years, are said to reach £700 or even £800, whilst there are others which do not amount to £100, and many at Cambridge which fall short of that sum. Being paid out -of the college revenues which arise from land they also vary from year to year, though from this arrangement, on the other hand, their general value with reference to the value of commodities is preserved nearly unchangeable, which would not be the case if they consisted of :a fixed payment in money. The senior fellowships are the most lucrative, a system of promotion being established among their holders; but they all confer on their holders the privilege of occupying apartments in the college, and generally, in addition, certain perquisites as to meals or commons. Many fellowships are tenable for life, but in general they are forfeited should the holder attain to certain preferments in the Church or at the bar, and sometimes in the case of his succeeding to property above a certain amount. In general, also, they are forfeited by marriage, though this disability may now be removed by a special vote of the college, permitting the fellow to retain his fellowship notwithstanding his marriage. With the single exception of Downing College, Cambridge, in which the graduates of both universities are eligible, the fellowships are confined to the graduates of the university to which they belong."

Fellowship

(κοινωνία), "joint interest, or the having one common stock. The fellowship of the saints is twofold:

1. With God (⁶⁰⁰⁸1 John 1:3; ⁴⁰⁰⁰1 Corinthians 1:9; ⁴⁶⁰¹1 Corinthians 13:14);

2. With one another (⁶⁰⁰⁷1 John 1:7). Fellowship with God consists in knowledge of his will (⁴⁸²²Job 22:21; ⁴⁸⁷⁸John 17:3); agreement in design (³¹⁸²Amos 3:2); mutual affection (⁴⁰⁸⁸Romans 8:38, 39); enjoyment of his presence (⁴⁹⁰⁶Psalms 4:6); conformity to his image (⁶⁰⁰⁶1 John 2:6; ⁶⁰⁰⁶1 John 1:6); participation of his felicity (⁶⁰⁰⁸1 John 1:3, 4; ⁴⁰⁸⁴Ephesians 3:14-21; ⁴⁷³⁴2 Corinthians 13:14). Fellowship of the saints may be considered as a fellowship of duties (⁴⁵¹⁶Romans 12:6; ⁴⁶²⁰1 Corinthians 12:1; ⁴⁵⁵⁷1 Thessalonians 5:17, 18; ⁴⁹¹⁶James 5:16); of ordinances (⁴⁸⁰⁴Hebrews 10:24; ⁴⁰²⁶Acts 2:46); of graces, love, joy, etc. (⁴⁸⁰⁴Hebrews 10:24; ⁴¹⁸⁶Malachi 3:16; ⁴⁷⁰⁴2 Corinthians 8:4); of interest spiritual, and sometimes temporal (⁴⁵¹⁴Romans 12:4, 13; ⁴⁸³⁶Hebrews 13:16); of sufferings (⁴⁵¹⁰Romans 15:1, 2; ⁴⁸⁰¹Galatians 6:1, 2; ⁴⁵²⁵Romans 12:15); of eternal glory (⁶⁰⁰⁹Revelation 7:9)." *SEE COMMUNION.*

Feltham, Owen

an English writer of the reign of James I, who was a native of Suffolk, lived many years in the earl of Thomond's family, and died about 1678. The work by which he is remembered is *Resolves, Divine, Political, and Moral*, which has passed through many editions, and is still reprinted.

Felton, Henry, D.D.

a learned English divine, was born at London in 1679, and was educated at Westminster school, the Charter House, and Edmund Hall, Oxford. In 1711 he became rector of Whitewell, Derbyshire, and was finally appointed principal of St. Edmund's Hall in 1722. He died in 1740. His principal works are, *A Dissertation on reading the Classics* (Lond. 3d ed. 1723, 12mo) :- *The common People taught to defend their Communion with the Church of England* (Oxf. 1727, 8vo) :- *The Christian Faith asserted against Deists, Arians, and Socinians* (Oxf. 1732, 8vo) :- *The Resurrection of the same numerical Body asserted* (London, 1733, 3d ed. 8vo) :- *Sermons on the Creation, Fall, and Redemption of Man*, etc. (Lond. 1748, 8vo) :- *Nineteen Sermons*, 1748 (posthumous). - *Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica*, s.v.; *Rose, New Genesis Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Female

ECCLESIASTIC. (For monographs, see Volbeding, *Index*, p. 164.) *SEE MINISTRY*; *SEE DEACONESS*; *SEE AGAPETAE*.

Fence

(^{<151B>}Psalm 62:3), *rdk*; *gader'*, a wall (q.v.) rather than hedge (as elsewhere generally rendered). The Hebrews use two terms to denote a fence of different kinds: *rdk*; *goder'*, or *hrdk*] *gederah'*, and *hk\cm*] *mesukah'*. According to Vitringa, the latter denotes the outer thorny fence of the vineyard, and the former the inner wall of stones surrounding it. The chief use of the former was to keep off men, and of the latter to keep off beasts, not only from gardens, vineyards, etc., but also from the flocks at night (see ^{<159>}Proverbs 15:19; 24:31). *SEE HEDGE*. From this root the Phoenicians called any enclosed place *guddir*, and particularly gave this name to their settlement in the south-western coast of Spain, which the Greeks from them called *Γάθειρα*, the Romans *Gades*, and the moderns *Cadiz*. *SEE GEDERAH*. In ^{<315>}Ezekiel 13:5; 22:30 *gader* appears to denote the fortifications of a city; and in ^{<151B>}Psalm 62:3, the wicked are compared to a tottering fence and bowing wall; i.e. their destruction comes suddenly upon them. Fenced cities (see below) were such as were fortified. *SEE AGRICULTURE*.

Fenced City

Picture for Fenced City 1

(*hr\xm*] *metsurah'*, intrenched; ^{<4110>}2 Chronicles 11:10, 23; 12:4; 14:6; 21:3; rendered "stronghold," ^{<4111>}2 Chronicles 11:11; "fort," ^{<239B>}Isaiah 29:3; "munition," 2:1. *rxbjnā*] *nibtsar'*, fortress, is also sometimes rendered "fenced" in connection with *ry22*], a city, ^{<4927>}Numbers 32:17, 36; ^{<1600>}Joshua 10:20; 19:35; ^{<1658>}1 Samuel 6:18; ^{<1200>}2 Kings 3:19; 10:2; 17:9; 18:8; ^{<4479>}2 Chronicles 17:19; ^{<2457>}Jeremiah 5:17; ^{<7115>}Daniel 11:15; elsewhere "stronghold," etc.). The broad distinction between a city and a village in Biblical language consisted in the possession of walls. *SEE CITY*. The city had walls, the village was unwalled, or had only a watchman's tower (*l Dgjnā*] *τύπος*, *turris custodun*; comp. Gesen. *Thes.* p. 267), to which the villagers resorted in times of danger. A threefold distinction is thus obtained: 1. cities; 2. unwalled villages; 3. villages with castles or towers

(^{<1275>}1 Chronicles 27:25). The district east of the Jordan, forming the kingdoms of Moab and Bashan, is said to have abounded from very early times in castles and fortresses, such. as were built by Uzziah to protect the cattle, and to repel the inroads of the neighboring tribes, besides unwalled towns (Ammian. Marc. 14:9; ^{<6885>}Deuteronomy 3:5; ^{<1430>}2 Chronicles 26:10). Of these many remains are thought by Mr. Porter to exist at the present day (*Damascus*, ii, 197)., The dangers to which unwalled villages are exposed from the marauding tribes of the desert, and also the fortifications by which the inhabitants sometimes protect themselves, are illustrated by Sir J. Malcolm (*Sketches of Persia*, c. 14:p. 148) and Frazer (*Persia*, p. 379, 380; comp. Judges v, 7). Villages in the Hauran are sometimes enclosed by a wall, or, rather, the houses, being joined together, form a defence against Arab robbers, and the entrance is closed by a gate (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 212). *SEE GATE.*

Picture for Fenced City 2

A further characteristic of a city as a fortified place is found in the use of the word **hnB**; *build*, and also *fortif*/; so that to "build" a city appears to be sometimes the same thing as to fortify it (comp. ^{<1063>}Genesis 8:20, and ^{<1416>}2 Chronicles 16:6, with ^{<1416>}2 Chronicles 11:5-10, and ^{<1157>}1 Kings 15:17). *SEE WALL.*

Picture for Fenced City 3

The fortifications of the cities of Palestine, thus regularly "fenced," consisted of one or more walls crowned with battlemented parapets, **t/NPæ** having towers at regular intervals (^{<1416>}2 Chronicles 32:5; ^{<2613>}Jeremiah 31:38), on which in later times engines of war were placed, and watch was kept by day and night in time of war (^{<1219>}2 Chronicles 26:9, 15; ^{<1095>}Judges 9:45; ^{<1297>}2 Kings 9:17). Along the oldest of the three walls of Jerusalem there were ninety towers, in the second fourteen, and in the third sixty (Josephus, *War*, v, 4, 2). One such tower, that of Hananeel, is repeatedly mentioned (^{<2613>}Jeremiah 31:38; ^{<3140>}Zechariah 14:10), as also others (Nehemiah iii, 1, 11, 27). The gateways of fortified towns were also fortified and closed with strong doors (^{<1418>}Nehemiah 2:8; 3:3, 6, etc.; ^{<1712>}Judges 16:2, 3; ^{<9270>}1 Samuel 23:7; ^{<10834>}2 Samuel 18:24, 33; ^{<1447>}2 Chronicles 14:7; 1 Macc. 13:33; 15:39). In advance of the wall there appears to have been sometimes an outwork (**l yj επροτείχισμα**), in A. Vers. "ditch" (^{<12123>}1 Kings 21:23; ^{<10015>}2 Samuel 20:15; Gesenius, *Thes.* p.

454), which was perhaps either a palisade or wall lining the ditch, or a wall raised midway within the ditch itself. Both of these methods of strengthening fortified places, by hindering the near approach of machines, were usual in earlier Egyptian fortifications (Wilkinson, *Anc Eg.* i, 401), but would generally be of less use in the hill forts of Palestine than in Egypt. In many towns there was a keep or citadel for a last resource to the defenders. Those remaining in the Hauran and Leja are square. Such existed at Shechem and Thebez (^{<0096>}Judges 9:46, 51; 8:17; ^{<1397>}2 Kings 9:17), and the great forts or towers of Psephinus, Hippicus, and especially Antonia, served a similar purpose, as well as that of overawing the town at Jerusalem. These forts were well furnished with cisterns (Acts, 21:34; 2 Macc. 5:25; Josephus, *Ant.* 18:4, 3; *War.* i, 5, 4; v, 4, 2; 6:2, 1). At the time of the entrance of Israel into Canaan- there were many fenced cities existing, which first caused great alarm to the exploring party of searchers (^{<0138>}Numbers 13:28), and afterwards gave much trouble to the people in subduing them. Many of these were refortified, or, as it is expressed rebuilt by the Hebrews (^{<0275>}Numbers 32:17, 34-42; ^{<0504>}Deuteronomy 3:4, 5; ^{<0612>}Joshua 11:12, 13; ^{<0027>}Judges 1:27-33), and many, especially those on the sea-coast, remained for a long time in the possession of their inhabitants, who were enabled to preserve them by means of their strength in chariots (^{<0633>}Joshua 13:3, 6; 17:16; ^{<0019>}Judges 1:19; ^{<1288>}2 Kings 18:8; ^{<1406>}2 Chronicles 26:6). The strength of Jerusalem was shown by the fact that that city, or at least the citadel, or "stronghold of Zion," remained in the possession of the Jebusites until the time of David (^{<1016>}2 Samuel 5:6, 7; 1 Chronicles 11:5). Among the kings of Israel and Judah several are mentioned as fortifiers or "builders" of cities, e.g. Solomon (^{<1097>}1 Kings 9:17-19; ^{<1404>}2 Chronicles 8:4-6), Jeroboam I (^{<1125>}1 Kings 12:25), Rehoboam (^{<1406>}2 Chronicles 11:5, 12), Baasha (^{<1157>}1 Kings 15:17), Omri (^{<1163>}1 Kings 16:24), Hezekiah (^{<1435>}2 Chronicles 32:5), Asa (^{<1446>}2 Chronicles 14:6, 7), Jeaoshaphat (^{<1472>}2 Chronicles 17:12), but especially Uzziah (^{<1242>}2 Kings 14:22; ^{<1461>}2 Chronicles 26:2, 9, 15); and in the reign of Ahab the town of Jericho was rebuilt and fortified by a private individual, Hiel of Bethel (^{<1163>}1 Kings 16:34). Herod the Great was conspicuous in fortifying strong positions, as Masada, Machaerus, Herodium, besides his great works at Jerusalem (Josephus, *War.* 7:6,1, 2; 8, 3; i, 21, 10; *Ant.* 14:13, 9). **SEE FORT.**

But the fortified places of Palestine served only in a few instances to check effectually the progress of an invading force, though many instances of

determined and protracted resistance are on record, as of Samaria for three years (^{<12810>}2 Kings 18:10), Jerusalem (^{<12818>}2 Kings 25:3) for four months, and in later times of Jotapata, Gamala, Machaerus, Masada, and, above all, Jerusalem itself, the strength of whose defences drew forth the admiration of the conqueror Titus (Josephus, *War*, iii, 6; 4:1 and 9; 7:6, 2-4 and 8; Robinson, i, 232). *SEE FORTRESS.*

The earlier Egyptian fortifications consisted usually of a quadrangular and sometimes double wall of -sun-dried brick, fifteen feet thick, and often fifty feet in height, with square towers at intervals, of the same height as the walls, both crowned with a parapet, and a round-headed battlement in shape like a shield. A second lower wall with towers at the entrance was added, distant thirteen or twenty feet from the main wall, and sometimes another was made of seventy or one hundred feet in length, projecting at right angles from the main wall, to enable the defenders to annoy the assailants in flank. The ditch was sometimes fortified by a sort of tenaille in the ditch itself, or a ravelin on its edge. In later times the practice of fortifying towns was laid aside, and the large temples, with their enclosures, were made to serve the purpose of forts (Wilkinson, *As-c. Egypt*. i, 408, 409, abridgm.).

The fortifications of Nineveh, Babylon, Ecbatana, and of Tyre and Sidon are all mentioned either in the canonical books or the Apocrypha. In the sculptures of Nineveh representations are found of walled towns, of which one is thought to represent Tyre, and all illustrate the mode of fortification adopted both by the Assyrians and their enemies, (^{<26130>}Jeremiah 51:30-32, 58; ^{<30001>}Amos 1:10; ^{<30008>}Zechariah 9:3; ^{<32711>}Ezekiel 27:11; ^{<30314>}Nahum 3:14; Tobit 4:17; 14:14, 15; Judith 1:1, 4; Layard, *Nin.* ii, 275, 279, 388, 395; *Nin. and Bab.* p. 231, 358; *Mon. of Nin.* pt. ii, pl. 39, 43). *SEE FORTIFICATION.*

Fencing The Tables

a special address in the ministration of the Lord's Supper among the Scotch Presbyterians. It is a lecture from the minister just before the distribution of the elements, pointing out the character of those who have and of those who have not a right to come to the Lord's table. It was formerly called "debarings," because in it the ministry debarred from the sacrament those who were not supposed to be worthy.

Fenelon, Francois De Salignac De La Mothe

the most venerated name in the modern history of the Roman Catholic Church, was born Aug., 6, 1651, at the castle of Fenelon, in Perigord. He was a younger son of the marquis of Fenelon. He was carefully trained at home up to twelve years of age, when he was sent to the University of Cahors, and afterwards to the College of Plessis at Paris. His mind was very early turned towards the Church; he preached his first sermon at fifteen. His theological studies were continued at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, then under the charge of the abbe Tronson, from whom he is believed to have imbibed the views of sanctity and of "disinterested love" which were so strongly brought out in his later life. He was ordained in 1675, and for three years was one of the priests of the parish of St. Sulpice. Before his ordination he was strongly inclined to a foreign mission in the Levant or in Canada, but was kept back, it is said, by his uncle. The *Correspondance Litteraire* (July 25, 1863) gives a letter (from the archives of the French Ministry of Marine) in Colbert's handwriting, date of 1675, to Frontenac, governor of Canada in which Louis XIV says, "I have blamed the action, of abbe Fenelon, and have ordered him not to return to Canada. But I ought to say to You that it was difficult to institute a criminal process against his, or to oblige the priests of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, at Montreal, to testify against him; and it was necessary to remit the case to his bishop or the grand vicar to punish him by ecclesiastical penalties, or to arrest him and send him back to France by the first ship." According to this, Fenelon was actually in Canada (*Am. Pres. & Review*, July, 1863). About the year 1678 he was appointed superior of the "*Nouvelles Catholiques*," a society formed to educate and proselyte the children of Protestants. In this office he wrote his first work, *De l'education des filles*, which has been translated into English. He now became intimate with Bossuet, and under his guidance wrote *Refutation du Systeme de Malebranche sur la nature et la grace*; and also a treatise entitled *Du Ministere des Pasteurs* in which heretics are attacked, though with moderation. Louis XIV, then about to revoke the edict of Nantes, employed Fenelon on a special mission to the Protestants of Poitou. He accepted the charge on the condition that no means of conversion were to be used but persuasion. In 1689 he was intrusted with the education of the young duke of Burgundy. For his royal pupil he wrote *Telemaque*. After five years' service, he was elevated to the archbishop of Cambrai in 1694. He had previously become intimate with Madame Guyon (q.v.), and his

relations with herb and the complications which, grew out of them, embittered more or less his whole after life.

This interesting history deserves to be recounted somewhat in detail. For the special history of Quietism, see the article under that title. Suffice it here to say, that the particular form of it taught by Madame Gusion began to spread widely, and to alarm the leading clergy of the Church of France. Bossuet was soon vigorously enlisted against her. He conducted the controversy against Madame Gusion with his usual skill. He, together with the bishop of Chartres and abbe Tronson, were appointed commissioners to inquire into the doctrines advanced by Madame Gusion. The conferences between the parties lasted for six months. Bossuet was little conversant at this time with mystical theology, and at his request Fenelon provided him with extracts from the chief of the mystical writers. The commissioners assembled at Issy, a retired country house belonging to the congregation of St. Sulpice. They drew up thirty articles, in which certain alterations were made abby Fenelon, by whom four were added. There was no mention in them of Madame Guidon or her doctrines, but they were supposed to express the doctrines of the established Church of France on the principal subjects in dispute. Their conclusion amounts to little more than this, that spiritualism, or an aim at the very highest devotional feeling and communion with God, is not necessary to all, and is liable to abuse. Madame Gusion immediately expressed her acquiescence in the articles of Issy. The whole question seemed now to be set at rest. Fenelon, having been nominated before these transactions to the archbishop of Cambray was duly consecrated, Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, officiating, at his own earnest request. But Quietism continued to gain ground, and, to stop its progress, Bossuet published his *Instruction sur les etats de l'oraison*, for which he sought the approbation of the new archbishop; but Fenelon refused on the ground that the book absolutely denied, the possibility of a pure disinterested love of God, and that its censures of Madame Gusion were too severe. Thus began: the bitter controversy between these two distinguished prelates, which for a long time disturbed the peace of the Church of France. Fenelon published his *Explication des maximes des saints sur la vie interieure*, but not before it was carefully examined by the cardinal de Noailles and abbe Tronson, two of the committee at Issy, and by M. Pirot, a theologian of eminence attached to Bossuet. These pronounced the *Maximes* to be a golden work. But no sooner was it published than an uproar was raised against it. In this controversy Louis XIV and Madame

de Maintenon took part against Fenelon. Bossuet had the support of the count, and made vigorous use of all the weapons at his command. Fenelon defended himself with spirit. An appeal was made to Rome. Bossuet artfully brought his influence with e Louis to bear upon the court of Rome, and insinuated that Fenelon was, in his own diocese, considered a heretic, and that, as soon as Rome should speak, Cambrai, and all the Low Countries, would rise against him. The pope (Innocent XII) proceeded cautiously, and delayed his decision. In the mean time the friends of Fenelon were persecuted by the court, and he himself was suspended from his office of preceptor to the royal dukes; but never, amidst all the indignities he suffered, did he lose the pious serenity of his mind. "Yet- but a little while," he says in one of his letters, ' and the deceitful dream of this life will be over. We shall meet in the kingdom of truth, where there is no error, no division, no scandal; we shall breathe thee pure love of God; he will communicate to us his everlasting peace. In the mean while let us suffer; let us be trodden under foot; let us not refuse disgrace. Jesus Christ was disgraced for us; may our disgrace tend to his glory." At length the pope appointed a congregation of cardinals, who met twelve times without coming to any resolution; he then appointed a new congregation of cardinals, who met fifty-two times, and extracted from Fenelon's work several propositions, which they reported to the pope as censurable. Meantime Louis XIV was urging the pope to condemn Fenelon, although the pope himself was unwilling to come to a final decision. It was difficult to censure Fenelon without censuring some writers of acknowledged orthodoxy. Holy, too, as Fenelon was, it was considered that to submit to a decision against him was an act of such heroic humility that it could scarcely be expected, and that a schism might be caused equal to that of the Reformation. The pope inclined to issue a brief, stating the doctrine of the Church, and calling upon each party to abstain from future discussions. But even a pope may stand in awe of worldly consequences. - Louis XIV, urged on by Bossuet, insisted upon the condemnation of Fenelon, and the pope at last (March 12, 1699) issued a brief, by which twenty-three propositions were extracted from Fenelon's work and condemned, "though the expressions used in the condemnation of them were so gentle, that it is evident that if the pope had feared God as much as he feared the French king, Fenelon would have escaped all censure. By this course, the friends of Fenelon were soothed and his adversaries mortified; and their mortification was increased by an expression of the pope, which was soon in every one's mouth, that F6nelon was in fault for too great love of God;

his enemies equally in fault for too little love of their neighbor" (Bausset, *Hist. de Fenelon*, ii, 220).

The controversy had been going on in France during the time occupied by the investigation at Rome. "Bossuet published a succession of pamphlets. Several of the bishops who had espoused the side of Bossuet issued pastorals in the same sense. Fenelon defended himself vigorously against them all in several publications, explanatory as well of his principles as of the personal imputations in which some of his adversaries did not scruple to indulge. The last blow against the ancient friendship of the great rivals was struck by Bossuet in his celebrated *Relation sur le Quietisme*. Fenelon was wounded to the heart. The copy of Bossuet's pamphlet which first came into his hands is still preserved in the British Museum, and the margin is literally filled with remarks, annotations, replies, denials, and rejoinders, in the singularly delicate and beautiful handwriting of the indignant archbishop. The copy now in the British Museum is most probably one which, as we learn from his correspondence, he sent to his agent at Rome, and on the margin of which he corrected, for the guidance of his friend, the many false and exaggerated charges of his great antagonist. The substance of these replies he gave to the public in a most masterly defence, written, printed, and published within little more than a fortnight from the appearance of Bossuet's *Relation*."

When the papal brief arrived, Fenelon submitted at once, and ordered all copies of the book that were in circulation to be brought that he might burn them with his own hand. He read the brief from his own pulpit, and addressed a pastoral to the people of his diocese, in which he said, "Our holy father has condemned my book, entitled *Maxims of Saints*, and has condemned in a particular manner twenty-three propositions extracted from it. We adhere to his brief, and condemn the book and the propositions simply, absolutely, and without a shadow of reserve." He even presented to the cathedral a piece of gold plate, on which is a picture engraved representing the angel of truth trampling on several erroneous books, among which is his *Maximes*. This submission appears to us Protestants to have been at once weak and ostentatious, but in the Roman Catholic Church it is one of Fenelon's highest titles to glory. Bossuet's conduct is variously represented: according to one account he was really touched by the conduct of Fenelon, and desired to be completely reconciled to him ; according to Others, he retained at heart his bitter feeling, and kept up the same spirit in the mind of the king. About this time Fenelon sent a

complete and corrected copy of *Telemaque* to the duke of Burgundy. The copyist, it seems, made a duplicate, and printed it at Paris, without the knowledge of Fenelon. The book was immediately suppressed by order of the king, but was printed again in Holland in 1699, spread throughout Europe, and was translated into almost every tongue. By the courtiers of Louis XIV *Telemaque* was regarded as a satire upon that monarch and his satellites, Sesostris being supposed to represent the king; Calypso, Madame de Montespan; Protesilaus, Louvois; and Eucharis, Mademoiselle de Fontanges. This scandal shut Fenelon out of the court of Louis XIV for the rest of his life. He was ordered to remain within his diocese, and was forbidden all intercourse with his pupil, the duke of Burgundy. But the displeasure of the court did not diminish the reputation of Fenelon either in France or in Europe generally. He devoted the remainder of his life to diligent care of his diocese, and to literary labors. He founded a seminary at Cambrai, to which he gave his personal attention. During the War of the Succession his diocese was often the scene of military operations, and he did his best to assuage the horrors of war. He brought together into his palace the wretched inhabitants of the country whom the war had driven from their homes, and took care of them, and fed them at his own table. Seeing one day that one of these peasants ate nothing, he asked him the reason of his abstinence. "Alas! my lord," said the poor man, "in making my escape from my cottage I had not time to bring off my cow, which was the support of my family. The enemy will drive her away, and I shall never find another so good." Fenelon, availing himself of his privilege of safe-conduct, immediately set out, accompanied by a single servant, and drove the cow back himself to the peasant. "This," said cardinal Maury, "is perhaps the finest act of Fenelon's life." He adds, "Alas ! for the man who reads it without being affected." Another anecdote, showing his tenderness to the poor, is thus related of him. A literary man, whose library was destroyed by fire, has been deservedly admired for saying, "I should have profited but little by my books if they had not taught me how to bear the loss of them." The remark of Fenelon, who lost his in a similar way, is still more simple and touching: "I would much rather they were burned than the cottage of a poor peasant." In 1709, the duke of Marlborough, by express-commands, exempted his lands from pillage, while that general himself and his allies showed the aged prelate every mark of courtesy.

In the Jansenist disputes Fenelon wrote against Jansenius, and expressed himself very strongly, though at first charitably, against Quesnel and

Pascal. *SEE JANSENISM; SEE PORT ROYAL*. He wrote a *Memoire* demanding a judgment from the pope to settle the controversy by a dogmatic decision, to which all must submit. This *Memoire* was laid before the pope (Clement XI), and his bull *Vineam Domini* shows evident traces of its influence. He also wrote a treatise, *De Summi Pontificis Auctoritate* (in his *Euvres*, Versailles, 1820, tom. ii), in which he yielded more to the papal claims than became him as a Gallican bishop. Denying the *direct* temporal power of the pope, he admits a *potestas directoria*, equivalent to what is called the *indirect* temporal power. *SEE POPE, TEMPORAL POWER OF*.

In his personal habits Fenelon was temperate almost to abstemiousness, took no repose except a few hours daily in the exercises of walking or riding, while the rest of his time was devoted to social intercourse with his friends, to visiting the poor, and other pastoral functions. The most of his revenues were devoted to benevolent uses. He died at Cambrai Jan. 7, 1715.

We cite a passage from Dr. Channing on the character and writings of Fenelon: "His works have the great charm of coming fresh from the soul. He wrote from experience, and hence, though he often speaks a language which must seem almost a foreign one to men of the world, yet he always speaks in a tone of reality. That he has excesses we mean not to deny, but they are of a kind which we regard with more than indulgence, almost with admiration. Common fanaticism we cannot away with, for it is essentially vulgar, the working of animal passions, sometimes of sexual love, and oftener of earthly ambition. But when a pure mind errs by aspiring after disinterestedness and purity not granted to our present infant state, we almost reverence its errors; and still more, we recognise in them an essential truth. They only anticipate and claim too speedily the good for which man was made. They are the misapprehensions of the inspired prophet, who hopes to see in his own day what he was appointed to promise to remoter ages. Fenelon saw far into the human heart, and especially into the lurkings of self-love. He looked with a piercing eye through the disguises of sin. But he knew sin, not, as most men do, by bitter experience of its power, so much as by his knowledge and experience of virtue. Deformity was revealed to him by his refined perceptions and intense love of moral beauty. The light, which he carried with him into the dark corners of the human heart, and by which he laid open its most hidden guilt, was that of celestial goodness. Hence, though the severest of

censors, he is the most pitying. Not a tone of asperity escapes him. He looks on human error with an angel's tenderness, with tears which an angel might shed, and thus reconciles and binds us to our race at the very moment of revealing its corruptions" (*Christian Examiner*, 6:7).

Literature. — The writings of Fenelon are too numerous to be mentioned in detail. They are classified as follows in the Versailles edition of his works (1820, 22 vols. 8vo): *Metaphysical and Theological Writings*, vols. i-iii; *The Quietistic Controversy, and Discussions thereon with Bossuet*, vols. iv-ix; writings on *Jansenism*, vols. 10-16; *Education of Girls, Sermons, Religious Meditations*, vols. 17, 18; *Fables, Dialogues, smaller writings*, vol. xix; *Telemaque*, vol. 20; *Dialogues on Eloquence, Correspondence, Lives of Ancient Philosophers*, vols. 21, 22. There are many collective editions of the writings of Fenelon, of which the most complete is that of Lebel, commenced at Versailles 1820-24, in 22 vols. 8vo., with 11 vols. additional of *Correspondance* (Paris, 1827-29), and 1 vol. of *Tables et Index* (Paris, 183.), making 34 vols. in all. The next best (in some respects the best) is that of the abbe Gosselin (Paris and Besancon, 1851-52, 10 vols. imp. 8vo), with a copious literary history of Fenelon. Of editions of his *select* works, the best are that of Perisse (Paris, 1842, 4 vols. large 8vo); that of Dufour, the first volume of which is a *Vie de Fenelon* (Paris, 1826, 12 vols. 8vo); and that of Lefevre, with *Vie* by Aime Martin (Paris, 1835; and by Didot, 1838, 3 vols. large 8vo). Of his separate writings the editions are too numerous to be mentioned here. Many of his writings have been translated into English; among them are, *On the Education of Daughters* (Lond. 1703; Albany, 1806); *Dialogues on Eloquence* (Lond. 1808; Boston, 1832); *Demonstration of the Existence of God* (London, 1749, 12mo); *Spiritual Works*, translated by Houghton, with *Life* (Dublin, 1771, 2 vols. 8vo); *Telemachus* (many editions; best by Hawkesworth, Lond. 2 vols. 12mo, 1808); *Lives of the Anc. Philosophers*, with *Life of Fenelon*, by Cormach (N.Y. 1841, 12mo); *Selections from the Writings of Fenelon, with a Memoir of his Life* by Mrs. Follen (Boston, 1829; new ed. 1859, 12mo). Of *Lives* of Fenelon, besides those already cited in connection with editions of his works, we name Ramsay, *Vie de Fenelon* (Paris, 1725, 12mo); Querbeuf, *Vie de F.* (Paris, 1787); Bausset, *Hist. de Fenelon* (Par. 1817, 3d ed., 4 vols. 8vo); Mudford, *Life of F.* (transl. from Bausset, Lond. 1810, 2 vols. '8vo); Butler, *Life of Fenelon* (abridged from Bausset, Lond. 1810, 8vo); Tabaraud; *Suppl. aux histoires de Bossuet et de Fenelon* (Paris, 1822, 8vo). See also Mackintosh, *Ethical*

Philosophy (Philadelph. 1832, 8vo), p. 96 sq.; *Quarterly Review* (Lond.)' 10:409; *Princeton Review*, April, 1853, art. i; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:319 sq.; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* v, 78 sq.; Matter, *Le Mysticisme en France au Temps de Fenelon* (Par. 1864); Sainte Beuve, *Nouv. Lundis* (Par. 1864), ii, 113 sq.; *Revue Chretienne*, 1863, 513 sq.; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, Jan. 1866; *Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theologie*, 1869, 239.

Fenestella

the niche at the side of an altar, containing the piscina (q.v.) or water-drain, into which was poured the water in which the priest washed his hands, and that with which the chalice was rinsed at the celebration of the mass. There is frequently a shelf above the water-drain, on which could be placed certain vessels which were required at the altar. A second niche, at the side of the fenestella, sometimes held the credence-table. In England the fenestella is almost universally at the south side of the altar. (G. F. C.)

Fenner, William, B.D.

an English Puritan, was born in 1600, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. He was appointed rector of Rochford, Essex, in 1629, and died about 1640. He was a very popular preacher, and his works, which have become very scarce, are written in a plain, earnest, and impressive style. The principal are, *A Treatise of the Affections; or the Soul's Pulse* (Lond. 1641, 8vo) :-*The Sacrifice of the Faithful; or the Nature, Property, and Efficacy of zealous Prayer* (Lond. 1648, sm. 8vo) :-*The spiritual Man's Directory, guiding to true Blessedness in his three maine Duties* (Lond. 1649, sm. 8vo), collected, with other writings, in his *Works* (Lond. 1658, 1 vol. in 2, fol.).--Darling, *Cyclopcedia Bibliographica*, s.v.

Fereter

usually indicates the portable shrine in which the relics of saints are carried about in procession; it is also applied to the fixed shrines or tombs in which the bodies or relics of saints are deposited.

Feretory

the inclosure or chapel of a church in which the fereter is placed.

Ferguson, Adam

a Scotch philosopher, was born in 1724 at Logierait, Perthshire. He studied at St. Andrew's and at Edinburgh with a view to the Christian ministry. On being ordained, he was appointed chaplain to the 42d regiment, in which he remained till 1757, when he retired, and was appointed keeper of the advocates' library of Edinburgh. In 1759 he was made professor of natural philosophy in the college of that city, and in 1764 he was appointed to the chair of moral philosophy, a branch of science to which he -had more particularly applied himself. In 1767 he published *Essay on the History of Civil Society*; in 1776, *Remarks on a Pamphlet of Dr. Price, entitled Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty*. " In 1778 he was appointed secretary to the commissioners who were sent to America-in order to try to effect a reconciliation with the mother country, an office in which Ferguson took a clearer view of the state of the question, and of the temper of the American people, than was common at that time with Englishmen. On his return in 1779 he resumed the duties of his professorship, and in 1783 he published *History of the Progress and the Termination of the Roman Republic* (3 vols. 4to)." In 1784 he resigned his professorship. "In 1792 he published *Principles of Moral and Political Science*, being chiefly a retrospect of lectures on ethics and politics, delivered in the College of Edinburgh (2 vols. 4to). Another work of Dr. Ferguson on the same subject, though a more elementary one, the *Institutes of Moral Philosophy*, which he first published in 1769, has been translated into the French and German languages, and often :reprinted." He died at St. Andrew's, February 22, 1816.-Chambers, *Encyclopedia*, S. V.

Ferguson, James

minister of Kilwinning, Scotland, a preacher and commentator of some eminence. Little is known of his life; he died about 1670. He published *Brief Exposition of Philippians and Colossians* (1656) :-*Brief Exposition of Galatians and Ephesians* (1659); and after his death appeared his *Brief exposition of 1 and 2 Thessalonians* (1674). Orme (*Biblioth. Biblica*) says that these " expositions are uncommonly sensible." They have been republished in one volume (London, 1841, large 8vo).

Ferguson, Samuel D.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in the city of New York in 1798, but removed with his parents at an early age to Delaware County, where he

was converted at fourteen. He entered the New York Conference in 1819, and died in New York, December 30, 1855. He was a highly influential and useful minister, and an able presiding elder. He was three times a delegate to the General Conference, in 1832, 1836, and 1844. He served some time as agent for the Troy Conference Seminary, and spent four years with eminent success as superintendent, of the Leake and Watts Orphan House, New York.-*Minutes of Conferences*, 6:64.

Ferloni, Severus Antonius

a Roman ecclesiastic, born in the States of the Church in 1740. He employed himself for thirty years on a *History of the Variations in the Discipline of the Church* which was to form 30 vols., and was on the point of completion when the French army entered Rome in 1798. His papers were destroyed and his labor lost. Ferloni was soon after engaged on the side of Napoleon, wrote homilies in his favor, and was made theologian to the privy council of the viceroy at Milan. Among other things he wrote a treatise *De Auctoritate Ecclesiae*, maintaining French views, but the censors would not allow it to appear. He died at Milan, 1813.-Migne, *Biographie Chret.* s.v.

Ferme (Or Fairholme), Charles

a Scotch divine, was born in Edinburgh, and was educated at the university there, where he became M.A. in 1587. In 1593 he was made one of the regents of the university. He afterwards became minister at Fraserburgh, and (1600) principal of the college there; he died at Fraserburgh in 1617. He wrote a *Logical Analysis of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans* which was published under the care of Dr. Adamson in 1671, and has been republished by the Wodrow Society (Edinburgh, 1850, 8vmo). In the preface to this edition, Dr. W. L. Alexander gives the work high praise, even saying, "So sagacious, exact, and perspicuous a commentary on the Romans I had not before, had the good fortune to peruse."

Ferment

SEE LEAVEN; SEE WINE

Fermentarians

(*Fermentarii*), a name given to the Greek Church by the Latins, because the former use leavened bread in the Eucharist; the Greeks calling the

Latins *Azymites* (q.v.). The word fermentum was used, even in the Latin Church, at an early period, to designate the Eucharist, showing that then fermented bread was used.-Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 15:ch. ii, § 5.

Fernand

(PHERNANDUS, FERDINAND, or FERRAND), a Belgian monk and reformer, was born at Bruges in 1450. He either lost his sight in childhood or was born blind, which, however, did not prevent him from studying philosophy, theology, rhetoric, poetry, and music. He pursued these studies in Paris, and was appointed by Charles VIII to the chair of belles-lettres in the University of Paris. It is possible that he may also have occupied the chair of theology. In 1490 he entered the order of the Benedictines, and soon after, by special dispensation from the pope, he was allowed, in spite of his blindness, to take deacon's orders, and began to preach. He died in 1496. His blindness did not prevent him from writing many books, among which are *Epistolae Caroli Phernandi, Brugensis* (Paris, no date, 4to):-*De Animi Tranquillitate libri duo* (Paris, 1512):-*Speculum monasticae disciplinae Patris Benedicti Magni*, etc. (Par. 1515, fol.): --*Elegiae de Contemptu Mundi*; *Odarum in laudem Christi Libri* (Paris, 1815).-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:455.

Ferne, Henry, D.D.

bishop of Chester, was born at York in 1602, and em-as educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he became a fellow. He was made chaplain to the bishop of Durham, and was successively presented to the livings of Masham, of Medborn, and to the archdeaconry of Leicester. He took his doctor's degree in 1642, and espoused the cause of Charles I, who made him his chaplain. On the Restoration Charles II gave him the mastership of Trinity College, and ha was twice chosen vice-chancellor. He was made bishop of Chester in 1660, died in 1661, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. He published four tracts against the rebellion, 1642-43; two sermons, 1644-49; and five treatises in defense of the Church of England against Romanism and Presbyterianism, 1647-60. He is said to have aided Walton in the Polyglot Bible.--Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 89.

Ferrand, Louis

a French Orientalist. He was born at Toulon October 3, 1645, and was educated in his native city and at Lyons, where he studied Hebrew and other Oriental languages. At twenty he went to Paris, and soon after to Mayence, to undertake a translation of the Hebrew Bible. This project not succeeding, he returned to France, studied law, and was received as advocate in the Parliament of Paris. He, however, occupied himself much less with his new profession than with controversial writings, and works on the history of the East. He died Mar. 11, 1699. His -works are, *Conspectus see Synopsis libri hebraici qui inscribitur Annales Regum Franciae et reagus domus Othomanicae* (Paris, 1670, 8vo):-*Reflexions sur la Religion Chretienne, contenant les propheties de Jacob et de Daniel sur la venue du Messie*, etc. (Paris, 1679, 2 vols. 12mo):-*Liber Psalmorum, cum argumentis, paraphrasi et annotationibus* (Paris, 1683, 4to):-*Traiti de l' Eglise contre les heretiques at principalement contra les calvinistes* (Paris, 1685, 12s-o):-*Reponse a l'Apologie pour la Reformation, pour les reformateurs et pour les reformes* (Paris, 1685, 12mo) :-*Psaumes de David en latin et en francais selon la Vulgate* (Paris, 1686, 12mo):-*Lettre a Mgr l' eveque de Beauvais sur le Monsachisme de saint Augstin* (Journal des Savants) :-*Discours ou l' on fait voir que saint Augustin a ete moine* (Paris, 1689, 12mo)': -*Summa Biblica seu dissertationes prolegomenicae de Sacra Scriptura* (Paris, 1689, 12mo). -Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:488.

Ferrandus Fulgentius

SEE FULGENTIUS FERRANDUS.

Ferrar, Nicholas

a clergyman of the Church of England, eminent for piety, was -born in London in 1592, and was carefully trained at home both in religion and letters. At fourteen he entered the University of Cambridge, and was eminently distinguished there by his abilities and learning, so that his tutor used to say of him, " May God keep him in a right mind! for if he should turn schismatic or heretic, he would make work for all the world." In 1612 he went abroad, studied at Leipsic and Padua, and, after visiting Rome, returned to England in 1618, and soon after became actively engaged in the affairs of a great company for colonizing Virginia, in America, of which he was chosen deputy governor. In 16-24 he was elected to Parliament, where

he was highly distinguished for eloquence and ability, but soon decided to quit public life and devote himself to a religious life. In the Church of Rome he would have been a monk, and he came as near to it as possible for a Protestant. He purchased in 1612 the manor of Little Gidding, in Huntingdonshire, and organized in the mansion a religious community of some forty persons, male and female, including his mother. In 1626 he was ordained deacon by Laud (then bishop of St. David's). He now ' signed a vow, that since God had heard his most humble petitions, and delivered him out of many dangers, and in many desperate calamities had extended his mercy to him, he would therefore now give himself up continually to serve God to the utmost of his power in the office of a deacon, into which office he had that morning been regularly ordained; that he had long ago seen enough of the manners and of the vanities of the world, and that he did hold them all in so low esteem that he was resolved to spend the remainder of his life in mortifications, in devotion and charity, and in a constant preparation for death." Benefices of great value were offered him, but he refused, saying that his fixed determination was to rise no higher in the Church than the place and office which he now possessed, and which he had undertaken only with the view to be legally authorized to give spiritual assistance, according to his abilities, to his family and others with whom he might be concerned; and that, as to temporal affairs, he had now parted with all his worldly estate, and divided it among his family. Ferrer allotted one room in his house as an oratory for the devotions of the whole family; besides two separate oratories for the men and women at night. His own lodgings were so contrived that he could conveniently see that everything was conducted with decency and order. He established a school close to the house, and provided masters for the free instruction of the children. He was diligent in catechizing the children of the neighborhood; and every Sunday, after service, these children, more than one hundred in number, were hospitably entertained. After evening service, all went into the oratory, when select portions of the Psalms were repeated. After this they were at liberty till eight o'clock, when the bell again summoned them to the oratory, where they sang a hymn to the organ and went to prayers, and then all retired. On the first Sunday in every month they received the communion. On week-days they rose at four^f, at five went to prayers, at six said the Psalms of the hour; then they sang a hymn, repeated some passages of Scripture, and at half past six went to church. "At seven they said the Psalms of the hour, sang a hymn, and went to breakfast. At ten they went to church to litany; at eleven to dinner, during which Scripture

and pious books were read aloud. They went to evening prayers in the church at four, after which came supper and recreations till eight, at which time they prayed in their oratory. During the night there was a continual vigil or watching, in which several of the men and women, in their respective oratories, repeated the whole Psalter, together with prayers for the life of the king and his sons, from nine at night till one in the morning. The time of this watch being ended, they awoke Nicholas Ferrar, who constantly rose at one o'clock, and betook himself to religious meditation, according to these words, 'At midnight will I rise and give thanks.' Ferrar himself lay upon a skin stretched on the floor, arrayed in a loose frieze gown, and he watched in the oratory or the church three nights in the week. King Charles I held Nicholas Ferrar in great reverence, and came more than once to visit this religious society; and, having perused the Harmony of the Gospels which they had compiled, he was so much pleased with it that he requested them to prepare a copy for his own peculiar use." He died in 1637. Ferrar translated and published (though without his own name) the *CX Considerations* of Valdes (1638).- Hook, *Eccles.*

Biography, v, 108; Peckard, *Life of Ferrar*, in Wordsworth, *Eccles.*

Biography, 4:111; Palmer, *Church History*, 184 sq. **SEE VALDES, JUAN.**

Ferrar, Robert

bishop of St. David's, a martyr of the reign of queen Mary, was born at Halifax, Yorkshire, and was educated at Oxford, where he became B. D. and a regular canon of the order of St. Augustine. The duke of Somerset, lord protector in the reign of Edward VI, was his patron, and employed him in carrying on the Reformation. He was one of the committee nominated to compile the English liturgy. The zeal of Ferrar, who was consecrated bishop in 1547 (under Edward VI), soon procured him many enemies among the Papists, and after the fall of his eminent patron he was, under a false charge, committed to prison some time before the death of the king. On the accession of Mary he was tried on the new charge of *heresy* as a Protestant, degraded from his ecclesiastical functions, and, in company with Hooper, Bradford, Rogers, Saunders, and others, delivered over to the secular power for punishment. A little before this good bishop suffered, a young gentleman who visited him lamented the severity of the kind of death he was about to undergo. Ferrar replied, "If you see me once to stir while I suffer the pains of burning, then give no credit to those doctrines for which I die." By the grace of God he was enabled to make good this assertion, for he never moved until he was struck down in the

flames by a blow on his head. He was burned at Caermarthen, in Wales, March 30, 1555. Middleton, *Evangelical Biography*, i, 346; Burnet, *Hist. of Reformation* (4 vols.), ii, 347 sq.; Fox, *Book of Martyrs*; Hook, *Eccles. Biography*, v, 96.

Ferrara, Council Of

(*Concilium Ferrariense*), falsely styled oecumenical. Eugene VI having published a bull Sept. 18, 1437, for the transfer of the Council of Basle (q.v.) to Ferrara, a few bishops and abbots assembled Jan. 8, 1438, viz. cardinal Julian, who presided, five archbishops, eighteen bishops, ten abbots, and some generals of the monastic orders; of these bishops only four had left the Council of Basle, which continued its sitting, justly regarding the pope's bull as illegal, and passing sentence of suspension on him Jan. 24, 1438. Charles VII, indeed, forbade any of his subjects to attend at Ferrara. On Jan. 10 the first sitting was held, in which the translation of the council from Basle was pronounced to be canonical, and therefore the oecumenical Council of Ferrara lawfully assembled. Pope Eugene presided in the second session, March 15, at the head of seventy-two bishops, and promulgated a decree against the fathers at Basle. The Greek emperor, John Manuel Paleologus, and the patriarch of Constantinople, Joseph II., arrived Feb. 9 at Venice, and were received with great pomp, together with Mark, archbishop of Ephesus; twenty-one other prelates (among whom was Isidore, a Russian bishop, and Bessarion of Nicaea), and other ecclesiastics, amounting in all to seven hundred persons. Before holding the first session with the Greeks, a scheme was drawn up of the different questions to be debated: 1. The procession of the Holy Spirit; 2. the addition - "*filioque*" to the creed; 3. purgatory, and the intermediate state; 4. the use of unleavened bread in the holy Eucharist; 5. the authority of the Roman see and the primacy of the pope. These questions were debated in thirteen sessions, up to the sixteenth, Jan. 10, 1439, when it was proposed to transfer the council from Ferrara to Florence, and, this being agreed to, publication was made of the change.-- Labbe, *Concil.* 13:1-222, 825-1031; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, p. 242; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 15:pt. ii, ch. ii, § 13; Mansi, t. 29:xxxii; Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, Lond. 1867, pt. ii, ch. vii. **SEE FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.**

Ferrara (Renata), Duchesse De

celebrated for her virtues and for her attachment to the Reformation, the daughter of Louis XII and Anne of Bretagne, was born at Blois Oct. 25, 1510. In 1527 she was married to Hercule d'Este, duke of Ferrara and Modena. She is said to have been very learned, excelling in mathematics, especially in astronomy. Her husband died in 1559, and the next year she left Italy on account of her religion, and returned to France, where she was permitted to profess the Protestant faith. She resided at Montargis, and there gave protection to as many as were persecuted till she was forced to desist. During the civil war in France she fed and maintained in her castle a great number of Protestants who had fled to her for refuge. She interceded strongly for the prince of Conde when he was imprisoned at Orleans in the time of the young king Francis, but was afterwards displeased with him, because neither she nor her ministers approved of the Protestants taking up arms. She died at Montargis- June 12, 1575, in full profession of the Reformed faith, though the Jesuit Le Laboureur seeks to show that she abjured her religion.--Bayle, *Dictionary*, ed. Des Maizeaux (Lond. 1736), iii, 30.

Ferrari, Francisco Bernardino

an Italian archaeologist, was born at Milan in 1576, Entering the Congregation of St. Ambrose, he studied philosophy and divinity, as well as the Latin and Greek languages, and was admitted doctor. Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, appointed him to travel into various parts of Europe to purchase the best books and MSS. to form a library at Milan. Ferrari passed over part of Italy and Spain, and collected a great number of books, which laid the foundation of the famous Ambrosian Library. About 1638 he was appointed director of the College of the Nobles, lately erected at Padua, which office he discharged two years, and then, on account of indisposition, returned to Milan. He died at Milan Feb. 3, 1669. Among his writings are, *De Antiquo Eccles. Epistolarum Genere libri tres* (Milan, 1613): *-De Ritu Sacrarum Ecclesiae Catholicae concionum libri tres* (Milan, 1620; Utrecht, 1692, cum praefatione Joannis Georgii Graevii) :- *De Veterum acclamationibus et plausu libri septem* (Milan, 1627; also in vol. vi of Graevius's *Thesaur. Antiq. Rom.*). His writings are full of learning; he is very judicious in his conjectures, and exact in his quotations.-Du Pin, *Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles.* 17:109 (Amst. 1711).

Ferraris, Lucius

an Italian divine, author of a large encyclopedic work, entitled *Promta bibliotheca canonica, juridica, moralis, theologica, necnon ascetica, polemica, rubricistica, historica* (edit. noviss. Venetae, 1782, 10 vols.: 4to). A new edition, revised and enlarged, was published by Migne (Paris, 1866, 8 vols. royal 8vo).

Ferrer, Bonifacio

brother of St. Vincent Ferrer, and prior of the Carthusian monastery of Portasceli, in Valencia. He translated the whole Scriptures into the Valencian or Catalonian dialect. This translation, which was printed at Valencia in 1478, although it was the work of a Roman Catholic author, and had undergone the examination and correction of the inquisitor James Borrell, had scarcely made its appearance when it was suppressed by the Inquisition, and consigned to the flames. He died in the year 1417. M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, ch. v.

Ferrer, Rafael

a Spanish missionary, was born at Valencia. Having entered the order of the Jesuits, he devoted himself to the preaching of the Gospel in the deserts bordering on the Amazon River. It was in particular, the ferocious and numerous nation of the Cofanes, which had never yet seen a missionary, and which, divided into twenty tribes, occupied a territory about sixty miles from Quito, to which he devoted his labors. The Cofanes had never been subjected to Spanish rule, and had recently destroyed the town of Ecija - and a number of villages. In 1603, after fourteen months of labor, Ferrer succeeded in organizing the mission of *San Paulo y San Pedro de los Cofanes*. In 1604 two other villages swelled the number of the converted population to 6500. In 1605 Ferrer followed the course of the Aguarico, penetrated into the Napo, and altogether, in the, course of two years and a half, travelled more than 1000 miles, and acquired a better acquaintance with the savage nations in the vicinity of the Amazon than any man of that time. In 1608 he returned to the Cofanes. He then prepared a Grammar of the language of the Cofanes, and translated for them the Catechism. He next undertook a journey to Quito, to induce the authorities to establish new mission-s. His petition having been granted, he again returned to the Cofanes, when his earnest sermons against polygamy cost him his life in

1611, one of the chiefs whom he had compelled to give up his concubines precipitating him from a steep rock.-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 17:535.

Ferrer Or Ferrier, Vincentius

(St.), a Dominican monk, was born in Valencia Jan. 23, 1357. He entered the order in 1374, and in 1380 he went to the University of Barcelona, where he spent two years. In 1384 he was made doctor at Lerida. In 1395 he was called to Avignon by pope Benedict XIII as master of the palace, and here he conceived the idea of devoting his life to the healing of the schism in the papacy which then threatened the destruction of the Roman Church. He carried out this idea by declaring for Martin V, and by striving for a reunion in many writings, and by vast labors and travels in Spain, France, Italy, and the British Islands. He died at Vannes, in Brittany, April 5, 1419, and was canonized by pope Calixtus in 1455. His writings are said to be poor in thought and language.-Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 15:pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 75; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, April 5.

Ferret

Picture for Ferret 1

Picture for Ferret 2

evidently a conjectural rendering for *anakah'* (**hqna**) a *sighing*; Sept. **mugal h**>Vulg. *mygale*), one of the unclean creeping things mentioned in. ^{<BIB>}Leviticus 11:30. The Rabbinical writers seem to have identified this animal with the hedgehog (see Lewysohn, *Zool. des Talmuds*, § 129, 134). The Sept. and Vulg. refer to an animal which, according to Aristotle (*Hist. Anim.* 8:24), is the *Mus araneus*, or shrew-mouse; but the associated names render it more probable that the animal referred to in Leviticus was a reptile of the lizard tribe (so Bochart and Gesenius), deriving its name from the mournful cry, or wail, which some lizards utter, especially those of the Gecko family. The *Lacerta gecko* (otherwise called "fan-foot" lizard; *Gecko lobulatus*, the *Ptyodactylus* of Hasselquist) is perhaps the animal intended. "The geckos are small lizards, usually somewhat clumsy in form, stealthy and cat-like in their actions, secreting themselves in holes and crevices by day, and at night coming forth to prey upon nocturnal insects. The form of the eye indicates their season of activity, for the pupil, which is capable of great expansion and contraction, closes to a vertical line. The animals crawl with ease and confidence on perpendicular walls, and even

on the under sides of ceilings, beams, and-the like, provided these have a somewhat roughened surface. This curious power, the rapidity with which they disappear in some crevice when alarmed, and their sombre and lurid hues, their association with night, their land and harsh, croak, their slow and stealthy pace, and especially a certain sinister expression of countenance, produced by the large globular eye, unprotected by as eyelid and divided by its linear pupil, have combined to give to these reptiles in all countries a popular reputation for malignity and venom, and they are generally much dreaded. This reputation, however, appears to be wholly groundless'; and the story told by Hasselquist of a man who would lay hold of the reptile, and whose hand instantly became covered with red pustules, inflamed and itching, must be received with suspicion. Still more incredible is another account by the same naturalist, to the effect that he saw at Cairo two women and a girl at the point of death from having eaten some cheese over which a gecko had crawled! The most interesting point in the economy of these curious lizards is the structure of their feet, by which they are enabled to defy the laws of gravity. The feet are nearly equal, short, stout, and terminated by five toes, differing- little in length, which radiate as if from a centre, so as to form two thirds of a circle. The under surface of the toes is, in most of the genera, much widened, and furnished with small plates or laminae, overlapping each other in a regular manner, which varies in different genera and species. The toes are frequently united by a membrane at their base. The claws are pointed, hooked, and kept constantly sharp, by an apparatus by which they are capable of retraction, like those of the cat. It is by means of the singular lamellated structure of the under surface of the toes that these reptiles, or at least many of them, are enabled to cling to vertical or even inverted surfaces, as house-flies do. The mode in which this is effected we do not thoroughly understand; but we may conjecture that it is by the raising, of these imbricated plates by muscular action, so as to form a vacuum beneath the sole, when the pressure of the external air causes the toe to adhere firmly to the surface. The similarity of the structure to that of the coronal sucker in the remora suggests this explanation. A familiar illustration of the principle is seen in the leathern suckers which children make, which adhere so firmly that large stones are lifted lay them." *SEE LIZARD.*

Ferrier, Jeremie

a French Protestant minister, was born about 1560, became professor of theology at Nismes, and is remarkable for having become a Papist, even

after having maintained in a public disputation in 1602 that "pope Clement the VIIIth Was properly the Antichrist." The Parliament of Toulouse having ordered his arrest, it became necessary for Henry IV to intervene to save him from the results of his temerity. In gratitude for this, Ferrier favored the restrictive measures adopted by the court against the Protestants. For this he was suspected by his Protestant friends, and was forbidden to preach by the Synod of Privas in 1612. He did not, however, change his religion till a popular tumult arose against him, in which his house was plundered, and himself so near being murdered, that, for the sake of escaping, he was obliged to lie three days concealed in a tomb. He then became a Roman Catholic, and removed to Paris, where he was subsequently made counsellor of state by Louis XIII. He died Sept. 26, 1626. He wrote a treatise, *De l'Antichrist et de ses marques, contre les ennemis de l'Eglise catholique* (Paris, 1615).-Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:550; Bayle, *Dictionary* (London, 1736), iii? 39.

Ferry, Paul

a French Protestant divine, was born at Metz Feb. 24, 1591, and was educated at the Seminary of Montauban. He became pastor at Metz in 1612, and held that position during sixty years. He was one of the most eloquent men in the province, and by his powers of mind, his activity, and his prudence, he gained the esteems of the most influential men of his time, and early obtained great influence over Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. Being troubled by the divisions which existed among the Protestants, and hoping to do something towards removing them, he held a correspondence on the subject with Duræus, *SEE DURY*, the great - "pacificator." Dury even came to Metz in 1662 to discuss the subject. Nothing substantial came of it; but Ferry carried his love of conciliation so far that he even regarded as possible the reunion of Protestants and Romanists; at all events, it is certain that he had on this subject a long correspondence with Bossuet. It occurred in this way. Ferry had published in 1654 a *Catechisme general de la Reformation*, in which he showed that the Reformation was a necessary reaction against the corruption of the Church. Bossuet, at that time canon and archdeacon of Metz, wrote a refutation of this little work. The discussion led to a mutual esteem between the disputants; and when, in 1667, the project of the reunion of Protestants and Roman Catholics was considered by the government, Ferry was consulted, and entered into correspondence with Bossuet on the subject. This correspondence is printed in vol. 24 of the (*Euvres de Bossuet*

(edition of Versailles). It has been proved almost -beyond doubt that Ferry was one of the ministers gained over by the cardinal Richelieu to agitate in favor of the reunion of the two religions, and that he received a pension of five hundred crowns for so doing. The receipt of Ferry for this sum is said to be shown in the Imperial Library of Paris. Ferry died at Metz July 28, 1669. He left a large number of writings, most of which remain in MS. Those which are published are, besides a volume of poetry, *Scholastici orthodoxi Specimen, hoc est Salutis nostrae methodus analytica, ex ipsis Scholasticorum veterum et recentiorum intimis juxta normam Scripturarum adornata et instructa* (Geneva, 1616, 8vo; 2d ed. Leyden, 1630, 8vo) :-*Le dernier Desespoir de la Tradition contra l' ecriture* (Sedan, 1618, m-a) :-*Refutation des Calomnies semees nouvellement contre certain endroit d'un livre publie il y a plusieurs annees et intitule; Le dernier Desespoir*, etc. (Sedan, 1624, 8vo): - *Remarques d'histoire sur le " Discours de la vie et de la mort de St. Sevier," publis par le Sieur de Ramberviller* (1624, 8vo) :-*Vindicis pro Scholastico orthodoxo, adversus Leon. Perinium, Jesuit., in quibus agitur d presdestinatione et annexis, de gratia et libern arbitrio, de cause peccati et justificatione* (Leyden, 1630, 8vao)*Quatra Sermons prononceis en divers lieux et sur differents sujets* (La Ferte-au-Col, 1646, 12mo):-*Lettre aux ministres de Geneve*, vol. ii of the *Bibliothique Anglaise*. -Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:563; Bayle, *Dictionary* (Lond. 1736), iii, 33; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Floquet, *Etudes sur la vie de Bossuet* (Par. 1855, 3 vols. 8vo), vol. i; *London Rev.* July, 1856, p. 409 sq.

Ferri, Paul

SEE FERRY

Ferry-Boat

Picture for Ferry Boat 1

Picture for Ferry Boat 2

(**hrb[]**abarah', passage; Sept. *diabasi*), a vessel for crossing a stream (¹⁰⁹⁸2 Samuel 19:18). The Syriac and Vulg. refer this word to the men mentioned in the above text- and accordingly Boothroyd renders the passage, "And these went over Jordan before the king, and performed the service of bringing over the king's household," which, as some of the Rabbins understand, was accomplished by carrying over on their backs the

women and children who could not conveniently ford the river. This, however, is not in accordance with the construction of the original (which, moreover, has the article emphatically **hrb** [h]; **hrb*** [w] and THE *ferry*[-boat] *crossed*). Some suppose (so Josephus, *Ant.* 7:11, 2) that there was a bridge of boats employed on this occasion, and others that a ferry-boat of some kind was used for this purpose (see Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note in loc.). It is probable that a raft, or float, was constructed; if not, some kind of boat, for the use of these must have been known to the Hebrews, as we find vessels apparently of this description delineated among the paintings of ships on the Egyptian monuments. Floats of various kinds, buoyed up by inflated bladders, calabashes, wicker-work, and even earthen or metallic vessels, have been used from the earliest ages on the Nile (^{<238P>}Isaiah 18:2) and Tigris,' for transporting passengers or goods; and modern travellers frequently allude to similar modes of conveyance at the present day among the Arabs. **SEE FLOAT**. Similar scenes are depicted upon the Assyrian monuments (Layard's *Nineveh*, i, 276). **SEE BOAT**.

Ferus, Johannes

(originally WILD), a Franciscan monk and cathedral preacher at Mentz, lived in the 16th century. He published a large number of sermons and Biblical commentaries. Of the latter several were put on the Roman Index. Ferus clings to the literal meaning of the Scriptures, and avoids allegorical interpretations. He recommends the reading of the Scriptures, and refutes the objection that the Scriptures are obscure. He complains of the prevalence of a Pharisaic spirit in the Roman Catholic Church, since there was in it a great deal of outward ceremonial, but little truth. He preached that repentance does not consist in outward works, such as fasting, praying, and giving alms, but that it begins, on the one hand, with the announcement of the divine law, the consciousness of one's sinfulness, and the fear of the judgment of God, and, on the other hand, with the announcement of the grace of God, and with confidence in the divine promise. Ferus thought that popes, emperors, councils, and the diets could do nothing so long as the Church was fill of errors and her doctrines corrupt. He died in 1554.-Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 16:141.

Fesch, Joseph

a French cardinal, was born in Ajaccio, Corsica, Jan. 3, 1763. His father's second wife was the mother of Laetitia Bonaparte. He studied at the

College of Aix, in Provence, entered the Church, and was archdeacon and provost of the chapter of Ajaccio when the revolution broke out. The Bonaparte family being exiled from Corsica in 1793 for their opposition to Paoli and his British allies, Fesch followed them to Toulon, where his circumstances compelled him to enter the commissariat of the army. In 1795 he was appointed to the commissariat of the Army of Italy, just placed under the command of his nephew, Napoleon Bonaparte. After the 18th Brumaire he resumed his ecclesiastical functions, and was actively engaged in the negotiations concerning the Concordat of July 15, 1801. Napoleon made him archbishop of Lyons, and Fesch took possession of that see Aug. 15, 1802. Six months later he was created cardinal of St. Laurent in *Lucina*. In 1804 he was appointed ambassador to Rome, and was accompanied in this mission by Chiateaubriand, who thus began his diplomatic career. He subsequently decided Pius VII to come to Paris to crown the emperor. Napoleon appointed him high almoner, commander of the Legion of Honor, and senator. Fesch paid great attention to the interests of his diocese, and established a high theological school. During the difficulties between Napoleon and the pope he showed much consideration for the latter, declining in 1809 the archbishopric of Paris, which was offered him-by the emperor, and even rejecting the petitions of the chapter that he would at least administer the diocese. In 1811 Napoleon called a council to settle his difficulties with Pius VII, and appointed Fesch its president, in which capacity he seems not to have acted according to the views of the emperor, for he was sent back to his diocese. A letter of his addressed to the pope, then at Fontainebleau, caused him to be deprived of his stipend. He introduced into France the order of the "Brethren of the Christian Schools," founded at Lyons a college of home missions, and was instrumental in procuring the recall of the Jesuits. When Napoleon I was sent to Elba, Fesch withdrew to Rome, where he was well received by Pius VII. During the "hundred days" he returned to France and into his archbishopric. After the battle of Waterloo he returned to Rome, declining, however, to resign his office as archbishop of Lyons. He died May 13, 1839. See *Biog. du Clerge contemporain*; *L' Ami de la Religion*; L'Abbe Lyonnet, *le Cardinal Fesch, fragments biographiques* (Lyon, 1841, 2 vols. 8vo); *La Verilt sur le cardinal Fesch* (Lyon, 1842, 8vo); Thiers, *Hist. du Consulat et de l'Empire*, t. xiii; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:572.

Fessler, Ignaz Aurelius

a Hungarian historian, was born at Czorendorf, Lower Hungary, in July, 1756. He became a Capuchin in 1773, and in 1784 or 1786 was appointed professor of Oriental languages and hermeneutics in the University of Lemberg. He afterwards joined the freemasons, and withdrew from the Capuchins. In 1787 the representation of a tragedy of his, entitled *Sidney*, which was denounced as impious, obliged him to retire to Silesia; here he became tutor to prince Carolath's sons. In 1791 Fessler became a Protestant. After remaining a long time in Berlin he went to Russia, and became professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of St. Alexander Newski, but was afterwards accused of atheism, and lost his situation. After being for a while a member of the Legislative Assembly, he went in 1817 to Sarepta, the head-quarters of the Moravians in Russia. In 1820 he became superintendent of the evangelical community at Saratof, and in 1833 general superintendent of the Lutheran congregation at Petersburg, where he died Dec. 15, 1839. His principal works are, *Marc-Aurel*, a historical novel (Bresh. 1790-92, 3 vols.): *Matthias Corvinus* (Breal. 1793):-*Aristides u. The mistokles* (Berlin, 1792 and 1818, 3d ed.):-*Attila* (Baeslau, 1794):-*Gesch. d. Ungarn*, etc. (Lpz. 1812-25):*Ruckblicke a. meine 70 jaehrige Pilgerschaft* (Breslan, 1826).-Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* (Paris, 1857).

Festival

(properly **gJ** ; *chag*, **ἑορτή**, "feast"), RELIGIOUS, OF THE ISRAELITES (compare Leviticus 23). These were occasions of public religious observances, recurring at certain set and somewhat distant intervals. In a certain sense, indeed, each day was such an occasion, for at the daily service two lambs of the first year were to be offered at the door of the tabernacle; one in the morning, the other in the evening, a continual burnt-offering. With each lamb was to be offered one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with one fourth of a hin of fresh oil, for a meat-offering, and one fourth of a hin of wine for a drink-offering. Frankincense was to be placed on the meat-offering, a handful of which, with the frankincense, was to be burnt, and the remainder was to be eaten by the priest in the holy place, without leaven. The priests were to offer daily the tenth of an ephah of fine flour, half in the morning and half in the evening, for themselves. The high-priest was to dress the lamps in the tabernacle every morning, and light them every evening; and at the same time burn incense on the altar of

incense. The people provided oil for the lamps which were to burn from evening to morning the ashes were removed by a priest, dressed in his linen garment and his linen drawers, and then carried by him out of the camp in his common dress. Great stress was laid on the regular observance of these requirements (^{<0201>}Numbers 28:1-8; ^{<0228>}Exodus 29:38-42; ^{<0108>}Leviticus 6:8-23; ^{<0210>}Exodus 30:7-9; 27:20; ^{<0341>}Leviticus 24:1-4; ^{<0402>}Numbers 8:2). *SEE DAILY SACRIFICE.*

So, likewise, there was a weekly, a monthly, and a yearly festival, as will presently appear. At the *New-moon* festival, in the beginning of the month, in addition to the daily sacrifice, two heifers, one ram, and seven lambs of the first-year were to be offered as burnt-offerings, with three tenths of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for each heifer; two tenths of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for the ram; and one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for every lamb; and a drink-offering of half of a hin of wine for a heifer, one third of a hin for the rams, and one fourth of a hin for every lamb. One kid of the goats was also to be offered as a sin-offering (^{<0400>}Numbers 10:10; 28:11-15). *SEE NEW MOON.*

I. Pre-exilian Festivals.—The religious times ordained in the law fall under three heads:

1. Those formally connected with the institution of the Sabbath. These embrace the following:

(1.) *The weekly Sabbath itself.* — On this day two lambs of the first year, without blemish, were to be offered for a burnt-offering, morning and evening, with two tenths of an ephah of flour, mingled with oil, for a meat-offering, and one half of a hin of wine for a drink-offering, thus doubling the offering for ordinary days. Twelve cakes of fine flour were to be placed every Sabbath upon the table in the tabernacle, in two piles, and pure frankincense laid on the uppermost of each pile.' These were to be furnished by the people; two were offered to Jehovah, the rest were eaten by the priests in the holy place (^{<0212>}Exodus 31:12; ^{<0231>}Leviticus 23:1; 26:2; ^{<0248>}Exodus 19:3-30; 20:8-11; 23:12; ^{<0152>}Deuteronomy 5:12-15; ^{<0233>}Leviticus 23:3; 24:5-9; ^{<0435>}Numbers 15:35; 28:9). *SEE SABBATH.*

(2.) *The seventh New Moon, or Feast of Trumpets* — The first day of the seventh month was to be a Sabbath, a holy convocation, accompanied by the blowing of trumpets. In addition to the daily and monthly sacrifices, one ram and seven lambs were to be offered as burnt-offerings, with their

respective meat-offerings, as at the usual New-moon festival (^{<0481>}Numbers 28:11-15; 29:1-6; ^{<0223>}Leviticus 23:23-25). *SEE TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.*

The other septenary festivals were:

(3.) The *Sabbatical Year* (q.v.), and

(4.) The *Year of Jubilee* (q.v.).

2. The great feasts ($\mu\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\xi\eta\mu$, *set times*; in the Talmud, $\mu\upsilon\lambda$ $\alpha\epsilon$] *pilgrimage feasts*) are : the Passover; the feast of Pentecost, of Weeks, of Wheat-harvest, or of the First-fruits; the feast of Tabernacles, or of Ingathering. In the arrangement of these festivals likewise a sabbatical order remarkably prevails (compare *Midrash Rabba* on ^{<0224>}Leviticus 23:24), and serves to furnish a strong proof that the whole system of the festivals of the Jewish law was the product of one mind. Pentecost occurs seven weeks after the Passover; the Passover and the feast of Tabernacles last seven days each; the days of Holy Convocation are seven is- the year-two at the Passover, one at Pentecost, one at the feast of Trumpets, one on the Day of Atonement, and two at the feast of Tabernacles; the feast of Tabernacles, as well as the Day of Atonement, falls in the seventh month of the sacred year; and, lastly, the cycle of annual feasts occupies seven months, from Nisan to Tisri. *SEE SEVEN.*

On each of these occasions every male Israelite was commanded "to appear before the Lord," that is, to attend in the court of the tabernacle or the Temple, and to make his offering with a joyful heart (^{<0270>}Deuteronomy 27:7; ^{<0489>}Nehemiah 8:9-12; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 11:5, 5). The attendance of women was voluntary but the zealot often went up to the Passover. Thus Mary attended it (^{<0141>}Luke 2:41), and Hannah (^{<0107>}1 Samuel 1:7; 2:19). As might be supposed, there was a stricter Obligation regarding the Passover than the other feasts, and hence there was an express provision to enable those who, by unavoidable circumstances or legal impurity, had been prevented from attending at the proper time, to observe the feast on the same day of the succeeding month (^{<0490>}Numbers 9:10-11). None were to come empty-handed, but every one was to give according as Jehovah had blessed him; and there before Jehovah was every one to rejoice with his, family, the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow (^{<0234>}Exodus 33:14-17; 34:22-24; ^{<0166>}Deuteronomy 16:16,17). On all the days of Holy- Convocation there was to be an entire suspension of ordinary labor of all kinds (^{<0216>}Exodus 12:16; ^{<0162>}Leviticus 16:29; 23:21,

24, 25, 35). But on the intervening days of the longer festivals work might be carried on. The lacy always speaks of the days of Holy Convocation as Sabbaths. But the Mishna makes a distinction, and states in de/tail what acts may be performed on the former, which are unlawful as the Sabbath, in the treatise *Yom Tob*; while in *-Mocd Katan* it lays down strange and burdensome conditions in reference to the intermediate days. **SEE CONVOCAION, HOLY.**

Brown has spoken (*Antiquities of the Jews*, i, 522) of the defenseless state in which the country lay when all the males were gathered together at Jerusalem. What was to prevent an enemy from devastating the land, and slaying women and children? He refers the protection of the country to the express interposition of God, citing "the promise," as found in ^{<0323>}Exodus 34:23, 24. He adds "During the whole period between Moses and Christ we never read of an enemy invading the land at the time of the three festivals. The first instance on record was thirty-three years after they had withdrawn from themselves the divine protection by imbruing their hands in the Saviour's blood, when Cestius, the Roman general, slew fifty of the people of Lydda, while all the rest had gone up to the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 66" (Josephus, *War*, ii, 19). The objection, however, which this writer thus meets is founded on the assumption that the law was strictly, uniformly, and lastingly obeyed. But the requirement that all males should appear three times a year before Jehovah is not without some practical difficulty. During the sojourn in the wilderness its observance would not only be easy, but highly useful in preventing the dispersion of individuals or numbers from the main body—an influence the more needful, because many persons would doubtless stray from time to time in search of pasture. In subsequent and more settled times it must have been a serious inconvenience for all the males of the nation to leave their families unprotected and their business neglected for so many days every year as would be necessary in going to and from Jerusalem. It is true that the seasons of the festivals were well fixed and distributed for the convenience of an agricultural people, Yet to have to visit Jerusalem thrice in seven months was a serious thing, especially in later times, when Israelites were scattered. far abroad. Even if the expense was, as many think **SEE ASSESSMENT**, a small consideration, yet the interruption to domestic life and the pursuits of business must have been very great; nor would it be an exaggeration to say that the observance was an impossibility to the Jews, for instance, who were in Babylon, Egypt, Italy, Macedonia, Asia Minor,

etc.: How far the law was rigorously enforced or strictly obeyed at any time after the settlement in Palestine, it would not be easy to say. Palfrey (*Lectures on the Jewish Scrip.* i, 199) supposes that "a man might well be said to have virtually executed this duty who appeared before the Lord (not in person, but) with his offering, sent by the hand of a friend, as a suitor is said in our common speech to appear in a court of justice when he is represented there by his attorney;" a conjecture which, to our mind, savors too much of modern ideas and usages. That some relaxation took place, at least in "the latter days," appears from ~~407B~~ John 7:8, in which more or less of what is voluntary is obviously connected in the mind and practice of our Lord with "the feast," though it must be allowed that the passage is an evidence of the general observance, not to say the universal obligation, in his days, of at least the feast of Tabernacles. If, however, there was in practice some abatement from the strict requirements of the law, yet obviously time enough was saved from labor by the strong hand of religion to secure to the laborer a degree of most desirable and enviable rest. Not, indeed, that all the days set apart were emancipated from labor. At the feast of Tabernacles, for instance, labor is interdicted only on the first and the last day. So, on other occasions, business and pleasure were pursued in connection with religious observances. But if all males appeared before Jehovah even only once a year, they must, in going and returning, as well as in being present at the festival, have spent no small portion of time in abstinence from their ordinary pursuits, and could not have failed to derive singular advantages alike to their bodies and their minds. The rest and recreation would be the more pleasant, salutary, and beneficial, because of the joyous nature of the religious services in which they were, for the greater part, engaged. These solemn festivals were not only commemorations of great national events, but they were occasions for the reunion of friends, for the enjoyment of hospitality, and for the interchange of kindness. The feasts which accompanied the sacrifices opened the heart of the entire family to joy, and gave a welcome which bore a religious sanction even to the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, art. 199). On these solemn occasions food came partly from hospitality (a splendid instance of which may be found in ~~448D~~ 2 Chronicles 35:7-9), partly from the feasts which accompanied the sacrifices in the Temple, and partly also from provision expressly made by the travellers themselves. 'It appears that the pilgrims to Mecca carry with them every kind of food that they need except flesh, which they procure in the city

itself. Lodging, too, was afforded by friends, or found in tents erected for the purpose in and around Jerusalem. *SEE HOSPITALITY.*

Besides their religious purpose, the great festivals must have had an important bearing on the maintenance of a feeling of national unity. This may be traced in the apprehensions of Jeroboam (^{<1126>}1 Kings 12:26, 27), and in the attempt at reformation by Hezekiah (^{<1401>}2 Chronicles 30:1), as well as in the necessity which, in later times, was felt by the Roman government of mustering a considerable military force at Jerusalem during the festivals (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:9, 3; 17:10, 2; compare ^{<1015>}Matthew 26:5; ^{<211>}Luke 13:1). Another effect of these festivals Michaelis has found in the furtherance of internal commerce. They would give rise to something resembling our modern fairs. Among the Mohammedans similar festivals have had this effect. In Article 199 the same learned writer treats of the important influence which the festival had on the Calendar, and the correction of its errors. *SEE YEAR.*

The agricultural significance of the three great festivals is clearly set forth in the account of the Jewish sacred year contained in Leviticus 23. The prominence which, not only in that chapter, but elsewhere, is given to this significance, in the names by which Pentecost and Tabernacles are often called, and also by the offering of "the first-fruits of wheat-harvest" at Pentecost (^{<1242>}Exodus 34:22), and of "the first of the first-fruits" at the Passover (^{<1239>}Exodus 23:19; 34:26), might easily suggest that the origin of the feasts was patriarchal (Ewald, *Alterthumer*, p. 385), and that the historical associations with which Moses endowed them were grafted upon their primitive meaning. It is perhaps, however, a difficulty in the way of this view that we should rather look for the institution of agricultural festivals among an agricultural than a pastoral people, such as the Israelites and their ancestors were before the settlement in the land of promise. The times of the festivals were evidently ordained in wisdom, so as to interfere as little as possible with the industry of the people. The Passover was held just before the work of harvest commenced, Pentecost at the conclusion of the corn-harvest and before the vintage, the feast of Tabernacles after all the fruits of the ground were gathered in. In winter, when travelling was difficult, there were no festivals. *SEE SEASONS.*

(1.) The first of these three great festivals, that of Unleavened Bread, called also the Passover, was kept in the month Abib, in commemoration of the rescue of the Israelites by Jehovah out of Egypt, which took place in that

month. The ceremonies that were connected with it will be detailed under the head PASSOVER. Every one who was ritually clean, and not on a journey, and yet omitted to keep the Passover, was to be cut off from the people. Any one who was disabled for the observance, either by uncleanness of being on a journey, was to keep the Passover on the fourteenth *day* of the next month. In order to make the season more remarkable, it was ordained that henceforward the month in which it took place should be reckoned the first of the national religious year (^{<0217>}Exodus 12:2). From this time, accordingly, the year began in the month Abib, or Nisan (March-April), while the civil year continued to be reckoned from Tisri (September-October) (^{<0218>}Exodus 12:3, 14, 27, 4349; ^{<0216>}Leviticus 23:5; ^{<0236>}Numbers 28:16; ^{<0561>}Deuteronomy 16:1-7). The Passover lasted one week, including two Sabbaths (De Wette, *Archilog.* p. 214). The first day and the last were holy, that is, devoted to the observances in the public temple, and to rest from all labor (^{<0216>}Exodus 12:16; ^{<0236>}Leviticus 23:6; ^{<0238>}Numbers 28:18; ^{<0568>}Deuteronomy 16:8). The modern Jews observe the 15th and 16th, and the 20th and 21st days of Nisan, as holy days in connection with this festival. *SEE NISAN.*

On the day after the Sabbath, on the feast of Passover, a sheaf of the first-fruits of the barley harvest was to be brought to the priest to be waved before Jehovah, accompanied by a burnt-offering. Till this sheaf was presented, neither bread nor parched corn, nor full ripe ears of the harvest, could be eaten (^{<0215>}Exodus 12:15-20; 13:6-10; ^{<0236>}Leviticus 23:6-8; ^{<0562>}Deuteronomy 16:28; ^{<0287>}Numbers 28:17-25). *SEE HARVEST.*

(2.) The feast of Pentecost or of Weeks was kept to Jehovah at the end of seven weeks from that day of the festival of Unleavened Bread, on which the sheaf was presented. On the morrow after the seventh complete week, or on the fiftieth day, two wave loaves were presented as first-fruits of the wheat-harvest, together with a burnt-offering, a sin-offering, and a peace-offering, etc. The day was a holy convocation, in which no servile work was done. The festival lasted but one day. The Jews of the present day, however, hold it during two successive days. It is said to have been designed to commemorate the giving of the law on Mount Sinai (^{<0569>}Deuteronomy 16:9-11; ^{<0535>}Leviticus 13:15-21; ^{<0235>}Numbers 28:26-31; 15:17-21). *SEE PENTECOST.*

(3.) The feast of Ingathering or of Tabernacles began on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, and continued eight days, the first and last being

Sabbaths. During the feast all native Israelites dwelt in booths made of the shoots of beautiful trees, palm branches, boughs of thick-leaved trees, and of the willows of the brook, when they rejoiced with their families, with the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, before Jehovah. Various offerings were made. At the end of every seven years, in the year of release, at the feast of Tabernacles, the law was required to be read by the priests in the hearing of all the Israelites (⁽¹⁵¹³⁾Deuteronomy 16:13-15; 31:10-13; ⁽¹⁸³³⁾Leviticus 23:39-43, 33-36; ⁽¹⁸⁹²⁾Numbers 29:12-38, 40). The feast of Tabernacles was appointed partly to be an occasion of annual thanksgiving after the ingathering of the harvest (⁽¹²⁴²⁾Exodus 34:22; ⁽¹⁸³³⁾Leviticus 23:39; ⁽¹⁵¹³⁾Deuteronomy 16:13), and partly to remind the Israelites that their fathers had lived in tents in the wilderness (⁽¹⁸³⁴⁾Leviticus 23:40-43). This feast took place in the end of the year, September or October. The modern Jews observe it for seven successive days, the first two and the last two of which are holy days. *SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.*

(4.) The festival of *New Year's Day* (*Rosh hash-Shanah* in the Talmud) is held by modern Jews for two days at the beginning of Tisri. *SEE TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.*

3. The tenth day of the seventh month was the *Day of Atonement*-a day of abstinence, a day of holy convocation, in which all were to afflict themselves. Special offerings were made (⁽¹⁸³⁶⁾Leviticus 23:26-32; 16:1,34; ⁽¹⁸⁹⁷⁾Numbers 29:7-11; ⁽¹⁸⁰⁰⁾Exodus 30:10). *SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF.*

II. Additional Post-exilian Festivals.

1. The term "the *festival of the Basket*" (*ἑορτὴ Καρτάλλου*) is applied by Philo (*Opp.* v, 51) to the offering of the first-fruits described in ⁽¹⁸⁰¹⁾Deuteronomy 26:1-11, and occurring on the 16th of the first month (Nisan). *SEE FIRST-FRUITS.*

2. The *Festival of Acra*, which was instituted by Simon Maccabaeus, B.C. 141, to be celebrated on the 23d of the Second month (Ijar), in commemoration of the capture and purifying of Acra (q.v.), and the expulsion of the Hellenists from Jerusalem (1 Macc. 13:50-52). *SEE MACCABEES.*

3. The *Festival of Wood-carrying*, as it was called (*ἑορτὴ τῶν ξυλοφοριῶν*), is mentioned by Josephus (*War*, ii, 17, 6) and the Mishna

(*Taanith*, 4:5). What appears to have been its origin is found in ~~46034~~ Nehemiah 10:34. It was celebrated on the 15th (21st) of the fifth month (Ab). *SEE XYLOPHORIA*.

4. The *Festival of Water-drawing* (*tyBetj ayababjVhi*), which was held on the 22d of the seventh month (Tisri), the last day of the feast of Tabernacles (comp. ~~43075~~ John 7:37; Mishna, *Succa*, 4:9; v, 1-3; see Frey, *De aquae libatione in festo tabernaculorum*, Altorf, 1744). *SEE SILOAM*.

5. The *Festival of Dedication* was appointed by Judas Maccabaeus on occasion of the purification of the Temple and reconstruction of the altar after they had been polluted by Antiochus Epiphanes. The hatred of this monarch towards the Jews had been manifested in various ways: he forbade their children to be circumcised, restrained them in the exercise of their -religion, killed many who disobeyed his mandates, burnt the books of the law, set up idolatry, carried off the altar of incense, the shew-bread table, and the golden candlestick, with the other vessels and treasures of the Temple, and went to such extremes as to sacrifice a sow upon the altar of burnt-offerings, build a heathen altar on the top of that sacred pile, and with broth of swine's flesh to sprinkle the courts and the Temple (1 Macc. i; 2 Macc. v; Prideaux, *sub* A.C. 167-8, 170). The new dedication took place on the 25th day of the ninth month, called Kisleu, in the year before Christ 170. This would be in December. The day was chosen as being that on which Antiochus, three years before, had polluted the altar by heathen sacrifices. The joy of the Israelites must have been great on the occasion, and well may they have prolonged the observance of it for eight days.. A general illumination formed a part of the festival, whence it obtained the name of the feast of Lights. In ~~43102~~ John 10:22 this festival is alluded to when our Lord is said to have been present at the feast of Dedication. The historian marks the time by stating "it was winter." (Compare 1 Macc. 4:52-59; Mishna, *Taanith*, ii, 10; *Moed Katon*, iii, 9; Josephus, *Ant. 12:7, 7; Ap. ii, 39.*) *SEE DEDICATION, FEAST OF*.

6. The *Festival of Nicanor* to commemorate the defeat by Judas Maccabaeus of the Greeks when the Jews "smote off Nicanor's head and his right hand which he stretched out So proudly," caused "the people to rejoice greatly, and they kept that day a day of great gladness; moreover, they ordained to keep yearly this day, being the thirteenth day of Adar" the twelfth month (1 Macc. 7:47; Josephus, *Ant. 12:10, 5; Taanith*, xii; Talm.

Jerus. *Taanith*, ii, 13; Josippon ben Gorion, iii, 22, p. 244, ed. Breith.).
SEE NICANOR.

7. The *Festival of Purim* or of Lots originated in the gratitude of the Jews in escaping the plot of Haman designed for their destruction. It took its name from the lots which were cast before Haman by the astrologers, who knew his hatred against Mordecai and his wish to destroy his family and nation (^{<TR>}Esther 3:7; 9:2, 5). The feast was suggested by Esther and Mordecai, and was celebrated on the 13th, 14th, and 15th days of the twelfth month (Adar). The 13th was a fast, being the day on which: the Jews were to have been destroyed; and the 14th and 15th were a feast held in commemoration of their deliverance (see 2 Macc. 15:36). The fast is called the Fast of Esther, and the feast still holds the name of Purim. Prideaux (*Connex.*) styles it the bacchanalia of the Jews. **SEE PURIM.**

The slaughter of Holofernes by the hand of Judith, the consequent defeat of the Assyrians, and the liberation of the Jews, were commemorated by the institution of a festival (Judith 14, 15). **SEE HOLOFERNES.** Some other minor festivals may be found noticed in Brown's *Antiquities*, i, 586, and in Simon's *Dictionnaire de la-Bible*, art. "Fetes." **SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.**

Literature. — Josephus, *Ant.* ii-iii, xiii-xvii; *War*, ii, 3, 1, and many other places; Philo, *De Septenario et Festis diebus* (Περὶ τῆς ἑβδομῆς, O. vi, . vol. p. 21, edit. Tauch.); the Mishna, *Tracts respecting the Festivals*, or d[wm rds]; especially the Talmudical tract *Chagiga* (Mishna, ii, 12), *sive de trib. festis solemn. c. vers. et Bartenorae comment.* (edit. Ludovici, Lips. 1696, 1712); also Hottinger, *De trina comparitione Israel. coram Domino* (Marb. 1707); Otho, *Lex Rabb.* p. 288; Johnston, *De festis Hebraeor. et Graecor.* (Vratisl. 1660; Jen. 1670); Meyer, *De tempor. et festis dieb. Hebraeor.* (Amst. 1724; als in Ugolini *Thesaur-* i); Credner, Joel, p. 213 sq.; Baur, in the *Tubing. Zeitschr.* 1832, iii, 125 sq.; George, *Die alte jud. Feste* (Berlin, 1835); Fairbairn, *Typology*, ii, 403 sq.; Meusel, *Biblioth. histor.* I, ii, 168 sq.; Hospimanus, *De fest. diebus Judaeor. Graecor. etc.* (Zur. 1592); Pfriem, *De festiv. Hebraeor.* (Bamb. 1765); Seligmann, *Das jud. Ceremoniell bei Festen* (Hamburg, 1722); Spencer, *De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus et earum rationibus* (Cantabrigiae, 1727); Bahr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelberg, 18,39), ii, 525 sq.; Ewald, *Die Alterthumer des Volkes Israel* (Gottingen, 1854), p. 379 sq.; *De Feriarum Hebraearum origine ac ratione* (Gottingae, 1841);

Creuzer, *Symbol.* ii, 597; Saalschutz, *Archilogie der Hebraer* (Konigsb. 1855), p. 207 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Nordhausen, 1857), ii, 106 sq.-; Jost, *Geschicht.cades Juddenthums* (Leipzig, 1857), i, 158 sq.; Raphall, *Festivals of the Lord* (Lond. 1839); Hupfeld, *De festis Heb. ex legibus Mosaicis* (Hal. 1865). **SEE SACRIFICE.**

Festivals In The Christian Church

SEE FEASTS.

Fes'tus

(*festal*), PORCIUS (Graecized Πόρκιος Φῆστος), the successor of Felix as procurator of Judaea (^{<427>}Acts 24:27; Joseph. *Ant.* 20:8, 9; *War*, ii, 14, 1), sent by Nero, probably in the autumn of A. D. 55. **SEE FELIX.** A few weeks after Festus reached his province he heard the cause of the apostle Paul, who had been left -a prisoner by Felix, in the presence of Herod Agrippa II. and Bernice his sister. Not finding any thing in the apostle worthy of death or of bonds, and being confirmed in this view by his guests, he would have set him free had it not been that Paul had himself previously (^{<451>}Acts 25:11, 12) appealed to Caesar. In consequence, Festus sent him to Rome. **SEE PAUL.** Judaea was in the same disturbed state during the procuratorship of Festus, which had prevailed through, that of his predecessor., Sicarli, robbers, and magicians were put down with a strong hand (*Ant.* 20:8, 10). Festus bad a difference with the Jews at Jerusalem about a high wall which t-hey had built to prevent Agrippa seeing from his palace into the court of the Temple. As this also hid the view of the Temple from the Roman guard appointed to watch it during the festivals, the procurator took strongly the side of Agrippa, but permitted the Jews to send to Rome for the decision of the emperor. He, being influenced by Poppaea, who was a proselyte (Joseph. *Ant.* 20:\$, 11), decided in favor of the Jews. Festus probably died in the summer of A. D. 62, and was succeeded by Albinus (Joseph. *War*, 20:9, 1). The chronological questions concerning his entrance on the province and his death are too intricate and difficult to be entered on here, but will be found fully discussed by Anger, *De temporum in Act. Apost. ratione*, p. 99 sq.; and 'Wieseler, *Chronologie der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 8999. **SEE CHRONOLOGY.** Josephus implies (*War*, ii, 14, 1) that Festus was a just as well as an active magistrate.

Fetichism-Or Fetishism

a term recently introduced to denote the lowest forms of human worship, "in which the shapeless stone, the meanest reptile, or any object however worthless or insignificant, is consecrated by a vague and mysterious reverence" (Milman). It is derived from *Feitico*, a term borrowed from the Portuguese *fetisso*, and used by the negroes of Senegal to denote an instrument of witchcraft. It was first brought into use in Europe by De Broses, in his *Du Culte des Dieux Fetiches* (Dijon, 1760). Fetichism is practised in Greenland, Africa, Australia, and Liberia. The fetiches in use in Africa are either *natural* (as a tiger, serpent, etc.) or *artificial* (as skins or claws of beasts, stones, etc.). Sometimes a single fetich is made the object of worship for a whole tribe, e.g. the *tiger* in Dahomey, the *serpent* by the Whydahs. The negroes of Benin make a fetich of their own shadows. But, besides these, each individual almost has his own particular fetich or fetiches. Any object may become one by the merest accident; e.g. by having been the subject of a dream. When any one has a fetich supposed to possess extraordinary powers of injuring others, no efforts are spared to get it from the owner. Collections of them are highly prized, and a traveller on the coast of Guinea saw as many as 20,000 fetiches in the possession of one negro. Sometimes they are purely imaginary, and are fantastic forms, such as are never found in nature, and generally contrived 'for the purpose of producing fear. At Cape Coast there is a public guardian fetich, supreme in power and dignity. This is a rock which projects into the sea from the bottom of the cliff on which the castle is built. To this rock annual sacrifices are presented, and the responses given through the priests are rewarded by the blinded devotees.

With regard to the religious relation between the fetiches and their worshippers, we find that, although undoubtedly sinking often to the rank of mere instruments of sorcery in practice, fetiches are yet essentially idols. They receive, every morning and evening, offerings of spices, milk, tobacco, etc., and are always approached with marks of respect and of fear. They are resorted to for protection against lightning, beasts of prey, murder, etc. They also serve to protect property, to attest oaths, and the negroes have even a vague idea that after death they will have to render an account to their fetiches. Yet the moral hold of the fetich over its worshipper is, after all, very weak; the object of worship is discarded or broken as soon as its efficacy is distrusted.

Substantially, fetishism is a rude form of pantheism. Its root is to be found in the fear generated in the rude nature of the savage by the unknown forces of the universe.-Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:395; Scholten, *Geschichte der Relig. und Philosophie* (Elberfeld, 1868); Lecky, *Rationalism*, i, 208 sq.; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters*, ii, 127.

Fetter

Picture for Fetter 1

Picture for Fetter 2

(*qzezek*, bond or chain in general, only in the plur. ^{<3318>}Job 36:8, else-where chains." ^{<4318>}Psalms 149:8; ^{<2314>}Isaiah 45:14; ^{<31810>}Nahum 3:10; **I bK**, ke'bel, sing. Perhaps the link joining the fetter, ^{<19518>}Psalms 105:18; plur. and of iron, 149:8; **tvj nj**-*necho'sheth*, brazen, in the dual, the appropriate term, ^{<2317>}Lamentations 3:7; ^{<17121>}Judges 16:21; ^{<1034>}2 Samuel 3:34; ^{<12317>}2 Kings 25:7; ^{<2417>}Jeremiah 39:7; 52:11; **πῆδη**, implying that they were for the feet, in the plur., ^{<4104>}Mark 5:4; ^{<1039>}Luke 8:29; Ecclus. 6:24, 29; 21:19), shackles or chains for binding prisoners, whether by the wrists or ankles. The Philistines bound Samson with fetters of copper (^{<17121>}Judges 16:21). Manasseh and Zedekiah, king of Judah were bound with fetters by the Chaldaens and carried to Babylon (^{<14311>}2 Chronicles 33:11; ^{<12317>}2 Kings 25:7). Manacles for the feet and hands are represented on the Assyrian monuments (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 376; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations*, ii, 437). **SEE CHAIN**. 'One mode of securing prisoners among the Egyptians, as depicted on the monuments,-was to enclose their hands in an elongated fetter of wood, made of two opposite segments, nailed together at each end, such as are used for a similar purpose in Egypt at the present day (Wilkinson, *Ancient Egyptians*, i, 410, abridgm.).

Feudal System

SEE FIEF

Feuguieres. Guillaume

was born at Rouen. In his native place he became minister of the Reformed Church. In 1578, at the recommendation of prince William the First, he was appointed first professor of theology in the recently founded University of Leyden. His influence was of decided advantage to the new

institution, but his connection with it was of short continuance. In 1579 he resigned his professorship, in order to accept the pressing invitation of his former charge to again become their pastor. There he spent the remainder of his days, and, died in 1613 at an advanced age. He wrote several works in Latin, of which we deem the following most worthy of mention: *G. - Feuguereii propheticae et apostolicae, i.e. totius diince et canonicae scripturae thesaurus, in locos communes rerum, dogmatum suis divinis exemplis illustratorum, et phraseom scripturae familiarium, ordine alphabetico Augustini Marlorati adversarius* (Lond. 1574; reprinted at Berne in 1601, and at Geneva in 1624. A compendium of it was published at Geneva in 1613) :-*Novum Testamentum latine, ex versione et cum annotationibus Th. Bezae, paucis etiam additis ex Joachimi Camerarii notationibus, studio Petri Loselerii Villeri-, theolog. profess. Genevensis, et nunc postraemo G. F. opera* (Lond. 1587). See B. Glasius, *Godgeleerd Nederland*, Dael i, blz. 464 en very.; also Soermans, *Acad. Regist.* bl. 32; Paquot, i, frag. 178. (J. P. W.)

Feuillants

Picture for Feuillants 1

(*Feuillants, Congregatio beatae Mariae Fuliensis*), a reformed congregation of the Cistercians (q.v.). Their founder, Jean de la Barriere, of the family of the Vicomtes de Turennes, was born at St. Cere in 1544, and finished his education at the University of Paris. In 1562, when only 18 years of age, he received the Cistercian abbey of Notre Dame de Feuillants *in commendam*, and three years later took possession of it. After heaving received the income of the abbey for eleven months, he entered the order himself. His efforts to restore a stricter monastic discipline met with the unanimous opposition of the members of the abbey, and he was even in danger of being assassinated. He was charged at the chapter general held at Citeaux with introducing innovations, -but his defence made so deep an impression that many of the assembled monks placed themselves under his spiritual guidance, and enabled him to carry through a thorough reformation in his abbey. La Barriere and his friends now suffered a great deal of persecution from the old Cistercians; but their reformation. was, in 1586 and 1587, approved by the pope, though they remained subject, with regard to such points as were not at variance with their new discipline, to the abbot of Citeaux. Other abbys were authorized to adopt the reformation of Feuillants, and pope Sixtus V gave them the house of San

Vito at Rome, to which, after a time, was added the house of St. Pudentiana, and somewhat later a beautiful monastery. In 1588 Henry III gave, them a monastery in Paris. During the civil-war La Barriere remained loyal to Henry III, whose funeral sermon he preached at Bordeaux, but many members of the order became ardent partisans of the Ligue. One of them, Bernard de Montgaillard, became celebrated under the name of "The Little Feuillant." By these partisans of the Ligue, La Barriere was denounced as a traitor to the interests of the Catholic Church. At a chapter held in 1592, under the presidency of the Dominican monk Alexander De Francis, subsequently bishop, of Forli, he was deposed from his position, forbidden to say mass, and required to report himself once every month to the Inquisition. A revision of the trial by cardinal Baronius led, however, to the acquittal of La Barriere. Pope Clement VIII fully dissolved the connection of the new congregation with Citeaux, placed them under the immediate jurisdiction of the papal see, and commissioned six of the members with framing new statutes. These new statutes provided for the mitigation of some of the rules, the rigor of which, it was reported, had caused the death of fourteen members-and they received the sanction of the Church in 1595. The congregation now spread in France and Italy, and at its head in France was an abbot elected for three years. As disciplines again began to slacken, pope Urban VIII in 1630 divided the congregation into two-the French, called after Notre Dame de Feuillants, and the Italians, the members of which were called reformed Bernardines. At the head of each was henceforth a general. Subsequently considerable alterations were made in the statutes of each (of the French in 1634, of the Italian in 1667). Among the most celebrated members of the two congregations belong cardinal Bona and Cosmus Roger. Joseph Moratius wrote their history (*Cistercii reflorescentis seu Congregationum Cistercio--Monasticarum B. M. Fuliensis in Gallia et reformatorum S. Bernardi in Italia chronologica historia*, Turin, 1690).

Picture for Feuillants 2

The first convent of nuns according to the reformed rule of Feuillants was organized in 1588 at Montesquieu. It was subsequently transferred to Toulouse. The chapters general held in 1595' and 1598 forbade the establishment of new convents, but in 1662 the wife of king Louis XIII succeeded in establishing one in Paris. According to a bull of Clement VIII of 1606, these nuns were subject to all the rules of the congregation of the Feuillants. It seems that the congregation has become entirely extinct in

consequence of the French Revolution.--Helyot, *Ordres Religieux*, ed. Migne, s.v.; Henrion Fehr, *Monchsorden*, i, 159; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 4:61. (A. J. S.)

Fever

the rendering, in the A. V., of the Hebrew **tj Dqj** *kaddach'ath* (^{<R32>}Deuteronomy 28:22), and the Greek **πυρετός** (Mat. 8:14; Mark i, 30; ^{<R38>}Luke 4:38; ^{<R42>}John 4:52; ^{<R48>}Acts 28:8). Both the Hebrew and Greek words are derived from the association of burning heat, which is the usual symptom of a febrile attack; the former coming from the verb **j dqj**; *to burn*, the latter from **πῦρ**, *fire* (comp. Aram. **אֲתַבָּ**, from **וּאֶ** Goth. *brinno*, from *brinnan*, to burn; Lat. *febris*, and our own *fever*, from *fervere*). In ^{<R36>}Leviticus 26:16, the A. V. renders **tj Dqj** by "burning ague," but the rendering *fever* seems better, as it is not necessarily the intermittent type of the disease which is thus designated. In all Eastern climates febrile diseases are common, and in Syria and Palestine they are among the commonest and severest inflictions under which the inhabitants suffer (Russell's *Aleppo*; bk. v, ch. iii). They are especially prevalent in the vicinity of Capernaum (Thomson, *Land and Book*, i, 547). The fever under which Peter's wife's mother suffered is called by Luke **πυρετός μέγας**, "a great fever," and this has been regarded as having reference to the ancient scientific distribution of fevers into the great and the less (Galen, *De diff febr.*; see Wetstein, in loc.), and as an instance of Luke's professional exactitude in describing disease. His use of **πυρετοί** in the plural in describing the disease under which the father of Publius labored (^{<R38>}Acts 28:8) has also been adduced as an instance of the same kind, inasmuch as that disease was, from its being conjoined with dysentery, not a continuous, but an intermittent fever. To this much importance cannot be attached, though it is probable that Luke, as a physician, would naturally use the technical language of his profession in speaking of disease. In ^{<R32>}Deuteronomy 28:22, besides **tj Dqj** two diseases of the same class are mentioned, **tqLDj** *dalle'keth*, a burning (A.V. "inflammation"), and **rj aj j** *charchur'*, intense parching (A. V. "extreme burning"). The Sept. renders the former of these by **ρίγος**, *shivering*, and the latter by **ἐριθισμός**, a word which is used by the Greek writers on medicine to designate "quodvis Naturae irritamentum, quo sollicitata natura ad obeundas motiones excitatur" (Foes, *Oecon. Hippoc.*). The former is

probably the ague, a disease of frequent occurrence in the East; and the latter probably dysentery, or some species of inflammatory fever. The Syriac version renders it by *burning*, which favors the latter suggestion. Rosenmuller inclines to the opinion that it is the *catarrhus suffocans*, but this is without probability. There is no ground for supposing it to be erysipelas. Fever constantly accompanies the bloody flux or dysentery (~~403B~~ Acts 28:8; compare De Mandelslo, *Travels*, ed. 1669, p. 65). Fevers of an inflammatory character are mentioned (Burckhardt, *Arab.* i, 446) as common at Mecca, and putrid ones at Jedda. Intermittent fever and dysentery, the latter often fatal, are ordinary Arabian diseases. For the former, though often fatal to strangers, the natives care little, but much dread a relapse. These fevers. sometimes occasion most troublesome swellings in the stomach and legs (ii, 290-291). *SEE DISEASE.*

Few, Ignatius A.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was born in Columbia County, Georgia, April, 1791. About the year 1804 he was sent North to be under the care of his uncle, then residing in New York, for the benefits of a Northern education. He was prepared for college by a Mr. Traphagen, at Bergen, N. J., and afterwards went to Princeton, but, instead of entering the regular college course, he preferred devoting himself to such accomplishments as music and French, drawing and fencing. After remaining at Princeton some time he went to the city of New York, and after prosecuting his studies there a short time he returned to Georgia. He commenced the study of law, but after his marriage, which took place in 1811, he gave up his legal pursuits, and settled down into the life of a planter, from which he was only aroused by an appointment as colonel of a regiment to repair to Savannah in 1815. At the end of the war he returned to his studies with such intensity as to lead to the neglect of his business and the loss of his property. In the year 1823 he removed to Augusta, and engaged in the practice of the law with flattering success, but in 1824 he was attacked with hemorrhage of the lungs, and from that time was unable to attend to the duties of his profession, and never afterwards fully regained his health. At this period of his life a great change in his character took place. Heretofore he had been inclined to one or other of the forms of scepticism, but Fletcher's *Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense* falling in his way, his scepticism was dissipated, and his heart opened to the influence of Christianity. In 1828 he was admitted on trial in the South Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. "Notwithstanding

he was always an invalid from the time he entered the ministry, he performed a great amount of labor, and filled some of the most important places in the gift of his denomination. He was the projector, and for a time the president, of Emory College, at Oxford, Ga., and rendered important service to the cause of education and sound morals. "The degree of LL.D. was conferred upon Mr. Few by the Wesleyan University in 1838. Dr. Few's last public act was the drawing up of the report on the division of the Methodist Church, which was, adopted by the Georgia Conference in 1845. The excitement produced by this effort was too much for his strength, and, though he partially rallied and lingered during the greater part of the year, his debilitated constitution sank at last, and he died in great peace at Athens, Ga., Nov. 21, 1845, and was buried in Oxford, the seat of Emory College. He left a widow, but no children. -Sprague, *Annals*, 7:739.

Fiacre, Saint

an Irish hermit, who died at Breuil (Brie), in France, about 670. He was originally called in France *Fefre* and, according to some writers, the name *Fiacre* was given to him about five or six hundred years after his death. Little is known about his life. According to some writers, he descended from an illustrious Irish family; according to others, he was the son of a king of Scotland. He came to France with some companions while still very young, cultivated a tract of land, and built cells for himself and his companions, and an asylum for foreigners. An Irish or Scotch nobleman, by the name of Chillen, induced him to preach in the neighboring provinces, and his sermons are said to have had great results. He was buried in his oratory at Breuil, and subsequently an oratory was erected on the spot. His relics became quite celebrated, as a number of miracles were ascribed to them; as, for instance, by queen Ann, wife of Louis XIII. In the former province of Artois, where he is the object of a particular veneration, he is commemorated on the 13th of November. He is also the patron of the gardeners, who commemorate him on the 30th of August. A class of four-wheeled French carriages, which became common in the 17th century, are said by some to have been named after him, as the inventor had on his sign the words *A Saint Fiacre*; but others explain the origin of the word differently. Some writers make mention of a letter written by Fiacre to his sister Syra, and containing some exhortations. Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biographie Generale*, 17:614.

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb

a German philosopher, was born May 19, 1762, at the village of Rammenau, near Bischofswerda, in Lusatia. The baron Miltetz, struck with the promise of the boy, assumed the charge of his education. At thirteen he was placed in the gymnasium of Schulpforte, and, while there he imbibed (from reading Lessing) a spirit of free inquiry which animated his whole intellectual life. At eighteen he entered the University of Jena as a student of theology, and while there he seems to have adopted the philosophy and theology of Spinoza. But the sense of "personality" soon lifted him out of that abyss. The death of baron Miltetz threw him on his own resources, and privation added strength to his character. For a while he was tutor in a family at Zurich, and in 1790 he went to Leipzig, where he suffered greatly from poverty. "I have nothing," he writes, "excepting courage left." Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (the Criticism of Pure Reason) wrought a revolution in his mode of thinking, and freed his mind entirely from the remains of Determinism. "I now heartily believe in the freedom of man, and am well convinced that it is only on this supposition that duty, virtue, and morality is so much as possible It is now evident to me that the doctrine of the necessity of all human actions is the source of a great part of the immorality of the so-called higher classes" (*Letter to Achelis*, 1790). In 1791 he went to Warsaw to fill a place as private tutor, but soon threw it up in disgust, and on his way home stopped at Konigsberg to visit Kant (June, 1791). Not finding at first a very cordial reception, he wrote, between July 13 and Aug. 18, his *Kritik aller Offenbarung* (Criticism of all possible Revelation), and laid it before Kant, as an introduction of "his mind" to that philosopher. Kant was, indeed, conciliated; but yet, when Fichte soon after asked for a small loan to help him forward, Kant refused. The book appeared in the spring of 1792, and attracted universal attention. It was everywhere ascribed to Kant, who was compelled to name Fichte as the author, in order to disclaim it completely for himself. The work seeks to determine the necessary conditions under which revelation must be given by God to man, and to lay down the criteria by which every professed revelation must be tested. In October, 1792, Fichte was married, and took up his abode with his father-in-law (Rahn) at Zurich, where he spent several months. Here he published a work on the French Revolution (1793, 2 vols.), in which he advocated the modern principle that no political constitution can be unchangeable; and that the best constitution is that which carries in itself the principle of progress, and provides a method

for its own change and improvement. He was charged with Jacobinism and democracy on account of this work. In 1794 he became professor of philosophy at Jena, as successor of Reinhold. His lectures awakened great enthusiasm among the students. Part of them were published under the title *Die Bestimmung des Gelehrten* (transl. by W. Smith, *The Vocation of the Scholar*, London, 1847, 12mo). In 1795 he published *Wissenschaftslehre* (Doctrine of Knowledge), and in 1798 his *Sittenlehre* (Doctrine of Ethics). The freedom and novelty of the doctrines taught in these lectures, together with the fact that he delivered many of them on Sunday (see below), brought upon him a charge of atheism, which he vigorously repelled in his *Appellation gegen die Anklage des Atheismus*. Nevertheless, he was compelled to resign his chair in 1799. He went to Berlin and delivered private lectures, which were very popular; and in 1800 he published his *Bestimmung des Menschen* (transl. by Mrs. Sinnett under the title *The Destination of Man*, Lond. 1846, 12mo). In 1805 he held the chair of philosophy at Erlangen for a few months. Between 1805 and 1807 he published lectures, *Ueber das Wesen des Gelehrten* (transl. by W. Smith under the title *The Nature of the Scholar and its Manifestations*, Lond. 1854, 12mo); lectures delivered at Berlin on *Grundzüge des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters* (transl. by W. Smith, *The Characteristics of the present Age*, London, 1847, 12mo); and *Anweisung zum seligen Leben, oder die Religionslehre*, the most important of his later writings, as giving what he considered to be the ethical and religious results of his philosophy (translated by W. Smith, *The Way towards the blessed Life, or the Doctrine of Religion*, London, 1849, 12mo). Returning to Berlin in 1807, he published *Reden an die Deutsche Nation* (Addresses to the German People), which awakened great political enthusiasm. On the restoration of peace he was called by the king to aid in reorganizing the University of Berlin, and in 1810 he was made rector of the university, which then included among its faculty Schleiermacher, Neander, De Wette, Von Humboldt, and other brilliant names. During the subjection of Germany to Napoleon, much of Fichte's time and thoughts were given to politics; his patriotism was pure, fervent, and self-sacrificing. After the great battles of 1813, the hospitals were filled with wounded men, and his wife was an assiduous and devoted nurse. She was seized with typhoid fever early in 1814, and her husband imbibed the infection from her; she recovered, but he died, Jan. 27, 1814. His son, Immanuel Hermann (born in 1797), inherited his father's aptitudes to a certain extent, has edited his works, and has also vindicated him from the charge of atheism and irreligion. Besides

the works of J. G. Fichte already mentioned, we name *Grundlage des Natur-Rechts* (Jena, 1767-9, 2 parts):-*Die Thatsacheen des Bewusstseyns* (Stuttgart, 1817). The following were edited by his son after his death: *Nachgelassene Werke* (Bonn, 1834, 3 vols.) :-*Religions philosophische Schriften* (Berlin, 1847): - *Popularphilos. Schriften* (Berlin, 1807, 7 vols.): -*Briefwechsel mit Schelling* (Stuttgart, 1856) :-*J. G. Fichte's Sammtliche Werke* (Berlin, 1845 sq. 8 vols.).

We can give only a summary view of the attempt of Fichte to found a complete philosophy. Historically he stands between Kant and Hegel, and forms the point of transition from the, one to the other. "The end which Fichte proposes to himself in his *Wissenschaftslehre* is to give to science a true, that is to say, an absolute principle, reposing only upon itself, and leaving a basis to all the rest. Here the idealism of Kant is accepted in all its rigor. There is no longer any arbitrarily supposed objective element, even as a simple phenomenon. All is severely deduced from the subject, the sole term of knowledge admitted by idealism. Fichte's problem is just this: to bring out philosophy whole and entire from the *Ego*; and this bold reasoner proposes to give his deduction a more than mathematical exactitude. Algebra rests upon the law of identity, which is thus expressed: $A=A$. Fichte maintains that this law implies another, the only one which a philosopher is entitled to admit without proof, and also the only one which he requires: $Me=Me$. When you say $A=A$, you intend to affirm nothing upon the existence of A. You only affirm that if A is A, A can be nothing else than A. The proposition $A=A$ is therefore, says Fichte, absolute only in its *form*, and. not in its *matter* or contents. I know not if A exists practically and materially or not; but it matters not. I am formally certain that *given* A, A cannot differ from A, and that there is necessary relation between these two terms. It is by the analysis of this relation that Fichte undertakes to prove the existence of *Ego*. In the proposition $A=A$, he argues, the first A is not considered under the same point of view as the second. The first A, as we have seen, is laid down conditionally, the second absolutely. What reduces these two terms to unity, puts them in a certain relation, judges, affirms, and constitutes this relation? Evidently the *Ego*. Take away the *Ego*, and you take away the -relation, the two terms, the proposition $A=A$. Above it, then, there is a higher and more immediate truth. The principle of identity is only absolute *inform*; the principle $Me=Me$ is absolute both *inform* and matter; it alone is *truly absolute*. I need not follow Fichte in the course of his deduction, the most subtle and

artificial which can-be conceived. It is enough for me to know that he pushed to the utmost the range idea of deducing a vast system of philosophy from this one principle, the *Ego*. The *Ego* alone is the principle, explaining, laying down, creating itself. I know not whether I should wonder more at the excess of extravagance to which the human mind may be carried, or at the amazing richness of its resources. By Kant it was condemned to be ignorant of the universe and of God, locked up in the prison of the *Ego*. Let him alone. This one reserved point will give him back all the rest. From the furthest limits of skepticism he will even pass to the most absolute dogmatism. But a little while ago he doubted of everything. Now he vaunts, not merely that he knows: Nature, but that he *creates* her. Nay, he vaunts that he creates God. Such are the very expressions, at once absurd and logical, of Fichte. He draws nature and God from the *Eye*. The *Ego* implies the *Non-Ego*. It limits itself. It is only itself by opposing to itself another which is not itself. It poses itself only by opposing its contrary. It is itself the link of this opposition, the synthesis of this antinomy. In fact, if the *Ego* only exists for itself the faculty of self-limitation which it possesses implies that, in itself, it is infinite and illimitable. Beyond the divisible and *relative Ego*, opposed to the *Non-Ego*, there is, therefore, an *absolute Ego*, comprising nature and man. This absolute Ego is God. Here, then, is thought in possession of its three essential objects; here are man, nature, and God, in their necessary relation, members of one identical thought, with three terms, at once separated and reconciled; here is a philosophy' worthy of the name; a rigorous, demonstrated, homogeneous science, starting from one great principle to follow out and to exhaust all its consequences.

"Such, in its general principle, is the metaphysics of Fichte. His morality is a logical, though perhaps unforeseen consequence of this. It is founded upon the *Ego*, whose eminent characteristic is liberty. To preserve one's own liberty, one's *Ego* is duty-; to respect the *Ego*, the liberty of others, is another not less sacred duty- which becomes the foundation of right. Hence the noble stoicism of Fichte, and that passion for liberty, which were in such perfect harmony with the masculine strength of his character and the generous part which he played in the political affairs of Germany. But the importance of the system of Fichte does not lie here. I find his greatness and originality in the extraordinary metaphysics so justly and boldly called by himself subjective absolute idealism. It has this singular feature, that in pushing the scepticism of Kant to its extremest

consequences, it prepares the way for the dogmatism of Schelling and of Hegel. Not only does it prepare the way for, but even begins and contains this dogmatism. Fichte openly aspires to absolute science. He explains all things—man, nature, and God. He leads German philosophy, if I may venture to say so, from the subjective to the objective by the subjective itself. From absolute scepticism he flings it into an enormous dogmatism. Setting out from a teaching so timid that it scarcely ventures to affirm one actual being, it is the prelude of that ambitious philosophy which embraces in its enormous frameworks the history of man and that of nature, and pretends to an unmeasured, unreserved, and universal explanation of all things" (Saisset, *Modern Pantheism*, Edinb. 1863, ii, 2 sq.).

On the relations of Fichte's life and works to theology and to the Christian Church, we make the following extracts from Hagenbach, *German Rationalism* (transl. by Gage and Stuckenberg, N. Y. 1865): "It would certainly be doing Fichte injustice to interpret his system to mean that he wished to make himself, J. G. Fichte, God. We might say with more propriety that Fichte, like Spinoza, denied the existence of God only in order to conceive him more spiritually; stripping off all associations of created things from the idea of the Creator, lest he should be dragged down into the sphere of the finite. The human mind is too apt to think of God in an anthropomorphic manner. Fichte was a teacher of academic youth. At his feet sat many who were destined to proclaim to Christian congregations the God of the Gospel; a God who is only Creator if there are creatures of his creation, who has called a world into being, not as a visionary world but as an actual and real one; a world in which sin, misery, and affliction appear but too real, from which the mere *imagination* that they do not exist cannot save us, but which can only—be removed by a higher reality, a divine fact, by God's act of love, as it appears historically in the redemption through Christ. If now the ground were taken from under the feet of those destined to proclaim such a doctrine, if nothing religious remained for them but their miserable Ego, of which they were not even as fully and energetically conscious as Fichte of his, must not many just scruples have arisen in the minds of those, too, who were not accustomed to restrain the freedom of investigation hastily? Hence Fichte was charged with no less an error than atheism, and to this day the learned are not agreed whether this oft-abused term may be applied to Fichte's system as represented in his *Wissenschaftslehre*. To this must be added, as Fichte himself remarks, that his democracy was as much a thorn in the eyes of his

opponents as his atheism. The fact that he disregarded all established customs offended many. He chose Sunday for delivering moral lectures to the students. In this the Consistory of Weimar, of which at that time Herder was a member, thought they recognised the secret intention of gradually undermining public worship, although Fichte protested solemnly against this, and appealed to the example of Gellert, whose moral lectures had also been delivered on Sunday, and why not then the philosophical lecture-room? The dispute about reading lectures on Sunday was, however, only the prelude to a fiercer contest. Fichte published a work *On the Grounds our Faith in the Divine Government of the World*, in which the moral order of the world was denoted as God, and the assertion was made that we need and can conceive of no other God. 'The existence of *this* God cannot be doubted; it is the most certain of all things, and the ground of all other certainty; but the idea of God as a particular substance is impossible and contradictory-. It is proper to say this candidly to strike down the prating of the schools, so that the true religion of doing right cheerfully may be elevated. Many pious minds, of course, took offence at these expressions. Although Fichte might be satisfied with this moral order of the world, *the Christian's faith in, God*, a faith, too, in 'doing right cheerfully,' but at the same time in a real God, could by no means be content with this philosophical theory. This faith would not, however, have been destroyed by this theory, even if no interdiction had been issued against it. Such an interdiction appeared. The book in which Fichte advocated the theory of the divine order of the world was attacked in the electorate of Saxony, and from this place the attention of the court at Weimar was called to the dangers of Fichte's doctrine, 'as one not only openly hostile to the Christian, but even to natural religion.'... It is remarkable in the case of Fichte that, after he had removed himself farthest from the common Christian feeling, he was led nearer and nearer it again.... After Fichte had called attention to the deep importance of faith, in the book *Die Bestimmung des Menschen*; after he had pointed out the importance of Christianity as the only true religion in the history, and the great importance of the Christian state, in the *Grundzuge des gegenwartigen Zeitalters*, he attempted, especially in his *Anweisungen zum seligen Leben, oder Religionslehre*, to prove the agreement of his: philosophy of that time with the principles of Christianity, which he regarded in a light entirely different from Kant. Kant and the Rationalists placed the essence of Christianity chiefly in morality and the fulfilment of the moral law, and, in accordance with this, esteemed and used with a

special predilection those passages in Scripture in which the various moral precepts are drawn in distinct outlines, as, for instance, the Sermon on the Mount, and several parables of Jesus in the first three gospels (while they had no taste for John, who appeared to them a mystic); Fichte, on the other hand, threw himself on the fourth gospel, and regarded it as the only true source of the genuine doctrine of Christ; he, of course, did this in a one-sided manner, and with a denial of the other truths of Scripture, which belong fully as much to the totality of Christian doctrine and history as the gospel of John. The person of Jesus had with him a signification entirely different from that of the Rationalists. He does not behold in him the teacher of morality, nor simply the moral example. No; exactly that oneness with God, as Christ expresses it in the gospel of John, exactly that real unity *with the Father* which the Rationalists desired to remove as a metaphysical formula of no use to morality was to him the heart and the star-- of the Gospel. On this account he held himself so closely to John and his doctrine of the Logos having become flesh, in which he beheld the fulness of all religious knowledge. We should, however, make a great mistake if from this we concluded that Fichte agreed with the old orthodox doctrine in reference to Christ. What this doctrine regarded as a historical fact, which had occurred once, that Fichte regarded as a fact eternally repeating itself, as occurring in every religious man. Christ was not the *Saviour* to him in the old sense; he was only the representative of that which is continually occurring still. The eternal Word becomes flesh at all times, in every one, without exception, who understands, in a living manner, his oneness with God, and who really yields his entire individual life to the divine life in living quite in the same manner as in Christ Jesus. In the house of the distinguished philosopher, each day, without exception, was closed with proper and solemn evening devotions, in which the domestics were also accustomed to take a part. After several verses had been sung from a choral-book, accompanied with the clavichord, the father of the family would make some remarks on some passage of the New Testament, most frequently on his favorite gospel of John. In these discourses he was less concerned about moral applications and rules of life than about freeing the mind from the distraction and vanity of the common affairs of life, and elevating the spirit to the eternal." Dorner regards Fichte as closing what he calls the period of "reflection" in philosophy by his theory of absolute subjective idealism; and holds the later form of Fichte's teaching to be Spinozistic, as denying the idea of a self-conscious God

distinct from the world (*Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl., div. ii, co-l. iii, 93 sq.).

Literature.-Besides the works already mentioned, see J. H. Fichte, *J. G. Fichte's Leben* (Sulzbach, 1830); T. H. Fichte, *Karakteristik d. neuesten Philosophie* (Sulzbach, 1841); Erdmann, *Entwicklung d. deutschen Speculation seit Kant* (vol. i); W. Smith, *Memoir of J. G. Fichte* (Lond. 1848, 2d ed. 12mo); *Christian Examiner*, May, 1841, p. 192 sq.; *Foreign Quart. Rev.* Oct. 1845; *Living Age*, c-i, 162; 30:193; Tennemann, *Manual Hist. Phil.* (ed. Bohn), § 4C0-415; Morell, *Mod. Philosophy*, ch. v, § 2; Lewes, *History of Philosophy* (Lond. 1867, 3d ed.). ii, 490. sq.; Krug, *Allg. Handwörterbuch d. philos. Wissenschaften*, ii, 31 sq.; Saintes, *History of Rationalism*, bk. ii, ch. xiii; Schwegler, *Hist. of Philosophy*, transl. by Seelye, § 41; Lasson, *J. G. Fichte im Verhältniss zu Kirche und Staat* (Berl. 1863) Kahnis *German Protestantism*, bk. i, ch. iv; M'Cosh, *Intuitions* (see Index); Mills, in *Christian Examiner*, July, 1866. Fichte's *Wissenschaftslehre* has recently been admirably translated by A. E. Kroeger, under the title *The Science of Knowledge* (Philadelphia, 1868, 12mo).

Ficinus, Marsilius

(*Marsiglio Ficino*)-the principal restorer of the Platonic philosophy and the most enthusiastic of its modern advocates-was born at Florence Oct. 19, 1433, and died at his villa of Careggi, in the neighborhood, Oct. 1, 1499. He was the son of the chief physician of Cosmo di Medici, and was designed for the same profession; but his youthful intelligence attracted the great Florentine, and induced his selection as the prospective head of the projected Medicean Academy. During the sessions of the Council of Florence, the conversations of Gemistus Pletho had inspired Cosmo with profound admiration for the Platonic doctrine, and with a desire to disseminate it in Tuscany. The excessive refinements and logomachies of the later schoolmen had discredited the system of Aristotle; the disturbance and alarms preceding the capture of Constantinople had driven many a educated Greeks into Italy, and introduced the works and the followers of Plato and the Neo-Platonists; and the acrimonious controversy of Pletho and Gennadius attracted attention to the sublime reveries and eloquent expositions of the Platonic school.

Marsilius Ficinus devoted himself with ardor-to the acquisition and illustration of the Platonic doctrines, and was abundantly supplied by the

Medici with MSS., and with the other requirements for the successful prosecution of his task. At the age of 23 he presented to his patron a synopsis of the tenets of the academy, but was recommended to suppress it, as his knowledge was obtained at second-hand, and he had not yet attained an adequate acquaintance with the Greek language. Ficinus continued his studies, and devoted his whole life to the translation and interpretation of the academic texts, inclining strongly to the views of the later Platonists. He rendered into Latin the whole works of Plato and of Plotinus, and parts of the writings of Proclus, Porphyry, Iamblichus, etc. The translation of Plotinus was undertaken at the suggestion of Pico di Mirandola, and was published in 1492. His whole heart seems to have been thrown into this labor of love. In part he transforms himself into Plotinus; in a greater degree he constrains Plotinus to give utterance to his own preconceptions. To each chapter of the work is prefixed a copious summary, which presents rather Ficino's scheme of transcendentalism than an accurate abbreviation of the text. It however affords something like an intelligible and coherent exposition, in place of the dark, oracular, and loosely connected pantheism of his author, which baffled even the penetration of Longinus. The intricacy, the opacity, and the mysticism of the doctrine expounded, and the ruggedness of its original exposition, are not relieved by any literary graces on the part of the summarist and translator. His style is inconceivably harsh, angular, and obscure; yet it is impossible to withhold admiration from the vigor, and skill, and grasp with which he compels the reluctant Latin to lend itself to the demands of the subject—to twist, and wind, and adapt itself to the sinuosities of the most plastic of all languages, applied to the most perplexed and attenuated of all speculations—and to interpret a style and a system totally foreign to the air of Latium. Lucretius apologized in the Golden Age for the stubbornness of his native tongue in the treatment of the simple and perspicuous doctrines of Epicurus; and a much more wonderful power is exhibited by Ficinus in constraining the dead and stiffened tongue of Rome to conform itself to all the convolutions of Greek thought and fantasy in their most bewildering license. Nor is it just to leave unnoticed the frequency with which Ficinus catches and reflects the splendors of his original, and reproduces the magnificences of their expression.

Attempts had often been made, and were renewed in the 15th century, to conciliate the teachings of Plato and Aristotle, and the evident aim of Ficinus was to impose upon Plato and the Neo-Platonists a significance

which might identify, or at least harmonize, their doctrines with the Christian creed. It was a preposterous revival of a design fruitlessly attempted at Alexandria in the age of Origen and his successors. Pantheism is wholly antipathetic to Christianity, whether presented as Neo-Platonism, as Spinozism, or as German transcendentalism. But it was a natural effort in that era of confusion and hopeful anticipation which witnessed the Renaissance. Moreover, the doctrines of Plotinus himself are manifestly moulded and modified by the contemporaneous influences of Christianity; and it is a curious taste to detect the Christian impress which marks so much of his abstruse metaphysics, especially in the closing books of the last *Aeneids*. It is scarcely possible to read the concluding *capitulum*, or summary, without feeling that the hallucination of Ficinus was an honest as well as an earnest delusion; and that, if he misrepresented both Plato and the Alexandrian school by Christianizing their doctrine. he did not suffer himself to be seduced from a recognition of the personality of the Supreme Being, or into any position consciously at variance with the Christian creed.

Ficinus was liberally maintained throughout his life by his generous patrons of the house of the Medici, retaining their favor for three generations--
μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσειν. He was equally countenanced by Cosmo, Pietro, and Lorenzo. He took holy orders in the forty-third year of his age, having, according to some accounts, had his thoughts earnestly directed to religion by the preaching of the celebrated Savonarola.

He was placed in charge of two churches in Florence by Lorenzo di Medici, and promoted to a canonry in the cathedral by the future pope Leo X. Lorenzo made him a present of the villa of Careggi, where he died, seven years after the death of the donor, and five years after the expulsion of his patrons from Florence. His constitution was always very feeble, his health uncertain, and his temperament melancholy. His frail body--for he scarcely attained half the ordinary stature of man--required constant care and nursing, and it is surprising that he was not worn out by continual study long before reaching his climacteric. His character was singularly pure and amiable; his attachments were strong and enduring; his tastes, simple, and his desires moderate. He refused to profit by his powerful connections to enrich either himself or his family. He partook largely of the popular superstitions of the time, which were accordant with the later Platonism which he professed; and is said to have reappeared after death to

his friend Michele Mercati, according to promise, to assure him of the immortality of the soul.

The Medicean Academy was extinguished by the invasion of Charles VIII; but Ficinus had disseminated his influence and renown through the chair of philosophy in the University of Florence, to which he had been appointed by the Cardinal di Medici, afterwards Leo X. Here he acquired many distinguished pupils and friends, among them Giovanni Pico di Mirandola, Cavalcanto, Politian, etc. Enthusiasts came from the depths of Germany to profit by his instructions. Reuchlin regarded him with reverence, and among other illustrious admirers he numbered Matthias Corvinus, the accomplished king of Hungary, and pope Sixtus IV.

The numerous productions of Ficinus are enumerated by Moreri, and a more correct list is given in the *Biographie Universelle*. A life of him was written by Domenico Mellini, but it was never published, and it disappeared. Another life, composed by Giovanni Corsi .in 1506, was published by Bandini (Pisa, 1771). .The best account of the philosophy of Ficinus is given by .Buhle, *Geschichte der Philosophie*; but the following authorities may be consulted: Schelhorn, *Amaenitatis Lit.* tom. i; Niceron, *Mem. des Hommes Illustres*, Negri, *Ist. Scritt. Florentini*; J. A. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Med. et Inf. Latin.* lib. vi, p. 496-7; Morhofius, *Polyhistor.* II, i, vii; § 15; Tiraboschi, *Storia della Lett. Ital.* tom. 6:lib. ii, c. ii, § xix-xxi; Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Phil.* per. iii, pt. i, lib. i, c. ii, § iii; Roscoe, *Life of Lorenzo di Medici*; Hallam, *Hist. Lit.* i, ch. iii, § 85-7, 115. (G. F.H.)

Fiddes, Richard

a clergyman of the Church of England, and author of several works marked by industry and research rather than talent, was born at Hunmanby, Yorkshire, in 1671. He took his bachelor's degree at University College, Oxford, in 1693. He was made rector of Halsham in 1694, but, losing his health, he devoted himself to authorship. Among his works are, *A Body of Divinity* (Lond. 1718-20, 2 vols. fol.) :-*Fifty-two practical Discourses* (London, 1714, 3 vols. 8vo):--*Life of Cardinal Wolsey* (London, 1724, fol.) :-*General Treatise on Morality* (Lond. 1724, 8vo). He died at Putney in 1725. Knight, in his *Life of Erasmus* (Introd. p. 15 sq.), accuses Fiddes of being at heart a Romanist. Knight accounts for Fiddes's speaking irreverently of Erasmus "probably because he had by his writings favored the Reformation. Dr. Fiddes censures the Reformation; and, to give it the more home strokes goes to the very root of it, and does all he can to evince

the unjustifiable grounds it proceeded upon, ridicules the instruments of it, and would insinuate that there was a change made for the worse, and therefore palliates some of the most absurd doctrines of the Church of Rome, which were happily thrown off at the Reformation." He afterwards goes further, asserting, among other particulars, that Fiddes had "most partially, and indeed scandalously, reflected upon the opening of the Reformation, laying on the grossest colors to hide the deformities of Popery." He then proceeds "to give the true rise and occasion of writing his life of Wolsey," which he declares to have been at the solicitation of the late bishop Atterbury, on occasion of the dispute in which he was then engaged with archbishop Wake. — *New General Biog. Dict.* v, 323.

Fidejussores

sureties, a title borrowed from the Roman law, and employed by Augustine to represent the office of sponsor. Baptism at an early period was considered in the light of a contract; and as many of the leaders in the early Church had, before their conversion, been engaged in the interpretation or administration of law, it was natural for them to use a term which they had been accustomed to employ in civil transactions. *SEE SPONSORS.*

Fideles

SEE FAITHFUL

Fidelis. ST.

properly MARCUS ROY, was born at Sigmaringen in 1577. He studied law, and in 1604-10 visited the principal cities of Europe, but on his return he quitted his profession, and entered the order of the Capuchins under the name of Fidelis. After studying theology in the convents of Constance and Frauenfeld, he was ordained, and in 1621 obtained charge of Feldkirch, in Vorarlberg, Tyrol. Here he labored with great success, trying to reestablish the sway. of the Roman Church among the Grisons. When Austria afterwards attempted to put down Protestantism by force of arms, Fidelis was sent by the pope as a member of the Propaganda, and the ruffian general Baldiron, with his dragoons, travelled from town to town exterminating those who refused to obey. But the peasants rose, defeated Baldiron, and only spared his life upon his taking the oath not to bear arms against them any more. The promise was soon broken; but the peasants rose again, and during the insurrection, Fidelis, having fallen into the hands

of a party of peasants, was put to death, April 24, 1622. He was canonized by Clement XIII.-Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:403.

Fidelium Missa

Mass of the Faithful. Under the *Arcani Disciplina* (q.v.) the catechumens were not permitted to partake of the Lord's Supper with the faithful (q.v.): they were allowed to join with them, in worship only until the offertory. Then the deacon gave a signal to the catechumens to leave the church, saying *Ite, missa est*, "Depart, the assembly is dismissed." Hence arose the twofold *missa*, namely, the *missa catechumenorum* and the *missa fidelium*; the former meaning that portion of the public worship which was performed before the dismissal of the catechumens, and the latter that portion which was continued until the communicants went away.-Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 13:ch. i, § 3; bk. 15:ch. i, § 1; Farrar, *Dictionary*, s.v. **SEE MASS.**

Fief, Feod, Feud; Feudalism; Feudal System

These terms relate to the peculiar organization of society in Western Europe during the Middle Ages, and specifically to institutions affecting real estate more profoundly than it has ever been affected by any others - institutions whose influence is still manifest in the language, doctrines, and procedure of law throughout Christendom.

A fief, feod, feud, or fee is-an estate-and, primarily, an estate in land-held of a superior on condition of the faithful discharge of prescribed services, chiefly military. Feudalism denotes the essential character of the organization founded on the basis of such estates, and is frequently employed in a concrete sense -to signify the organization itself and its accompaniments. The Feudal System is the name given to this organization, or to that body of institutions, political and social, established upon the military tenure of land which characterized the rising kingdoms of modern Europe. In the period of its incipient growth, in its maturity, and in its decline, the feudal system, like all other political arrangements, assumed diverse aspects, and assimilated to itself other coincident tendencies, but its identity may be discerned through all its manifold transformations. Its existence has been distributed by Sir Thomas Craig into four periods: I. From the barbarian invasions of the Roman empire to the 'reunion of the Frank' monarchy under Dagobert I in 628; II. To the restoration of the Western empire in-the person of Charlemagne in 800; III. To the accession

of the Capetian dynasty in France, and of the Franconian line in Germany; IV. From the commencement of the 11th century to the gradual extinction of the polity at different times and in different degrees, in different countries. This division has not been universally accepted, and is open to many objections, but it may be of service. The culminating era of feudalism may be assigned to the times of the first crusade, and to the early ages of chivalry which constituted its bloom and expedited its decay.

An examination of the principles and phenomena of the feudal system will furnish all necessary information in regard to the other terms included in this title so far as these illustrate the religious, moral, and social aspect of Europe during the period over which feudalism extends.

Under the feudal system the whole order of society rested directly on the tenure of land by military service. Territorial possessions were granted by the suzerain, or supreme lord, in consideration of prompt and gratuitous service in war, and participation in his deliberative and judicial courts. Lands were held of the principal lords, or tenants *in capite*, by the lesser barons, by similar obligations. By the like service, lands were held by vavassors, knights, and squires. Even the lowest tenure of all, the peculiarly English tenure of socage, frank and villein, was of an analogous character, and secured the cultivation of the lord's domain, and the maintenance of himself, his family, and his retainers, in war and in peace. The system was strictly military in its nature—a uniform organization from the crown to the lowest landholder, establishing a regularly appointed army in scattered strongholds through every part of the country, to insure the support of the whole body politic in arms for the repression of domestic insurrection: and the repulsion of foreign at, tack.

Though such was the feudal system in its definite constitution, it did not, of course, begin in this closely articulated and rigorous form. It assumes much of this aspect even in the Lombard occupancy of Northern Italy in the 6th century; and its general outline may be imperfectly distinguished in the Ostrogothic kingdom of Theodoric (Sartorius, *Peuples d' Italie sous les Goths*, v, 61). But it had a simpler commencement, and both expanded and modified itself with the changing necessities of, successive generations. It is in its rudimentary types, however, that its essential principles, and its singular adaptation to urgent contemporary needs, can be best detected. Inattention to its humbler beginnings has occasioned numerous

controversies with regard to its origin, and rendered the information, accessible on the subject often perplexed, contradictory, and uninformative.

The vital germ of feudalism is contained in the act of *homage-homagium, hominium, hominagium, hominaticum, hominiscum*, etc.-the solemn formula by which a dependent professed himself *the man and faithful* adherent of a superior, originally of his own selection, and always theoretically so ("*Integram et perfectam in se continet fidelitatem*," *Libri Feudorum* ii, vii). The liegeman knelt down, placed his hands between the hands of his intended chief, and took upon himself the obligation of absolute *fidelity* in certain prescribed relations, so long as his superior performed the corresponding duties: of protection and support. The contract was sealed with a kiss, and confirmed with the sanctions of religion (Galbert, *Vie de Charles-le-Bon, de Flandres*, ch. eii; Guizot, *Mem. pour servir*, etc., 7:339-40). The profession of *fidelity* was ultimately expressed by the following declaration in the presence of the baronial court: "*Devenio homo vester de tenemento quod de vobis teneo, et fidem vobis portabo contra omnes gentes, salva fide debita Domino Regi et haeredibus suis*" (Bracton, ii, xxxv 8; *Libb. Feud.* - ii, x). With this declaration should certainly be compared the statement of Procopius in regard to the ancient usage under the Roman empire (*De Bello Vandal.* ii, 18:vol. i, p. 491).

Homage, then, was the pledge of true and loyal service to a superior-*liege* faith and *liege* obedience -given in consideration of defence and maintenance promised by the baron (*man, par excellence baronem ingenuum*," a free man, *Lex Salic.* xxxi; see Du Cange, *Gloss. Med. et Inf. Latin.* tit. *Baro*, who omits in his classical authorities for the word, Petron. *Satyr.* liii). One man voluntarily became the man of another, and that other became the chief, leader, adviser, patron, and protector of his homager. The vassal originally had, and long retained, the right of formally renouncing the reciprocal obligations contracted by the process of *diffidatio*, or defiance. By carrying this relation of perfect trust and faithful dependence through all gradations of society till it reached the head of the tribe or nation, the whole feudal hierarchy was: constructed, and all the members of the associated body were linked together in strict military union and subordination.

The principal object of this close correlation of the constituents of society was to maintain the population in a constant state of preparation for war,

"with its captains over tens, and its captains over fifties, and its .captains over hundreds, and its captains over thousands." For this purpose the lord granted to his liegeman a definite quantity of land, to be held on condition of rendering a definite amount of service in the wars and other affairs of his chief. In this way, every man within the feudal circle was professed the *faithful* follower of some lord--except the chief lord of all--the suzerain; and every piece of land was held *in fee* of some feudal superior. Hence arose the doctrine that the eminent domain of the whole realm belonged to the king, and that all honor, authority, and ownership of the soil descended from him. Hence, too, the maxim of the English law, *nulla terra sine domino*--no estate in land without its lord. But these deductions were not drawn by the companions of Ataulph the Visigoth, of Clovis the Frank, or of Alboin the Lombard.

The principle of homage and thee principle of the military tenure of hand are not necessarily though they are usually connected. They have existed separately, but they coalesced in the Middle Ages, and engendered by their conjunction what is so familiar under the name of the Feudal System.

When society was disintegrated by internal discord, misery, and both civil and foreign war; when it was constantly assailed by new hordes of barbarians; when life, and property', the fruits of industry and tranquillity, were continually imperilled by the hazards of the times, the weakness of the government, and the exactions of imperial officials; when there was no longer any *faith* between man and man, any honesty of dealing, any security or protection against violent or insidious attacks (all which phenomena characterized the declining age of the Western empire and the ensuing centuries; Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 7:xv; Salvian. *De Gubernat. Dei*, 4:v-vi, *et passim*), the social ties' which bind men together snapped like flax in the fire, and the' social organism rotted into incoherent atoms, which were totally deprived of old mutual attractions, and of capacity for continued combination in the ancient forms. In order that men might live together--and together they must live in order to live at all in such times--it was necessary to provide mutual support against aggression, and to establish entire fidelity at least between individual men, so that conjoint resistance might be obtained by reliance on reciprocal support. These wants were satisfied by the feudal relation, which, commencing with the elements of society' reunited them, separately man to man, under pledges of mutual trust, fidelity, and dependence. It provided also for the defence of the soil and the fruits of the soil, nearly the sole productions of such disordered

times, by resisting any attack upon the community or its members (Salvian. *Ibid.* v, viii). Feudalism thus supplied the means of reconstructing society from its very foundations, and of restoring coherence and some degree of security to distracted and dissociated populations. Of course, the scheme was cradled in weakness and imperfection, and grew, through many changes-of feature and fluctuations of fortune, into perfect symmetry of form. Of course, long and anxious generations were required to permit the confluence, and full development of arrangements at first local and, obscure. And of course, too, the scheme expanded and became more systematic among an intrusive band of foreign warriors, settled in the midst of a larger and more intelligent population, and menaced from without by new intruders, and it developed itself still further and more predominantly as new -necessities, new temptations, and new opportunities arose.

This organization of society with the corresponding tenure of land, is so essential to the maintenance of any degree of social order or public safety in certain conditions of society, that it has presented itself, in some form or other, in analogous circumstances, in widely separated ages and countries. So frequent and so striking is this recurrence, that it suggested to Sir Walter Scott in 1789 an essay, in which he undertook to prove that the feudal system "proceeds upon principles common to all nations when-placed-in a certain situation." Sir Walter s-as delighted is his old age by finding this view illustrated and enforced in colonel Tod's *History of Rajahstan* (Lockhart, *Life of Scott*, ch. vi). It contains a considerable amount of truth, but is far from expressing the whole truth.

There are distinct indications of something very like feudalism in ancient Egypt. Approximations to it are found in the early history of China, India, and Persia. Analogies of the same sort may be discovered among the Jews in their early occupation of the Holy Land They' may be suspected in the Spartan constitution; they are very evident in the institutions of Macedon. The principles of feudalism are involved in Plato's ideal state (*De Legg.*). Time relation of patron and client at Rome was essentially feudal. A semi-feudal organization was adopted by the Saracens in Spain, -and exhibited by the Timariots, or mounted militia, among the Ottoman Turks. It may still be detected among the warlike tribes of Afghanistan, and among the Mongolian tributaries of the Chinese empire. Humboldt recognised it among the Guanches of Teneriffe, and among some of the South-Sea Islanders (*Personal Narrative*, ch. ii). Other instances might be noted. All show how some arrangement of the kind is inspired or necessitated by

appropriate social requirements; they explain the facility with which feudalism was adopted, and its vitality when adopted; but they do not interpret its special forms in mediaeval Europe, nor supply any testimony to the historical origin of the feudal system.

In regard to this origin a wide divergence of opinion has existed. Montesquieu, Guizot, and the generality of recent writers refer feudalism to the voluntary followers and companions-*comites*-of the Germanic chieftains, who invaded the Roman empire in the 5th and succeeding centuries; but it was never found among those Northern races in their original abodes. Some juridical antiquaries of the 16th century traced it to the *patronatus* and *clientelae* of ancient Rome; but these resembled much more nearly the clans of the Scotch Highlands and the septs of Ireland. The better opinion appears to be that the principles and general framework of the system were of later Roman origin, whatever modifications and developments they may have received in the Teutonic kingdoms. This is the view espoused by Franciscus Balduinus (*ad Leges Romuli, apud Heineccii Jurispr. Rom. et Att.* i, 50), the profound but inconstant jurist of the 16th century. It was entertained by his rival, the greater jurist Cujacius, and favored by Camden in his *Britannia* and by Du Cange in his wondrous *Latin Glossary*. It has been reaffirmed, with suitable rectifications, by Sir Francis Palgrave, Lehuierou, Ozanam, and a few recent students of mediaeval archaeology. This view does not conflict with the distinct acknowledgment of Teutonic influences in animating, sustaining, and moulding the feudal elements.

It is impossible to introduce here either the arguments or the evidences by which this conclusion may be confirmed; but it is scarcely necessary to do more than examine the titles *Beneficiarius, Emphyteusis, Milites Limitanei, Leati, Culoni, Adscriptitii, Inquilini*, in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, and the same titles, with the addition of *Commendatio, Feudum* and its-derivatives, in Du Cange, in order to be assured of its substantial correctness. It may be expedient to corroborate this position by citing the earliest distinct notice in a Latin author of such an organization: "*Sola quae, de hostibus capta sunt, limitaneis ducibus et militibus donavit, ita ut eorum ita essent, si heredes illorum militarent, nec unquam ad privatos pertinerent; dicens, attentius eos militarent, si etiam sua rura defenderunt*" (Lamprid. *Alex. Severus*, c. lviii; *Cod. Theod.* vii,- Xv, ii; *Novell. Theod.* xxxiv; *Cod. Just.* xi:lx [lix], 3; Bocking, *Notit. Dign.* i, 292; ii, 1068*). -To this may be added a significant exposition of the manner in which like

arrangements sprung up in the interior of the Roman empire... "Tradunt se ad tuendum protogendumque majoribus, dedititios se divitum faciunt, et quasi in jus eorum ditionemque transcendunt: *nec tamen grave hoc aut indignum abitrarer, immo potius gratularer hanc potentum magnitudinem quibus se pauperes dedunt; sipatrocinia ista nshan venderens si quod se humiles dicunt defensare, humanitati tribuerent, non cupiditati*" (Salvianus, *De Gubernat. Dei*, .v. viii). The class technically designated *dedititi* ultimately. merged into serfdom, it is true, but only by Justinian's edict of 530 (*Cod.* 7:v); and the term is plainly. metaphorical in Salvian.

Wherever the Teutonic hordes passed the frontiers of the Roman empire, they found the presence or the memory of the *Milites Limitanei*, whose constitution, traceable beyond the reign of Augustus, accorded with all the essential characteristics of undeveloped feudalism. These military borderers were, indeed, of kindred blood and race, and when they were supplanted or overlaid by new tribes, the institutions were retained, which had been designed as a protection against incursion. This was only the observance of the habitual policy of thee barbarians in regard to the Roman civilization.

As has been already observed, the feudal scheme, like all other imperial forms, was contracted or extended, weakened or strengthened, according to the changes of fortune and social condition which checkered the agitated and anxious periods attending the overthrow of the Western empire. At times it was as much disguised and obscured, as largely recompounded with Teutonic associations, as was the, ever-subsisting Roman jurisprudence during, the same ages. But it survived in spirit and in outline, ready always to multiply its ramifications, and to attain such proportions as contemporaneous necessities might induce. It is thus that its existence and operation so frequently elude regard during the earlier centuries of its growth, and that its origin is so often referred to the late era when it became predominant and universal as the sole corrective of returning anarchy under the feeble successors of Charlemagne.

It is impracticable, within the space at command, to recount and explain the successive transformations of feudalism which culminated in the perfect type of the feudal system in the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries. Its development accompanied and was due to the progressive dissolution and increasing inaptitude of the complex administrative organization of imperial Rome. A distinction of ages and a contradistinction of institutions have been suspected in the succession of the terms *munera*, *beneficia*, and

feuda; and feudalism has been restricted to the period when the last of these designations prevailed. *Munera* is supposed to represent estates at will; *beneficia*, estates for life; and *feuda*, estates of inheritance. It has been assumed that feudalism could not properly be said to exist until benefices became hereditary. But the essence of feudalism does not reside in the duration of the estate but in the nature, and especially in the obligation of the tenure. Moreover, the contrasted terms may be in some measure concurrent with, but they do not denote, such diversities of duration. *Munera* is a generic term applied to all honors, dignities, offices, and donations. There was no such clear line of demarcation, in meaning or in time, as Montesquieu and others imagine, between estates for life and estates heritable. Such precision was entirely foreign to the habits and the dispositions of those troubled but practical ages. Life estates were conceded in Germany as late as 1378. The commencement of hereditary feuds is often referred to Hugh Capet, in 947. Montesquieu assigns it to the reign of Charles the Bald, in 877. But such tenures are found under Louis le Debonnaire in 814; and in the form of *beneficia* they were customary under the Roman empire. Estates in perpetuity are mentioned under the name of *beneficia* as early as 759 (Ratpert, *Casus S. Galli*, § 2, *apud* Pertz, *Mon. Germ. Hist.* ii, 63; comp. S. Anskarii *Vita S. Willehadi*, § 8; *Ibid.* p. 382). But, in order to ascribe a purely Germanic origin to feuds, *beneficia* and *feuda* have been represented as diverse institutions. They are used as convertible terms throughout the *Book of Feuds*. "*Feudum idem cum beneficia*," says Du Cange (s.v., p. 258, cal.). King Alfonso the Wise, of Castile, declares in *Las Siete Partidas*: "*Feudo es beneficio que da el senior a algun home, porque se torna su vasallo, et le fece homenaje de serle leal. E tomo este nombre de fe que debe siempre guardar el vasallo al senior.*" The term *feudum* is a barbarous, and probably hybrid compound, whose first employment Hallam assigns to a constitution of Robert I of France in 1008, though: it is found in a constitution; of somewhat doubtful authenticity, of Charles the Fat, in 884. Were there no fiefs antecedent to the introduction of this name? If there were, then *beneficia* are fiefs. If there were not, then fiefs are the same things as *beneficia*. The confusion has proceeded from the fantastic derivation of *Feod*, from the supposed Teutonic word *Fe*, represented by the Anglo-Saxon *Fea*, *Feoh*, fee, and the Scandinavian *od*, *odh*, property. Unfortunately, feudalism was a late and very partial innovation among both Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians, while the term *Feudum* springs up along the Rhine; and the Anglo-Saxon *Feoh* is congenerous to the Latin *pecus-pecorris* if not borrowed from it.

The *fe* in *Fe-od*, the Spanish and Provençal *fe*, the modern French *foi*, the Scotch *feu*, are apparently nothing but contractions of the Latin *fide* or Italian *fede*. "Feudum, *credo*, a fide, *quia vox ex Italia in Gersaniasm venit. Et ante saeculum xii feuda in Germania et apud omnes Francos beneficia appellabantur*" (Leibnitz, *Collect. Etymolog. Opp.* ed. Dutens, tom. 6:Pt. ii, pa 58, 59). "*Nulla autem investitura debet ei fieri, qui fidelitatem facere recusat, qeum a fidelitate feudum dicatur vel a fide*" (*Libb. Feud.* ii, iii, 3; compare vii). This derivation of the term *Feod* is, singularly corroborated by the use of the word "truage" in Sir Thomas Malory's *Morte d'Artur*: "And thus Sir Marhans every day sent unto king Marke for to pay the *truage* which was behind of seven years, or else to find a knight to fight with him for the *truage*" (pt. ii, ch. 4:*Romance of Sir Tristrem*).

It is indubitable that feudal tenures long existed in the midst of Roman *fundi* and *possiones*, and of Germanic allodial estates; it is also unquestionable that these were gradually absorbed or transmuted into feudal tenements, for the conversion of allodial into feudal holdings is illustrated by ample documentary evidence; and it is also certain that this feudalization of the land was not completed till the times when the word-*feuda* comes into use. But this will not justify the juridical distinctions which have been proposed, nor sanction the alleged derivation of *Feod*, nor sustain the Germanic origination of the tenure. The designation of *Feod* may well have been devised as a counterpart to *allodh*; but the generally received etymology of *allodh* is very unreliable, and strong arguments may be adduced for referring it to the same source as the common English word *lot*. This question, however, cannot be examined here. (Compare Kemble, *The Saxons in England*, bk. i, ch 4:vol. i, p. 90, 91, with Procopius, *De Bell. Vandal.* i, v, in regard to the [κλήροι Βανδύλων](#).)

In the 10th and 11th centuries the feudal system acquired its widest extension, assumed its full, symmetrical form, and engrossed nearly all the functions of government, judicature, police, war, and industrial organization. It constrained and overshadowed the attenuated framework of the Roman administrative constitution (which, however, coexisted with it), and adapted itself to it by making the king the feudal suzerain of the nation the emperor, the supreme temporal head of Christendom. Everything accepted a feudal complexion and a feudal structure "nothing but did suffer a sea-change." The process of government, the public revenue, the offices of state, the modes of jurisdiction, the command in

war, the ecclesiastical constitution, the municipal arrangements, the guilds and corporations of arts and trades, the occupations of rural, mining, and other industry, were all feudalized. Everything rested on homage, fealty, and the military tenure of land, or was assimilated to the forms springing from that basis. As in the Russian empire, all office or authority is invested with a military character and designation, so everything under the feudal system adopted a feudal type. To this cause we must attribute the ecclesiastical baronies which arose during the period, and also the priestly warriors, the fighting abbots, and the knightly bishops, who inspire such surprise and disgust during the Middle Ages. The Roman Church, with the pope at its head, was the spiritual empire, rivalling and co-ordinate with the secular empire of Germany, and contending for a loftier supremacy. The ecclesiastical organization became baronial and feudal throughout all its provinces and dioceses, as the counterpart and counterpoise of the feudal kingdoms, and duchies, and counties, under the acknowledged but disregarded suzerainty of the holy Roman empire. No other scheme, no idea inconsistent with the prevailing scheme, could be entertained among populations saturated with feudalism, and environed with its universal atmosphere. How thoroughly the Church had accepted the general feudalization is shown by an allocution of pope Innocent II to the Lateran Council, April 20, 1139: "The pontifical throne is the source of all ecclesiastical authority and dignity; so that every such office or dignity is to be received at the hands of the Roman pontiff as a *feoff of the Holy See*, without which *enfeoffment no such office can be lawfully exercised or enjoyed*" (quoted by Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri*, bk. 12:ch. i).

By this process, infinitely diversified, though ever essentially the same, society was slowly reconstructed and re-edified through long generations of anarchy, wretchedness, and foreign peril from new swarms of ruthless assailants. The elements and forces of a new civilization were thus collected and harmonized, and were recombined into a uniform and coherent system on the simple basis of fidelity -between man-and man. Ancient paganism had died out, and universal scepticism had supervened before the new religious faith which was to regenerate the world had been accepted by minds still largely tainted with heathenism. All human trust had been betrayed and dissipated; all social ligaments had been corroded or ruptured; all dependence upon government, law, and public force had been deceived and outraged; and yet--consentaneously with the introduction of a new religious creed, and of fresh races to maintain that creed (Salvian. *De*

Gubernat. Dei; Augustine,- Civitas Dei)--the seeds of a renovated social union were sprouting in the dust and ashes of the dissolving empire, and grew up in the midst of violence and disorder:

*“Per damna, per Cae les, ab ipso
Ducit opes animumque ferro.”*

This new growth, from its earliest development, protected life and property, rendered industry possible once more, sustained or revived languishing hope, defended the shattered relics of the old civilization from the ruin of interminable swarms of ever increasing barbarians, disciplined communities in habits of obedience and order, renewed the culture of the soil, reorganized the nations, and inaugurated a new series of the ages by introducing loyal faith between lord and vassal, and the honorable protection of the weak by the powerful. The political renovation thus ran parallel with the spiritual transmutation, deriving life and encouragement from it even when resisting its influence, and confirming its dominion even while contaminating its morality by the infection of worldly interests and passions. Though the feudal order never realized in practice the ideal which its function suggests--what human institution has ever done this though sore blemishes at all times stained its actual manifestations, yet the strong but rare eulogies bestowed upon it are fully justified by the inestimable services' which it rendered to the nations during the millennial agony of humanity. High, indeed, must be the merits which provoke a concert of praise from such antipodes as Montesquieu and De Maistre, and make the former proclaim his conviction that "the feudal system was the best-constituted government that ever existed upon earth;" and the latter declare that "feudalism was the most perfect institution that the universe has seen." The criminations which have been so bitterly, and not altogether unjustly, directed against the feudal spirit, are applicable to its decline, when it had rendered its incomparable service to mankind, and had become an embarrassment and a tyranny amid the enlarging industry, the augmented intelligence, and the ampler aspirations which its long duration had cherished and trained.

Montesquieu boasted of closing his discussion of feudalism where others commenced, yet he mistook or overlooked its true antecedents and characteristics. From this notice nearly everything has been excluded which is repeated in familiar or accessible authors; nor has the associated topic of

serfs and serfdom been noticed, as it presents an occasion for extended and independent consideration.

From Blackstone, Robertson, Hallam, etc., may be learned the habitual organization of nations during the maturity of the feudal system. From authors of a like character may be pleasantly ascertained the romantic and other aspects of those memorable developments of feudalism, the Crusades and Chivalry—"a gilded halo hovering round decay." — From similar sources may be drawn all needful information in regard to the various species of feuds or fees, and to what are called feudal incidents. These incidents attached to every fief, and consisted of, 1. Reliefs; 2. Fines on alienation; 3. Escheats; 4. Aids; 5. Wardship; 6. Marriage (Hallam, *Hist. Middle Ages*, ch. ii, pt. i; Blackstone, *Comm.* bk. ii, ch. v; Robert (du Var), *Hist. de la Class Ouvriere*, liv. 4:ch. vi; liv. v, ch. i-iv). These *servitia*, or burdens, varied somewhat at different times and in different countries; they were incidental rather than essential to feudalism, and most of them accompanied the early Roman *clientela*. Their exposition, therefore, is not indispensable in a summary appreciation of the general characteristics and operation of the feudal system.

Authorities. — To give a list of authorities for such topics as Fief, Feudalism, Feudal System, would require the enumeration of volumes sufficient for an extensive library. It may suffice to note here some of the principal works connected with the subject, a few of which have been already referred to, and most of which have never been seen by the writer:—*Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Gothofredus); *Corpus Juris Civilis* (ed. Gothofredus); *Basilica* (ed. Heimbach); Baluzii *Capitularia*--a more complete and satisfactory edition is found in Pertz, *Monumenta Hist. Germ.*; *Libri Feudorum*, cum commentatione J. Cujacii; Foucher, *Assizes de Jerusalem*; Beugnotm *Assizes de Jerusalem* (very instructive extracts from this text are given in Cantu, *Hist. Universelle*, vol: 9:append. A); Lespeyres, *Entstehung u. ilteste Bearbeitung der Libb. Feudorum*; Marculfi *Formulare*; Beaumanoir, *Coutumes de Beauvosiis*; Houard, *Coutumes Anglo-Normandes*; Loysel, *Institutions Coutunieres*; Alteserra, *Origines Feudorum*; Caravita, *Prselectiones Feodales*; Cragius, *De Fcudis*; Dalrymple, *History of Feudal Property*; Boehmer, *Principia Juris Feudorum*; Salvaing, *L' Usage des Fiefs*; Brussel, *Usage General des Fiefs*; Jenichen; *Thesauus Juris Feudalis*; Turgole, *Traite de la Seigneurie Faodale Universelle*, Guyot, *Des Fiefs*; *Institutions Feudales*; Winspeare, *Abusi Feudali*; Gebauer, *Origines Feodi*; Le Fevre, De

l'Origine des Fiefs; De Gaillardon, Scenes de la Vie Feodale au xiii Siecle; Gallafid, Traite du Franc-Alieu; La Boulaye, Hist. du Droit Fancier en Occident; Lehuerou, Institutions Mironingiennes et Carolingiennes; Bocking, Notitia Dignitatum Utriusque Imperii; Meyer, Esprit, Origine, et Progres des Institutions Judiciaires; Allen, On the Royal Prerogative; Spence, Inquiry into the Origin of the Laws and Institutions of Modern Europe, Equitable Jurisprudence of the Court of Chancery, vol. ii Savigny, Hist. du Droit Romain; Mortreuil, Hist. du Droit Byzanti.; Du Cange, Glossarium Med. et Inf. Latinitatis; Du Bos, Hist. Crit. de la Monarchie Francaise; Boulainvilliers, Mem. Hist. sur l'Etat de Franc ; Mablv, Observations sur l'Histoire de France; Mademoiselle De Lezardiere, Theorie des lois politiques de la Monarchie Francaise; Montlosier, De la Monarchie Francaise; Montesquieu, Esprit des Lois, liv. 30, 31; Guizot, Hist. de la Civilisation en Europe; Hist. de, la Civ. en France; Ozanam, La Civilisation au Cinquieme Siecle; Etudtes Germaniques; Blackstone, Comentaries on the Laws of England; Robertson, Life of the Emperor Charles V; Lyttelton, History of Henry II, King of England; Hallam, History Of the Middle Ages; and Supplement; Kemble, The Saxons in England; Palgrave, The English Commonwealth; Hist. of Normandy and England; St. Palayc, Histoire de la Chevalerie; St. Marie, Diss. Hist. sur la Clevalerie. (G. F. H.)

Field

(usually **hdc**; *sadeh'* [poetic **yDe**; *saday'*], ἄγρος; but occasionally /ra, *e'rets, land* [Chald. **rBj** *bar, open country*], **χώρα**; **ʾWh**, *chuts, out-doors; hqj]*, *chelkah'*, a portion or plot, **χωρίον**; **h22mdø**] *shedemah'*, a cultivated *field*, according to Gesenius and Furst from the context, in the plur. ^{<652>}Deuteronomy 32:32 ; ^{<1234>}2 Kings 23:4; ^{<2168>}Isaiah 16:8; ^{<2640>}Jeremiah 31:40; ^{<3167>}Habakkuk 3:17; also **bgy**, *fageb'*, an *arable field*, in the plur. ^{<2690>}Jeremiah 39:10). The Hebrew *sadeh* is not adequately represented by our "field:" the two words agree in describing *cultivated* land, but they differ in point of extent, the *sadeh* being specifically applied to what is *unenclosed*, while the opposite notion of enclosure is involved in the word *field*, **SEE DESERT**. The essence of the Hebrew word has been variously taken to lie in each of these notions, Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, p. 1321) giving it the sense of *freedom*, Stanley (*Palest.* p. 484) that of *smoothness*, comparing *arvum* from *arare*. On the one hand *sadeh* is applied to any cultivated ground, whether pasture (^{<1230>}Genesis 29:2; 31:4;

34:7; ^{<0108>}Exodus 9:3), tillage (^{<0370>}Genesis 37:7; 47:24; ^{<0802>}Ruth 2:2, 3; ^{<0346>}Job 24:6; ^{<0458>}Jeremiah 26:18; ^{<0302>}Micah 3:12), woodland (^{<0145>}1 Samuel 14:25, A. V. "ground;" ^{<0216>}Psalms 132:6), or mountain-top (^{<0082>}Judges 9:32, 36; ^{<0021>}2 Samuel 1:21): and in some instances in marked opposition to the neighboring wilderness, as in the instance of Jacob settling in the field of Shechem (^{<0339>}Genesis 33:19), the field of Moab (^{<0355>}Genesis 36:35; ^{<0221>}Numbers 21:20, A. V. "country;" ^{<0800>}Ruth 1:1), and the vale of Siddim, i.e. *of the cultivated fields*, which formed the oasis of the Pentapolis (^{<0143>}Genesis 14:3, 8), though a different sense has been given to the name (by Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1321). On the other hand, the *sadeh* is frequently contrasted with what is enclosed, whether a vineyard (^{<0225>}Exodus 22:5; ^{<0258>}Leviticus 25:3, 4; ^{<0464>}Numbers 16:14; 20:17; compare ^{<0223>}Numbers 22:23; "the ass went into the field," with ver. 24, "a path of the vineyards, a wall being on this side and a wall on that side"), a garden (the very name of which, ^{<0616>}גן implies enclosure), or a walled town (^{<0538>}Deuteronomy 28:3, 16): unwall'd villages or scattered houses ranked in the eye of the law as fields (^{<0251>}Leviticus 25:31), and hence the expression εἰς τοὺς ἄγρους = *houses in the fields* (Vulg. *in villas*; ^{<0036>}Mark 6:36, 56). In many passages the term implies what is remote from a house (^{<0048>}Genesis 4:8; 24:63; ^{<0225>}Deuteronomy 22:25) or settled habitation, as in the case of Esau (^{<0227>}Genesis 25:27; the Sept., however, refers it to his character, ἄγροικος): this is more fully expressed by ἡδὲ χιὲν ^{<0616>} "the open field" (^{<0247>}Leviticus 14:7, 53; 17:5; ^{<0496>}Numbers 19:16; ^{<0011>}2 Samuel 11:11), with which is naturally coupled the notion of exposure and desertion (^{<0492>}Jeremiah 9:22; ^{<0545>}Ezekiel 16:5; 32:4; 33:27; 39:5). **SEE MEADOW.**

The separate plots of ground were marked off by stones, which might easily be removed (^{<0594>}Deuteronomy 19:14; 27:17; comp. ^{<0342>}Job 24:2; ^{<0228>}Proverbs 22:28; 23:10); the absence of fences rendered the fields liable to damage from straying cattle (^{<0225>}Exodus 22:5) or fire (ver. 6; ^{<0443>}2 Samuel 14:30); hence the necessity of constantly watching flocks and herds, the people so employed being in the present day named *Nature* (Wortabet, *Syria*, i, 293). A certain amount of protection was gained by sowing the tallest and strongest of the grain crops on the outside: "spelt" appears to have been most commonly used for this purpose (^{<0325>}Isaiah 28:25, as in the margin). From the absence of enclosures, cultivated land of any size might be termed a field, whether it were a piece of ground of limited area (^{<0233>}Genesis 23:13, 17; ^{<0308>}Isaiah 5:8), a man's whole inheritance (^{<0276>}Leviticus 27:16 sq.; ^{<0045>}Ruth 4:5; ^{<0439>}Jeremiah 32:9, 25 ;

Proverbs 27:26; 31:16), the *ager publicus* of a town (^{<0148>}Genesis 41:48; ^{<6129>}Nehemiah 12:29), as distinct, however, from the ground immediately adjacent to the walls of the Levitical cities, which was called *vrghn* (A. V. "suburbs"), and was deemed an appendage of the town itself (^{<0211>}Joshua 21:11, 12), or, lastly, the territory of a people (^{<0147>}Genesis 14:7; 32:3; 36:35; ^{<0211>}Numbers 21:20; ^{<0306>}Ruth 1:6; 4:3; ^{<0301>}1 Samuel 6:1.; 27:7, 11). In ^{<0275>}1 Samuel 27:5, "a town in the field" (Auth. Vers. "country")=a provincial town as distinct from the royal city. A plot of ground separated from a larger one was termed *hdq; tqi j* , (^{<0319>}Genesis 33:19; ^{<0313>}Ruth 2:3; ^{<0311>}1 Chronicles 11:13), or simply *hqj j* , (^{<0340>}2 Samuel 14:10; 23:12; comp. ^{<0329>}2 Samuel 19:29). Fields occasionally received names after remarkable events, as Helkath-Hazzurim, *the field of the strong men*, or possibly *of swords* (^{<0326>}2 Samuel 2:16), or from the use to which they may have been applied (^{<0287>}2 Kings 18:17; ^{<0303>}Isaiah 7:3; ^{<0207>}Matthew 27:7).
SEE LAND.

It should be observed that the expressions "fruitful field" (^{<0303>}Isaiah 10:18; 29:17; 32:15, 16) and "plentiful field" (^{<0360>}Isaiah 16:10; ^{<0433>}Jeremiah 48:33) are not connected with *sadeh*, but with *karmel*, meaning a park or well-kept wood, as distinct from a wilderness or a forest. The same term occurs in ^{<0293>}2 Kings 19:23, and ^{<0374>}Isaiah 37:24 (A. Vers. "Carmel"); ^{<0303>}Isaiah 10:18 ("forest"), and ^{<0405>}Jeremiah 4:26 ("fruitful place"). **SEE CARMEL.** Distinct from this is the expression in ^{<0375>}Ezekiel 17:5, [*rġhnde*](A.V. "fruitful field"), which means a field suited for planting suckers. **SEE AGRICULTURE.**

Field, David Dudley, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born in East Guilford, Conn., May 20, 1781, prepared for college under Dr. John Elliott, of Guilford, and graduated at Yale in 1802. After studying theology under Dr. Backus, he was licensed to preach in 1803, and was installed pastor at East Haddam in 1804. He filled this charge with great diligence and success until 1818, and in 1819 accepted a call to Stockbridge, Mass. After eighteen years' pastoral service at Stockbridge, he was called in 1837 to his old parish at Haddam. In 1848 he travelled in Europe. In 1851 he gave up his charge at Haddam, and spent the remainder of his life in quiet retirement at Stockbridge, where he died April 15, 1867. Dr. Field was a man of strong character. His mental powers were vigorous and comprehensive; his culture was at once

thorough and varied. His duties as preacher and pastor were always filled with conscientious care; and his long pastorates, with the unusual case of his return to his first charge after an absence of thirty-three years, sufficiently attest the confidence and affection of his parishioners. Of his ten children, six sons are now living, and all eminent as professional men; among them are Cyrus W. Field, the "father" of the Atlantic Telegraph, and Dr. H. M. Field, editor of *The New York Evangelist*. Besides a number of occasional sermons, Dr. Field published *History of Middlesex: History of Berkshire:- Genealogy of the Brainerd Family.*-*Appleton's Annual Cyclop.* 1867, p. 301.

Field, Richard, D.D.

one of the best of the High Church writers of the Church of England, was born at Hampstead, Hertfordshire, is- 1561, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, where he lectured for seven years on logic and philosophy' and gained the reputation of a learned preacher and an acute disputant. He was afterwards reader of divinity at Lincoln's Inn, London, and rector of Burghclear in Hampshire. Here he refused the offer of St. Andrew's, in Holborn, London, a much more valuable living, that he might serve God and pursue his studies in a more retired situation. In 1598- queen Elizabeth made him one, of her chaplains, and he formed a warm friendship with Richard Hooker, a man of kindred spirit. In 1604 he was made canon of Windsor, and in 1609 dean of Gloucester. "He was esteemed a perfect oracle in ecclesiastical learning. Divines, even of the first order, scarce ever went to him without loading themselves with questions. Fuller calls him 'that learned divine, whose memory smelleth like a field which the Lord hath blessed.' When king James heard him preach the first time he said, 'This is a Field for God to dwell in His majesty retained so good an opinion of him that he designed to raise him to the bishopric of Oxford; but God was pleased, as Mr. Wood remarks, to prefer him for a better place, for, on the 21st of November, 1616, he died, leaving behind him a character equally great and amiable. His reputation rests securely on his great work, *The Book of the Church*, which was originally issued in 1606, and with a fifth book added in 1810. A new edition, printed for the " Eccl. Hist. Society," appeared at Cambridge, 1847-52 (4 vols. 8vo).-Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* v, 116; Middleton, *Eccl. Biog.* ii, 374.

Field-Preaching

or preaching in the open air, "a plan adopted by reformers in every age, in order to propagate more extensively and effectually their peculiar sentiments among the great masses of the people⁶. Christ and his apostles not only availed themselves of the privileges which the synagogues afforded of making known the 'Gospel of the Kingdom' to those who assembled therein from Sabbath to Sabbath, they also proclaimed the doctrines and precepts of the new dispensation on the highways and hedges, on the seashore and on the barren glade, on the mountain's side and in -the streets of the teeming city. Wherever men were found, and under whatever circumstances they were placed, if their ears could be reached, there the voice of the first teachers of Christianity was heard, warning sinners of coming danger, and pointing out the only way of escape the only medium of access unto God. So was it, too, with other reformers, whose labors our limits forbid our noticing, as we desire to add a few words on the field-preaching of Whitefield and Wesley. The practice was commenced by the former, and that without any misgivings as to the 'irregularity' of such a strange proceeding; whereas the latter, though a man of more highly cultivated intellect, and who, on that account, ought to have risen superior to the prejudices of his order, em-as, with much reluctance, induced to follow in the course so heroically opened up by the eloquent Whitefield. But having once commenced, there was no drawing back; he had taken to the field, and no man's face or frown should cause him to retire. John Wesley was not a man of a weak and shrinking spirit, as his whole life testifies; but he was a man who proved himself on all occasions to be a good soldier of Jesus Christ. When Whitefield was refused the pulpits of the London and Bristol churches, and after he had been threatened by the chancellor of the diocese of the latter place with suspension and excommunication if he persisted in preaching in his diocese without a license, he resolved in his mind whether it might not be his duty to preach in the open air. Indeed, he had thought of this before he was refused permission to preach in the pulpits of the establishment, when he saw that thousands who sought to hear him could not gain admittance into the churches. He mentioned his thoughts to some friends, who pronounced the idea to be a mad one; but now, he believed that in Bristol his duty in this respect was no longer doubtful. Moreover, many persons said to him "What need of going abroad? Have we not Indians enough at home? If you have a mind to convert Indians, there are colliers enough at Kingswood.

To these, therefore, he determined to preach the message of reconciliation. The colliers at Kingswood were without any means of religious instruction; they had no church in which to worship, no minister to teach' them the duties of religion, or to. pray with them hence they were notorious for their brutality and wickedness, and in times of excitement were a terror to all around them. On February 17, 1739, Whitefield proceeded to Rose Green, Kingswood (his first field-pulpit), where he preached to as many as the novelty of the scene collected, which were about 200. The ice being now broke to use his own observation on this first open-air sermon he determined to persevere in the same course. Accordingly, he visited Kingswood frequently, and every time he went there the number of his hearers increased; for, besides the colliers, thousands of all ranks flocked from Bristol and the neighborhood, and the congregation was sometimes computed at 20,000. With gladness and eagerness many of these despised outcasts, who had never been ins a church in their lives, received the instruction of this eminent follower of him who '*went about* doing good.' 'The-first discovery,' says he, 'of their being affected was to see the white gutters made by their tears, which plentifully fell down their black cheeks, as they came out of their coal-pits... Sometimes, when 20,000 people were before me, I had not, in my own apprehension, a word to say, either to God (in prayer) or to them (by preaching)... The open firmament above me,' the prospect of the adjacent fields, with the sight of thousands and thousands, some in coaches, some on horseback, and some on the trees, and at times all affected and drenched in tears together, to which sometimes was added the, solemnity of the approaching evening, was almost too much for, and quite overcame me.' Whitefield was then-requested to preach in a bowling-green in the city, and he complied. Many of the audience sneered to see a stripling with a gown mount a table on unconsecrated ground; for field-preaching, since common enough in England, was then unknown, and therefore obloquy was poured upon it. His engagements so increased that he sought the help of Mr. Wesley. Without delay Mr. Wesley proceeded to Bristol, and on. his arrival was invited to preach in the open air. I could scarce reconcile myself at first,' says he, 'to this strange way of preaching in the fields, of which he (Whitefield) set me the example on the Sunday, having been all my life, till very lately, so tenacious of every point relating to decency and order that I should have thought the saving of souls a sin if it had not been done in a church.' However, on the following day, Mr. Wesley preached from a little eminence in an open ground adjoining the city to about 3000 people. In the

days of Whitefield and the Wesley's field-preaching was not unfrequently attended with danger. Though they often met with a kind reception from the Multitudes, yet at other times they experienced the rudest and most determined opposition, and often their lives were in imminent peril from the violence of an ignorant, depraved, and excited populace. In his *Earnest Appeal*, Mr. Wesley asks, 'Who is there among you, brethren, that is willing (examine your own hearts) even to save souls from death at this price? Would not you let a thousand. souls perish rather than you would be the instrument of rescuing them thus? I do not speak now with regard to conscience, but to the inconveniences that must accompany it. Can you. sustain them if you would? Can you. bear the summer sun to beat upon your naked head? Can you suffer the wintry rain or wind, from whatever quarter it blows? Are you able to stand in the open air, without any covering or defence, when God casteth abroad his snow like wool, or scattereth his hoar frost like ashes? And yet these are some of the smallest inconveniences which accompany field-preaching. Far beyond all these are the contradiction of sinners, the scoffs both of the great vulgar and the small contempt and reproach of every' kind; often more than verbal affronts-stupid, brutal violence. sometimes to the hazard of health, or limbs, or life. Brethren, do you envy us this honor? What, I pray you, would buy you to be a field-preacher? When Mr. Wesley had been accustomed to field-preaching for more than twenty years, he made the following remarks: 'One hour in Moorfields might convince any impartial man of the expediency of field-preaching. What building, except St. Paul's church, could contain such a congregation? and if it would, what human voice could have reached them there? By repeated observations, I find I can command thrice the number in the open air that I can under a roof. And who can say the time for field-preaching is over, while,

1. Greater numbers than ever attend;

2. The converting as well as the convincing power of God is eminently present with them? One extract more, and this article must close. Mr. Wesley thus describes these open-air services: I cannot say I have ever seen a more awful sight, than when, on Rose Green or the top of Hannan Mount, some thousands of people were calmly joined together in solemn waiting upon God, while

*"They stood, and under open air adored
The God who made both air, earth, heaven, and sky."*

And whether they were listening to his word with attention still as night, or were lifting up their voice in praise as the sound of many waters, many a time have I been constrained to say in my heart, "How dreadful is this place!" This, also, "is no other than the house of God! this is the gate of heaven!" (*See Memoirs of Wesley, by Coke, Southey, and Watson; also Jackson's Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism.*) Having now once adopted this mode of imparting instruction to the neglected classes of the community, Mr. Wesley never abandoned it to the end of his life; and in a short time his brother Charles followed his example in the same self-denying labor of love, being, urged thereto by the indefatigable Whitefield. Mr. Charles Wesley's first field-sermon was preached at Moorfields on June 24, 1739, his congregation amounting to about 1000, and in the evening of the same day- he preached to multitudes on Kennington Commons. A few weeks afterwards he preached to about 10,000 people in Moorfields; and for several years he followed with equal steps both his brother and Mr. Whitefield in laborious zeal and public usefulness. It is not to be supposed that Mr. Wesley had not preached in the open air till the time he was induced by Mr. Whitefield to do so at Bristol. He had done so in Georgia before Mr. Whitefield was ordained, but he had no intention of resuming, the practice in England until compelled to do so by the necessities of the case. He says, "Wherever I was now desired to preach (in churches), salvation by faith was my only theme. Things were in this posture when I was told I must preach no more in this, and this, and another church; the reason was usually added without reserve, " Because you preach such doctrine." After a time I determined to do the same thing in England which I had often done in a warmer climate-to preach in the open air.' 'Be pleased to observe,' he adds,

1. That I was forbidden to preach in any church "for preaching such doctrine."
2. That I had no desire nor design to preach in the open air till after the prohibition.
3. That when I did, as it- was no matter of choice, so neither of premeditation. There was no scheme at all previously formed which was to be supported thereby.
4. Field-preaching was therefore a sudden expedient-a thing submitted to rather than chosen; and therefore submitted to because I thought preaching even thus better than not preaching at all. Field-preaching, or, as it was

called, tent-preaching, that is, 'preaching from a tent, was common in Scotland on summer sacramental occasions up till a very recent period. The practice; still survives in some parts of the Highlands. Thousands from neighboring parishes used to assemble on the brae or in the quiet hollow, and listen to the word of life. But unhallowed scenes sometimes occurred, of which Burns's *Holy Fair* is an exaggerated picture; and such gatherings have been discontinued. Of late, however, field-preaching has been resorted to for a different purpose—that of evangelization—so that the masses may be reached which have given up attendance at the house of God. Everywhere the result seems to be satisfactory, and the practice is every year more: and more extensively followed in 'Great Britain." *SEE CAMP-MEETING.*

Fifth-Monarchy-Men

a sect of Millenarians which sprung up in the time of Cromwell, and held that the millennial reign of Christ on earth, styled by them the fifth great monarchy, reckoned in succession with the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman ones, was then to begin. Under the lead of Thomas Venner, a wine-cooper, they formed a plot to inaugurate their kingdom of the saints on April 9th, 1657, but were foiled by the vigilance of Thurloe, the secretary of state, and a number of the conspirators, arrested with arms in their hands, were sent to the Tower, though the penalty of the law, death, was not inflicted on any of them. On the 6th of January, 1661, some fifty' or sixty of these madmen, led by the same Venner, rose is- insurrection, if we may term it such, against the government of Charles II, proclaimed "king Jesus," attacked the police force, and, after concealing themselves for two day's in Caen Wood, near Highgate, returned to encounter the train-bands, insanely believing that neither bullet nor steel could harm them. Most of them, refusing quarter, were slain outright; but Venner and sixteen others were taken, tried, and executed.—Knight, *Popular Hist. of England*, 4:206, 251; *Pictorial Hist. of England*, iii, 421, 679 (Chambers's ed.); Burnet, *Hist. of His Own Times*, vol. i, bk. ii; Baxter, *Hist. of the Church of England*, p. 606, 611; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans* (London), 4:186. (J. W. M.)

Fig

Picture for Fig 1

The usual Hebrew word for this is **hnaē**] (*teenah'*, of uncertain etymology), which is universally translated *fig* (N.T. **σῦκον**) and *fig-tree* (N.T. **σνκῆ**) in both ancient and modern versions, and no doubt correctly so. It has from the earliest times been a highly esteemed fruit in the East, and its present as well as ancient Arabic name is *tin*. When figs are spoken of as distinguished from the fig-tree, the masc. plur. form **μυναῖ**] is used (see ^{<2183>}Jeremiah 8:13). The other words rendered *fig* in the Auth. Vers. are: **gpi** (*pag*, "green fig," ^{<2123>}Song of Solomon 2:13; **ὄλυνθος**, "untimely fig," ^{<1163>}Revelation 6:13), a designation of the late fig, which, being unripe at the proper time for gathering, frequently hangs on the tree over winter (comp. also the name BETH-PHAGE); and **hrWKBa**] (*bikkurah* "first ripe," ^{<2304>}Isaiah 28:4; ^{<2212>}Jeremiah 24:2; ^{<3101>}Micah 7:1; ^{<2090>}Hosea 9:10), which denotes the early or spring fig, still called *boccore* in Mauritania, and in Spanish *albacora* (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 370, fol.). **SEE SYCAMORE.**

Picture for Fig 2

The fig is mentioned in so many passages of Scripture that our space will not allow us to enumerate them, but they are detailed by Celsius (*Hierobot.* ii, 368). The first notice of it, however, occurs in ^{<1002>}Genesis 3:7, where Adam and Eve are described, as sewing fig-leaves together to make themselves aprons. The common fig-leaf is not so well suited, from its lobed nature, for this purpose; but the practice of sewing or pinning leaves together is very common in the East even in the present day, and baskets, dishes, and umbrellas are made of leaves so pinned or sewn together. Hence some have supposed the *Ficus Indica* to be the tree there referred to, but this is unlikely and unnecessary. The fig-tree is enumerated (^{<1888>}Deuteronomy 8:8) as one of the valuable products of Palestine; "a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, and pomegranates." The spies who were sent from wilderness of Paran brought back from the brook of Eshcol clusters of grapes, pomegranates, and figs. Mount Olivet was famous for its fig-trees in ancient times, and they are still found there (see Stanley, *Sinai and Palalentine*, p. 187, 421, 422). The fig-tree is referred to as one of the signs of prosperity (^{<1005>}1 Kings 4:25). Hence "to sit under one's own vine and one's own fig-tree" became a proverbial expression among the Jews to denote peace and prosperity (^{<3004>}Micah 4:4;

<880>Zechariah 3:10). The failure of this fruit is likewise noted as a sign of affliction (<9453>Psalm 105:33). The very frequent references which are made in the Old Testament to the fig and other fruit-trees are in consequence of fruits forming a much more important article of diet in the warm and dry countries of the East than they can ever do in the cold and moist regions of the North (see Judith 10:5; comp. Mishna, *Shebiith*, 4:7). Figs are also used medicinally; and we have a notice in <1210>2 Kings 20:7, of their employment as a poultice (comp. Pliny, 23:62 Dioscor. i, 184). In the historical books of the Old Testament-mention is made of cakes of figs, used as articles of food, and compressed into that form for the sake of keeping them (ἰσχάδες, *caricae*, Lucian, *Vit. Auct.* 19; Martial, 13:28). Such a cake was called **hl bḏ** (Talmud, **l wj** [or **rkk**, Mishna *Terumoth*, 4:8), or more fully **μυναῖ]τι bḏ**] on account of its shape, from the root **l bḏ**; *to make round* (see <9812>1 Samuel 30:12; Jern 24:2 sq.). Hence, or rather from the Syriac **atl br** the first letter being dropped, came the Gr. word **παλάθη** (see Wesseling, *ad. diod. Sic.* 17:67). Atheneus (xi, p. 500, ed. Casaub.) makes express mention of the **παλάθη Συριακή**. Jerome, on Ezekiel 6:describes the **παλάθη** as a mass of figs and rich dates, formed into the shape of bricks or tiles, and compressed in order that they may keep. Such cakes harden so as to need cutting with an axe. The fig is still extensively cultivated in the East, and in a dried state, strung upon cords, it forms an extensive article of commerce from Persia to India. The fig-tree, though now successfully cultivated in a great part of Europe, even as far north as the southern parts of Es-gland, is yet a native of the East, and probably of the Persian region, where it is most extensively cultivated. The climate there is such that the tree must necessarily be able to bear some degree of cold, and thus be fitted to travel northwards, and ripen its fruit where there is a sufficient amount and continuance of summer heat. It has a smooth stem, which is seldom quite straight, and is covered with a gray bark; the leaves are of the shape of a heart, with three or five lobes, and are indented; the upper side is rough, the lower is covered with fine hair. The fruit makes its appearance before the leaves, but not before the flowers or blossom, Which lies concealed within a hollow, fleshy receptacle (Hogg, *Vegetable Kingdom*, p. 676). The fertilization of-the blossoms is often assisted by an artificial process called *caprification* (Pliny, 20:21; Tournefort, ii, 32; Russel, *Aleppo*, i, 108; Hasselquist, p. 221). See the *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Fig-Tree, Cursed.

Few passages in the Gospels have given occasion to so much perplexity as that of ^{<4113>}Mark 11:13, where the evangelist relates the circumstance of our Lord's cursing the fig-tree near Bethany: "And seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it he found nothing but leaves, *for the time of figs was not yet.*" The apparent unreasonableness of seeking fruit at a time when none could naturally be expected, and the consequent injustice of the sentence pronounced upon the tree, has been made the ground of grave impeachment of the Gospel record, and of our Saviour's character itself.

The fig-tree (*Ficus Carica*) in Palestine produces fruit at two, or even three different periods of the year: first, there is the *bikkurah*, or "early ripe fig" (^{<πρίδρομος>}, *praecox*, Pliny, 15:19; 16:49; Macrob. *Sat.* ii, 16), frequently mentioned in the O.T. (see ^{<3701>}Micah 7:1; ^{<2304>}Isaiah 28:4; ^{<3910>}Hosea 9:10), which ripens on an average towards the end of June, though in favorable places of soil or temperature the figs may ripen a little earlier, while under less favorable circumstances they may not be matured till the middle of July (Buhle, *Calendar (Econ.* p. 15). The *bikkurah* drops off the tree as soon as ripe; hence the allusion in ^{<3482>}Nahum 3:12, when shaken they "even fall into the mouth of the eater." Shaw (*Trav.* i, 264, 8vo ed.) aptly compares the Spanish name *breba* for this early fruit, "quasi *breve*," as continuing only for a short time. About the time of the ripening of the *bikkurim* the *kermus* or summer fig begins to be formed; these rarely ripen before August (Buhle, *ut sup.* p. 41), when another crop, called "the winter fig," appears. Shaw describes this kind as being of a much longer shape and darker complexion than the *kermus*, hanging and ripening on the tree even after the leaves are shed, and, provided the winter proves mild and temperate, as gathered as a delicious morsel in the spring (see Miss Bremer's *Travels in the Holy Land*, i, 195; compare Pliny, N. H. 16:26, 27). Thus, especially in sheltered situations (e.g. the plain of Gennesareth, Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 8), fresh figs might be had at almost all seasons of the year (compare Strabo, 11:508; Columella, *Arbor.* 21).

The attempts to explain the above-quoted passage in Mark are numerous, and for the most part very unsatisfactory; passing over, therefore, the ingenious though objectionable reading proposed by Dan. Heinsius (*Exercit. Sac.* ed. 1639, p. 116) of ο υ γάρ ην, και ρος σύκων where he was, it was the season for figs" and merely mentioning another proposal to

read that clause of the evangelist's remark as a question, "for was it not the season of figs ?" and the no less unsatisfactory rendering of Hammond (*Annot. ad St. Mark*), "it was not a good season for figs," we come to the interpretations which, though not perhaps of recent origin, we find in modern works.

The explanation which has found favor with most writers is that which understands the words καὶ ῥὸς σὺκῶν to mean " the fig-harvest ;" the γάρ in this case is referred, not to the clause immediately preceding, "he found nothing but leaves," but to the. more remote one, "he came if haply he might find anything thereon ;" for a similar *trajection* it is usual to refer to -1113Mark 16:3, 4; the sense of the whole passage would then be as follows: 'And seeing a fig-tree afar off having leaves, he came if perchance he might find any fruit on it (and he ought to have found. some), for the time of gathering it had not yet arrived, but when he came he found nothing but leaves.'" (See the notes in 'the Greek Testaments' of Burton, Trollope, Bloomfield, Webster, and Wilkinson; Macknight, *Harm. of the Gospels*, ii, 591, note, 1809; Elsley's *Annot. ad 1. c.*, etc.) A forcible objection to this explanation will be found in the fact that at the time implied, viz. the end of March or the beginning of April, no figs at all eatable would be found on the trees: the *bikkurim* seldom ripen in Palestine before the end of June, and at the time of the Passover, the fruit, to use Shaw's expression, would be "hard, and no bigger than common plums," corresponding in this state to the *paggim* (μυγῆ) of -2113Song of Solomon 2:13, wholly unfit for food in an unprepared state; and it is but reasonable to infer that our Lord expected to find something more palatable than these small, sour things upon a tree which by its show of foliage bespoke, though .falsely, a corresponding show of good fruit, for it is important to remember that *the fruit comes before the leaves*. Again, if καὶ ῥός denotes the " fig-harvest," we must suppose that, although the fruit might not have been ripe, the season was not very far distant, and that the figs in consequence must have been considerably more matured than these hard *paggim*; but is it probable that *Mark* would have thought it necessary to state that it was not yet the season for gathering figs in March, when they could not have been fit to gather before June at the earliest? It would be better to understand the γάρ here in an adversative-illative sense =*although*.

There is another way of seeking to get over the difficulty by supposing that the tree in question was not of the ordinary kind. Celsius (*Hierob.* ii, 385) says there is a peculiar fig-tree known to the Jews by the name of *Benoth-*

shuach (j wç twnb), which produces *grossuli*, "small unripe figs" (*paggim*) every year, but only good fruit every third year; and that our Lord came to this tree at a time when the ordinary annual *grossuli* only were produced ! We are ignorant as to what tree the *Benoth-shuach* may denote, but it is obvious that the apparent *unreasonableness* remains as it was. As to the tree which Whitby (*Commentary in Mark*, 1. c.) identifies with the one in question, that it was that kind which Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* 4:2, § 4) calls *ἀείφυλλον*, "evergreen," it is enough, to observe that this is no fig at all, but the carob or locust tree (*Ceratonia :siliqua*). Dr. Thomson, however, speaks of a large green-colored fig that ripens in May on Lebanon, and probably much earlier in milder positions (*Land and Book*, i, 538).

But, after all, where *is*: the *unreasonableness* of the whole transaction ? It has been stated above that the fruit of the fig-tree, appears before the leaves (see Hackett, *Illust. of Scripture*, p. 133); consequently, if *the tree produced leaves*, it should also have had some figs as well. As to what-natural causes had operated to effect so unusual a thing as for a fig-tree to have leaves in March, it is unimportant to inquire; but the stepping out of the way with the possible chance (*εἰ ἄρα*, *siforte*, "under the circumstances;" see Winer, *Gram. of N. Test.- Diction.* p. 465, Masson's transl.) of finding eatable fruit on a fig-tree in leaf at the end of March, would probably be repeated by any observant modern traveller in Palestine. The whole question turns on the *pretensions* of the tree; had it not proclaimed by its foliage its superiority over other fig-trees, and thus proudly exhibited its *preciousness*; had our Lord at that season of the year visited any of the other figtrees upon which no leaves had as yet appeared with the prospect of finding fruit, then the case would be altered, and the unreasonableness and injustice real. The words of Mark, therefore, are to be understood in the sense which the order of the words naturally suggests. The evangelist gives the reason why no fruit *was* found on the tree, viz. "because it was not the time for fruit;" *we* are left to infer the reason why it *ought to have had* fruit if it were true to its pretensions; and it must be remembered that this miracle had a typical design (see the *Christ. Annotator*, i, 228), to show how God would deal with the Jews, who,, professing, like this precocious fig-tree, "to be first," should be "last" in his favor, seeing that no fruit was produced in their lives, but only, as Wordsworth well expresses it, "the rustling leaves of a religious profession, the barren traditions of the Pharisees, the ostentatious display of the law,

and vain exuberance of words without the good fruit of works" (comp. ^{<51724>}Ezekiel 17:24). So Trench (*Notes on the Miracles*, p. 438) concludes: "All the explanations which go to prove that, according to the natural order of things in a climate like that of Palestine, there might have been, even at this early time of the year, figs on that tree, either winter figs which had survived till spring, or the early figs of spring themselves—all these ingenious as they often are, yet seem to me beside the matter. For, without entering further into the question whether they prove their point or not; they shatter upon that **ο υ γάρ ην καιρὸς σύκων** of *Mark*, from which it is plain that no such calculation of probabilities brought. the Lord thither, but those abnormal leaves which he had a right to count would have been accompanied with abnormal fruit."

Monographs on this fig-tree cursed by the Saviour have been written in Latin by Flensburg (Hafn. 1775), Gosgen (Lips. 1697), Hofmann (Jena, 1670), Iken (Bre. men, 1741), Juster (Abo, 1724), Muler (Hafnioe, 1739), Schmidt (Viteb. 1701), Majus (in *Obs. sacr.* p. 71 sq.), Simonis (Fr. ad V. 1689), Withon (in *Opusc.* p. 159 sq.), Witsius (Lugd. Bat. 1709); in German by Pagendarn: (Wolfenb. 1755), Ebeling (in *Ilamb. gel. Briefwechsel.* 1750, p. 513 sq.), Stosch (in Rathlef's *Theolcg.* 1754, p. 27 sq.), Kunze (in the *Studien u. Krit.* 1844, iii, :702). **SEE JESUS.**

Fight

(**hmj l mā** *milchamah'*, Deuteronomy ii, 32; ^{<12125>}1 Kings 20:26; 2 Chronicles 26:11; 32:2, *war* or battle, as usually rendered; or **hkr22[m]** *maarah'*, ^{<91723>}1 Samuel 17:20, *battle-array*, as often rendered; in other passages some form of the verbs **μj l**; **abx**; etc.; Gr. **πύλομος** *war*, as usually rendered, or **μαχή**; also **ἄγων**, etc.). Thee Israelites began their existence as a nation with an aggressive campaign, in the sequel of which nevertheless they were from time to time compelled to occupy a defensive position throughout the entire period of the Judges (q.v.). This consisted, however, for the most part, of tumultuary and disconnected skirmishes. Regular engagements first occurred under (Saul and) David; and the frequent hostile collisions of disciplined Hebrew generals in, the civil and foreign commotions of subsequent periods must have greatly stimulated military training. The opening of a campaign (generally in spring, ^{<11102>}2 Samuel 11:1; Josephus, *Ant.* 7:6, 3; Harmer, ii, 283), as well as of single engagements, although not prefaced by regular diplomatic communications

or a declaration of war (but see <07112>Judges 11:12 sq.; <11112>1 Kings 20:2 sq.; <12418>2 Kings 14:8; Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 41), was preceded in important and deliberate cases by an interrogation of the Urim (q.v.) and Thummim (<07112>Judges 20:27 sq.; <09457>1 Samuel 14:37; 23:2; 28:6; 20:8) or a prophet (1 Kings 22:6 sq.; <41804>2 Chronicles 18:4 sq.; <12912>2 Kings 19:2 sq.), in like manner as the Greeks consulted oracles before beginning a contest, and even took seers with them to the field (see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Aterth.* iii, 390, 411). A peculiar species of divination prior to an attack is mentioned (<35112>Ezekiel 21:20 -sq.) with regard to the Chaldaeans, *SEE LOT*, like the *extispicium*. of the Romans (Cicero, *Divin.* i, 16; ii. 12 sq.). *SEE SOOTHSAYER*. In solemn instances, while the army stood in sight of the enemy, an offering was brought (<09109>1 Samuel 7:9; 13:9 sq.), and a priest (<43112>Deuteronomy 20:2 sq.), who always appears to have accompanied the prince to the field (<41312>2 Chronicles 13:12, 14; comp. <41012>Numbers 10:9; a specially selected and anointed functionary of this kind, like a modern field chaplain [Mill, *De sacerdote cast-enssi veter.* - *Hebr* Utr. 17281, is , mentioned in the Mishna, *Sotah*, 8:1, by the taste of ' $\hat{h}k\ \text{hmj} \ | \ \text{jn} \ j \ \text{WVm}$; see Reland, *Amitiq. Sacm.* ii, 3, 2; Otho, *ex. Reabb.* p. 89; Van Alphen, in Oebrich's *Collectio*, ii, 515 sq.; Tatii *Diss. de sacerdote castr. Hebr.*, and Ugolini *Diss. deasacea. castr.* [both in Ugolini *Thesaur.* xii]; Thorschmed, *De sacerdote ad bell. uncto*, Torg. 1737; Kretzsachmar, *De uncto belli*, Dresd. 1738; although not mentioned in the O.T. books; comp. Deyling, *Observe.* ii, 298, Lakemacher, *Observv. Philol.* iii, 236 sq.), or the commander himself, delivered a hortatory oration (<44112>2 Chronicles 20:20). Then followed my a trumpet blast the signal for the conflict (<04312>Numbers 13:12; 1 Macc. 16:8), and the struggle began amid terrific battle-cries ($\text{h}[\text{WrT}]$ <09752>1 Samuel 17:52; <23133>Isaiah 13:13; <31000>Amos 1:14; Jeremiah 1, 42; <35112>Ezekiel 21:22; as among almost all ancient nations; see especially Homer, *Il.* ii, 144 sq., 394 sq.; iii, 2 sq.; 4:452 sq.; <23110>Song of Solomon 3:10, 1; Tacit. *Germ.* iii, a; Dougtsei *Analect.* i, 74 sq.; Potter, *Greek Antiq.* ii, 174 sq.). The battle-array $\text{hkr}[\]\ \text{ni} \ \text{tkr}[\]\ \text{ni}$ Samuel 4:2; 22:8, 20, etc.; comp. $\text{E}[\]$; <07112>Judges 20:30; <09721>1 Samuel 17:21) appears to have been a simple ranging of the troops in line; and even is- the Maccabean period, when the Jews had acquired some of the strategic art of the Greek' Syrians, their leaders seem to have rested in their simple tactics, gaining advantage over the martial skill of the enemy chiefly by their patriotic valor. Scientific marshallings and exact military lists are mentioned in 1 Macc. 7:36 sq.; 9:11 ; comp. ver. 45 (see Joseph. *Ant.*

13:12, 5); 10:77 sq.; 12:28. The foreign troops of the later Jewish kings were maneuvered according to Greek and Roman tactics (comp. Joseph. Ant. 13:12, 5). For stratagems of the Jews during their final war, see Josephus, War, iii, 7, 13, 14, 20, 28. Nevertheless we can early trace a division of the army into three corps, probably with a view to charge the enemy in the centre- and upon both flanks (^{<0076>}Judges 7:16, 19; ^{<0111>}1 Samuel 11:11; ^{<0182>}2 Samuel 18:2; comp. 1 Macc. 5:33; so four divisions, 2 Macc. 8:22: the expression *wings* of the army was already known, comp. **μυράκ**]8:8; **μυρῶν**] ^{<3214>}Ezekiel 12:14, 17; 38:6, etc.; see Gesenius, *Comment. zu Jes.* i, 335, and *Thesaur.* p. ?29). The field was probably fought man against man.. The extended arms of the combatants appear to have been bare ("exserti lacerti, humeri," etc. Sil. Ital. 12:715; Lucan, ii, 543; Stat-is, *Theb.* i, 413 etc.), the military mantle having no armlets (comp. ^{<0107>}Ezekiel 4:7; ^{<2520>}Isaiah 52:10; so Dougltaei Analect. 1, 257 sq.). Great prowess, especially bodily dexterity' and agility (for attack and pursuit), was a main qualification for the soldier or officer (^{<0123>}2 Samuel 1:23; 2:18; 1 Chronicles; 12:8; ^{<3189>}Habakkuk 3:19; the "swift of foot" of the Homeric heroes). Signals for retreat or desisting from pursuit of the enemy were sounded on the trumpet (**ρπ/ν**, ^{<0128>}2 Samuel 2:28 18:16; 20:22). Single combat (q.v.) between two champions, which decided the battle (like the Horatii and Curiatii of Livy, i, 24), is the well-known one between David and Goliath (1 Samuel 17);' another example occurs ^{<0124>}2 Samuel 2:14 sq. Sometimes peculiar stratagems were resorted to in the fight (comp. ^{<1172>}2 Kings 7:12 sq.; see Rosenmuller, *Morgenl.* iii, 233 sq.), especially the surprise (^{<0076>}Judges 7:16 sq.), the ambuscade (**βραο** ^{<0182>}Joshua 8:2, 12; ^{<0216>}Judges 20:36; ^{<0155>}1 Samuel 15:5), and surrounding (^{<0123>}2 Samuel 5:23). Informants and spies **μυλ ἑφῆμι, κατάσκοποι** were also employed (Joshua 2, 6, 22; Judges 7, 11 sq.; ^{<0204>}1 Samuel 26:4; 1 Macc. 5:38; 12:26). Distinguished acts of individual valor were often secured by an appointed prize (^{<0156>}Joshua 15:16; ^{<0112>}Judges 1:12; ^{<0175>}1 Samuel 17:25 sq.; 18:25 sq.; ^{<3116>}1 Chronicles 11:6). With the design of insuring a successful issue in battle, the sanctuary (ark of the covenant) was sometimes carried into the field (^{<0104>}1 Samuel 4:4 sq.; comp. ^{<0121>}2 Samuel 5:21). We have no sufficient accounts at the disposition of the Hebrew camp aside from the Mosaic arrangement (Numbers 2); although from ^{<0171>}1 Samuel 17:20; 26:5, it appears to have had a circular form, like that of the Arabs (also the Bedouins, Arvieux, iii, 214) and ancient Greeks (Xesoph. *Rep. Laced.* 12:1), and we may understand the term **Ι Γ[ἄσπ**

(Auth. Vers. "trench") to refer to the bulwark of vehicles and beasts of burden, or (with Thenius) the circumvallation of the encampment (q.v.). The camps were usually guarded by carefully-posted sentinels (^{<0079>}Judges 7:19; 1 Macc. 12:27), and during the action a garrison remained in them or among the baggage (^{<0824>}1 Samuel 30:24). Vanquished enemies were in general treated very severely: the captured generals and princes were put to death (^{<0824>}Joshua 10:24; ^{<0075>}Judges 7:25); not unfrequently they were cut to pieces alive or beheaded when dead (2 Macc. 15:30; ^{<0754>}1 Samuel 17:54; comp. Herodot. 7:77; Joseph. War, i, 17, 2); all warriors were stripped (^{<0824>}1 Samuel 31:8; 2 Macc. 8:27), and the living captives either carried into-slavery (^{<0824>}Numbers 31:26 sq.; ^{<0824>}Deuteronomy 20:14; some mitigation, however being shown in the case of females, ^{<0824>}Deuteronomy 21:11 sq.) or put to death (^{<0095>}Judges 9:45), sometimes in a cruel manner (^{<0824>}2 Samuel 12:31; ^{<0824>}2 Chronicles 23:12; comp. ^{<0087>}Judges 8:7), or even mutilated (^{<0087>}Judges 1:6 sq.; ^{<0824>}1 Samuel 11:2), although these cases of extreme severity are evidently peculiar and exceptional. As in all ancient warfare, the gentler sexes and tender age were not always spared amid the ruthless fury of vengeance: there are notices of women violated or disembowelled of their unborn infants and of children dashed in pieces against stones and the corners of streets (^{<0824>}2 Kings 15:16; comp. ^{<0824>}2 Kings 8:12; ^{<0824>}Isaiah 13:16; ^{<0824>}Amos 1:13; ^{<0824>}Hosea 10:14; 14:1; ^{<0824>}Nahum 3:10; 2 Macc. 5:13; see Schultens, *Monument. histor. Arab.* -p. 125 Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterthümer*, iii, 425); although these occur chiefly in connection with heathen countries (comp. Josephus, Apion, ii, 29). Captured horses' were hamstrung (^{<0824>}2 Samuel 8:4; ^{<0824>}Joshua 11:6, 9). But **SEE BOOTY**. Conquered cities were occasionally burnt or demolished (^{<0095>}Judges 9:45; 1 Macc. 5:28, 52; 10:84); at least heathen sanctuaries were destroyed (1 Macc. 5:68; 10:84) or carried away (Isaiah 46, see Gesenius, *Comment.* in loc.); the open country itself was laid waste (^{<0824>}Judges 6:4; ^{<0824>}1 Chronicles 20:1; ^{<0824>}2 Kings 3:19, 25; comp. Judith ii, 17; Herodot. i, 17). Sometimes the conquerors contented themselves with pulling down the fortifications and carrying away the treasures (^{<0824>}2 Kings 14:14; comp. ^{<0824>}1 Kings 14:26; ^{<0824>}2 Kings 24:13), demanded hostages (^{<0824>}2 Kings 14:14), and exacted contributions (^{<0824>}2 Kings 18:14; see ^{<0824>}Isaiah 33:18); garrisons were also left in charge (^{<0824>}2 Samuel 8:6, 14). But a more absolute war of extermination was waged by the Hebrew people against the Canaanites on the episode into Palestine. **SEE ACCURSED**. Victory was celebrated with joyful shouts, songs, and dances (^{<0824>}Judges 5:1 Samuel 18:6 sq.; 2 Samuel 22; Judith 16:2, 24; 1 Macc.

4:24); trophies were also set up (^{<0952>}1 Samuel 15:12; ^{<1083>}2 Samuel 8:13; but see Thenius, ad loc.). As permanent memorials of good fortune in war, captured weapons or pieces of armor were deposited in the sanctuary (^{<0209>}1 Samuel 21:9; *see*. ^{<31>}31:10; ^{<12110>}2 Kings 11:10; ^{<3100>}1 Chronicles 10:10; comp. Homer, *II*. 7:83; Virg. *En*. 7:183 sq.; Justin, 9:7, Lucan, i; 240; Tacit. *Annal*. i,59, 2). For military exploits, individuals were honored with presents or a promotion (^{<0985>}1 Samuel 18:25 sq. [comp. Rosellini, *Moism.*; *Sttor*. 4:74]; ^{<1081>}2 Samuel 18:11), and David had a sort of honorary legion (2. Samuel 23:8).. Herod the Great once rewarded all his soldiers for a hard earned victory with money (Joseph. *Ant*. 14:15, 4). Leaders who fell were honored by the army with military mourning (^{<1033>}2 Samuel 3:31), and their weapons were placed in their grave (^{<3527>}Ezekiel 32:27; comp. Dougtaei *Anal*. ut sup.), as in that case the burial (with the tumultuary pomp of war, ^{<3102>}Amos 2:2) of the remains was a cardinal duty of the army and its commander (^{<1115>}1 Kings 11:15). The scrupulousness of the. later Jews respecting the observance of the Sabbath (q.v.) sometimes gave the enemy an advantage over them.' See generally Lydii *Syntagma de re mi'itari*, c. notis Van Til (Dordaei, 1698; also in Ugolini *Thes*. xxvii). Kausler's *Worterb. der Schlachten aller Volker* (vol. i, Ulm, 1825) is of little value for Hebrew archeology. **SEE BATTLE**. On ^{<4105>}1 Corinthians 9:26, **SEE GAMES**.

Figure

stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative of the following words in the original: **l m s**, *se'mel*, ^{<1346>}Deuteronomy 4:16, i.e. an *idol*, as elsewhere rendered; **t [l] q m a z i k l a ' a t h**, ^{<1102>}1 Kings 6:29, a *carving*, as, elsewhere rendered; but usually, in a metaphorical sense, **t y n b a t j** *tabnith'*, ^{<23413>}Isaiah 44:13, *likeness* or pattern, as elsewhere rendered; to which correspond in the N.T. **τύπος**, ^{<4073>}Acts 7:43; ^{<4514>}Romans 5:14, a *type*; **ἀντίτυπον**, ^{<3024>}Hebrews 9:24, ^{<1082>}1 Peter 3:21, an *antitype*; and **παραβολή**, ^{<3009>}Hebrews 9:9; 11:19, a *parable*, as elsewhere rendered. **SEE TYPE; SEE PARABLE**.

Fiji Islands

a group of islands in Polynesia, situated 340. miles north-west of the Friendly Islands, between lat.15° 30' and 19° 30', and long. 177° and 1780 West. It comprises 225 islands, of which 95 are inhabited. The others are occasionally resorted to by natives for the purpose of fishing, and taking

the *bichede-mer*, or sea-slug. Two are large islands, stretching north-east and south-west nearly throughout the whole extent of the group, and are supposed to be each about 300 miles in circumference. The group comprises seven districts, and is under as many principal chiefs. All the minor chiefs on the different islands are more or less connected or subject to one of these. The area of the whole group is estimated at 8033 sq. miles, and the population at from 125,000 to 150,000. The white population is about 2000, among whom are 40 Americans. The people are divided into a number of tribes, independent of and often hostile to' each other. In each tribe great and marked distinction of rank exist. The classes which are readily distinguished are as follows: 1. kings; 2. chiefs; 3. warriors; 4. the king's messengers (*matanivanua*, literally "eyes of the lands"); 5. slaves (*kaisi*). *Mbau*, the metropolis and imperial city, is situated on a small island, about two miles in circumference. It contains nearly one thousand inhabitants.

War is a constant occupation of the natives, and engrosses most of their time and thought. In 1809 they became acquainted with the use of fire-arms. The crew of a brig which had been wrecked on the reef off *Nairai*, in order to preserve their lives, joined the *Mbau* people, instructed them in the use of the musket, and assisted them in their wars. Next to war, agriculture is the most general occupation of this people. They have a great number of esculent fruits and roots, which they cultivate in addition to many spontaneous productions of the soil.

Of the religion of the natives, the following account is given in Newcomb, *Cyclopcedia of Missions*: "The *pantheon* of the Fijians contains many deities. Many of the natives,' says Mr. Hunt, in his Memoirs of Mr. Cross ' believe in: the existence of a deity called *Ove*, who is considered the maker of all men; yet different parts of the group ascribe their origin to other gods. A certain female deity is said to have created the *Vewa* people; and yet if a child is born malformed it is attribute to an oversight of *Ove* The god most generally known next to *Ove* is *Ndengei*. He is worshipped in the form of a large :serpent, alleged to dwell in a district under the authority of *Mbau*, which is called *Nakauvandra*, and is situated near the western end of *Viti-Levu*. To this deity they believe that the spirit goes immediately after death for purification, or to receive sentence. All spirits; however, are not believed to be permitted to reach the judgment-seat of *Ndengei*; for, upon the road, it is supposed that an enormous. giant, armed with a large axe, stands constantly on the watch. With this weapon he endeavors to wound

all who. attempt to pass him. Those who are wounded dare not present themselves to Ndengei, and are obliged .to wander about in the mountains. Whether the spirit be wounded or not depends not upon the conduct in life; but they ascribe an escape from a blow to good luck. They have four classes of gods besides their malicious deities.' The occasions on which the priests are required to officiate are. usually the following: to implore good crops of yams and taro; on going to battle; for propitious voyages; for rain; for storms, to drive boats and ships ashore, in order that the natives may plunder them; and for the destruction of their enemies. Their belief in a future state, guided by no just notions of religious or moral obligation, is the source of many abhorrent practices, among which are the custom of putting their parents to death when they are advanced in years, suicide, the immolation of wives at the funeral of their husbands, and human sacrifices."

The islands were discovered in 1643 by Tasman, partly rediscovered in 17-73 by Cook, visited in 1789 and 1792 by Bligh, but accurate information about them was for the first time obtained through the expeditions of Dumont d' Urville (1827) and Wilkes (1840). The; history of the Christianization of the Fiji Islands began in 1835. In October of that year, the Rev. Wm. Cross and D. Cargill Wesleyan missionaries from England, proceeded from Vavau,. one of the Friendly Islands, to Lakemba, one of the Fiji Islands. It is but a small island, being only, about 22 miles in circumference, and did not contain above 1000 inhabitants. The chief, to whom their object was explained, appeared friendly, gave them a piece of land on which to live, and built a temporary dwelling for each of their families. In a few months the missionaries baptized number of the natives, some of whom had previously obtained a knowledge of Christianity in the Friendly Islands. The chief, being only a tributary chief, appeared unwilling to take any step in favor of Christianity until he knew the minds of the more powerful chiefs of Fiji, and amen threatened and persecuted the converts. Is the course of a few years, the missionaries, with the aid of native teachers and preachers, some of whom came from the Vavau Islands, introduced the Gospel into various other islands of the Fiji group besides Lakemba, as Rewa, Vewa, Bua, Nandy and some others of minor importance. They were favorably received by a number of the chiefs and the people, in some instances, however from motives of a secular character. In 1845 and the following year 'there was a great religious movement in the islands of Vewa, which extended as-o to other islands,

and resulted in large additions to the Christian churches. Among the most remarkable fruits of the movement was the conversion of a chief whose name was Varin and who had long acted as the human butcher of Seru, being called the Napoleon of Fiji.

In 1854, the chief king of the islands, king Thakombau, who occupied several of the smaller islands and the eastern coast of Viti-Levu, together, with his tribe, embraced Christianity. Since this time the prosperity of the islands has rapidly increased, and they are now partially civilized. A number of whites have; settled on the island, and have developed to a considerable extent the natural resources of the soil. A great part of the territory of Thakombau is now mapped off into cotton and. sugar plantations, most of the planters being Australians. There is also in the island of Levuka, now the head-quarters of the king and his seat of government, a flourishing little town called Ovalau, which has a hotel and a number of stores, all of them kept by whites. There is a British consul also stationed in this island, and in 1868 an agent of the American government was sent there from Sidney. About the same time that king Thakombau embraced Christianity, the crews of two American whalers were murdered by his subjects. The American government preferred a claim for compensation, and it was ultimately agreed that \$45,000 should be paid by the Fijians in reparation for the outrage committed.; The king, finding it difficult-to raise the sum agreed upon, offered in 1858 his entire territory to the English government, by which it was, however, declined. In 1868 the king's prime minister, C. H. Hare (an Englishman), proposed that the American government should not only take possession of the three islands which had been mortgaged to it, but that it should also purchase all the other islands of the group. As the government of the United States was disinclined to buy the islands, an offer was accepted from a company in Melbourne the Fiji Trading and Banking Company, Which undertook to pay the amount due to the U. States, and in re turn received very extensive rights and privileges.

Christianity is now the predominant religion in the Fiji Islands. In the *Wesleyan Methodist Calendar* for 1869, the statistics of the mission are reported as follows: circuits, 9, chapels; 4 53 other preaching-places, 339; missionaries and assistant missionaries, 58; subordinate paid and unpaid agents, 4051; members, -17,836; on trial for membership, 4609; scholars in schools, 35,617; attendants on public worship, 109,088. The Christianization of the whole group makes rapid progress. One heathen

island was visited in 1867 for the first time. In the same year the Rev. Mar. Baker, a Wesleyan missionary, also a native assistant missionary, a native catechist, and six native students were murdered by the people in the interior of Viti Levu. See Newcomb, *Cyclopedia of Missions*, p. 720; Brown's *History of Missions*, vol. i ; J. Hunt's *Life of Mr. Cross*; Walter Lawry, *Missions in Tonga and Fiji*; G. R. Rowe-, *Life of John Hunt T. Williams and James' Calvert, Fiji 'and the Fijians* (London, 2d edit. 1868, 2 vols.). (A. J. S.)

File

is the incorrect rendering in the Eng. Bible of the expression μῦρπαρυχῆ (*pelsirah'pim* found only in ^{ⲀⲠⲈⲢⲓ}1 Samuel 13:21), which literally signifies a *notching of the mouth* or *edge* of tools, i.e. bluntness or dulness of the agricultural instruments, in consequence of the want of smiths to sharpen them by welding out the point.

Filiation

(OF SON OF GOD). The state of, relationship' in which the Second Person .of the Godhead stands to the First, as the Son of the Father. *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*; *SEE FATHER*; *SEE SON OF GOD*; *SEE SONSHIP*; *SEE TRINITY*.

Filioque Controversy

a historical question as to the introduction of the words καὶ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ (*filioque* and from the Son) into the Nicene Creed, to denote the procession "of the Holy" Ghost from the Son as well as from the Father. The Western churches admit the filioque; the Eastern deny it; and this is the chief doctrinal point of division between the Greek and Latin churches.

1. The original Nicene Creed (A.D. 325), it is admitted on all hands, does not contain the filioque. The simple statement there made is, "We believe also in the Holy Ghost" (καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον). *SEE CREED*, The Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed (A.D. 381) adds the phrase τὸ ἐκ τῶν πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, *who preceded from the Father*; but says nothing about "the Son". The Council, of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) made certain modifications of the language of the creed *SEE CHALCEDON*, but left the passage relating to the Holy Ghost unchanged. Nor has any change on this point ever been authorized by any general council recognised, as

such either by the Eastern or Western churches. To this day the creed is recited and used throughout the East in the original form But the Roman Church, and also the Reformed church used it with the words " and from the Son." The historical question is, When and how did this interpolation take place ?

2. It was said under CREED *SEE CREED* that this addition of *filoque* first appeared in the acts of a synod at Braga, in Spain, A.D. 412 (A.D. 411; Bingham, *Orig. Ecet.* 10:4, 16), but the records of that synod are now acknowledged, even by the Latins, to be spurious (Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ii, 91). In 446, Turibius bishop of Astorga, addressed a letter to-Leo the Great complaining of the Priscillianist heresy in Spain. Leo ordered a council of all Spain, but the troubles of the time (the Goths controlling much of the country) made this impossible; and two synods were held, one in Toledo, the other in Galicia (A.D. 447; Mansi, 6:491). At Toledo, nineteen bishops were present; and here, and by these nineteen Spanish bishops, the words *filoque* were first used- of the procession of the Holy Ghost in a creed (Hefele, *Concilmengeschichte*, ii, 289). But the records were not added here to the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed. This was first done at the third Council of Toledo (A.D. 589), held by order of king Reccaredus, on the occasion of his abjuring Arianism (Hefele, iii, 44). At this council, and by order of Reccaadus, an anathema was declared against all who should deny the procession from "the Son also" (*filoque*). It is doubtful, however, whether the reverend fathers really knew what was the original form of the creed, as they issued a canon at the same time ordering the creed to be recited " according to the form of the Oriental churches." But the General Council of Constantinople (A.D. 681) paid no attention to this obscure Spanish innovation, and promulgated time creed in its original form, as also did the seventh General Council at Nicaea, A.D. 787. But the habit of using the creed with the *flioque* had now grown up in the West, and was favored by Charlemagne. In 809 two Western monks from the court of Charlemagne were at Mount Olivet, and there used this new Western: form, for which they were accused of heresy by the Easterns. Charlemagne hated the East heartily, drew up a refutation of the Eastern doctrine, and summoned a council at Aix-la-Chapelle (809), which sanctioned *the filoque*, and sent deputies to Leo III to obtain his confirmation of their decision. Leo refused to add *the filoque* to the creed, and even had the creed, itself, in its original form, engraved on two silver shields (in Greek and Latin), which he hung up in St.: Paul's Church as a

testimony to his unwillingness to break his oath of allegiance to the general councils by adding to the creed. At the same time, he gave his sanction to the doctrine of the *filoque* as scriptural and sound. In the latter part of the century the troubles with Photius (q.v.) renewed the controversy between East and West; and the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 879), which was attended by 380 bishops, anathematized all who add the *filoque*. No pope had as yet formally authorized the addition, and yet-it-was coming into general use in the West, under the authority, especially, of pope Nicholas I (Neale, *Eastern Church*; p. 1155 sq.; Mansi, 15:255). Finally, Rome *did* add *the filoque* to the creed, but in no public or open way; "no decretal, encyclical or synodical, announcing her adhesion. The thing was done in a corner, and, but for a curious liturgical writer of the Western empire, who went to see his sovereign, Henry II, crowned at Rome, A.D. 1014, by pope Benedict VIII, nobody could have guessed when it occurred. Beruo therefore records what he witnessed with his own eyes and ears; and being engaged himself in a work on the Mass, he would naturally be very particular in his inquiries when he came to Rome, of all places, how things were done there. Now his account is that up to that time the Romans, that is, the Church of Rome generally, had *in no wise* chanted the creed after the gospel; but that the lord emperor Henry would not desist till, with the approval of all, he had persuaded the apostolic lord Benedict to let it be chanted at high mass. Thus Reccard inaugurated the addition, Charlemagne patronized it, and Henry II got it adopted by the popes themselves. When this had been done, the pontifical oath was changed. Later popes, of course, shrank from imprecating a judgment-upon themselves, according to the terms of their oath, in case they failed to keep the decrees of the general councils enumerated in it, '*usque ad unum npticem,*' when they felt they had notoriously failed to do so by the creed. That clause was accordingly struck out. For the last 1000 years the Roman communion has been committed to the use of a creed which is not that of the Church, but of the Crown! I do not say, *therefore*, to the use of a creed which is heterodox. On the theological question involved in it I would wish to speak with becoming reverence; but thus much is certain, that the addition which forms its distinguishing feature was made and had been in use many centuries before any pope judged it allowable, much less necessary; many centuries before theologians in the West had agreed among themselves whether the terms 'mission' and 'procession' were distinguishable. Doubtless it has since found able defenders; but among them there are scarce two who give the same account of it, historically or doctrinally, and

some of them are neither consistent with each other nor with themselves. Others, in arguing for it against the Easterns, have grievously misstated facts, and numberless passages have been adduced in support of it from the fathers, either wholly spurious or interpolated. I know of no parallel to it in this respect in any religious controversy before or since. If the Athanasian Creed was not expressly coined for this controversy, it was employed in this controversy first as a polemical weapon" (Ffoulkes, *Letter to Archbishop Manning*, London, 1868).

For the renewal of the question, with a view to union between the Greeks and Latins at the Council of Florence, *SEE FLORENCE*. The great English divines, Pearson and Waterland, while adhering to the doctrine of the West, condemn the interpolation of the creed. So Pearson remarks: "Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental for *adding filioque* to the creed, contrary to a general council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the authority of another council; and so the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, never to be ended until those words, *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ νιοῦ*, are taken out of the creed" (*Exposition of the Creed*, art. 8:Oxford, 1820, ii, 394).

The commissioners for a review of the English Prayer-book, 1689, expressed in a note their opinion that something should be done to satisfy the Greek Church. At a later period the non-juring prelates made proposals to the Greeks, stating that in the clause *filioque* nothing more is meant than "from the Father by the Son;" to which the Greek patriarch and Synod of Constantinople replied (April 12, 1718): "We receive no other rule or creed than that which was set forth by the first and second holy General Council, in which it was decreed that the Holy Ghost proceeds 'from the Father.' Therefore *we receive none who add the least syllable* (and the most perfect word would fall far short), either by way of insertion, commentary, or explication to this holy creed, *or who take anything from it*. For the holy fathers at that time anathematize all such as shall either take from or add to it any word or syllable. If any one has formerly inserted any word, *let it be struck out*, and let the creed be unaltered as it was at first written, and is to this day, after so many years, read and believed by us. Now, concerning this point, we thus believe that there is a *twofold procession* of the Holy Spirit: the one natural, eternal, and before time, according to which the Holy Spirit *proceeds front the Father alone*; and of which it is both written in the creed, and the Lord has said, the Comforter,

whom I will SEND unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER' (~~4536~~ John 15:26). The other procession is *temporal* and *deputative*, according to which the Holy Spirit is externally sent forth, derived, proceeds, and flows from both the Father and the Son for the sanctification of the creature. As to his temporal and outward procession, we agree that he proceeds, comes, or is sent *by* the Son, or *through the Son's mediation*, and *from the Son*, in this sense of an *outward* procession, for the sanctification of the creature. But this **πρόεσις**, or mission, we do not call procession, lest we should be as unhappy as the Papists, who, because of the limited dialect of the -Latin language, which is unable to express the **πρόεσις**, or mission, by one word, and the **ἐκπόρευσις**, or procession, by another, have called them both processions, which afterwards grew into error, and made them: take the *eternal* procession for that **πρόεσις** which was *in time*" (*Amer. Quart. Church Rev.* April, 1868, p. 93).

The historical question is very thoroughly discussed by the Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes (a convert from the Anglican to the Roman Church) in several recent works of his, especially in *A Historical Account of the Addition of the Words Filioque to the Creed* (Lond. 1867). Mr. Ffoulkes states that he has no objection to the doctrine of the double procession in the abstract, but he objects to its "embodiment in the creed in a word of four syllables, foisted in without authority, retained there without authority, in a place that was never designed for it, in a proposition set apart for the declaration of another truth" (p. 31). Moreover, he objects to the clause because it binds to the acceptance of a proposition which has two meanings; "the sense in which the Holy Ghost is said to proceed from the Son not being *in every way coextensive* with the sense in which he is said to proceed from the Father." And he expresses his conviction that this clause has a good deal to do with the Socinianism and Unitarianism so long rife in the West. Mr. Ffoulkes notices that in the East, where the filioque is not adopted, "there is positively no such thing known as Unitarianism among baptized Christians" and it happened to himself once to meet with this reply from a literary friend with whom he had been discussing the clause-" I find my escape from it in Unitarianism."

3. For the theological question involved, **SEE HOLY GHOST, PROCESSION**. Suffice it bare to say, that while the Latins are inexcusable, according to their own canons law, for their addition of the filioque to the creed, they are still correct as to the doctrine. Their deeper anthropological

investigations naturally developed the doctrine of the *mission* of the Holy Ghost by the Son. Palmer (*Dissertations on Subjects relating to the Eastern Communion*, Lond. 1853, 8vo, p. 103.sq.) gives the following summary of the controversy:

I. That When the expression of the Holy Ghost proceeding also from the Son was first noticed and objected against by the Greeks, the Latins explained it away or dissembled it, instead of openly insisting on it as truth. Again,

II. That when, at length, they had all received it themselves, the Latins attempted to force it into the creed, and to impose it on the Church at large by overbearing violence, not by an ecumenical council.- Again,

III. That in seeking to impose it upon the Easterns, the Latins generally have rested it upon manifestly false grounds, as upon the ground of unbroken and. explicit tradition. Again,

IV. That a vast multitude of. passages, formerly alleged by the Latins, both from Greek and Latin fathers, have been proved either to be interpolations altogether, or to have been corrupted. Lastly,

V. That some of the texts most insisted on by the Latins at the Council of Florence, and shown afterwards, by Zoernikaff, to have been corrupted, have, since Zoernikaff wrote, been surrendered, even by Latin editors; so that the Greek cause, as respects the critical examination of passages, has gained materially in strength since the Council of Florence. But to reject a doctrine not revealed in Scripture, nor handed down by us broken tradition from the beginning, but dug out' or developed by a part of the Church ins later ages, and violently thrust upon t-he rest on false grounds, can never be heresy. If, indeed, it were confessed to be a novelty and a development, and sufficiently shown to be, notwithstanding, a legitimate and necessary development, there might be a greater responsibility -in rejecting it. On the other side, very many of the Greeks assert, not only that the Latin doctrine is false in itself, but also that it is a heresy, and that the Latins are heretics for maintaining it.

But against this view it is fair to object,

I. That those heretical consequences which seem to flow from the assertion of the procession from the Son as well as from the Father, and on

account of which the doctrine itself is said to be heresy, are clearly rejected and condemned as heresies by the Latins, no less than by the Greeks; - which would seem to reduce the Latin error, if it be an error, to a mere misconception and misuse of words.

II. That all heresies spring from evil motives; but the motive, which prompted the assertion of this doctrine is commonly admitted, even by the Greeks, to have been good, namely, the desire to maintain against the Arians and other heretics, the coequality of the Son with the Father.

III. That the Greeks have repeatedly and all along offered to unite and communicate with the Latins, winking at all other faults if only the form of the creed were restored, which they could not have done if the doctrine of the procession from the Son had been held to be heresy in itself. **IV.** That until not only some or many passages, but all those passages in St. Augustine and other Latin fathers which assert the procession from the Son, have been shown to be corrupt or interpolated, or, in sense, to mean no more than they were stated to mean in the explanation given at Rome to Maximus the martyr in the 7th century, the Latins, even if they be in error, cannot be called heretics for adhering to a doctrine seemingly taught and bequeathed to them by great saints, who are venerated as such by the Eastern Church, no less than by their own. 'We conclude, then, that so long as the "*Filioque*" is not interpolated into the creed without the consent of a council, the question of the doctrine in itself is still open and pending; and that neither are the Greeks heretics if they deny it, nor the Latins if they assert it, so long as they both desire that the subject may be fairly and religiously decided by an ecumenical council.'

Literature. Besides the works already mentioned, see J. G. Walch, *Hist. Cont. Graec. Latinorumque* (Jen. 1751, 8vo); J. G. Voss, *De Tribus Symbolis*, diss. iii.; Neale, *Eastern Church, Introduct.*; *Waterland, Works* (Oxford, 1843), iii, 201, 437; Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. viii; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 169; Neander, *Church History*, Torrey's transl., iii, 234, 553 sq.; Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, § 131; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* § 13, 41; *Hist. of the Council of Florence*, transl. by Popoff and J. M. Neale (Lond. 1861; 12mo); Neale, *Voices from the East* (London, 1859), p. 60 sq.; Harvey, *History of the Creeds*, p. 452 sq.; Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 61, n. 4; Browne, *Exposition of the Articles*, p. 114 sq.; Procter, *On Common Prayers*, p. 234; Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica.*, p. 121; *Christian Remembrancer*, July, 1853, p. 69 sq.;

Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, i. 59 sq.; ii, 67, 551 sq.; *Westminster Rev.* Jan. 1868, p. -111; *American Quarterly Church Review*, April, 1868, art. v. *SEE FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF; SEE GREEK CHURCH; SEE HOLY GHOST; SEE PROCESSION.*

Fillan, ST.

"Two Scoto-Irish saints of the name of Fillan appear in the Church calendars, and have left their mark on the topography of Scotland and Ireland.

(1.) ST. FILLAN, or Faoaan, surnamed the Leper, had his yearly festival on the 20th of June. His chief church in Scotlaned was at the east end of Loch Enne, in Perthshire, where St. Fillan's Well was long believed to have supernatural powers of healing. A seat in the rock of Dunfillan still keeps thee s-me of 'St. Fillan's Chair;' and two cavities beside it are said to have been hollowed by St. Fillan's knees in prayer. His Irish church is at Ballyheyland (anciently called Killhealan or Kill Feelain), in the barony of Cullenagb, in Queen's County.

(2.) ST. FILLAN, the abbot, the Son of St. Kentigerna of Inchscaleoch, in Loch Lomond, lived in the 8th century, and had his yearly festival on the 7th or 9th of January. His church in Ireland was at Cluain Maosenaain Fartullacb, in the county of Westumeath. His chief church in Scotland was is Perthshire, in the upper part of Glesndoeheart, which takes from him the name of Strathfillan. Here a well-endowed priory, dedicated in his honor, was repaired or rebuilt in the beginning of the 14th century. King Robert Bruce made a grant of money to the work, in gratitude, probably, for the miraculous encouragement which be was said to heave received on the eve of Bannockburn from a relic of the saint-one of his arm bones enclosed in a silver case. Another relic of St. Fillan's the silver head of his crosier or pastoral staff has been preserved to our time. It is called the 'Coygerach' or 'Quigrich,' and appears in record as early same year 1428, when it was in the hereditary keeping one family named Jore or Dewсар, who were believed to leave been its keepers from the time of king Robert Bruce. They bad half a boll of meal yearly from every parishioner of Glendochart who held a merk land, and smaller quantities from smaller tenants; and they were bound, in return, to follow the stolen cattle of -the parishioners wherever their traces could be found within the realm of Scotland. The Quigrich, besides its virtues in the detection of theft, was venerated-also

for its miraculous powers of healing. In 1487, the right of keeping it was confirmed to Malice Doire or Dewar by king James III in a charter, which was presented for registration among the public records of Scotland so lately as the year 1734. Sixty years later, the Quigrich still commanded reverence; but its healing virtues were now only tried on cattle, and its once opulent keepers had fallen to the rank of farm-laborers. It was publicly exhibited in Edinburgh in the year 1818, before being carried to Canada, where it now is, in the hands of a descendant of its old custodians, a farmer named Alexander Dewar. He puts such a value on the relic that he has hitherto refused to part with it for less than £400 sterling, or 1000 acres of Canadian land. It has been recently figured and described by Dr. Daniel Wilson in a paper in the *Canadian Journal*, No. 24:reprinted in a pamphlet, with the title of *The Quigrich, or Crosier of St. Fillan* (Toronto, 1859); and in the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 233, plate xxvi (Edinb. 1861). A linn in the river Fillan or Dochart, in Strathfillan, was long believed to work wonderful cures on insane persons, who were immersed, in the stream at sunset, and left bound hand and foot till sunrise in the ruins of the neighboring church of St. Fillan. A hand-bell, which bore the name of St. Fillan, was also believed to work miracles."

Fillet

Picture for Fillet

is an erroneous translation in the A. V. of two Heb. words: מַיְקָרְטִי *chashukim'*, *joinings* (comp. ^{<12817>}Exodus 38:17, 28; 27:17), the poles or rods which served to join together the tops of the columns .around the court of the tabernacle (q.v.), and from which the curtains were suspended (^{<12710>}Exodus 27:10, 11; 36:38; 38:10, 11, 12,17,19). פַּוּי , *chut*, a *thread* (as elsewhere rendered), a measuring-line 12 cubits long for the circumference of the pillars of copper in Solomon's Temple (^{<2521>}Jeremiah 52:21). **SEE COLUMN; SEE GARLAND.**

Fillet

a small flat face or band in classical architecture, used to separate mouldings; in Gothic architecture, a flat band on a curved moulding, used to decorate a shaft on a larger moulding. When on the front of a large

moulding, it is called its keel; on the sides, it is called a wing. In the cut, *a a* are examples of fillets.

Fin

(*ryPæs*] *senappir'*, of uncertain etymol.), the fin of a fish (q.v.), a distinctive mark of such as might be eaten under the Mosaic law (^(R10)Leviticus 11:9, 10, 12; ^(B4B)Deuteronomy 14:9, 10). *SEE CLEAN.*

Final Perseverance

SEE PERSEVERANCE

Fine

or *mulct* for damages (q.v.). In some instances, by the Mosaic law, the amount of a fine, or of an indemnification that was to be made, was determined by the person who had been injured; in other instances it was fixed by the judge, and in others was defined by the, law (^(D21B)Exodus 21:19-36; ^(B21B)Deuteronomy 22:19, 29). Twofold, fourfold, and even fivefold restitution of things stolen, and restitution of property unjustly retained, with twenty percent over and above, was required. Thus, if a man killed a beast, he was to make it good, beast for beast. This ordinance, observes Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, art. 160), appears only incidentally in ^(B3B)Leviticus 24:18, among criminal laws. If an ox pushed or gored another man's servant to death, his owner was bound to pay for the servant thirty shekels of silver (^(D21B)Exodus 21:32). In the case of one man's ox pushing or goring another's to death, it would have been a very intricate point to ascertain which of the two had been to blame for the quarrel, and therefore both owners were obliged to bear the loss. The living ox was sold, and the price, together with the dead one, equally divided between them (^(D21B)Exodus 21:35). If, however, the ox had previously been notorious for pushing, and the owner had not taken care to confine him, this made a difference; for then, to the man whose ox had been pushed, he was obliged to give another, and the dead ox he got himself (^(D21B)Exodus 21:36). If a man dug a pit and did not cover it, or let an old pit belonging to him remain open, and another man's beast fell into it, the owner of the pit was obliged to pay for the beast, and had it for the payment (^(D21B)Exodus 21:33, 34). When a fire was kindled in the fields, and did any damage, he who kindled it was obliged to make the damage good (^(D21B)Exodus 22:6). *SEE PUNISHMENT.*

Finer

(*ἄρξοψορέφ'*),:a gold and silver worker (^{<12704>}Proverbs 25:4). *SEE REFINER*. In ^{<17704>}Judges 17:4, our version renders the word "founder;" in ^{<23407>}Isaiah 41:7, "goldsmith." It refers especially-to the melting of fine metal. *SEE FURNACE*. The Egyptians carried the working of metals to a very extraordinary degree of perfection, as their various articles of jewelry preserved in our museums evince; and there is no doubt the Hebrews derived their knowledge of these arts from this source, though there is at the same time reference to their being known before the Flood (^{<11449>}Genesis 14:19-22). *SEE METAL*.

Finger

([*Ἔκφα*, *etsba'*, *δάκτυλος*), besides its ordinary meaning, is used in Scripture to denote the special and immediate agency of any one. *SEE ARM*. The Egyptian magicians, terrified by the numerous plagues inflicted upon their country, at length said, "This is the finger of God," i.e. this is done by the power of God himself (^{<1389>}Exodus 8:19). Moses gave the tables of the law written by the finger (personal direction) of God to the Hebrews (^{<12318>}Exodus 31:18). The heavens are said to be the work of God's fingers, i.e. his power (^{<1008>}Psalms 8:3). Christ cast out devils with the finger or power of God (^{<1112>}Luke 11:20). "To put forth the finger" is a bantering, insulting gesture (^{<2880>}Isaiah 58:9). Some take this for a menacing gesture, as Nicanor stretched out his hand against the Temple, threatening to burn it (2 Macc. 14:33). "Four fingers thick" occurs as a measure in ^{<2621>}Jeremiah 52:21. *SEE RING*.

Finial

Picture for Finial

the cluster of foliage that is frequently used to ornament the top of pinnacles, canopies, pediments, etc., in Gothic architecture. The term is also often used as synonymous with the pinnacle of a spire, roof, or canopy.

Finning-Pot

Picture for Finning Pot

(*āraṅṅi matsreph'*), a *crucible* or melting-pot (²⁰⁰⁸Proverbs 17:3; 27:21). *SEE METALLURGY*. The use of these for reducing gold was familiar to the ancient Egyptians " Much cannot, of course, be expected from the objects found in the excavated tombs to illustrate the means employed in smelting the ore, or to disclose any of the secrets they possessed in metallurgy; and little is given in the paintings beyond the use of the blow-pipe, the forceps, and the mode of concentrating heat by raising cheeks of metal round three sides of the fire in which the crucibles were placed. *SEE FURNACE*. Of the latter, indeed, there is no indication in these subjects, unless it be in the accompanying woodcut; but their use is; readily suggested, and some which have been found in Egypt are preserved in the museum of Berlin. They are nearly five inches in diameter at the mouth, and about the same is- depth, and present the ordinary form and appearance of those used at the present day" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* abridgm. ii, 138). *SEE HANDICRAFT*.

Finland

when first mentioned in history was inhabited by savage tribes belonging to the Finnish nations, which by piracy and frequent inroads became especially formidable to the Swedes. The latter subjugated with difficulty and only for a short time the coast of Finland, while the republic of Novgorod extended its rule over the southern branches of the Finns. The frequent robberies of the pagan Suousi induced king Eric of Sweden to conquer them, and compel them to adopt Christianity. Accompanied by bishop Henry, of Upsala, an Englishman, he landed in 1157 on the south-western coast, and at first met with but little resistance. The first church was built at Iendams-ecki, near the town of Abo, the foundation of which had likewise been laid by Eric. When Eric returned to Sweden, bishop Henry remained in the country, but the progress of Christianity was very slow, as the Finns had yielded only to compulsion; the missionaries had a very imperfect knowledge of the language, and the poverty of the language presented the greatest obstacles to an adequate designation of the new Christian ideas. While outwardly professing Christianity, most of the converts remained secretly addicted to their old pagan ideas, or at least sized up Christian doctrines with pagan mythology. Bishop Henry baptized a large number,

established an episcopal see at Rendameeki, and finally lost his life (1160) in consequence of his zeal in enforcing Church discipline.. After the complete triumph: of Christianity, the Finns venerated him as their apostle and patron saint. He was commemorated on the 19th of January and the 18th of June; his picture, exhibiting his full episcopal ornament with an axe by his side and the murderer at his feet, was hung up in every church, and many miracles were ascribed to his relics (*SEE HENRY*, apostle of the Finns). His successor, Rudolphus, was carried off by -the Courlanders and killed. The progress of Christianity was considerably delayed by the opposition of the Russians to the advance of the Swedes, on whom the existence of the feeble Christian Church was wholly dependent. In 1198, Abo was burned by the Russians, and the fourth bishop, also an Englishman, had to seek a refuge upon the island of Gothland. In 1249, the brother of the king of Sweden, Birger Magnusson, the first year of thee kingdom, landed on the southern coast of Asterbothnia, routed the tribe of the Tavasti, established the fortress of Tavasteborg, subsequently called Tavastehus, built several churches, and compelled the inhabitants to accept Christianity and to pay taxes to the bishop These taxes the fifth bishop, Bero, of his own accord, ceded to thee king. Another great Swedish expedition was undertaken in 1293 by Thorkel Knutson, the guardian of the minor king, Birger II. The pope not only sanctioned this expedition, but granted to the knights and warriors who took part in it the same indulgences as to the Crusaders. Thorkel landed with a large fleet, overpowered the inhabitants, and established the fortress of Wiborg. Bishop Peterm of Westeras, announced Christianity; to the tribes which were still pagans, and the Swedish arms left to thee natives only the choice between Christianity and slavery. Thus Christianity was gradually forced upon the whole -nation, with the exception of a few remote districts where paganism continued to maintain itself. Though planted and spread by force, Christianity finally rooted itself in the minds of the people by means of schools and churches. The episcopal see at Abo attained considerable celebrity. The number of churches was largely- increased, the cathedral school of Aba was numerously attended, and gradually six monasteries were established. The Reformation met in Finland with comparatively little resistance, and soon the Lutheran Church superseded Roman Catholicism altogether. In consequence of the wars between Sweden and Russia in the 18th and the beginning of the 19th centuries, Finland was lost to Sweden and gained by the emperor of Russia. In 1721, at the peace of Nyastadt, Russia received thee tomens of Wiborg and Kaeybholm; in 1743, at the

peace of Abo, a territory of about 4800 square miles, with the fortresses of Nyslott, Frederiksham, and Savolax; and in .1809, at the peace of Frederikshana, the whole of Finland. Emperor Alexander I reunited Wiborg, which for some time had constituted a Russian province, with Finland, which retains its old Constitution, its Swedish laws, and Lutheran religion. Finland is, in point of administration, wholly separated from Russia Proper; the highest authority is the imperial senate for Finland, consisting of 16 natives, under the presidency of a governor general. The diet, as formerly in Sweden, consists of four estates, nobility, clergy, burghers, and peasants.

The population of Finland in 1887 amounted to 2,232,0378, of whom 41,032 was connected with the Greek Church, which has 17 churches and 2 monasteries. The Roman Catholics have a church in Wiborg and in Helsingfors. Nearly the whole remainder, a population of about 2,190,000, belongs to the Lutheran Church. The organization of the Lutheran Church of Finland is in every respect similar to that of the Lutheran Church of Sweden. Liturgies, hymn-book, catechism, and other Church books, are substantially the same as in Sweden. The Church has one archbishopric, of Abo (the archbishop resides at Helsingfors), and two bishoprics, of Borgio and Kuopio, the latter of recent origin. The number of parishes in 1867 was 214. Most of the congregations have, besides the pastor, a chaplain, also a church council. The churches are generally well attended. In most of the churches, especially in the country, the sermons are preached in the Finnish language; in others, both Finnish and Swedish are used and in some Swedish exclusively. The highest literary institution is the University of Helsingfors (until 1847 at Abo). It has among the faculties one of Lutheran theology, about 45 professors, and about 1700 students. There is also at Helsingfors a theological seminary. Finland has 6 gymnasias, 13 secondary and 33 primary schools, 3 female institutions, and a number of schools for special purposes. At the higher institutions instruction is generally given in Swedish; but the use of the Finnish language is advancing at the expense of the Swedish, and this movement is greatly encouraged by the Russian government. An Evangelical Society was established in 1817; there are also several Bible Societies.-Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 4:7 ; Wiggers, *Kirchl. Statistik*, ii, 423; Rube, *Fins and u. se-a Bewohner* (Leipz. 1808). (A. J. S.)

Finley, James Bradley

one of the most distinguished and useful pioneers of Methodism in Ohio, was the son of the Rev. R.W. Finley, and was born in North Carolina July 1, 1781. He received a good education from his father. In 1801 he married, and settled in what is now Highland County, Ohio. In 1802, while returning from a camp-meeting in Kentucky, he was converted. He at once felt called to preach, but refused to obey, lost, all religion, and lived for seven years a- worse sinner than before. At the end of this time he was again converted, and immediately began to persuade his wicked neighbors to seek God, and soon formed a large society. , In 1809 he entered the Western Conference, travelled with great success for six years, and was in 1816-21 presiding elder on Steubenville, Ohio, and Lebanon Districts. Through the labors of John Stewart, the colored preacher, and Between-the-Logs, a converted chief, a great revival had begun among the Wyandotte Indians at Upper Sandusky. Thither Finley was sent in 1821, and spent six years of labor, suffering, and glorious success among the Indians. After his removal he still had supervision of the mission, and from 1829 to 1845 served the Church as preacher or presiding elder in the principal cities of Southern Ohio. He served as chaplain of the Ohio Penitentiary, at Columbus, from 1845 to 1849, when his health failed, and he was made superannuate. He was afterward appointed to Clinton Street, Cincinnati (from him named Finley Chapel). His last appointment was that of Conference missionary. He was thus forty-five times a delegate to the, General Conference. He died. Sept. 6, 1856, in Cincinnati. Both in character and labors he was an extraordinary man. His zeal, his indomitable courage, which the Indian chiefs both respected and feared, his sympathy and his integrity, gave him a dominant control over men of all professions and conditions. His eloquence in the pulpit, especially at camp-meetings, often brought down thousands almost at a stroke, and wherever he went conversions were multiplied. He published an *Autobiography* (Cincinnati, 1854, 12mo) :--*Wyandotte Mission* (12mo) :--*Sketches of Western Methodism* (Cincinnati, 1857, 12mo):*Life among the Indians* (Cincinnati, 1857, 12mo):- :*Memorials of Prison Life* (Cincinnati, 1860, 12mo).-.*Minutes of Conferences*, 6:441; *Autobiography of J. B. Finley* (Cincinnati, 1854); Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, vol. iv.

Finley, John P.

a Methodist Episcopal minister and professor of languages in Augusta College, Kentucky, was born in South Carolina in June, 1783, and, though early removed by his parents to the West, "* through their exertions and his own he obtained a classical education." From 1810 to 1822 he taught in schools and academies in Ohio, and preached also with zeal and success. In 1822 he was elected to the chair of languages in Augusta College, and the same year entered the itinerancy, and in both labored zealously and usefully until his death in May, 1825.- *Minutes of Conferences*, i, 505.

Finley, Robert, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, and president of the University of Georgia, was born at Princeton, N. J., in 1772, and graduated at Princeton College in 1787. From 1793 to 1795 he was a tutor in the college, and a trustee from 1807 to 1817, when he resigned. He was the minister of a Presbyterian church at Baskingridge, N. J., from June, 1797, till 1817. In 1816 he became greatly interested in the welfare of the free blacks, and formed a plan of sending them to Africa. He was thus the founder of the American Colonization Society. -He was chosen president of Athens College, Ga., and went there in 1817, but died Oct. 3d of that year.-Sprague, *Annals*, 4:126.

Finley, Robert Smith

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Basking Ridge, New Jersey, May 9, 1804, and was educated at Princeton College. He studied law, and was admitted to the bar at Cincinnati; but in 1833 he determined to enter the ministry, and spent a short time at Lane Seminary. In 1835 he was licensed by-the Presbytery of Mississippi, and was ordained in 1842. His first charge was Pine Grove, La.; and for some time he was missionary among the slaves near Natchez. For six years he edited, at St. Louis, the *Liberian Advocate*, devoted to African colonization, 'in which cause he was greatly interested through life. In 1850 he became pastor of the Presbyterian church at Metuchin, N. J., and in 1858 principal of the Presbyterian Female Institute at Talladega, Ala., where he died July 2, 1860.--Wilson, *Presbyterian Almanac*, 1861, p. 85.

Finley, Robert W.

a distinguished Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bucks County, Pa., June 9, 1750. He was converted at seventeen. Soon after he entered Princeton College, N. J., where he spent seven years in general and theological studies. In 1774 he was licensed to preach in the Presbyterian Church, and was sent as a missionary to Georgia and the Carolinas. Here he was a patriot as well as a preacher, and was often with general Marion in his expeditions, and incurred much enmity and risk of life from the Tories. In 1784 he went to Hampshire County, then in New Virginia, where he preached two years. In 1788 he emigrated to Kentucky, and eventually opened a school for students in divinity, and a number of his pupils were distinguished in subsequent life. In 1795 he went with general Massie to explore the Scioto country, then in the Northwest Territory and in May, 1796, he settled on the Scioto, below Chillicothe. In 1808 he connected himself with the Methodist Church, and in 1811 or 1812 joined the Ohio Conference as a travelling preacher. For many years he labored with great success, and received hundreds into the Church., When almost eighty and superannuated, he mounted his horse, with his books and clothes, and set off as a missionary to Sault St. Mari, and there formed a circuit and appointed a camp-meeting. He died at Germantown, Ohio, Dec. 8, 1840.-*Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 239. ,

Finley; Samuel, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister and president of-New, Jersey College, was born in County Armagh, Ireland,, and came to America in 1734. On his arrival at Philadelphia he renewed his studies preparatory to the ministry, and was licensed in 1740. He labored long and successfully in West Jersey, in Deerfield, Greenwich, and Cape May, and supplied the church in Philadelphia for a time. He was ordained by the Presbytery of New Brunswick in 1742, and in 1744 he accepted a call from Nottingham, Maryland, where he continued for nearly seventeen years, and where he kept an academy of great reputation. In 1761 he was called to the presidency of New Jersey College, and removed to Princeton, and soon after was honored with the degree of D.D. from Glasgow.; He died July 17, 1766. He published a sermon entitled *Christ triumphing and Satan raging*, 1741: *A Refutation of a Sermon on the Doctrine of Convictions*, 1743 :-*Satan. stripped of his angelic Robes*, 1743:-*A charitable Plea for the Speechless*, 1747:-*A Vindication of-the preceding*, 1748 :-*A Sermon-*

The Curse of Meroz, etc., 1757 :-A Sermon on the Death of President Davies, 1761.-Sprague, Annals, iii, 96.

Finnan

an Irish ecclesiastic whom Oswin, king -of Northumberland, called to the abbacy of Lindisfarne, and to superintend the churches in his kingdom. The Venerable Bede says, "He was a man of fierce and rough nature, but very successful in ministerial labors. He baptized Peada, king of the Middle Angles, and sent four priests to instruct his subjects in Christianity." He also consecrated Ceadmon, who afterwards became a very prominent bishop among the East Angles, and baptized Sigebert their king, together with great numbers of the common people. He was very active in promoting the temporal as well as the spiritual interest of the Church. During his superintendency, Bede says " he erected a church on the island of Lindisfarne fit for an episcopal see, which, nevertheless, he built after the manner of the Scatts [Irish], not of stone, but of sawn oak, and covered it with thatch" (Eccles. Hist. lib. iii, c. xxv). Years afterwards, when the Britishm clergy took possession of these churches in Northumberland, Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, required this church to be reconsecrated, and dedicated to the patronage of St. Peter. 'Finnsan, having for ten years superintended the abbacy' of Lindisfarne and the churches of Northumberland under the simple title of "bishop," died A.D. 661. Ha left a treatise entitled *Pro Valters-Pasclali Rile*, regarding the Irish and Oriental time of keeping Easter as the old and true time, and that of Rome as of recent date. See Bede's *Eccles. Hist.; Illust. Men of Ireland*, vol. i.' (D. D.),

Finns

"geographically the name of the inhabits of Finland, bit in ethnology that of a considerable branch, of the Ugrian race, dwelling for the most part in Finland, though with: some representatives in Sweden and Norway as wall. The Ugrians have bees classed among the nations said to have a Mongolian origin. Dr. Lathasn places them among the 'Tauranian Altaic Mongolidaw,' and divides them into Ugrians of the East and Ugrians of, the West. The Western Ugrians consist of Lapps, Finns, Permians, and other nations or tribes in the north and north-west of Russia, and of the Magyars in Hungary. The Magyars are the most numerous, and next after these come the Finns comprising about--2,000,000 of individuals. All the other tribes

of Western Ugrians do not together comprise so many. The Finns, in common with the other Ugrians, are of the Mongolian type. The Finns, from having been originally a nomadic race, have for many centuries. been stationary and civilized. Long before the arrival of the German and Slavic nations in the north of Europe, the Ugrians, or, *Ogres* (for the name, so common in fiction, is really of historic origin), possessed it, and were gradually pushed further north and east by the new invaders. Both Finns and Lapps, there is good reason to believe, originally extended much further south than they do at present occupying, perhaps, the whole of Sweden and Norway. "The Finns," says Priebard, were in the time of Tacitus as savage as the Lapps; but the former during the succeeding ages, became so far civilized as, to exchange a nomadic life for one of agricultural pursuits, while the Lapps have ever continued to be barbarous nomades,—as well as the Siberian tribes of the same race—namely, the Woguls and Ostiaks. The Finns, as well as their brethren the Beormahs, or Finns of the White Sea, had probably undergone this change long before the time when they were visited by Otther, the guest of Alfred. When the Finns were conquered by the Swedes, they had long been a settled people, but one of curious, and singular, and isolated character." *SEE FINLAND.*

Fintanus Or Fintan

the founder of the monastery of Rheinau (q.v.), in the canton of Zurich. He descended from a noble family in the province of Leinster, Ireland, In a war between two chieftains, one chieftain killed Fintan's brother, and, fearing that Fintan would avenge the brother's death, caused him insidiously to be carried off by the Normans. Having changed his master several times within a few days, Fintan was to be taken to Scotland, but escaped when the vessel landed at one of the Orkney Islands. He had to spend three days on this uninhabited island, after which he swam, miraculously supported, to Scotland. He remained for two years with a bishop who had studied in Ireland then, in compliance with a vow, he journeyed, through Gallia, Alemannia, and Lombardy, to Rome. After his return he first went to the monastery of Pffaffers, and from there to Rheinau, where he completed, conjointly with Wolfen, a scion of the house of the Welfs, the monastery which the grandfather and father of Wolfen had begun. After working at Rheinau for five years as a priest, he entered the monastery in 851, remained there five years?, and thereupon became a hermit, leading for 22 years, from 856 to 878, the year of his death, a life of extreme asceticism. Thus he came to be venerated as a saint, even

during his lifetime, throughout the whole region. When his friend Wolfen, who in the mean time had become abbot of Rheinau, returned from Rome with the relics of St. Blasius, Fimntan took a portion of them to a cell in the Black Forest, which subsequently was called St. Blasien.-Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie* 19:491.

Fir

(the -name. of an extensive family of coniferous evergreens; see Penny *Cyclopaedia*, s.. v.. Abies) is the uniform rendering in the Auth.Vers. of **v/rB]** *berosh* (from its being cut into planks, Gesenius, *Thees. Heb.* p, 246), which frequently occurs (^{<1065>}2 Samuel 6:5; ^{<1068>}1 Kings 5:8, 10; 6:15, 34, 9:11; ^{<1023>}2 Kings 9:23; 2 Chronicles 2:8; 3:5; ^{<1947>}Psalms 104:17; ^{<2348>}Isaiah 14:8; 37:24 41:19; 55:13; 60:13; ^{<3275>}Ezekiel 27:5; 31:8; ^{<3448>}Hosea 14:8; ^{<3413>}Nahum 2:3; ^{<3112>}Zechariah 11:2), and **t/rB]** *beroth'*, which is said to be only the Aramsean form of the same word (in ^{<2017>}Song of Solomon 1:17). In most of the passages. the terms rendered cedar and fir in the Auth.Vers. are mentioned together. *Berosh* is: translated variously in the Sept. *πίτυς*, *πεν"κη*, *κνπάρισσος*, and (Ezek. 27:5) *κέδρος*; in ^{<2348>}Isaiah 14:8, *ξύλα Διβάνου*; in the Vulg. chiefly abies, *cupressals*. It was a lofty tree (^{<2353>}Isaiah 55:13), growing on Lebanon (^{<2374>}Isaiah 37:24), and of an ornamental figure (^{<2303>}Isaiah 60:13). The passages from which any special account of its use can be derived are,

1. Of musical instruments (^{<1065>}2 Samuel 6:5);
2. Of doors (^{<1053>}1 Kings 6:34);
3. Of gilded ceilings (^{<485>}2 Chronicles 3:5);
4. Boards or decks of ships (^{<3275>}Ezekiel 27:5), or planks for flooring, (^{<1065>}1 Kings 6:15). Rosenmuller says "In most of the passages where the Hebrew word occurs, it is by the oldest Greek and the Syriac translators rendered *cypress*." Celsius, on the contrary, is 'of opinion that *beroshk* indicates the cedar of Lebanon, and that *es-z*, which is usually considered to have that meaning, is the common pine (*Pinus syrestris*), apparently because he conceives *berosh* to be changed from *sherbin*, the Arabic name of *pine*' J. E. Faber, as quoted by Rosenmuller, conjectures that the Hebrew name *berosh* included three different trees which resemble each other, viz, the evergreen cypress, the thyine, and; the savine. The last, *Jenaiperua soabi/a*, is so like the cypress that the ancients often called it by that name,

and the moderns have noticed the resemblance, especially as to the leaves. "Hence, even among the Greeks, both trees bore the old Eastern names--of *berash*, *learoth*, *brutha*, or *brathy*" (Rosesmuller *Bot. of the Bible*, ta-an-sl. p. 260). The word *berosh* 'or *beroth* is slightly varied in the Syriac and Chaldee versions, being written *berutha* in the former, and *berath* in the latter. All these are closely allied to' *breta*, a name of the *sacsnea* plat, which is the βράθου, βράθουν, and βαράθους of the Greeks, and which the 'Arabs have converted into *burasi* and *busratl*.' By them it is applied to a species of juniper, which they call *abhul* and *ases* or *oss*. It appears that man' of these terms must be considered generic rather than specific in the modern sense, when so much care is bestowed on the accurate discrimination of one species from another. Thus *arus*, applied by the Arabs to a juniper, indicates a pine-tree in Scripture, whether we follow the common acceptation and consider it the cedar, or adopt the opinion of Celsius, that the *Pinus sylvestris* is indicated. So *bursal*' may have been applied by the Arabs, etc. not only to the sasvine and other species of juniper, but also to plants, such as the cypress, which resemble these. In many of those 'cases, therefore, where we are unable to discover any absolute identity or similarity of name, we must be guided by the nature of the trees, the uses to which they were applied, and the situations in which they are said to have been found. Thus, as we find *erez* and *berosh* so constantly associated in Scripture, the former may indicate the cedar with the wild pine-tree, while the latter may comprehend the juniper and cypress tribe. **SEE CEDAR; SEE CYPRESS; . SEE JUNIPER.** All these were extensively used for architecture, and are at this day found in Lebanon (Balfour, *Trees of Scripture*, p. 11; Thenius on ^{<1063>}1 Kings 6:34; Saalschutz, *Hebr. Arch.* i, 280, note 4; Miller, *Gardener's Dict.* s.v. Cupressus;. Stephens, *Thes. Ling. Gr.* s.v. πέύκη; Belon, *Obs.* c. 110, p. 165; Loudon, *Arboretum*, 4:2163). In ^{<2848>}Hosea 14:8, the " stone-pine " (*Pinus pinea*), which has a cone containing an edible nut, seems to be intended (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, in loc.), although Henderson (*Comment.* in loc.) thinks that a fruitless tree is there referred to by way of contrast. **SEE TREE.**

Fire

(properly vaj *esh*, πῶρ). On the origin of fire, see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* i, 94. The applications of fire in Scripture are susceptible of the following classification:

I. Religious.

1. That which consumed the burnt sacrifice and the incense-offering, beginning with the sacrifice of Noah (^{<080>}Genesis 8:20), and continued in the ever-burning fire on the altar; first kindled from heaven (^{<080>}Leviticus 6:9, 13; 9:24), and rekindled at the dedication of Solomon's Temple (^{<400>}2 Chronicles 7:1, 3). *SEE SACRIFICE.*

"Fire from heaven," "'fire of the Lord', usually denotes lightning in the Old Testament; but, when connected with sacrifices, the "fire of the Lord" is often to be understood as the fire of the altar, and sometimes the holocaust itself (^{<029>}Exodus 29:18; ^{<080>}Leviticus 1:9; 2:3; 3:5, 9; ^{<086>}Numbers 28:6; ^{<028>}1 Samuel 2:28; ^{<300>}Isaiah 20:16; ^{<300>}Malachi 1:10). *SEE LIGHTNING.*

The perpetual fire on the altar was to be replenished with wood every morning (^{<082>}Leviticus 6:12; comp. ^{<300>}Isaiah 31:9). According to the Gemara, it was divided into three parts, one for burning the victims, one for incense, and one for supply of the other portions (^{<085>}Leviticus 6:15; see Reland, *Antiq. Hebr.* i, 4, 8, p. 26; and 9:10, p. 98). Fire for sacred purposes obtained elsewhere than from the altar was called "strange fire," and for use of such Nadab and Abihu were punished with death by fire from God (^{<080>}Leviticus 10:1, 2; ^{<080>}Numbers 3:4; 26:61). *SEE ALTAR.*

2. Parallel with this application of fire is -to be noted the similar use for sacrificial purposes, and the respect paid to it, or to the heavenly bodies as symbols of deity (see below), which prevailed among so many nations of antiquity, and of which the traces are not even now extinct: e.g. the Sabæan and Magian systems of worship, and their alleged connection with Abraham (Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* ii, 1, 2); the occasional relapse of the Jews themselves into sun, or its corrupted form of fire-worship (^{<300>}Isaiah 27:9; compare Gesenius, s.v. *^Mj j Thesaur.* p. 489; see ^{<087>}Deuteronomy 17:3; ^{<480>}Jeremiah 8:2; ^{<386>}Ezekiel 8:16; ^{<305>}Zephaniah 1:5; ^{<276>}2 Kings 17:16; 21:3; 23:5, 10, 11, 13; comp. Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* c. 6:§ 405, 408); the worship or deification of heavenly bodies or of fire, prevailing to some extent, as among the Persians, so also even in Egypt (Herod. iii, 16; see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* i, 328, abridgm.); the sacred fire of the Greeks and Romans (Thucyd. i, 24; ii, 15; Cicero, *De Leg.* ii, 8, 12; Livy, 28:12; Dionys. ii, 67; Plutarch, *Numa*, 9, i, 263, ed. Reiske); the ancient forms and usages of worship, differing from each other in some important respects, but to some extent similar in principle, of Mexico and Peru (Prescott,

Mexico, i, 60, 64; *Peru*, i, 101); and, lastly, the theory of the so-called Guebres of Persia, and the Parsees of Bombay. (Frazer, *Persia*, c. 4:p. 141, 162, 164; Sir R. Porter, *Travels*, ii, 50, 424; Chardin, *Voyages*, ii, 310; 4:258; 8:367 sq.; Niebuhr, *Travels*, ii, 36, 37; Mandelslo, *Travelb.* b. i, p. 76; Gibbon, *Hist.* c. 8:i, 335, ed. Smith; Benj. of Tudela, *Early Trav.* p. 114, 116; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 156.) **SEE IDOLATRY.** On the heathen practice of children "passing through the fire," **SEE MOLOCH.**

3. In the case of the spoil taken from the Midianites, such articles as could bear it were purified by fire as well as in the water appointed for the purpose (^{<08123>}Numbers 31:23). The victims slain for sin-offerings were afterwards consumed by fire outside the camp (^{<08042>}Leviticus 4:12, 21; 6:30; 16:27; ^{<08311>}Hebrews 13:11). The Nazarite who had completed his vow, marked its completion by shaving his head and casting the hair into the fire on the altar on which the peace-offerings were sacrificed (^{<01618>}Numbers 6:18).

II. Domestic.- Besides for cooking, baking, and roasting purposes, **SEE BREAD, FOOD**, etc, fire is often required in Palestine for warmth (^{<2462>}Jeremiah 36:22; ^{<11454>}Mark 14:54; ^{<31818>}John 18:18; see Harmer, *Obs.* i,125; Raihner, p. 79). For this purpose a hearth with a chimney is sometimes constructed, on which either lighted wood or pans of charcoal are placed (Harmer, i, 405). In Persia, a hole made in the floor is sometimes filled with charcoal, on which a sort of table is set covered with a carpet; and the company, placing their feet under the carpet, draw it over themselves (Olearius, *Travels*, p. 294; Chardin, *Voyages*, iii, 190). Rooms in Egypt are warmed, when necessary, with pans of charcoal, as there are no fireplaces except in the kitchens (Lane, *Mod. Eg.* i, 41; *Eng. in Eig.* ii, 11). **SEE COAL; SEE FUEL.**

On the Sabbath, the law forbade any fire to be kindled even for culinary purposes (^{<02918>}Exodus 35:3; ^{<04532>}Numbers 15:32). As the primary design of this law appears to have been to prevent the proper privileges of the Sabbath day from being lost to any one through the care and time required in cooking victuals (^{<021623>}Exodus 16:23), it is doubted whether the use of fire for warmth on the Sabbath day was included in this interdiction. In practice, it would appear that the fire was never lighted or kept up for cooking on the Sabbath day, and that consequently there were no fires in the houses during the Sabbaths of the greater part of the year; but it may be collected that in winter fires for warming apartments were kept up from the

previous day. Michaelis is very much mistaken with respect to the climate of Palestine in supposing that the inhabitants could, without much discomfort, dispense with fires for warmth during winter (*Mosaisches Recht*, 4:195). To this general prohibition the Jews added various refinements; e.g. that on the eve of the Sabbath no one might read with a light, though passages to be read on the Sabbath by children in schools might be looked out by the teacher. If a Gentile lighted a lamp, a Jew might use it, but not if it had been lighted for the use of the Jew. If a festival day fell on the Sabbath eve no cooking was to be done (Mishna, *Shabb.* i, 3; 16:8, vol. ii, p. 4, 56; *Moed Katan*, ii, vol. ii, p. 287, ed. Surenhus). The modern Jews, although there is no cooking in their houses, have fires on the Sabbath day, which are attended to by a Christian servant; or a charwoman is hired to attend to the fires of several houses, which she visits repeatedly during the day. *SEE SABATH.*

III. Statutory Regulation. — The dryness of the land in the hot season in Syria of course increases the liability to accident from fire (^{<0795>}Judges 9:15). The law therefore ordered that any one kindling a fire which caused damage to corn in a field should make restitution (^{<0226>}Exodus 22:6; comp. ^{<0750>}Judges 15:4, 5; ^{<0404>}2 Samuel 14:30; see Mishna, *Maccoth*, 6:5, 6; vol. 4:48, Surenhus.; Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 496, 622). This law was calculated to teach caution in the use of fire to the herdsmen in the fields, who were the parties most concerned. And it is to be remembered that the herdsmen were generally substantial persons, and had their assistant shepherds, for whose imprudence they were made responsible. Still no inference is to be drawn from this law with regard to fires breaking out in towns, the circumstances being so very different. *SEE DAMAGES.*

IV. Penal. — Punishment of death by fire was awarded by the law only in the cases of incest with a mother-in-law, and of unchastity on the part of a daughter of a priest (^{<0204>}Leviticus 20:14; 21:9)., In the former case both the parties, in the latter the woman only, was to suffer. This sentence appears to have been a relaxation of the original practice in such cases (^{<0334>}Genesis 38:24). Among other nations, burning alive appears to have been no uncommon-mode, if not of judicial punishment, at least of vengeance upon captives; and in a modified form was not unknown ins war among the Jews themselves. (^{<0023>}2 Samuel 12:31; ^{<0492>}Jeremiah 29:22; Daniel 52:20). In certain cases the-bodies-of executed criminals and of

infamous persons were subsequently burnt (<0075>Joshua 7:25 ; <12316>2 Kings 23:16). *SEE PUNISHMENT*-.

V. Military.-In time of war towns were often destroyed by fire. This, as a war usage, belongs to all times and nations'; but among the Hebrews there were some particular notions connected with it, as an act of strong abhorrence, or of demotement to abiding desolatioas. *SEE ACCURSED*. The principal instances historically- commemorated are the destruction by fire of Jericho (<00624>Joshua 6:24); Ail (<00819>Joshua 8:19); Hazor (<00111>Joshua 11:11); Laish (<07827>Judges 18:27); the towns of the Benjamites (<07248>Judges 20:48); Ziklag, by- the Amalekites (<00101>1 Samuel 30:1); Jazerine Pharaoh (<10916>1 Kings 9:16); and the Temple and Palaces of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (<12319>2 Kings 25:9). Even the war-chariots of the Canaanites were burnt by the Israelites (<00624>Joshua 6:24; 8:28; 11:9,13), probably on the principle of precluding the possibility of recovery by the enemy of instruments of strength for which they had themselves no use. The frequency with which towns Ware fired in ancient warfare is show in by the very numerous threats by the prophets that the towns of Israel should be burned by their foreign enemies. Some great towns, not of Israel, are particularly named; and it would be an interesting task to trace, as far as the materials exist, the fulfilment of these prophecies in those more marked examples. Among the places thus threatened we find Damascus (<23512>Isaiah 43:12, 13), Gaza, Tyre, Teman (Amos 1:7, 10, 11). - The temples and idols of a conquered town or people were very often burnt by the victors (<23512>Isaiah 53:12, 13). The Jews were expressly ordered to destroy the idols of the heathen nations, and especially any' city of their own relapsed into idolatry (Exodus 32,:20; <12106>2 Kings 10:26; <00105>Deuteronomy 7:5; 12:3; 13:16). One of the expedients of war in sieges was to set fire to the- gate of the besieged place (<07049>Judges 9:49, 52). *SEE SIEGE*.

In battle, torches were often carried by the soldiers, which explains the use of torches is the attack of Gideon upon the camp of the Midianites (<00106>Judges 7:6). This military use of torches was very general among ancient nations, and is alluded to by many of their writers (Statius, *Theb.* 4:5, 7; Stobus, *Serm.* p. 194; Michaelis, in -*Symbol. Liter. Bremens.* iii, 254). *SEE TORCH*.

Signal fires on the tops of mountains were also anciently common as a telegraphic mode of conveying intelligence both in civil and military matters (Judith 7:5). *SEE BEACON.*

VI. Funeral. - Incense was sometimes burnt in honor of the dead, especially royal personages, as is mentioned specially in the cases of Asa and Zedekiah, and negatively in that of Jehorah (^{<464>}2 Chronicles 16:14; 21:19' ^{<245>}Jeremiah 34:5). *SEE FUNERAL.*

VII. Metallurgic. — The use of fire in reducing and refining metals was well known to the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus, (^{<224>}Exodus 32:24'; 35:32.; 37:2, 6, 17; 38:2, 8; ^{<468>}Numbers 16:38, 39). Kitto, s.v.; Smith, s.v. *SEE HANDICRAFT.*

VIII. Figurative Senses.

1. Fire is in the Scriptures considered as a symbol of Jehovah's presence (see Malbner" *De Deo in igne*, Dresd., n. d.) and the instrument of his power, in the way either of approval or of destruction (^{<249>}Exodus 14:19; ^{<410>}Numbers 11:1, 3; ^{<733>}Judges 13:20; ^{<188>}1 Kings 18:38; ^{<210>}2 Kings 1:10, 12; 2:11; 6:17; comp. ^{<256>}Isaiah 51:6; 66:15, 24; ^{<212>}Joel 2:30; ^{<302>}Malachi 2:2, 3; 4:1; ^{<620>}2 Peter 3:10; ^{<614>}Revelation 20:14,15; see Reland, *Ant. - Sacr.* i, 8, p. 26; Jennings, *Jewish Ant.* ii, 1, p. 301; Josephus, *Ant.* iii, 8, 6; 8:4, 4). , Thus he appeared in this element at the burning bush and on Mount Sinai (^{<112>}Exodus 3:2; 19:18). He showed himself to Isaiah, Ezekiel, and John in the, midst of fire (^{<264>}Isaiah 6:4; ^{<204>}Ezekiel 1:4; ^{<614>}Revelation 1:14), and it is said that he will so appear at his second coming (^{<308>}2 Thessalonians 1:8). The people of Israel wandered through the desert, guided by the Lord under the form of a -pillar of fire, *SEE PILLAR*, (^{<212>}Exodus 13:21); and Daniel, relating his vision, in which, he saw the Ancient of days, says, "A fiery stream issued and came forth before him" (7:10). God may be compared to fire, not only by reason of his glorious brightness, but also on account of his anger against sin, which consumes those against whom it is kindled, as-sire does stubble (^{<622>}Deuteronomy 32:22; ^{<207>}Isaiah 10:17; ^{<523>}Ezekiel 21:3; ^{<822>}Hebrews 12:29).. Coals of fire proceeding from God's mouth denote his anger (^{<988>}Psalms 18:8). His word also" is compared to fire (^{<239>}Jeremiah 23:29). Thus in ^{<254>}Jeremiah 5:14, " Behold, I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them." *SEE FLAME.*

2. Hence the destructive energies of this element and the torment which it inflicts rendered it a fit symbol of

(1) whatever does damage and consumes (Proam. 16:27; ^{<3918>}Isaiah 9:18);

(2) of severe trials, vexations, and misfortunes (^{<3819>}Zechariah 12:9; ^{<4229>}Luke 12:49 [see the dissertations on this text -by Scharbes' (*Obs. Sacs-*. p. 127-146), Ellrod (Erlang. 1774)]; ^{<4183>}1 Corinthians 3:13, 15 [see the dissertation on this text by Liebenstein (Hainest. 1771), Georgi (Viteb. 1748)]; ^{<4007>}1 Peter 1:7);

(3) of the punishments beyond the grave (^{<4162>}Matthew 5:22; ^{<4094>}Mark 9:44; ^{<6440>}Revelation 14:10; 21:8). *SEE HELL.*

3. Fire or flame is also used in a metaphorical sense to express excited feeling and divine inspiration (^{<3939>}Psalm 39:3; ^{<4119>}Jeremiah 20:9). Thus the influences of the Holy Ghost are compared to fire (^{<4181>}Matthew 3:11), and the descent of the Holy Spirit was denoted in the appearance of lambent flames, or tongues of fire (^{<4118>}Acts 2:3). *SEE TONGUE.* The angels of God also are represented under the emblem of fire (^{<3944>}Psalm 104:4). "These are the more benign application as of the figure, in the sense of warmth, activity, and illumination. *SEE LIGHT.*"

Fire-Baptism

The expression "baptize with fire" (^{<4181>}Matthew 3:11; ^{<4116>}Luke 3:16) is understood by most modern interpreters to be synonymous with *baptism by the Holy Spirit*, e.g. on 'the day of Pentecost (See Arthur, *Tongue of Fire*, passim, Lond. 1856, N. Y. 1857). Olsleusen (Comment. ad loc., Am. ed. i, 269) regards " fire" here is put in contrast with the opposite element " water," i.e. the spiritual as distinct from the material baptism. So also Alford (*Greek Test.* ad 10b. Matthew), who remarks that -"to separate off *Πv. Αγ.* as belonging to one set of persons, and *7s-pt* as belonging to another, when both are united in *ὕμῶς*, is harsh and confused." Yet so Origen early understood the passage, and in this Neander, De Wette, Meyer, and many other expositors coincide. Dr. Robinson observes that "the *wheat* are evidently those who receive Christ as the Messiah, and embrace his doctrines; these he will baptize with the Holy Ghost, i.e. he will impart to them spiritual gifts, the teachings and consolations of the Holy Spirit; while the *chaff* are as evidently those who

reject-Christ and his doctrines, and live in sin; these he will baptize with fire unquenchable" (in Calmet, s.v. Baptism). There are monographs on this subject by Iken (Dissert. p.300-316) Mieg (*Misc. Duisb.* i, 205 sq., 602 sq.), Osiander (Tubingen, 1755), Schmid (Lips. 1706), Ribov (Gott. 1744), Zeibich (Ger. '1781) Compare *SEE BAPTISM. WITH FIRE.*'

Firebrand

(*dWā*, *ud*, a poker or burnt end of a stick, ^{<2704>}Isaiah 7:4; ^{<3041>}Amos 4:11; "brand," ^{<382>}Zechariah 3:2; *dyPḅā* *lappid'*, ^{<7154>}Judges 15:4, a lamp, or torch [as often elsewhere], i.e. flambeau; *qzēzek*, only in the-plur., burning darts, i.e. arrows, [q.v.] fitted with combustibles, ^{<218>}Proverbs 26:18; comp. ^{<4166>}Ephesians 6:16). In ^{<7154>}Judges 15:4, it is said, "And Samson went and caught three hundred foxes [jackals], and took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails." A firebrand in such a position, if sufficiently ignited to kindle a blaze in the shocks of corn, would soon have burnt itself free from the tails of the foxes, or have been extinguished *by* being drawn over the ground. A torch or flambeau, on the other hand, made' of resinous wood or artificial materials, being more tenacious of flame, would have answered a far better purpose, and such is the legitimate import of the original. His "turning them tail to tail" was apparently intended to prevent them making too rapid a retreat to their holes, or, indeed, from going to their holes at all. They were probably not so tied that they should pull in different directions, but that they might run deviously and slowly, side by side, and so do the more effectual execution. Had he put a torch to the tail of each, the creature, naturally terrified at fire, would instantly have betaken itself to its hole, or some place of retreat, and thus the design of Samson would have been wholly frustrated. But by tying two of them together by the tail they would frequently thwart each other' in running, and thus cause the greater devastation. Similar conflagrations' produced by animals, particularly by foxes, were well known to the Greeks and Romans. Thus Lycophron (*Alexandra*, 344) makes Cassandra represent Ulysses as a cunning and mischievous man, the 'man for many wiles renowned" of Homer, and styles him, very properly, *λαμπουρίς*, *fre-tail*, a name for the fox (Aesch. *Fragm.* 386). The Romans, also, at their feast in honor of Ceres, the patron goddess of grain, offered in sacrifice animals injurious to corn-fields, and therefore introduced into-the circus, on this occasion, foxes with firebrands so fastened to them as to burn them: a retaliation, as Ovid seems to explain

it, of the injuries done to the corn by foxes so furnished (*Fasti*, 4:681, 707, 711). In Leland's *Collectanea*, there is an engraving representing a Roman brick found twenty-eight feet below a pavement in London, about the year 1675, on which is exhibited, in basso-relievo, the figure of a man driving into a field of corn two foxes with a fire fastened to their tails, which many have supposed to refer to the feat of Samson, or at least to be a memento of the Roman usage just mentioned. Richardson, in his *Dissertation oe the Eastern Nations*, speaking of the great festival of fire celebrated by the ancient Persians on the shortest night of the year, says, "Among other ceremonies common on this occasion, there was one which, whether it originated in superstition or caprice, seems to have been singularly cruel. The kings and great men used to set fire to large bunches of dry combustibles, fastened around wild beasts and birds, which being let loose, the air and earth appeared one great illumination; and as these terrified creatures naturally fled to the woods for shelter, it is easy to conceive that the conflagrations which would often happen must have been peculiarly destructive." *SEE FOX*.

Firepan

(**hTj** **ḥi** *machtah'*, from **htj**; to *take up* coals of fire, etc.; Sept. **πυρεῖον**, Vulg. *ignium receptaculum*), one of the vessels of the Temple service (^{<0278>}Exodus 27:3; 38:3; ^{<0255>}2 Kings 25:15; ^{<0529>}Jeremiah 52:19); elsewhere rendered "snuff-dish" (^{<0258>}Exodus 25:38; 37:23; ^{<0049>}Numbers 4:9; Sept. **ἐπαρυστήρ**, **ἐπαρυστήρις**, **ὑπόθεμα**, Vulg. *emunctorium*) and "censer" (^{<0800>}Leviticus 10:1; 16:12; ^{<0466>}Numbers 16:6 sq.; ^{<0022>}2 Chronicles 4:22; Sept. **θυμιατήριον**, Vulg. *thuribulum*). These appear, however, not to have been two or three forms of utensils, but essentially the same kind of article, probably i. q. a' metallic- *cinder-basin*, of different sizes, for at least two uses': one, like a chafing-dish, to carry live coals for the purpose of burning incense; another, like-a snuffer-dish, used in trimming the lamps, in order to (carry the snuffers and) convey away the snuff. *SEE CENSER*.

Fire-Worship

For an account of the fire-worshippers of modern times, the reader is referred to the article PARSEES. We attempt here only a brief sketch of the origin and extent of pyrolatry among ancient nations. Under varying conceptions, was the symbol of purity, or of the divine presence and power, or as one of the constituent elements, or as typifying the destructive

principle in nature, fire was early and among many nations an object of religious worship. If we attach any credit to the statements of the reputed Sanchoniathon, Usous, whose name reminds us of the Biblical Uz, the son of Aram, was the first to introduce the worship of fire. The violence of the winds at Tyre, by rubbing the branches of trees together, caused this element to manifest its presence, and Usous thereupon erected rude altars to fire and wind, and made libations thereon of the blood of animals captured in the chase.

The prevalence of pyrolatry among the Canaanites is frequently referred to in the Scriptures, and the people of God are solemnly and repeatedly warned against forsaking his worship to join in the abominations which belonged to the worship of Molech, the fire-god of these people (^{<4882>}Leviticus 18:21 20:2-5; ^{<6523>}Deuteronomy 12:31; ^{<11107>}1 Kings 11:7; ^{<12168>}2 Kings 16:3; 23:10,13; ^{<14283>}2 Chronicles 28:3; ^{<19467>}Psalms 106:37, 38; ^{<2473>}Jeremiah 7:31; 19:5, 6; 30:35; ^{<25161>}Ezekiel 16:20, 21; 23:37); yet, despite the denunciations of divine wrath and punishment, the Israelites sometimes apostatized to this worship, and caused their seed to pass through or be burnt in the fire to Molech. Solomon and Ahaz were notable instances of such apostasy, and from the terms employed to describe the conduct of the latter, "*and burnt his children in the fire after the abominations of the heathen whom the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel*" (^{<4438>}2 Chronicles 28:3), we learn that the worship of Molech in the time of Ahaz was the same as in that of the old Canaanites. For the ceremonies of this worship, *SEE MOLECH*.

"Adrammelech, the fire-god of Scpharvaim; Chemosh, the fire-god of Moab; Urotal, Dusares, Sair, and Thyandrites, of the Edomites and neighboring Arab tribes, and the Greek Dionysus, were worshipped under the symbol of a rising flame of fire, which was imitated in the stone pillars erected in their honor" (Movers, *Phonizier*, i, c. 9). Among the ancient Persians and Medes fire-worship was practised in very early times by their religious teachers, the Magi, though pyrea or fire-temples probably date no further back than Zoroaster. Herodotus states (iii, 16) that the Persians regarded fire as a god, and sacrificed to it, as also to the heavenly bodies, and the other terrestrial elements (i, 131), using the tops of mountains or hills, for they had no temples or altars for the worship of their deities. Strabo, in agreement with Herodotus, states (§ 732) that they worshipped on high places, had no images or altars, and called the heavens Zeus; that they made sacrifices, especially (*διαφέροντως*) to fire and water, placing

dry wood without the bark, and putting fat upon it, then kindling the fire from beneath, not blowing it with the breath, but fanning it, for they esteemed it worthy of death to defile this sacred element by blowing the breath or placing a corpse or excrement upon it. In speaking of Cappadocia (§ 733), he, moreover, tells us that there were many magi there, called fire-worshippers (πύραιθοι), and also *pyroetha* or fire-temples, in which the sacred fire was kept perpetually burning by the Magi. Fire-temples also were found in Persia and other places. The chief men of Persi were wont to feed the sacred fires with precious oils and rich aromatics, styled by them fire banquets (*epulte Ignis*)¹. For the ceremonies of worship in connection with these fire-temples, *SEE MAGI AND PARSEES*.

Fire-worship was practised also among the Carthaginians, Scythians, the ancient Germans, and the ancient inhabitants of the British Isles, and we find traces of it also in the Mexican and Peruvian -worship (Prescott *Mexico*, i, 60, 64; *Peru*, i, 101). Diodorus Siculus states (xx, 14) that the Camluginians, when hard pressed by Agathocles, attributing their reverses to the anger of their ancestral divinities, whose worship they had neglected, sacrificed 200 of the noblest children (to which number 300 were added by voluntary offerings.) to Chronos or Saturn, whose brazen statue was so constructed that a child pierced in its arms loaded into a pit of fire. This deity was therefore evidently the same as the Mahech of their Tyrian ancestors. The Hymetians worshipped Agni, the god of fire, and in their mythology fire was the symbol of Siva, the destroyer, a conception of this element seemingly in accord with that of the ancient Egyptians (Herod. iii 16).

The sacred fire was carefully watched in the temple of Vesta, at Rome, by virgins consecrated to this special service (*Virginesque Vestales in urbem custodiunt ignem focipublici sempiternum*, Cic. *De Leg.* ii, 8), and the extinction of this fire was regarded as a fearful omen, portending great disaster to the state, so that the unhappy Vestal whose carelessness or ill luck was the occasion of such a misfortune atoned therefor by a severe and degrading punishment (Liv. 28:11). The ancient Greeks paid worship to the same divinity in Hestia, reckoned one of the twelve great gods, and symbolized by the fire which burns upon the hearth a deity admitted to the penetralia of domestic life.

We find the worship of the heavenly bodies frequently mentioned in connection with that of the gods of fire, and the former was doubtless

older, As it was the higher form of worship (^{<1577B>}Deuteronomy 17:3; ^{<2176>}2 Kings 17:16, 17; 21:3; 23:5, 11; ^{<2279>}Isaiah 27:9; ^{<2482>}Jeremiah 8:2; ^{<2486>}Ezekiel 8:16; ^{<3006>}Zephaniah 1:5; Herodotus, 1. c.; Strabo, 1. c.). There appears, therefore, to have been some connection between them. According to the Greek legends, it was Prometheus, the fire-bearer who, purloining the ethereal and beneficent element from the sun, the high divinity of the Sabaeen worship, conveyed it by stealth to earth as a gift to men, braving therefor and incurring thereby the anger of Zeus, the Greek form of the name by which, according to Herodotus and Strabo, the circuit of the heavens was called by the Magi, and probably the same as Mithra. May we not find symbolized in this Promethean legend the connection and the conflict between sun-worship and fire-worship, Sabmeanism and Magism? For an abstract of the relation of the Mithraic worship and the original doctrines of the Zend-Avesta, with references to works of modern writers on this subject, see De Guignaut's. translation of Creuzer's *Rel. de l'Antiquite*, notes 8, 9, to bk. ii, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 728.-Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v. Molech and Fire; *Auct. Univ. Hist.* (Lond. 1747, 21 vols. 8So; see index in vol. 20); Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of Rom. Empire* (N. Y. 1852, 6 vvas. 12mo), i, 226-238; Smith, *Genti/le Nationms* (N. Y.); Stoddart, *Introd. Univ. Hist.* p. 228-9, 301; Hyde, *De Ielig. vet. Persarum* (Oxon. 1700, 4to); Creuzer, *Religion de l'Antiquitl*; Anquetil du Perron, *Zend-Avesta*, etc. (improved in German translation by discussions of Kleuker); Richter, *Aelteste Religionen des Oriens*. (J. W. M.)

Firkin

(μετρητής, a measurer, occurs only in ^{<4815>}John 2:6), a metretes, i.e. the Attic AMPHORA, a -measure for liquids, equivalent to thee Hebrew BATH, and containing about 8S gallons (Smith's *Diet. of Class. Antiq. S.* v. Metretes). *SEE METROLOGY*.

Firmament

a term introduced into our language from the. Vulgate, which- gives firmamentum as the equivalent of the στερέωμα of the Sept. and the raki'a ([יָרְקַעַ] of the Hebrew text (^{<3006>}Genesis 1:6); more fully רַקִּיעַ [יָרְקַעַ] *firmament of the heavens*, ^{<3004>}Genesis 1:14,15, 17). *SEE HEAVEN*. '

1. The Hebrew term is generally regarded as expressive of simple *expansion*, and is so rendered in the margin of the A. V. (1. c.); -but the true idea of the word is a complex one, taking in the mode by which the

expansion is effected', and consequently implying the *nature of the material* expanded. The verb [qir; means to expand by beating, whether by the hand, the foot, or any instrument. It is especially used, however, of beating out metals into thin plates (^{<0290>}Exodus 39:3; ^{<0469>}Numbers 16:39), and hence the substantive **mu[^{<0468>}amāh** "broad plates" of metal (^{<0468>}Numbers 16:38). It is thus applied to the flattened surface of the solid earth (Isaiah 42:5; 44:24; ^{<0466>}Psalm 136:6), and it is in this sense that the term is applied to the heaven in ^{<0878>}Job 37:18,—"Hast thou spread (rather hammered) out the sky- which is strong, and as a molten looking-glass"-the mirrors to which hue refers being made of metal. The sense of *solidity*, therefore, is combined with the ideas of *expansion* and *tenuity* is- the term *rakia*. Saalschütz (*Archaol.* ii, 67) conceives that the ideas of solidity is inconsistent with ^{<0016>}Genesis 2:6, which implies, according to him, the passage of the mist through the *rakia*; he therefore gives it the sense of pure *expansion*-it is the large and lofty room in which the winds, etc. have their abode. But it should be observed that ^{<0016>}Genesis 2:6 implies the very reverse. If the mist had penetrated the *rakia* it would have descended in the form of rains the mist, however, was formed under the *rakia*, and resembled a heavy dew-a mode of fructifying the earth which, from its regularity and quietude, was more appropriate to a state of innocence than rain, the occasional violence of which associated it with the idea of divine vengeance. But the same idea of *solidity* runs through all the references to the *rakia*. In ^{<0240>}Exodus 24:10, it is poetically represented as a solid floor, "a paved work of a sapphire stone nor is the image much weakened if we regard the word **tnb]** as applying to the transparency of the stone rather than to the *paving* as in the A. V., either sense being admissible. - So again, in ^{<0122>}Ezekiel 1:22-26, the "firmament" is the floor on which the throne of the Most High is placed. That the *rakia* should be transparent, as implied in the comparisons with the sapphire (Exodus 1. c.) and with crystal (Ezek. 1. c.; comp. ^{<0406>}Revelation 4:6), is by no means inconsistent with its solidity. Further, the office of the *rakia* in the economy of the world demanded *strength* and *substance*. It was to serve as a division between the waters above and the waters below (^{<0007>}Genesis 1:7). In order to enter into this description we must carry our ideas back-to the time when the earth was a chaotic mass overspread with water, in which the material elements of the heavens were intermingled. The first step, therefore, in the work of orderly arrangement as to separate the elements of heaven and earth, and to fix a floor of partition between the waters of the heaven and the waters of the

earth; and accordingly the *rakia* was created to support the upper reservoir (^{<1380>}Psalm 148:4; comp. ^{<1340>}Psalm 104:3, where Jehovah is represented as ".,building his chambers of water," not simply "in water," as the A. Vers.; the prep. B]signifying the material out of which the beams and joists were made), itself being supported at the edge or rim of the earth's disk by the mountains' (^{<1028>}2 Samuel 22:8; ^{<1361>}Job 26:11). In keeping with- this view the *rakia* was provided with "windows-" (^{<0071>}Genesis 7:11; ^{<2348>}Isaiah 24:18; ^{<3880>}Malachi 3:10) and " doors" (^{<1783>}Psalm 78:23), through which the rain and the, snow might descend. A secondary purpose which the *rakia* served was to support the heavenly bodies, sun, moon, and stars (^{<0014>}Genesis 1:14), in which they were fixed as nails, and from which consequently, they might be said figuratively to drop off (^{<2342>}Isaiah 14:12; 34:4; ^{<129>}Matthew 24:29). .In all these particulars we recognise the same view as: was entertained by the Greeks, and, to a certain extent, by the Latins. The former applied to the heaven such epithets as "brazen" (*χάλκεον*, Homer, *Illad*, xvii, 425; Pind. *Pyth.* 10:42; *Nem.* vi, 6; *πολύχαλκον*, *I.* v, 504; *Od.* iii,'2) and iron "*σιδήρεον*, *Od.* 15:328; 17:565)-epithets also used in the Scriptures (^{<1339>}Leviticus 26:19)-and that this was not merely poetical embellishment appears from the views promulgated: by their philosophers, Empedocles, who described the heavens as *στερέμνιον* and *κρυσταλλοειδής*, composed of air glacialized by fire (Plutarch, *Plac. Phil.* ii, 11; Stobaeus, *Eclog. Phys.* i, 24; Diog. Laertius, 8:77; Lactant. *De Opif Dei*, c. 17; comp. Karsten, *Phil. Gr. Veter. Operum Reliquicejii*, 422); and Artemidorus, who taught that "summa cceli ora solidissima est, in modum tecti durata" (Seneca, *Qucest.* 7:13). The same idea is expressed in the *ccelo afixa siderao* of the Latins (Pliny ii, 39; 18:57). Plato also, in his *Timceus*, makes mention of the visible heaven under the notion of *τάσις* (from *τείνω*, *to extend*), not unlike the ;Hebrew derivation. If it be objected to the Mosaic account that the view embodied in the word *rakia* does not harmonize with strict philosophical truth, the answer to such an objection is, that the writer describes things as they appear rather than as they are. But, in 'truth, the same absence of philosophic truth may be traced throughout all the terms applied to this subject, and the objection is levelled rather against the principles of language than anything else. Examine the Latin *coelum* (*κοίλον*), the "hollow place" or cave scooped out of solid space ("cavernme coeli," Lucret. - 4:172; compare Pott, *Etymol. Forschungen*, i, 23, 27); our own heaven," i.e. what is *heaved up*; the Greek *οὐρανός*, similarly significant of height' (Pott, *Etym. Forsch.i*, 123); or the German

"himmel," from *heimeln*, to cover the "roof" which constitutes the "heim" or abode of man: in each there is a large amount of philosophical error. Correctly speaking, of course, the atmosphere is the true *rakia* by which the clouds are supported, and undefined space is the abode of the celestial bodies. There certainly appears an inconsistency in treating the *rakia* as the support both of the clouds and of the stars, for it could not have escaped observation that the clouds were below the stars; but perhaps this may be referred to the same feeling which -is expressed in the *caelumn ruit* of the Latins, the downfall of the *rakia* in stormy weather. Although the *rakia* and the *shamayim* ("heavens") are treated 'as identical in ^{<0008>}Genesis 1:8, yet it was more correct to recognise a distinction between them, as implied in the expression "firmament of the heavens" (^{<0014>}Genesis 1:14), the former being the upheaving power and the latter the upheaved body-the former the line of demarcation between heaven and earth, the latter the *strata* or stories into which the heaven was divided. *SEE COSMOGONY.*

2. Hence it is easy to conceive how the Gr. translators came to render the Heb. term in question by *στερέωμα*, a word which is commonly used to designate some compact solid, such as the basis of a pillar, or a pillar itself, and which is used elsewhere by the Sept. as equivalent to the Heb. [I ὄ, 'a rock (^{<0012>}Psalm 18:2), and by Symmachus and Theodotion as the rendering of the Heb. hFmj a staff. Basil (*Hexaem.* 'Hom. 3) explains the term as not intended to describe what is naturally hard, and solid, and weighty, which belongs rather to the earth; but says that because the nature of the object above it is fine and thin, and not perceptible by sense, it is called *στερέωμα*, by a comparison between things of extreme rarity and such: as can be perceived by sense (*συγκρίσει τῶν λεπτοτάτων καὶ τῆαίσθήσει καταληπτῶν*). It is not very clear what his meaning here is, but probably he intended that as a solid extension would be *properly* called a *στερέωμα*, so this mass of light and vapory substances might by *analogy* receive this name. Others have suggested that this term was employed to indicate that the [ἵqæ is the "universitas τῶν λεπτομερῶν in regione in superam conglobata et firmata," along with the idea that this "nihil habet uspiam inanitatis, sed omnia sui generis nature plena" (Fuller, *Miscel. Sac.* bk. i, c. vi). Fuller thinks also that the Sept. selected *στερέωμα* rather than *πέτασμα* or *περιπέτασμα* in order to convey the idea of *depth* as well as superficial expansion. The general opinion, however, is, that the Sept. adopted this term rather than one exactly equivalent to the original, because it conveys what was the Hebrew belief concerning the upper

atmosphere or visible heavens, which they regarded as a solid expanse encircling the earth, although the true state of the case was probably not unknown to them (^{<1832>}Job 36:27, 28). Others, nevertheless, think that the waters above, the *rakia* are merely the clouds, which need no solid support (Delitzsch, *Comment.* on ^{<1006>}Genesis 1:6; Kurz, *Bible and Astronomy, in Hist. of the Old Covenant*, i, 30).

3. With some old astronomers the *firmament* is the orb of the fixed stars, or the highest of all the heavens. But in Scripture and in common language it is used for the middle regions, the space or expanse appearing like an arch immediately above us in the heavens. Many of the ancients, and of the moderns also, account the firmament a fluid substance; but those who gave it the name of "firmament" must have regarded it as solid. In the Ptolemaic astronomy, *the firmament* is called the eighth heaven or sphere, with respect to the seven spheres of the planets, which it surrounds. It is supposed to have two motions--a diurnal motion imparted to it by the *primum mobile*, from east to west, about the poles of the ecliptic, and another opposite motion from west to east, which last is completed, according to Tycho, in 25,412 years; according to Ptolemy, in 36,000; and according to Copernicus, in 25,800; in which time the fixed stars return to the same points in which they were at the beginning. This period is called the *Platonic*, or *Great Year*. **SEE ASTRONOMY.**

Firmicus, Julius Maternus

a Christian writer of the 4th century, of whom little is known. There was an astrologer of the same name and time, who wrote *Matheseos lib. viii*. There was a bishop of Milan of the same name, who flourished at the same time, but probably not the same person. He wrote a book, *De errore Profanarum Religionum*, which he dedicated So Constantius and Constans; and from this it appears he was bred up in heathenism, and afterwards converted to the Christian faith. He is not mentioned by any ancient writer; and there is no direct evidence that he held any sacred office in the Christian Church. From internal evidence, it appears certain that the treatise was written between A.D. 343 and 350.' An analysis of it is given by Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Pat. 1865), 4:310 sq. The object of the treatise is to trace the history of the pagan faith, and to demonstrate the falsehood of its various forms. It adopts and applies the theory of Euhemerus (q.v.). It was first 'printed by Matthew Flacius (Strasburg, 1562); the latest separate edition is that of Munter (Copenhagen, 1826, 8vo), with

prolegomena and notes. It may be found also in *Bib. Mar. Patrol.* 4:164; Galland, *Bib. Patrol.* v, 23-; and Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. xii.

Firmilian, St.

bishop of Ceesarea, in Cappadocia, was an intimate friend both of Origen (Euseb. 6:27) and Cyprian, with the latter of whom he took part in the controversy relative to the necessity of rebaptizing those who had been baptized by heretics. On this subject he wrote an *Epistle to St. Cyprian*, which was undoubtedly written in Greek, though the epistle, extant in St. Cyprian's works is in Latin; it is generally allowed to have been translated by Cyprian himself. It is very valuable in disproving the authority of the bishop of Rome *is pope* in the 3d century. This epistle, which is a very long one, is the sixty-fifth among those of St. Cyprian, and may be found in Oberth-Ur's edition of Cyprian (i, 254) ; also in Routh, *Script. Eccl. Opuscula* (Oxon. 1840, i, 227); and in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* vol. iii. Baronius places the death of Firmilian A.D. 272.-Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature.* i, 172; Cave, *Hist. Liter.* (Geneva, 1720), i, 78; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacrs* (Paris, 1865), ii, 435 sq.

Firmin, Thomas

an English. Unitarian, noted for public benefactions and charities, was born at Ipswich, in Suffolk, June, 1632. His parents were Puritans, very reputable and substantial people, and at a proper age put out their son to, an apprenticeship in London. His master was an Arminian, a hearer of Mr. John Goodwin, to whose sermons young Firmin resorting, "exchanged," as we are told, "the harsh opinions of Calvin, in which he had been educated, for those more reasonable ones of Arminius and the Renmonstrants-." -He was led to certain opinions not agreeable to the orthodox faith, for instance, that "the unity 'of God is a unity of person as well as of nature, and that the Holy Spirit is indeed a person, but not God." He settled in business in Lombard Street, and became intimate with Whichcote, Wilkins, Tillotson, etc.; so particularly with the last that, when obliged to be out of town, at Canterbury, perhaps, where he was dean, he left to Mr. Firmin the provision of preachers for his Tuesday's lecture at St. Laurence. Queen Mary heard of his usefulness, and that he was heterodox in the articles. of the Trinity', the divinity of our Saviour, and the atonement. She spoke to Tillotson, therefore, to set him right in those weighty and necessary' points, who answered that he had often endeavored it, but that Mr. Firmin had

now so long imbibed the Socinian doctrine as not to be capable of renouncing it. However, his grace, for he cm-as then archbishop, published his sermons, formerly preached at St. Laurence's, concerning those questions, and sent Mr. Firmin one of the first copies from the press, who, not convinced, caused a respectful answer to be drawn up and published, with this title, *Considerations as the Applications and Defences of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, himself giving a copy to his grace. The plague in 1665, and the fire in 1666, furnished his- with a variety of objects of charity. He went on with his trade in Lombard Street till 1676, at which time his biographer supposes him to have been worth £9000, though he had disposed of incredible sums in charities. This year he erected' his warehouse in Little Britain for the employment of the poor in the linen manufacture, on which Tillotson, spoke honorably in his funeral sermon on Mr. Gouge in 1681. In 1680 and 1681 came over the French Protestants, who furnished news work for Mr. Finmin's zeal and charity, and in. 1682 he set up a linen, manufacture for them at Ipswich. During the last twenty years of his life he was one of the governors, of Christ-church Hospital' in London, to which he procured many. considerable donations. In April, 1693, he became a governor of St. Thomas's Hospital in Southwark; and, indeed,-there was hardly any public trust of charity in --which he either was not or might not have been concealed. He was buried, according to his desire, in the cloisters of Christ-church Hospital, and there is placed -in the wall near his grave an inscription in terms of the highest panegyric. His *Life*, was published in 1698, and again by Cornish, 1780, 12mo.-*New Gen. Biog. Dict. s.v.*; Wesley, *Works* (N. Y.), ii, 574. v

First-Born

(r/kB]j rwb] hryk~~B~~] from rkB; to ripen early; Sept., and N T. πρωτότοκος, Vulg. prsimogenitus), applied equally to animals and human beings. Among the Hebrews the first-born son had many privileges, to be entitled to which it was not only required that a man should be the first child of his mother, but that he should be, at the same time,-the first son of his father (^(R215)Deuteronomy 21:15-17). The eldest son received a double portion of the father's inheritance (^(R217)Deuteronomy 21:17), but not of the mother's (Mishna, *Bekoroth*, viii; 9)-. If the father had married two wives, of whom he preferred one to the' other, he was forbidden to give precedence to the son of the one if the child of the other were the first-born (^(R215)Deuteronomy 21:15, 16). 'In the case of levirate marriage, the son' of

the next brother succeeded to his uncle's vacant inheritance (^{<16275>}Deuteronomy 25:5, 6). Under the monarchy, the eldest son usually, but not always, s-appears in the case of Solomon, succeeded his father in the kingdom (^{<1013>}1 Kings 1:30; 2:22). That some rights of primogeniture existed in very early times is plain, but it is not so clear in what they consisted. They have been classed as

- (a.) authority over the rest of the family
- (b.) priesthood;
- (c.) a double portion of the inheritance.

The birthright of Esau and of Reuben, set aside by authority or forfeited by misconduct, prove a general privilege as well as quasisacredness of primogeniture (^{<0123>}Genesis 25:23, 31, 34; 49:3; ^{<13101>}1 Chronicles 5:1; ^{<81216>}Hebrews 12:16), and a precedence which obviously existed, and is alluded to in various passages (as ^{<18127>}Psalm 89:27; ^{<181813>}Job 18:13; Roam. 8:29; ^{<51015>}Colossians 1:15; ^{<81223>}Hebrews 12:23); but the story of Esau's rejection tends to show the supreme and sacred authority of the parent irrevocable even by himself, rather than inherent right existing in the eldest son, which was evidently not inalienable (^{<0279>}Genesis 27:29, 33, 36; Grotius, Calmet, Patrick, Knobel, on Genesis 25). See Hottinger, *De primogenitis* (Marb. 1711); Schreder, *De vet. Hebrm. et prissogeanitis* (Msarb. 1741); Fabricius, *Bibliogr. Antiq.* p. 892; Gerdes, *De variis locis ismb quibus primogenitorum mentio occurrit* (Duisb. 1730); Frischmuth, *De primogens-tura* (Jan. 1649). **SEE BIRTHRIGHT.**

The expression "first-born" is not always to be understood literally' it is sometimes taken for the prime, most excellent, most distinguished of things. Thus "'Jesus Christ" is "the first-born of every creature, the first-begotten, or first--born from the dead;" begotten of the Father before any creature was produced; the first who rose from the dead by his own power (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Apr. 1861). Wisdom, says that she came out of the mouth of the Most High before he had produced any'creature (^{<1182>}Proverbs 8:22; Ecclus. 24:3; Ina. 14:390). "The first-born of the poor." signifies the most miserable of the poor (^{<181813>}Job 18:13). "the first-born of death," the most terrible of deaths (see Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.*). The "Church of the firstborn" (^{<81223>}Hebrews 12:23) signifies the Church of the redeemed-those who have become peculiarly the Lord's, and through the blood of the everlasting covenant, applied to their consciences, are consecrated to his

for evermore, in accordance with the custom of consecration described below (see Schottgen, *Hoas. Hebr..i*, 922).

DESTRUCTION OF THE FIRST-BORN. This was the tenth and last plague inflicted on the Egyptians (^{<0210>}Exodus 11:1-8; 12:29, 30). 'We learn from Herodotus (ii, 85) that it was the custom of the Egyptians to rush from the house into the street, to bewail the dead with loud and bitter outcries; and every member of the family united in these expressions of sorrow. How great must their terror and grief have been when A' at - midnight Jehovah smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt.", Hemmgstenberg remarks (*Egypt and the Books of Moses*) that the phrase 'sall the first-born' must' not be pressed too far. The whole tenor of the narrative is opposed to such a proceeding, and particularly the declaration, 'There was no house where there was not as dead; since in every house there was not a first-born. It must not be inferred that none of the first-born remained alive in the land, or that none besides the first-born died. That the Egyptians were swept off by an epidemic is indeed probable,' and much more than probable, from ^{<0015>}Exodus 9:15. What the Lord there says he had long been able to do, that he now really dies; since the reasons here given in ver. 16, which until now have prevented him from proceeding to this last resource, have now ceased; since, in short, he has by a series of acts sufficiently unfolded his omnipotence and grace." *SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.*

FIRST-BORN, SANCTIFICATION AND REDEMPTION OF.(*rwb&B*)
t vllldqj *~Bai* *wydpæ* Males of human beings and animals were strictly enjoined to perpetuate the remembrance of the death. of Egypt's first-born, whereby the liberty of the Israelites was secured, and of the preservation of Israel's first-born. Compare ^{<0120>}Exodus 12:2,11-15.

1. Sanctification of the First-born, its signification, etc. - The fact that the first-born of Egypt were selected to be smitten down for the hard-heartedness of Pharaoh, and that their death was regarded as the greatest calamity, shows of itself that a peculiar sanctity had already been attached to the first-born of both man and cattle. The cause of this is easily traced in the Scriptures. The power of procreation was declared by God himself to be a special blessing (^{<0022>}Genesis 1:22, 28; 9:1; 17:16; 29:31), and was granted as a reward to those who were well pleasing in his sight (^{<0150>}Genesis 15:4; ^{<0304>}Psalms 128:4). This was fully appreciated by the Jews; for the possession of children, especially of the male sex, was esteemed the

climax of social happiness (^{<0142>}Genesis 16:2; 29:31; ^{<0173>}Deuteronomy 7:13, 14; ^{<0308>}Psalms 128:3, 4), and the absence of them was considered a *reproach* (**hPrj**), since it implied divine displeasure (^{<0123>}Genesis 30:23), and no other earthly blessing could compensate for it (^{<0140>}Genesis 16:1-5). Moreover, the first-born of newly-married young people (**ynB**)**µyrW**[**Nhi** ^{<0704>}Psalms 127:4) were believed to represent the prime of human vigor (**wa tyvæ**), being born before the strength of the father began to diminish (Genesis 43; ^{<0217>}Deuteronomy 21:17; ^{<0751>}Psalms 78:51; 105:36). It was therefore natural that the first instalment of God's blessing, and the prime of man's strength, should be regarded with peculiar affection, and have special sanctity attached to him, and that by virtue of the claim which God has to what is most loved and held sacred by us, and gratitude on the part of man, the first-born males, both of man and animals, should be consecrated to the Giver of all good things; the one as a priest, representing the family to which he belonged (^{<0122>}Exodus 19:22, 24), and the other as a sacrifice (^{<0041>}Genesis 4:4), just as the fat of sacrifices was devoted to God because it was regarded as the prime part of the animal. **SEE FAT.** This explains the fact why the plague of the first-born of the Egyptians was so terribly felt; it was the destruction of the objects most dear and sacred to them, whilst the first-born of the Hebrews, i.e. their priests and sacrifices, were spared. Moreover, it shows the import of the consecration enjoined in ^{<0133>}Exodus 13:1. Hitherto it was optional with the Hebrews whether they would devote the first-born to the Lord, but now God, by virtue of having so signally interposed for their deliverance, *claims the public* consecration of the first-born of man as his priests, and of the first-born of animals as sacrifices.

2. Origin of the Redemption of the First-born.-This devotion of the first-born was believed to indicate a priesthood belonging to the eldest sons of families, -which being set aside in the case of Reuben, was transferred to the tribe of Levi. This priesthood is said to have lasted till the completion of the tabernacle (Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* 10:§ 165, 387; Selden, *De Syn.* c. 16; Mishna, *Zebachins*, 14:4, vol. v, 58; comp. ^{<0245>}Ezekiel 24:5). After the building of the tabernacle and the introduction of the extensive sacrificial service, which required a special priestly order, as well as a separate staff of servants, who could *exclusively* devote themselves to the ministry of the sanctuary, the offices of the firstborn were superseded by those of the Levites (Numbers iii, 11-13); and it was ordained that the first-born of the

other tribes, as well as the first-born of the animals which could not be sacrificed, should henceforth be redeemed (ib. 18:15).

3. Redemption of the First-born of Man.-The redemption of a child is to take place when it is a month old, when the father is to give to the priest five silver shekels of the sanctuary, i.e. about three dollars as the maximum. If it died before the expiration of 30 days, the Jewish doctors held the father excused, but liable to the payment if it outlived that time (^{<0132>}Exodus 13:12-15; 22:29; ^{<0187>}Numbers 8:17; ^{<0276>}Leviticus 27:6; Lightfoot, *Hor. - Hebr.* on ^{<0122>}Luke 2:22; Philo, *De Pr. Sacerd.* i, i, 233; Mangey). If the child was sickly, or appeared otherwise to be inferior to children generally, the priest could estimate it at less than this sum (^{<0145>}Numbers 3:46, etc.; 18:16). The priest had to come to the house of the infant, as the mother could not appear with it in the Temple because her days of purification, according to the law (^{<0122>}Leviticus 12:2,4), were not as yet accomplished. No bargaining was allowed, but if the priest saw that the parents were poor, he could, if he chose, return the money when the ceremony was over. When the mother's days of purification were accomplished, and she could appear in the Temple, she then brought the child to the priest to be presented publicly to the Lord (^{<0122>}Luke 2:22). The Jews still observe this law of redemption. When the first-born male is thirty days old, the parents invite to their house their friends and a priest (^{<0122>}Luke 2:22) to a meal for the following day. The priest, having invoked God's blessing upon the repast, and offered some introductory prayers, etc., looks at the child and the price of redemption presented before him, and asks the father which he would rather have, the money or the firstborn child. Upon the father's reply that he would rather pay the price of redemption, the priest takes the money, swings it round the head of the infant in token of his vicarious authority, saying, "This is for the firstborn, this is in lieu of it, this redeems it; and let this son be spared for life, for the law of God, and for the fear of Heaven. May it please Thee, that, as he was spared for redemption, so he may be spared for the Law, for matrimony, and for good works. Amen." The priest lays his hand upon the child's head and blesses it, as follows: "The Lord make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh!" etc. It is to this that the apostle Peter refers when he says, "Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold," etc. (^{<0118>}1 Peter 1:18). When the first-born son is thirteen years of age, he fasts the day before the feast of Passover, in commemoration of the sparing of the first-born of the Hebrews in Egypt.

SEE FAST.

4. Redemption of the First-born of clean Animals. The male first-born of animals (מִן הַבְּרִיָּה, Sept. *διανοίγον μῆτραν*; Vulg. *quod aperit vulvam*) was also devoted to God (^{<0133>}Exodus 13:2, 12, 13; 22:29; 34:19, 20; Philo, . c., and *quis rerum div. hceres.* 24, i, 489, Mang.). The first-born of every clean animal (i.e., ox, sheep, goat, etc.), from eight days to twelve months old, had to be taken to Jerusalem every year (^{<0116>}Deuteronomy 12:6, etc.), and delivered to the priest, who offered it as a sacrifice to Jehovah, sprinkled its blood upon the altar, burned the fat, and ate the flesh (^{<0133>}Exodus 13:13; 22:30; 34:20; ^{<0485>}Numbers 18:15-17; ^{<0606>}Nehemiah 10:6). In the mean time the animal was not to be used for any work, for it belonged to the Lord (^{<0159>}Deuteronomy 15:19); but if it had any blemish it was not to be sacrificed, but eaten up at home (ib. 15:21, 22). Various refinements on the subject of blemishes are to be found in *Mishna, Bekoroth*. (See ^{<0308>}Malachi 1:8. By "firstlings," ^{<0143>}Deuteronomy 14:23, compared with ^{<0487>}Numbers 18:17, are meant tithe animals: see Reland, *Antiq.* iii, 10, p. 327.; Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 387). If, however, the man whose cattle had first-born lived at too great a distance from Jerusalem to carry them thither, he was commanded to sell them, and take the money to the sanctuary :(^{<0124>}Deuteronomy 14:24, 25).

5. Redemption of the First-born of unclean Animals --.The first-born of unclean animals, not being allowed to be offered as sacrifices, were either to be redeemed according to the valuation of the priest, with the addition of one fifth of the value, and then remain with their owner, or be' sold, and the price given to the priests (^{<0271>}Leviticus 27:11-13, 27). The first-born of an ass was to be redeemed with a lamb, or, if not redeemed, put to death- (^{<0133>}Exodus 13:13; 34:20; ^{<0485>}Numbers 18:15). Commentators hold that them first-born of dogs were killed, because they ere unclean; and that nothing was given for them to the priests, because there was no trade or commerce in them. See ^{<0238>}Deuteronomy 23:18.

6. Literature.-Josephus, *Ast.* 4:4, 4; *Mishna, Bekoath*; Maimonides, *Mishusa Tora*, iii, 241; *Hilchoth Bechoroth*; Ibn Ezra's comments as- the passages cited in this article; Calmet, on Numbers 18 *The Hebrew Prayer-Book*, by Knopflmacher (Vienna, 1859), entitled *Derech Ha-Chajim*, p. 407; *Der Israelitische Volksleher*, 7:41. sq.; 9:138 sq., 212 sq., 248 sq.

First Day Of The Week

SEE LORDS DAY.

First-Fruit

Picture for First Fruits

(in the sing. **ty2avare** *reshith, beginning*; in the plur. **myr** **𐤁𐤃𐤅** *bikkurim'*, *first-ripe fruits*; -Sept. **πρωτογεννήματα, ἀπαρχή, ἀφάρεμα**; Vulgate *priimtica, priunitiva, frugum initia*; comp. **hm** **𐤍𐤃𐤅** *Ierumak'*, *ablation*; A. V. "heave-offering," etc.). The -same natural feeling which at first led man out of, gratitude to consecrate to the Giver of all good things the 'first-born of both man and animals, and the prime parts -of sacrifices, because they were regarded as the first instalments of his blessings, and which afterwards led to the legalizing of these offerings, also gave rise to the offering of thee first-fruits and to its becoming law. This was done publicly by the nation at, each of the three great -yearly festivals, sand also by, individuals without limitation of time. No ordinance appears to leave been more distinctly recognised than this, so that the use of the term in the way of illustration carried within a full significance even in N.T. times (^{<2189>}Proverbs 3:9.; Tob. i, 6; 1 Macc. iii, 49; ^{<8123>}Romans 8:23; 11:16; ^{<3018>}James 1:18; ^{<6640>}Revelation 14:4).'

1. Character and Classification of the First-fruits.

(1) On the morrow after the Passover Sabbath, i e. on the 16th of Nisan, a sheaf of new corn was to be brought to the priest, and waved before the altar, in acknowledgment of the gift of fruit-fulness (^{<82316>}Leviticus 23:5, 6, 10, 12; 2:12). Josephus tells us that the sheaf was of barley, and that, until this ceremony had been performed, no -harvest work was to be begun (Ant. iii, 10, 5). **SEE PASSOVER.**

(2.) At the expiration of seven weeks from this time, i e. at the feast of Pentecost, an oblation was to be made of two loaves of leavened bread made from the new flour, which were to be waved in like manner with the Passover sheaf (^{<8242>}Exodus 34:22; ^{<82315>}Leviticus 23:15, 17; ^{<82316>}Numbers 28:26). **SEE PENTECOST.**

(3.) The feast of ingathering, i.e. the feast of Tabernacles is- the 7th month, was itself an acknowledgment of the fruits of the harvest (^{<82316>}Exodus 23:16; 34:22; ^{<8239>}Leviticus 23:39). **SEE TABERNACLES.**

Besides these stated occasions, the law also required every individual to consecrate, to the Lord a part of the first-fruit of the land (comp.

^{<0723>}Exodus 22:29; 23:19; 34:26; ^{<0450>}Numbers 15:20 21; 18:12, 13; ^{<0804>}Deuteronomy 18:4; 26:2-11). The first-fruits to be offered are restricted by Jewish tradition to the seven chief productions of Palestine, viz. wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives, and honey, mentioned in ^{<0808>}Deuteronomy 8:8 in praise of the land (comp. Mishna, *Biksrin*, i, 3; *Berachoth*, 35, a; Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka*, *Hichoth Bikmrin*, ii, 2), to which perhaps may be added dates (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 219; Mishna, *Bikursim*, i, 3; 1Hasselquist, *Travels*, p. 417); but the law appears to have contemplated produce of all sorts, and to have been so understood by Nehemiah (^{<0810>}Deuteronomy 26:2; ^{<1005>}Nehemiah 10:35, 37). By the Talmudists they are divided into two classes:

1. *The actual produce* of the soil, the raw material, such as corn, fruits, etc., which are denominated μυρ Β α π ρ ω τ ο γ ε ν ν ή μ α τ α, and,
2. *Preparations of the produce*, as oil, flour wine, etc., which are called τ μ β ρ τ ι α ι α π α ρ χ α ί, (comp. Midras-h *Rabba*, the Chaldee Paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uziel, and Rashi on Exodus 22:29). (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1276.; Augustine, Quaest. in *Hebr.* 4:32, vol. iii, p. 732; Spencer, *De Leg. Hebr.* iii, 9, p. 713; Reland, *Anstiq.* iii, 7; Philo, *De Pr. Sacard.* i [ii 233, Mang.]; *De Sacrific. Abel. et Ca/am*, 21 [i, 177, M.]; *De Monarchia*, ii, 3 [ii, 224, Mang.]
2. *Quantity and Time of Offering.*— Of the public offerings -of first-fruits, the law defined no place from which the Passover a sheaf should be chosen but the Jewish custom, so far as it is represented by the Mishna, prescribed that the wave-sheaf or sheaves should be taken from the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Terumoth, 10:2). Deputies from the Sanhedrim went out on the eve of the festival, and tied the growing stalks in bunches. In the evening of the festival day the sheaf was cut with all possible publicity, and carried to the Temple. It was there threshed, and an omer of grain, after being winnowed, was bruised and roasted: after it had been mixed with oil and frankincense laid upon it, the priest waved the offering in all directions. A handful was thrown on the altar-fire, and the rest belonged to the priests, to be eaten by those who were free from ceremonial defilement.' After this the harvest might be carried on. After the destruction of the Temple all this was discontinued, on the principle, as it seems, that the house of God was exclusively the place for oblation (^{<2014>}Lamentations 2:14; 10:14; 23:13; Numnb. 18:11; Mishnaf Terum. v, 6; 10:4,5; *Shekalim*, -viii, 8; Josephus,

Ant. iii, 10, 5; Philo *Dea Proem. sac.* i [ii, 233, Mang.]; Reland, *Antiq.* iii, 7, 3; 4:3, 8).

The offering made at the feast of Pentecost was a thanksgiving for the conclusion of wheat harvest. It consisted of two loaves (according to Josephus one loaf) of new flour baked with leaven, which were waved by the priest as at the Passover. The size of the loaves is fixed by the Mishna at seven palms long and four wide, with horns of four fingers length. No private offerings of first-fruits were allowed before this public oblation of the ten loaves (^{<R2315>}Leviticus 23:15, 20; Mishna, Terunu. 10:6; 11:4; Josephus, Ant. iii, 10, 6; Reland, *Antiq.* .iv, 4, 5).

The quantity of private first-fruits to be consecrated to the Lord has neither been fixed by the law nor by tradition; it was left entirely to the generosity of the people. "Yet" says Maimonides, "it is implied that a sixtieth part is to be consecrated, and he who wishes to denote all the first-fruits of his field may do so" (*Hilchoth Bikurim*, ii, 17). The way in which a proprietor fixed which first-fruit he should offer was this, as the Mishna tells us, "when he went into his field and saw a fig ripening, or a bunch of grapes, or a pomegranate here a first-fruit" (*Bikurim*, iii). All the first-fruits devoted to the Lord had to be delivered at Jerusalem between the feasts of Pentecost and Dedication (^{<R2316>}Exodus 23:16; ^{<R2316>}Leviticus 23:16, 17; *Bikurims*, i, 36); any offering brought after this time was not received.

3. Manner in which these offerings were taken to Jerusalem.-The first-fruits of the land were to be brought in a basket to the holy place of God's choice, and there presented to the priest, who was to set the basket down before the altar. The offerer was then, in words of which the outline, if not the whole form was prescribed, to recite the story of Jacob's descent into Egypt, and the deliverance therefrom. of his posterity, and to acknowledge the blessings with which God had visited him (^{<R340>}Deuteronomy 26:2-11). The law that every one should take up the first-fruits to Jerusalem was soon found impracticable, since even the most pious Israelite found it very-difficult, in addition to his appearing at the three great festivals, to have to go to the Temple; with every newly-ripened fruit. Nor was it found convenient for every one to go up with his first-fruits separately. Hence the custom arose, that when the first-fruits were ripe, all the inhabitants of one district who were ready to deliver, them assembled together in the principal town of that locality where their representative lived, with a basket containing the ripe fruits of the seven several kinds, arranged in the

following manner: "The barley was put lowermost, the wheat over it, the olives above that, the dates over them the pomegranates over the dates, and the figs were put uppermost in the basket, leaves being put between every kind to separate it from the other, and clusters of grapes were laid upon the figs to form the outside of the basket" (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Biksrin*, iii, 7; *Tosifta Bikurim*, ii). With this basket all the pilgrims (or at least a company of twenty-four persons) staid up all night in the open market-place, because they were afraid to go into houses to sleep lest any inmate of theme should die, and thus cause pollution. Early in the morning the representative of the district, who was the official ($\text{dm}[\text{m}]$) and *ex officio* the leader of the imposing procession, summoned them with the words of the prophet Jeremiah, " Arise, and let us go up to Zion, to the house of Jehovah our God" (31:6). The whole company were then ready to start. We cannot do better than give literally the description which the Mislna and the Talmud give of this imposing procession: An ox [destined for, a peace-offering] went before them with gilded horns and an olive crown upon his head, and a piper who played before them, whilst the air rang, with the song of the people, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord" (Psalm 122:1). On approaching Jerusalem a messenger was sent forward to announce their arrival, and the first-fruits were tastefully' arranged. Thee officiating priest, the Levites, and the treasurers went out to meet them, the number of officials who went out being in accordance with the largeness of the party that arrived, and conducted them into the holy city, singing, as they entered, "Our feet stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem" (Psalm 112:2), whilst all the workmen [who plied their craft] in the streets of Jerusalem stood up before them and welcomed them, saying, " Brethren of such and such a place, peace be with you." The piper continued to play before them till the procession came to the mount of thee Temple. Here every one, even the king ,took his own basket upon his shoulders, and went forward till they all came to the court-of the Temple, singing, "Praise ye thee Lord, praise God in his sanctuary," etc. [through the whole. of Psalm 101]; whereupon the' Levites sang, "I will extol thee, O Lord! -because thou. hast. lifted me up, and hast not made my foes to rejoice over me' (Psalm 30). Then the pigeons which were hung about the baskets were taken for burnt-offerings, and the pilgrims gave to the priests what they brought in their hands. 'With the baskets still upon their shoulders every one repeated, " I profess this' day unto 'the Lord thy God," etc., till he came to the words, "'A wandering Syrian was my father" (i.e. from $\text{Deuteronomy 26:3-5}$), when he took the basket off his

shoulders' and laid hold of it by its brim; the priest then put his hands under it and waved it, whilst the offerer continued to recite from the words "A wandering Syrian," where he had left off, to the end of the section (to ⁽¹⁵³⁰⁾Deuteronomy 26:10), then put the basket by the side of the altar, threw himself down on his face, and afterwards departed (Mishna, *Bikurim*, iii 2-6; *Jerusalem Bikurim*, 65; Maimonides, *Hilchoth Bikurim*, 4:16, 17). These first-fruits then became the property of the priests who officiated 'during that week. The baskets of the rich were of gold or silver, 'those of the poor of peeled' willow. The baskets of the latter kind were presented to the priests who waved the offerings at the S.W. corner of the altar: the more valuable baskets were returned to the owners (*Bik.* iii, 6, 8). After passing the night at Jerusalem, the pilgrims returned on the following day to their homes (⁽¹⁵⁴⁰⁾Deuteronomy 16:7; *Terum.* ii, 4). It is mentioned that king Agrippa bore his part in this highly picturesque national ceremony by carrying his basket like the rest to the Temple (*Bik.* iii, 4). Among other by-laws were the following:

1. He who, ate his first. fruits elsewhere than in Jerusalem and without the proper form, was liable to punishment (*Macccoti*, iii, 3, vol. 4:284, *Surenh.*).
2. Women, slaves, deaf and dumb persons, and some others are exempt from the verbal oblation before the priest, which was not generally used after the feast of Tabernacles (*Bik.* i, 5, 6).
4. *Exemption from the, Offering or the connected Service.*-Those who simply possessed the trees and not the land', were exempted from the offering of firstfruits, for they could not say "'the land which thou hast given me" (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Bikurim*, ii, 13). Those, too, who lived beyond the Jordan could not bring firstfruits in the proper sense of the libation, inasmuch as they could not say the words of the service, from "the land that floweth with milk and honey" (⁽¹⁵⁴⁵⁾Deuteronomy 26:15; compare Mishna, *Bikurim*, i, 10). A proselyte, again, though he could bring the offering, was not to recite the service, because he could not use the words occurring therein (⁽¹⁵⁴⁸⁾Deuteronomy 26:3), "I am come to the country which the Lord sware -unto our fathers to give us" (*Bikurim*, i, 4),- Stewards, servants, slaves, women, sexless parson, and hermaphrodites were--also not allowed to recite the service, though they could offer the libation, because they could. not use the words, "I have brought the. first-

fruits of *the land which thou, "O Lord, hast given me"* (Deuteronomy 26:,10), they having originally had no share in the land (*Bikurim*, i, 5). '

5. Offering of -the prepared Produce.-In this, too, the quantity to be offered was left to the generosity of the people. -But it was understood', says Maimonides, that "a liberal man will give a fortieth part of his first-fruits; one who is neither liberal nor illiberal will give a fiftieth part, and a covetous man will give 'a sixtieth" (*Hilchoth Teruma*,,iii, 2). They had to be presented even -from the produce of Jewish fields is *foreign* countries, and were not allowed to be taken from the portion intended for tithes, nor from the corners left for the poor (*Teru-ma*, i, 5;' iii, 7), and were not required to be delivered in the Temple, but might be given to thee nearest priest (lb. 4:3; *Bikurins*, ii, 2). They consisted of wine, wool, bread, oil, date-honey, onions, cucumbers (Teruim. ii, 5, 6; ^{<04519>}Numbers 15:19, 21; ^{<05104>}Deuteronomy 18:4). The measuring-basket was to be thrice estimated during the season (lb. 4:3). He who ate or drank his offering by mistake was bound to add one fifth, and present it to the priest (^{<03516>}Leviticus 5:16; 22:14), who was forbidden to remit the penalty (*Terum.* 6:1, 5). The -offerings were to be eaten or used only by those who were clean from ceremonial defilement (^{<04811>}Numbers 18:11; ^{<05104>}Deuteronomy 18:4).

6. The First-fruit of the Dough.-Besides the offering of the first-fruits themselves, the Israelites were also required to give to the Lord a cake. made of the first -corn that was threshed, winnowed, and ground (^{<04518>}Numbers 15:18-21). Tradition restricts this to wheat, barley, casmin, or rye, fox-ear (barley), and oats (*Chala*, i, 1; Maimonides, *Bikurim*, 6:1), of which a twenty-fourth part had to be given, but the baker who made it for sale had to give a forty-eighth part (Maimonides, *Hichoth Bikerum*, v, 2, 3)." This was the perquisite of the priest, and it is to this that' the apostle refers in ^{<05116>}Romans 11:16.

7. First-fruits of Fruit-trees.-According to the law, the fruits of every newly-planted tree were not to he eaten or sold, or used. in any way for the first three years, but considered "Uncircumcised" or unclean. In the fourth year, however, the first-fruits were to be consecrated to the Lord, or, as the traditional. explanation is, eaten in Jerusalem, and in the fifth year became available to the owner (^{<03523>}Leviticus 19:23-25). The three years, according to Rabbinic law, began with 'the first of *Tisri*, if the tree was planted before the sixteenth *of Ab*.' The reason of this is that the fruits of 'those three years were considered imperfect; such imperfect fruit could

not, therefore, be offered to God; and as man was not allowed to partake of the produce 'before he consecrated the first instalment of God's blessings to the giver of all good things, the planter, had to wait till the fifth year (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 19; and Aben Ezra on ^{<6923>}Leviticus 19:23). The law may also have had the ulterior object of excluding from use crude, immature, and therefore unwholesome fruits. 'Michaelis (iii.: 267-8), indeed, finds a benefit to the 'trees themselves in this regulation: "The economical object of the law is very striking. Every gardener will teach us not to let fruit-trees bear in their earliest years, but to pluck off the blossoms; and for this reason, that they will 'thus thrive the better, and bear more abundantly afterwards, since, if we may not taste the fruit the first three years, we shall be the more disposed to pinch off the blossoms, and the son will learn to do this of his father. The very expression 'to regard them as uncircumcised' suggests the propriety of pinching them off; I do not say *cutting* them off, because it is generally the hand, and not a knife, that is employed in the operation." The trees found growing by the Jews at the conquest were treated as exempt from this rule (Mishna, *Osrlah*, i, 2).
SEE FRUIT.

8. Historical Notices.--The corruption of the nation after the time of Solomon gave rise to neglect in these as well as in other ordinances of the law; and restoration of them was among the reforms brought about by Hezekiah (^{<4805>}2 Chronicles 31:5, 11). Nehemiah also, at the return from captivity, took pains to reorganize the offerings, of first-fruits of both kinds, and to appoint places to receive them (^{<6005>}Nehemiah 10:35, 37; 12:44). Perversion or alienation of them is reprobated, as care in observing is eulogized by the prophets, and specially mentioned in the sketch of the restoration of the Temple and Temple-service made by Ezekiel (^{<0204>}Exodus 20:40; 44:30; 48:14; ^{<3008>}Malachi 3:8).

An offering of first-fruits is mentioned as an acceptable one to the prophet Elisha (^{<0402>}2 Kings 4:42).

Offerings of first-fruits were sent to Jerusalem by Jews living in foreign countries (Josephus, *Ant.* 16:6, 7).

Offerings of first-fruits were also customary in heathen systems of worship (Homer, *Il.* 9:529; *Odys.* iii, 444; Eurip. *Orest.* 96; *Phan.* 1523; Callim. *in Cerer.* 19; Theocr. 7:31; Stat. *Thieb.* ii, 742; Aristoph. *Ran.* 1272; Pausan. i, 43, 4; ix, 19, 4; Long. *Pastor.* ii, 2 and 22; Diod. Siculus, i, 14; Plutarch, *Isid.* 66; Pliny, 18:2; 4:6; Calpurn. Eccl. 4:122; Ovid, *Met.* 8:273; 10:431;

Fast. ii, 519; *Tibul.* i, '1, 13; Spanheim, *ad Callim. Del.* 283; Porphyry, *De Abstn.*: ii, 56, 32; Epictet.'38; etc.). See Patrick, *On Deuteronomy* 26; Spencer, *De Lea. Hebr.* iii, 9, *De Primitiarum Origine*; Les'lie, *On Tithes*, in *Works*, vol. ii; *Doughtmei Analect.* i, 89; Lakemacher, *Ant. Gr* p. 402; Munter, *Relig. der Karthag.* p. 54.

9. Figurative Allusions.-In the New Testament, the "first-fruits" are emblematical of abundance and excellence, and also the earnest or sample of a full harvest at hand. Paul says (~~6183~~Romans 8:23) Christians "have the first-fruits of the Spirit," i.e. the first gifts of the Spirit' the earnest, the pledge of future and still higher gifts. (See the monographs on this text by Gruner [Hal. 1767], Anon. [Gott. 1767], Muller [*Sardura Obs. Philol.* p. 120], Keil [Lips. 1809].) Christ is called " the first-fruits of them that slept," i.e. the first who rose from the dead (~~6151~~1 Corinthians 15:20, 23; 16:15; ~~6116~~Romans 11:16; ~~6018~~James 1:18; ~~6104~~Revelation 14:4).

10. Literature.-*Mishna, Bikurim, Teruma, Chala, and Orla*; Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chaaka, Hilchoth Bikurim*, iii, 121; Lewis, *Antiq. of the Hebrew Republic*, i, 145, etc. (Lond. 1724); Saalschiitz, *Mosaische Recht*, i. 343 sq., 416 sq., 433 sq.; Herzfeld, *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, ii, 128 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. 172 sq.; Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 611 sq.; Bauier. *Gottesd. Verfassuvng*, i, 251 sq.; Gruner, *De primitiarum oblatione* (Lugd. B. 1739; also in Ugolino, xvii). **SEE OFFERING.**

First-Fruits.

1. True Christians are called 'a kind of first-fruits of God's creatures (~~6018~~James 1:18), as being specially consecrated to him.'

2. The communications of God's grace on earth, as. an *earnest* of future glory, are also so called (~~6183~~Romans 8:23), and for the same. reason, the resurrection of Christ, as the *pledge* of the resurrection of the just' (~~6101~~1 Corinthians 4:20).

3. In an ecclesiastical sense, this term is applied to the *first year's produce* of benefices, which the pope demanded of foreigners to whom he gave benefices of the Church of England. Henry VIII rescued this payment from the pope, but annexed it to the crown. Queen Anne, however, gave them back to the Church for the augmentation of small livings" (Eden). **SEE ANNATES.** The *valor beneficiorum*, commonly called the *value in the King's Books*, was made at the same time as the statute 26 Henry VIII, c.

3, by which these payments were transferred to the crown. A former valuation had been made, 20 Edward I, which still exists in the exchequer. By this statute and one subsequent, 1 Elizabeth IV, every spiritual person admitted to a benefice must pay his first-fruits within three months after induction, in proper proportion: if he does not live half a year, or be ousted before the expiration of the first year, only one quarter is required; if he lives' the year, or be ousted before eighteen months, one half; if a year and a half, three quarters; if two years, the whole. Archbishops and bishops have four years allowed them, and shall pay one quarter every year, if they live so long on the see. Other dignitaries pay as rectors and vicars. By several statutes of Anne, all livings under £50 per annum are discharged of the payment of first-fruits and tenths. The following notice of the valuation in the King's Books, and the former payments to the pope as *primitiae*, is taken from Godwin's work, *De Præsulibus Angl.* The florin was 4s. 6d., the ducat 8s. English:

Fish

Picture for Fish 1

Picture for Fish 2

Picture for Fish 3

Picture for Fish 4

(gd; dag, so called from its *great fecundity*; Gr. ἰχθῦς, ^{<0002>}Genesis 9:2; ^{<0412>}Numbers 11:22; ^{<0311>}Jonah 2:1,10; ^{<0370>}Matthew 7:10; 14:17; 15:34; ^{<0316>}Luke 5:6; ^{<0206>}John 21:6, 8, 11). The Hebrews recognised fish as one of the great divisions of the animal kingdom, and, as such, give them a place in the account of the creation (Genesis i,-21, 28; 'where, however, they are included under the general terms /רַב, *she'rets*, *swarm*, and תַּמְרוֹ *romneseth*, *creeping* thing, i.e. destitute of legs; and as distinguished from the larger inhabitants of the deep, מַיְנִימַיִם *tanninim*'), as well as in other passages where an exhaustive description of living creatures is intended (^{<0002>}Genesis 9:2; ^{<0204>}Exodus 20:4; ^{<0348>}Deuteronomy 4:18; ^{<0463>}1 Kings 4:33). They do not, however, appear to have acquired any intimate knowledge of this branch' of natural history. Although they were acquainted with some of the names given by the Egyptians to the different species. (for Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 8, compares one found, in the Sea of Galilee to the *coracinus*), they did not adopt a similar method of

distinguishing them ; nor was any classification attempted beyond the broad divisions of clean and unclean,. great and small. The former was established by the Mosaic law (^{<OR10>}Leviticus 11:9, 10), which pronounced unclean such fish as were devoid of fins and scales: these were and are regarded as unwholesome food in Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* iii, 58, 59), so much so that one of the laws of El-Hakim prohibited the sale, or even the capture of them (Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, i, 136, note; De Sacy, *Chrestomathie Arabe*, 2d ed. i, 98). This distinction is probably referred to in the terms **σαπρά** (*esui nona ido.nea*, Schleusner's *Lex.* s.v.; Trench, *On Parables*, p. 137) and **καλά** (^{<OR13>}Matthew 13:48). This law of Moses may have given rise to some casuistry, as many fishes have scales, which, though imperceptible when first caught, are very apparent after the skin is in the least dried. Maimonides, with less reason, sees in the Levitical distinctions of *fins* and *scales* among fishes "marks whereby the more noble and excellent species might be distinguished from those that were inferior" (Townley's *Store Noevochi.in*, p. 305). In no ordinance of the laws of Moses do we *find fishes* prescribed as religious offerings. In this respect, as well as many others, these laws were opposed to the heathen rituals, which appointed fish-offerings to various' deities. Besides the *lepidotus*, the *oxyrhincus*, the *phagrus* (*eel*, "from its unwholesome qualities not eaten by the ancient Egyptians," Wilkinson, v, 251), *latus*, and *ncoetes* were held sacred in various parts of ancient Egypt (Clem. Alex., Plutarch, Strabo, Athenaeus, are the authorities referred to by Sir G.Wilkinson, v, 125). In the *Ordinances of Menu*, ch. v (on *Diet, Purification*, etc.), sees. 15, 16, "the twice-born man is commanded diligently 'to abstain from fish; yet the two fishes called *pathina* (sheat-fish, *Silurus pelorius*) and *rohila* (rohi-fish, *Cyprinus denwiculatus*) may be eaten by the guests, when offered at a repast. in honor of the gods or manes; and so may the *rajiva* (a large fish, *Cyprinus Niloticus*), the *sinhatunzda*, and the *sasalca* (probably shrimps and prawns) of every species" (Sir W. Jones's *Laws of JIMenit*, by Haughton, p. 146). Similarly in the heathen observances of other nations'; thus *Apua* [queryj *Anchovy*] *Veneri erat sacra.*; *Concha* [perhaps 'Pearl' oyster] *Veneri stat*; *Mullus Diane* ; *pisces omnes Neptuno*; *Thunnus Neptunio*." (Beyer, *Addit. ad Seldeni Syntag. de Diis Syriis*; Ugolini *Thesaur.* 33:338. 'Vossius, in Hoffmanni *Lexicon*, iii, 771, has a much longer list of fourteen fishes, "a *veteribus pro Diis habiti*." Consecrated fishes were kept in reservoirs, with-rings of gold, or silver, or brass attached to them. So Sir J.Chardin in Harmer, iii, 58.) It was perhaps as an image of fecundity that the fish was

selected as an object of idolatry: the-worship of it was widely spread, from Egypt (Wilkinson, iii, 58) to Assyria (Layard, *Nineveh*, ii, 467), and even India (Baur, *Mythologie*, ii, 58). -Among the Philistines, Dagon (=littlefish) was represented by a figure half man and half fish (^{<OR4>}1 Samuel 5:4). On this account the worship of fish is expressly prohibited (^{<OR4>}Deuteronomy 4:18). **SEE DAGON**. The form of a fish (*Notius Poseidon*) was, from remote ages, a type of protective dominion, which the symbolizing spirit of the ancients caused to pass into Christianity, as appears from Eusebius (*Life of Constantine*) and St. Augustine (*De Civitate Dei*). On the walls of the oldest catacombs of Rome the representation of the **IXΘΥΣ** is frequently discernible, and always interpreted as an emblem of the Saviour.

Taking fishes in the scientific sense of "oviparous, vertebrated, cold-blooded animals, breathing water by means of gills or *branchice*, and generally provided with fins," none are mentioned by *name* throughout the O. T. and N.T.; but, regarded in the popular and inexact sense of aquatic animals, inhabitants more or less of the water, we meet with eleven instances which require some notice here. -

1. That well-known batrachian reptile, the 'frog ([**dēp̄k̄**] *tseparde'i*), which emerges from a fish-like infancy, breathing by gills instead of lungs, and respiring water instead of air, is often mentioned in Exodus 8 but only in two passages else, ^{<OR5>}Psalms 78:45, and 105:30. **SEE FROG**.
2. The annelid *horse-leech*, whose name occurs only once, ^{<OR5>}Proverbs 30:15 (**hqwl [}** *alukah'*). "It would appear that the blood-sucking quality of this useful little animal is a direct and exclusive ordination of Providence for man's advantage. That blood is not the natural food of the animal is probable from the fact that, in the streams and pools which they inhabit, not one in a hundred could, in the common course of things, ever indulge such an appetite; and even when received into the stomach, it does not appear to be digested; for, though it will remain there for weeks without coagulating or becoming putrid, yet the animal usually dies unless the blood be vomited through the mouth" (Gosse's *Zoology*, ii, 374). Of course it is the smaller species, the *Hirudo medicinalis*, that is here referred to. But the larger species, the *Hcemopsis satuigsugiqā*, or "*horse-leech*," has a still greater voracity for blood. Bochart (*Sieqroz*. ii,.. 796-802) and Schultens (Proverbs in loc.) give another turn to ^{<OR5>}Proverbs 30:15, by identifying **hqwl [** with the Arabic *aluk*, and *maldngfte* or destiny, instead

of the *horse-leech*, the insatiable exacter. The ancient versions, however, must be deemed to outweigh their learned speculations; added to which the Arabic *alakat*, the Syriac *aluka*, and the Chaldee and Talmudic: אקל [] or א2אקל [] -all designate the *leech*, which is as abundant in the East as it ever was in our Western countries. The blood-appetite of this animal made it suitable to point a proverb: Horace says, *Non missura cutecm, nisi plena cruoris, hirudo* (De Arte Poet. 476). With this comp. Plautus, *Epidicus*, ii, 2, 4, 5; and Cicero, *ad Atticum*, lib. i, epist. 13. **SEE HORSELEECH.**

3. The testaceous mollusk (*Ostrea marina*, Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1263), called by the Hebrews אַמְרָמָי *argamann'*; by Avicenna, *Alargiawan*; by Galen, Θαλασσία φορφύρα, is the *Murex trunculus* of, zoology, 'from which the renowned Tyrian dye used to be obtained. This shell-fish (and not the "purple" extracted from it) is with good reason supposed by Gesenius to be referred to in אֲזַרְבָּבַד Song of Solomon 7:5: *The tresses of thine head are like the wreathed shell of the purple-fish* ; reminding us of the ancient head-dresses of the Athenians, described by Thucydides, i, 6, 3 (comp. the conical head-tuft of the Roman *Tutulus* [Varro, *De ling. latin.* 7:3, 90], and Virgil's *Crines nodantur in aurum*). A second reference to this shell-fish probably occurs in אֲזַרְבָּבַד Ezekiel 27:7.. The Tyrians seem to have imported some *murices* from the Peloponnesus (the same as "Elishah" according to Heeren, *Researches, Asiatic Nations* [Oxford. trans.], i, 361); and Gesenius supposes that these, the material' out of which the celebrated dye was procured, are referred to by the prophet in his enumeration of the Tyrian merchandise.' That these fishes were supplied from the coast of *Greece* we learn from Horace, Od. ii' 18, 7 (*Laconics puspurce*) from Pausanias, iii, 21, 6; and from Pliny, ix,.36. **SEE PURPLE.**

4. The other word used by Ezekiel in this passage, תִּלְבָּתִי *teke'leth*, in described by Gesenius, *Thes.* 1503, as "a species of shellfish (*Conchylium, Helix ianthinae* [conches-]), found' cleaving to the rocks in the "Mediterranean Sea, covered with a violet shell (Forskal, *Descript. animal.* p. 127), from which was procured a dark-blue dye." In the many other passages where these two words occur, they undoubtedly designate either the colors or the material dyed in them. The phrase "treasures hid in the sand" (אֲזַרְבָּבַד Deuteronomy 32:19) is supposed to refer to the abundance of the rich dyes afforded by the תִּלְבָּתִי and other testaceous animals found in the sand, on the Phoenician coast, assigned to. Zebulon and Issachar

(Targum of Jonathan b. Uziel, Walton, 4:387, and Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1503). **SEE BLUE.**

5. The $\hat{y}N\bar{I}T\bar{i}$ -tannin (*plur.* $\mu y n \bar{y} N \bar{I} T \bar{i}$ or $\mu n \bar{y} N \bar{I} T \bar{i}$) must be carefully distinguished from $\mu y N \bar{I} T \bar{i}$ 'itannin', the plural of thee-unused word $\hat{T}i$ a *jackel*, according to Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1138. "The seamonsters," which are described by Jeremiah (Lament. 4:3) as "suckling their young," used to be regarded as the mammiferous whales or other large *cetacea* (Calbnet by Taylor, "Fragments" on *Natural History*, No. 26). ' They are by Gesenius (*I. c.*) supposed to be rather $\mu y N \bar{I} T \bar{i}$, *jackals*; this is the reading of some of the MSS. (Kaennicott, ii, 546), and Gesenius accepts the Masoretic text as an Aramaic form of it. In ^{<301B>}Ezekiel 29:3, and 32:2, the textual reading $\mu y N \bar{I} T \bar{i}$ which is represented usually as an anomalous singular noun, should -no doubt be $\hat{y}N\bar{I}T\bar{i}$ the regular singular, which may well bear (what the other word could not) the 'suitable' sense of crocodile; the MS. authority in favor of the latter word is overwhelming (Kennicott ii, 212). For a description of the $\hat{y}nt$, **SEE WHALE.**

6. $t/mh\bar{B}j$ *Behemoth'* (q.v.).

7. $\hat{t}y\bar{w}j$ *Leviathan.* **SEE CROCODILE.**

8. "The great. fish," $I / d\bar{G}; gD;$ of ^{<3017>}Jonah 1:17 ($hgD;$ in 2:1), was probably some species of shark, such as the *Zygaene malleus*, or the *Carcharias vulgaris* (the white shark), therefore -strictly *a fish*. Of the same kind of huge fish, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omicron\iota$, does Amos speak in prophecy, ^{<301B>}Amos 9:3, "I will command the serpent from a the bottom of the sea, and he shall bite them" (Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, c. 40, l. 40). The difficulty that in the Sept. of Jonah, and in the Greek Testament (^{<4124>}Matthew 12:40), $\kappa\hat{\eta}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ is the word by which the fish is designated, is removed by the fact, that, this Greek term does not specifically indicate whales only as the objection supposes, but any of the larger inhabitants of the deep. (Wesseling's Herodot. *Fragm. de Incrementos Nili*, p. 789, as quoted in Valpy's *Stephani Thes.* s.v. $\kappa\hat{\eta}\tau\omicron\varsigma$; here "*Pisces*," as well as "*be/s-ceu 'qcehi bet ingenae-s, veluti crocodilus et hippopotamus.*" are included.) Accordingly $\kappa\hat{\eta}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ stands in the Sept., *passim*, for $gD;$ 'as well as for $\hat{y}N\bar{I}T\bar{i}$ (see Schleusner, *Lex. V. T.* s.v. $\kappa\hat{\eta}\tau\omicron\varsigma$). Admiral Smyth, in the chapter on Ichthyology, in his *Mediterranean*, p. 196, says the white shark has been called "*Jonce piscis*' from its transcendent claim "to have been *the great fish* that swallowed the

prophet, since lie can readily engulf a man whole." For more on the subject of this fish, see Kitto, *Bibl. Illustr.* 6:399-404, and *SEE JONAH*.

9. Of Tobit's fish,. O.T. Fritzsche, in his commentary on the passage (Tobit 6:*passim*) enumerates nine or ten speculations by different writers. According to Bochart and Helvigius, the *Silurus* has the best claim. This the former describes as "being very large, of great strength and boldness, and ever ready to attack other animals, even men, an inhabitant of the rivers Euphrates and Tigris." C. H. Smith, in the first edition of Kitto's *Cyclopaedia*. combats Bochart's conclusions, and suggests the *Sicsar* of the Indus, a, crocodile, probably of the genus *Gavial*, which grows to a great size, is, eaten, and has a gall bladder, still used to cure obstinate wounds and defluctions Glaire suggests the *sturgeon*, but this is more suitable to Northern rivers. Pennant mentions. the capture of one in the Esk weighing 464: pounds (*British Zoology*, iii, 127). See more in Bochart, *Hieroz.* v, 14; Glaire, *Introduction de l'Ancien. et du N.T.* ii, 91 [ed. 3], Paris, 1862, and TOBIT.

10. If Dr. French and Mr. Skinner, in their *Translation of the Psalms*, are right in rendering ^{<QAB>} Psalm 104:26, "There swimmeth the nautilus and the whale" etc. (as if the sacred writer meant to indicate, a *small*, though conspicuous, as well as a large aquatic animal, as. equally the object of God's care), we have, in the *t/Ynā', aniyoth'*, A. V. 's-ships, "an unexpected addition to our Scripture nomenclature of fishes, in what lord Byron calls

*"The tender Nautiltis who steels his prow,
The sea-born sailor of his shell canoe,
The ocean Mab, the fairy of the sea.--The Island,*

In their note the translators say, "*The Nautilus*. This little creature floats at pleasure upon the surface of the sea. Its shell resembles the *hull of a ship*, whence it has its name." Mr. Thrupp accepts the new rendering as having "much apparent probability" (*Introduction to the Psalms the Psalms*, ii, 178).¹ Another recent expositor of the Psalms, J. Olshausen (*Exeg. Handb.* p. 402), remarks that "the introduction of *ships* amongst the living creatures of the sea has always presented an 'obstacle' to the understanding of the sentence. The paper nautilus (*Argonauta*) frequents the Mediterranean. The verb *^WkLəj]* *proceed*, walk, very well describes the stately progress of the nautilus as it floats upon the wave. We may add that it gives greater fitness to the 27th verse, which at present is hardly

compatible with the 25th and 26th, owing, to the intrusion of the clause, *there go the ships*. Replace this by the *nastilus*, and the coherence of the 27th verse with the two preceding is complete in all its terms.

11. Our last specific fish is rather suggested than named in ²³⁹⁴Ezekiel 29:4, where the prophet twice mentions "the fish of the rivers which cleave to the scales" [of the crocodile]. This description seems to identify this fish with the *Echeveis remora*, so remarkable for the adhesive or sucking disc which covers the upper part of the head, and enables it to adhere to the body of another fish or to the bottom of a vessel. (Its fabulous powers of being able even to arrest a vessel in her course are recorded by Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 32:1; it is mentioned by Aristotle, *Hist. Assinm.* ii, 14, ἰχθύδιόν τι ὁ καλοῦσί τινες ἔχεν ηἰδα. It is also mentioned by Fonakal as seen at Gidda, and by Hassebquist at Alexandria). The *lump-sucker* (*Cyclopterus lumpus*) is furnished with ventral fins which unite beneath the body and form a concave disc, by which the fish can with ease adhere to stones or other bodies. Either in the remora, with its adhesive apparatus above, or in the lump-sucker with a similar appendage below, or in both, we have in all probability the prophet's fishes which cleave to the monster of the Nile. The species of fishes known to the Hebrews, or at least to those who dwelt on the coast, were probably very numerous, because the usual current of the Mediterranean sets in, with a great depth of water, at the Straits of Gibraltar, and passes eastward on the African side until the shoals of the delta of the Nile begin to turn it towards the north; it continues in that direction along the Syrian shores, and falls into a broken course, only when turning westward on the Cyprian and Cretan coasts. Every spring, with the sun's return towards the north, innumerable, troops of littoral species, having passed the winter in the offings of Western Africa, return northward for spawning, or are impelled in that direction by other unknown laws. A small part only ascend along the Atlantic coast of Spain and Portugal towards the British Channel, while the main bodies pass into the Mediterranean, follow the general current, and do not break into more scattered families until they have swept round the shores of Palestine. Lists of species of the fish frequenting various parts of the Mediterranean may be found in Risso (*Ichthyol. de Nice*), who describes 315 species he had observed at Nice; and in Adm. Smyth's Mediterranean, where in the chapter on *Ichthyology* he gives a list of about 300 fishes haunting the waters of Sicily, besides 240 *crustacea*, *testacea*, and *mollusks*. Admiral Smyth remarks generally of the Mediterranean fish, that, "though mostly

handsomer than British fishes, they are, for the most part, not to be compared with them in flavor" (p. 192-209). Professor E. Forbes (in his *Report on Lgean Inveslebrala*) divides that part of the East Mediterranean, in which for many years he conducted his inquiries, into eight regions of depth, each characterized by its peculiar fauna. "Certain species," he says, "in each are found in no other; several are found in one region which do not range into the next- above, whilst they extend to that below, or *vice versa*. Certain species have their maximum of development in each zone, being most prolific in individuals at that zone in which is their maximum, and of which they may be regarded as especially characteristic. Mingled with these true natives are stragglers, owing their presence to the secondary influences which modify distribution." The Syrian waters are probably not less prolific. The coasts of Tyre and Sidon would produce at least as great a number. The name of the latter place, indeed, is derived from the Phoenician word *fish* (see Gesenius, s.v. *ִדְיֻסִי* Sidon: the modern name has the same meaning, Saida; Abulfar. Syria, p. 93. **SEE SIDON**), and it is the oldest fishing establishment for commercial purposes known in history. The Hebrews had a less perfect acquaintance with the species found in *the Red Sea*, whither, to a certain extent, the majority of fishes. found in the Indian Ocean resort. Besides these, in Egypt they had anciently eaten *those of the Nile* (for the fish of the Nile, sea. Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, ii, 119-121, and, more fully, Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, iii, 58; v, 248-254); subsequently, those of *the lake of Tiberias and of the rivers* falling into the Jordan (Von Raumer, Palistina, p. 105, after Hasselquist, mentions the *Sparus Gallilcus*, a sort of bream the *silurus* and *mulil*; and Reuchlin, in *Herzog* after Dr. Barthe, adds the *Labrus Nicloticusas* inhabiting this lake, which Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 375, represents as abounding in fish of all kinds [comp. ^{<B211>}John 21:11, with ^{<D447>}Matthew 14:17 and 15:34]. From the earliest times-so said the Rabbinical legends-this lake had-been so renowned in this respect [see Reland, p. 260, who quotes the *Baba Bethra* of the Babylonian Gemara], that one of the ten fundamental laws laid down by Joshua was, that any one might fish with a hook in the Sea of Galilee [see Lightfoot, *Talm. Exercit.* on ^{<D008>}Matthew 4:8]. Two of the villages on the banks derived their name from their fisheries, the west and the east *Bethsaida*, "house of fish" [compare the modern name of Sidon just mentioned]. The numerous streams which flow into the Jordan are also described by Stanley as full of fish, especially the Jabbok, p. 323); and they may have been acquainted with species of *other lakes*, of the *Orontes*, and even of the *Euphrates*. The

supply, however, of this article of food, which the Jewish people appear to have consumed largely, came chiefly from the *Mediterranean*. From ^{<636>}Nehemiah 13:16, we learn that the Phoenicians of Tyre actually resided in Jerusalem as dealers in fish, which must have led to an exchange of that commodity for corn and cattle. They must have previously salted it (in which form it is termed *j y l m* in the Talmud; Lightfoot on ^{<147>}Matthew 14:17): the existence of a regular fish-market is implied in the notice of the fish-gate, which was probably contiguous to it (^{<234>}2 Chronicles 23:14; ^{<488>}Nehemiah 3:3; 12:39; ^{<310>}Zephaniah 1:10). In addition to these sources, the reservoirs formed in the neighborhood of towns may have been stocked with fish (^{<1023>}2 Samuel 2:13; 4:12; ^{<2008>}Isaiah 7:3; 22:9, 11; ^{<2004>}Song of Solomon 7:4, where, however, "fish" is interpolated in the A. V.). *SEE FOOD*. - The most nutritious and common of the fishes which must have filled the Jewish markets were genera of *Percadem* (perch tribes); *Scicenids* (much resembling the perches); and particularly the great tribe of the *Scomberidce* (mackerel), with its numerous genera and still more abundant species, frequenting the *Mediterranean* in prodigious numbers, and mostly excellent for the table; but being often without perceptible scales, they may have been of questionable use to the Hebrews. All the species resort to the deep seas, and foremost of them is the genus *Thynnus*, our tunny, a fish often-mentioned with honor by the ancients, from Aristotle downward; a specimen taken near Greenock in 1831 was nine feet in length. Its flesh is highly prized, and from its great solidity it partakes much of the character of meat. Although repeatedly taken on the English coast, it is really a native of the *Mediterranean*, where it abounds, not only in Sicilian waters but, in three or four species, in the *Levant*. The following complete the catalogue the *Mugilidae* family (the sea mullets, *mugiles*, being valuable in every part of the *Mediterranean*), the *Labridce* (or *Wrasse* of Pennant), and *Cyprinidce* (carps, particularly abundant in the fresh waters of Asia); after these may be ranged the genus *Mormyrus*, of which the' species, amounting to six or seven, are almost exclusively tenants of the Nile and the lake of Tiberias, and held among the most palatable fish which the fresh waters produce. Cat or sheat-fish (*Si-slude*) are a family of numerous genera, all of which, except the *Loricarice*, are destitute of a scaly covering, and were consequently unclean to the Hebrews; though several -of them were held by the ancient Gentile nations and by some of the modern in high estimation, such as the blackfish, probably the shilbeh (*Silurus Shilbe' Niloticus*) of the Nile, and others. Of salmons (*Salmonidsce*), the *Myletes denstex* or *Hasselquist* belongs to the

most edible fishes of the Egyptian river; there were also *Clupeidae*.(herrings) and the *Gadidae* (or cod), these last being present about Tymre; *Pleuronectes* (or flatfish) are found off the Egyptian coasts, and eel-shaped genera are bred abundantly in the lakes of the Delta. A comparison of this list with the enumeration of the ancient Egyptian fish given by Strabo (xvii, 823), or by Sir G. Wilkinson in his *Ancient Egyptians* (iii, 58), will show us that some of the fish which have to the present day preserved their excellent character as wholesome food (such as some species of the *Percadce* [e.g. the "gisher"], and the *Labridae* [e.g. the " bultit"], and the Cyprinidit [e.g. thee "benni;" " the carpe is a dayntous fische," wrote old Leonard Maschal in 1514, when he introduced the fish into England]), were the identical diet which the children of Israel " remembered" so invidiously at Taberah, when they ungratefully loathed the manna (^{<44116>}Numbers 11:5). Finally, there are the cartilaginous orders, where we find the file-fish (genus *Balistes*), having a species (*B. vetusa*) in the waters of the Nile; and true chondropterygians, containing the sharks, numerous in genera and species, both in the Mediterranean and Red Sea. We notice only *Carcharus Lamia*, the white or raging shark, often -found of enormous size off Alexandria, and always attended by several pilot-fish (*Naucrates*), and the saw-fish (*Pristis antiquorum*), most dreaded by the pearl-fishers in the Persian Gulf, and which has been seen in the Red Sea pursuing its prey even into the surf, with such force and velocity that, on one occasion, half of a fish cut asunder by the saw flew on shore at the feet of an officer while employed in the surveying service. On rays we shall only add that most of the genera are represented by species in either sea, and in particular the sting rays (*Trigon*) and electric rays (*Torpedo*), with which we close our general review of the class, although many interesting remarks might be subjoined, all tending to clear up existing misconceptions respecting fishes in general-such as that cetaceans, or the whale tribe, belong to them; and the misapplication of the term when tortoises and oysters are denominated fish; for the error is general, and the Arabs ven include lizards in the appellation. *SEE ZOOLOGY.*

The extreme value of fish as an article of food [when cooked, or otherwise prepared as a relish, ὀψάσιον, lit. *sauce*] (our Lord seems to recognise this as sharing with *bread* the claim to be considered as a prime necessary of life, see ^{<4409>}Matthew 7:9, 10) imparted to *the destruction* (fish the character of a divine judgment (see Isaiah 1, 2; ^{<3008>}Hosea 4:3; ^{<3008>}Zephaniah 1:3; compare with ^{<1078>}Exodus 7:18, 21; ^{<1053>}Psalms 105:29;

and ^(239B)Isaiah 19:8). This would especially be the case in Egypt, where the abundance of fish in the Nile, and the lakes and canals (Strabo, 17:p. 823; Diod. i, 36, 43, 52; Herod. ii, 13, 149), rendered it one of the staple commodities of food (^(241E)Numbers 11:5; comp. Wilkinson, iii, 62). How fish is destroyed, largely in the way of God's judgment, is stated by Dr. E. Pococke on ^(240B)Hosea 4:3, where he collects many conjectures of the learned, to which may be added the more obvious cause of *death by disease*, such as the case mentioned by Welsted (*Travels in Arabia*, i, 310) of the destruction of vast quantities of the fish of Oman by an epidemic, which recurred nearly every five years. St. John (*Travels in Valley of the Nile*, ii, 246) describes a vast destruction of fish from cold. Aristotle (*Hist. Anim.* 8:19) mentions certain *symptoms of disease* among fish as known to skilful fishermen; but he denies that epidemics such as affect men and cattle fall upon them. In the next section he mentions the *mullein plant* (*verbascum*, **πλόμος**) as poisonous to fresh-water and other fish. Certain waters are well known to be fatal to life. The instance of the Dead Sea, the very contrast of the other Jordan lakes so full of life, is well described by Schwarz (*Describe Geography of Palestine*, p. 41-45), and by Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 290-294), and more fully by De Saulcy (*Dead Sea*, passim). Contrast the present condition of this Sea of Death with the vitality which is predicted of it in the vision of Ezekiel (^(237D)Ezekiel 47:9, 10). Its healed waters and renovated fish "exceeding many," and "the fishers which shall stand on it from Engedi even unto Eneglaim," and "the places on its coast to spread forth nets"-all these features are in vivid opposition to the present condition of "the Asphaltic lake." Of like remarkable import is 2 Esdr. v, 7, where the writer, among *the signs of the times to come*, predicts, "The Sodomitish sea shall cast out fish." For *ancient* testimonies of the death which reigns over this lake, see St. Jerome on *Ezekiel*, lib. xiv., Tacitus, *Hist.* v, 6; Did. Sic. ii, 48, and 19:98; and the Nubian Geographer, iii, .5, as quoted by Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 40. But there are other waters equally fatal to fish life, though less known, such as the lake called *Canoudan* .(Avicenna, i. q. **ἄγονον**, *without life*.), in Armenia, .and that which Aelian (*Hist. Animal.* iii, 38) mentions **ἡ δὲ ἐν Φενεῶ λίμνη ἰχθύων ἄγανός ἐστιν**). This epithet **ἄγονος** is applied to the Dead Sea itself by Josephus, *War*, v, 4 (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* i, 40). **SEE DEAD SEA.**

Fish In Christian Symbolism.

Of all the symbols used by the early Christians, none was more widely used than that of the fish. It was employed as a metaphor in the writings of the fathers of the Church, and was graven or painted as a secret sign upon monuments of all kinds. We do not speak, of course, of the fish introduced into arabesque ornamentation, or into the scenes drawn from the New Testament, nor of those cases where it was used upon tombs to indicate the calling of the deceased, but of those cases where it was used independently, and manifestly in a purely symbolical sense. Numberless examples are extant of its being thus used on tombstones, rings, seals, and amulets. It manifestly had two significations, sometimes referring to Christ, and sometimes to the Christian Church.

I. Referring to Christ, it was in familiar use as early as the 2d century. Its significance was drawn from the fact that the letters of **ἰχθύς**, the Greek word for fish, form the initials of the acrostic **Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, Θεοῦ, Υἱός, Σωτήρ** (*Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour*).

The complete acrostic is found upon but one monument, a tombstone. It is explained in the writings of St. Augustine. Sometimes the entire word was used; in other cases there were but parts of it. The figure of a fish was very frequently cut or painted to represent the Saviour. Fishes of glass or of bronze were often hung upon the necks of believers as amulets. Seals and rings often had other symbols also, as the anchor, the cross, and the **A Ω**. The fish was especially used on baptismal fonts and on the walls of baptisteries. A ship resting on a fish was used to indicate that Christ supports the Church.

II. The fish represents the Christian in all artistic presentations of those parables where the apostles are spoken of as fishers of men. The fish, attached to a hook and line, with or without a fisherman, always refers to the Christian, as do those representations of a number of fishes on pavements of churches, and on those tombstones where funeral inscriptions, as *injrace*, are added. Often two fishes are given, one on each side of an anchor or a cross. Many interpretations are given of this, the best established being the one that considers them as referring to the Jews and Gentiles, though much weight is attached to the interpretation which considers the two fishes to allude to the two covenants, the Jewish and the Christian. The baptisteries were therefore sometimes called *piscinee*.

Tertullian speaks of Christians as accustomed to please themselves with the name *pisciculi*, "fishes," to denote that they were born again into Christ's religion by water. He says, *Nos piscicui secundum ἰχθῦν, nostrum Jesum Christum, in aqua nascimur* (*De Bapt.* ch. i).

The use of the fish as a symbol ceased almost entirely with the death of Constantine the Great, though examples are found of it as late as the 5th or 6th century.—Rossi, *De Christianis Monumentis IXΘYN ex" hibentibus* (Par. 1855); Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes* (Paris, 1865); Piper, *Die christliche Kunst*; Becker, *Die Darstellung Jesu Christi unter dem Bilde des Fisches'* (Breslau, 1866, 8vo); Didron, *Christi/as Iconography*, i, 344; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. i, ch. i, § 2-'

Fishing

(*gyDj dig; ἄλιεύειν*). The copious supply of fish in the waters of Palestine encouraged the art or a vocation of fishery, to which frequent allusions are made in the Bible: in the O. T. these allusions are of a metaphorical character, descriptive either of the conversion (²⁴⁶⁶Jeremiah 46:16; ²⁶⁷⁰Ezekiel 47:10) or of the destruction (²⁵²⁸Ezekiel 29:3 sq; ²⁰⁹²Ecclesiastes 9:12; ³¹⁰²Amos 4:2; ³⁵¹⁴Habakkuk 1:14) of the enemies of God. In the N.T. the allusions are of a historical character for the most part (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 79), though the metaphorical application is still maintained in ⁴¹³⁷Matthew 13:47 sq. It was from the fishing-nets that Jesus called his earliest disciples to "become fishers of men" (⁴⁰¹⁶Mark 1:16-20); it was from a fishing-boat that he rebuked the winds and the waves (⁴⁰⁸⁵Matthew 8:26); it was from a fishing-boat that he delivered his wondrous series of prophetic parables of the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 13); it was to a fishing-boat that he walked on the sea, and from it that Peter walked to him (⁴¹²¹Matthew 14:24-32); it was with fish (doubtless dried) as well as with bread that he twice miraculously fed the multitude (⁴¹⁴⁹Matthew 14:19; 15:36); it was from the mouth of a fish, taken with a hook, that the tribute-stater was paid (⁴¹⁶⁷Matthew 16:27); it was "a piece of broiled fish" that he ate before his disciples on the day that he rose from the dead (⁴²⁴²Luke 24:42, 43); and yet again, before he ascended, he filled their net with "great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three," while he himself prepared a "fire of coals," and "laid fish thereon," on which then he and they' dined (⁴³²⁰John 21:1-14).

The most prevalent method of catching fish in use among the Hebrews was by sets of various kinds and sizes. Four of these are mentioned: two in ^{<3015>}Habakkuk 1:15, 16, **מַרְי** , (che'rem, Sept. ἀμφίβληστρον: no doubt in v, 16 this word and **σαγήνη** have been by' some means transposed; verse 17 compared with verse 15 makes this evident), the *casting-net*, ^{<4048>}Matthew 4:18 (**δίκτυον**), and ^{<4016>}Mark 1:16; and **מִקְמֵרֵת** (*mikme'reth*, Sept. **σαγήνη**), the *drag-net*, a larger kind (see ^{<4138>}Matthew 13:48),. requiring the use of a boat: the latter was probably most used on the Sea of Galilee, as the number of boats kept on it was very considerable (Josephus, *War*, iii, 10, 9). The third occurs ^{<2092>}Ecclesiastes 9:12, **חֲמִי** (*mitst3odah'*, Sept. ἀμφίβληστρον),. a *castling-net*. The fourth, **רֶשֶׁת**, (*re'shet'*, Sept. **παγίς**), a *fowler's net as sell as a fisher's*. In ^{<4987>}Psalm 35:7, 8, the **רֶשֶׁת**, *inet*, is used with **בְּיַם** a *pit* ("they have hid for me their net in a pit"): the allusion would seem to be to that mode of winter-fishing which Aristotle describes as practised by the Phoenicians (*Hist. Animal.* 8:20). Net-fishing is still used on the lake of Tiberias (Dr. Pococke, *Descrip. of the East*, ii, 69). **SEE NET**. This mode of fishing prevailed in Palestine, and is a prominent feature of the piscatorial associations in the Gospel history to the very last (see ^{<4326>}John 21:6, 8, 11). It is certainly less characteristic of Egyptian fishing, of which we have frequent mention in the O. T. **SEE ANGLING**. The instruments therein employed were the **חֲכִי** (*chakkmh'*, Sept.- **ἀγκίστρον**, comp. ^{<4077>}Matthew 17:27), as *angling-hook*, four smaller fish; ^{<2908>}Isaiah 19:8; ^{<3015>}Habakkuk 1:15. These hooks were (for disguise) made to resemble *thorns* (on *the principle* of the fly-fishing instruments, though not in the same m inner; for the Egyptians, neither anciently nor now, seem to have put winged insects on their hooks to attract their prey Wilkinson, iii, 5-4), and were thence called **רִיסֵי סִסְאוֹת**, ^{<4042>}Amos 4:2 (" from their resemblance to thorns," Gesenius, *Lex. s.*, v.); and (in the case of the larger sort) **חֲכִי סֻכְכָּה**, A. V. " barbed irons ;" ^{<3827>}Job 12:7 [40:31]. As-other name for these thorn-like instruments was **מַגְּבֵי** ^{<4042>}Amos 4:2 (a *generic* word, judging from the Sept., **ὄπλα**). **יַי** , was either a hook or a ring put through the nostrils of fish to let them down again, alive into the water (Gesenius), or (it may be) a *crook* by which fishes were suspended to long poles, and carried home after being caught (such as is shown in plate 344 [from a tomb near the Pyramids] in Wilkinson, iii, 56). The word is used in ^{<3842>}Job 41:2 [40:26] with **מַגְּבֵי אַגְמֹן**, a *cord of rushes* (**σχοῖνος**). Rosenmuller, ad loc.,

applies these two words to the binding of larger fish to the bank of the river until wanted, after they are captured and quotes Bruce for instances of such a practice in modern Egyptian fishing. The rod was occasionally dispensed with (Wilkinson, iii, 53), and is not mentioned in the Bible: ground-bait alone was used, fly fishing being unknown. Though we have so many terms for *the hook*, it is doubtful whether any have come down to us denoting the *line* $\sim/mg\bar{a}$ and I bh , and though the most nearly connected with piscatorial employment, hardly express our notion of a line for *angling* (see Gesenius, s.v.); while fWj and I ytP (*thread*, twine) are never used in Scripture for fishing purposes. **SEE HOOK**.—The large fish-spear or *harpoon* used for destroying the crocodile and hippopotamus was called $\mu ygd; \text{I xl } \bar{x}$ (^{<1890>}Job 41:7 [40:31]; comp. with Wilkinson, iii, 72, 73). $\text{I xl } \bar{x}$ means a cymbal or any clanging instrument, and this seems to have led to the belief of fishes being attracted and caught by musical sounds; stories of such, including Arioa- and the dolphin, are collected by Schelhorn in his *Dissertatio de Dean* $\mu ygd \text{ I xl } \bar{x}$ (Ugolini Thesaur. 29:329). "The Egyptian fishermen used the net; it was of a long form, like the common drag-net, with wooden floats on the upper and leads on the lower side, though sometimes let down from a boat, those who pulled it generally stood on the shore and landed the fish on a shelving-bank" (Wilkinson, ii, 21). This net is mentioned in ^{<2908>}Isaiah 19:8, under the name $\text{tr/mk}\bar{m}$. It is, however, doubtful whether this be anything more than a frame, somewhat between a basket and a net, resembling the landing-net represented in Wilkinson, iii, 55. The Mishna (vi, 76, 116) describes it by the word $\bar{Y}qa$; *nassa*, *corbis piscatoria*, a basket. Maillet (*Epist.* ix) expressly says that "*nets for fishing are not used in Egypt*." If this be so, the usage has much altered since the times which Wilkinson has described. Frame's for fishing, attached to stakes driven into the bottom, were prohibited in the lake of Tiberias, "because they are an impediment to boats" (Talmudic Gloss, quoted by Lightfoot, *Hora Heir.* on ^{<4048>}Matthew 4:18). No such prohibition existed in Egypt, where wicker-traps, now as anciently, are placed at the mouth of canal, by which means a great quantity of fish is caught (Rawlinson, *Herod.* ii, 232', note). The custom of drying fish is frequently represented in the sculptures of Upper and Lower Egypt (p. 127, note). There was a caste of fishermen; and allusion to the artificial reservoirs and fish-ponds of Egypt occurs in the Prophets (^{<2908>}Isaiah 19:8-10). Fishing pavilions, apparently built on the margin of artificial lakes, also appear in the Assyrian sculptures (Layard's *Nineveh*, i,

55). According to Aristotle (*Hist. Animal.* 8:19), compared with ^{<4086>}Luke 5:5. *the night* was the best time for fishing operations: "before sunrise and after sunset."

Fisher

(gWDj *davvag'*, ^{<2466>}Jeremiah 16:16 [marg.]; ^{<2570>}Ezekiel 47:10; or gYDj *dayyag'*, ^{<2398>}Isaiah 19:8; ^{<2466>}Jeremiah 16:16 [text]; Gr. *ἀλιεύς*, *seaman* or *sailor*, hence *fisherman*, as rendered ^{<4086>}Luke 5:2), a term used, besides its literal import [*SEE FISHING*, above], in the phrase "fishers of men" (^{<4086>}Matthew 19:1; Mark i, 17), as applied by our Saviour to the apostles (q.v.) in calling them to their office; and in a like typical manner, but in an unfavorable sense, the word occurs ^{<2466>}Jeremiah 16:16. The application of the figure is obvious (see Wemyss, *Symbolical Dict.* s.v.). On the "fisher's coat" (*ἔπενδύτης*, ^{<4207>}John 21:7), *SEE COAT*.

Fisher, Edward

an English Protestant theologian, was born in 1597, and was educated at Oxford, where he became a gentleman commoner in 1627. He taught a school at Caermarthen, in Wales, and died in Ireland. He was a strong Calvinist. His *Marrow of Modern Divinity*, published in 1644, excited a vigorous controversy when republished in Scotland by Hogg (1718, 8vo). It went through numerous editions (12th ed. Lond. 1726, with notes by Thomas Boston, 2 vols. 8vo). *fisher* also wrote *Appeal to the Conscience* (Oxford, 1644, 8vo):-*Feast of Asses* (1644, 4to) :-*Caveat to the Sabbatarians* (1650, 4to).-Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, s.v.; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, ed. Smith, ii, 431. *SEE MARROW CONTROVERSY*.

Fisher, John

bishop of Rochester, was born at Beverly, in Yorkshire, in 1459. He was educated at Michael House, Cambridge, of which house he became master in 1495; and being appointed confessor to Margaret, countess of Richmond, mother of Henry VII, he induced her to found St. John's and Christ's colleges. He was made divinity-professor in Cambridge, 1502, and bishop of Rochester, 1504. He was a great benefactor to the University of Cambridge. He opposed the Lutheran reformation, and was supposed by some to be the real writer of Henry VIII's book against Luther; and on Luther's replying, he wrote a *Defence of the King of England's Assertion*

of the Catholic Faith. He continued in high favor with Henry VIII till he opposed the king's divorce, and to his honest views on this point he adhered unflinchingly. He remained unmolested till 1534, when he refused to take the oath of allegiance, and was committed to the Tower. He was attainted by Parliament November 3, 1534, and his bishopric was declared void January 2, 1535. He would probably have been permitted to remain quietly in prison during the rest of his life had not Paul III, by making him, in May, 1535, cardinal-priest of St. Vitalis, angered the king, who issued orders that no person should be permitted to bring the hat into his dominions. Lord Cromwell, being sent to examine the bishop, asked him, "My lord of Rochester, what would you say if the pope should send you a cardinal's hat; would you accept of it?" The bishop replied, "Sir, I know myself to be so far unworthy any such dignity, that I think of nothing less; ut if any such thing should happen, assure yourself that I should improve that favor to the best advantage that I could, in assisting the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, and in that respect I would receive it upon my knees." When this answer was brought to the king by secretary Cromwell, Henry said in a great passion, "Yea, is he yet so lusty ? Well, let the pope send him a hat when he will, Mother of God, he shall wear it on his shoulders then, for I will leave him never a head to set it on." Fisher was convicted of high treason, and beheaded on Tower Hill, June 22, 1535. His *Life* Rev. Bailey is published with those of *More* and *Roper* (Dublin, 1835, 7th edit.). There is also a *Life* by Lewis (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo). His polemical and miscellaneous writings will be found in the edition *Opera. J. Fisheri quæ hæctenus inveniri potuerunt omnia* (Wurtzb. 1597, fol.). "The character of Fisher is remarkable for firmness. In his steady maintenance of the fallen cause of queen Catharine, undaunted by the anger of the vindictive king, this quality peculiarly shone forth; and still more with regard to the oath of supremacy, refusal to take which was certain to call forth severe punishment, and in all probability death. Fisher was immovable, not being convinced that he was in the wrong; his fearless firmness allowed him to maintain an open profession that he was in the right. He was a learned and devout man, and his conduct fully proved his sincerity."-Dupin, *Eccles. Hist.* cent. 16:p. 412; Burnet, *Hist. Reform.* ii, 248, 567 sq.; Hook, *Eccl. Biography*, v, 132.

Fisher, Jonathan

a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 7, 1768, at New Braintree, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College, 1792, entered the ministry Oct. 1793,

and was installed pastor at Blue Hill, Me., July 13, 1796, where he labored until Oct. 24, 1837, and died Sept. 22, 1847. He published a volume of *Miscellaneous Poems; Scripture Animals*; and a sermon.-Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 344.

Fisher, Richard Adams

a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Berks Co., Pa., Oct. 25, 1805. Having finished his preparatory studies under his own pastor, Rev. F. Herman, Jr., he began the study of theology with Rev. Dr. Hermsan; was licensed and ordained in 1826. He took charge of the German Reformed congregation in Sunbury, Pa., together with several affiliated churches, in 1827, and continued in this field of labor till 1854, when failing health. compelled him to resign. Recovering somewhat, he labored a short time in Lyken's Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa., where he died Jan. 27, 1857. Mr. Fisher had- a good mind, was a logical and instructive preacher, a genial and kind friend, and was greatly beloved throughout the church in which he labored. He preached well in -both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

Fisher-Ring Or Fisherman's Ring

SEE ANNULUS.

Fish-Gate

(*μυγDhir* [*v*]*ishah'ar had-dagim*, gate of the fishes; Sept. ἡ πύλη ἡ ἰχθυϊκή, in Neb. ἡ πύλη ἰχθυρά, in Zephaniah πύλη ἀποκεντούντων; Vulg. *porta uiscium*), the name of one of the gates of Jerusalem (^{<4334>}2 Chronicles 33:14; ^{<3688>}Nehemiah 3:3; 12:39; ^{<3010>}Zephaniah 1:10); probably on the east side, just north of the Temple enclosure (Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, Append. i, p. 18), although Bartlett (*City of Great King*, p. 153) locates it on the west side of the Temple, supposing it to have been near the mediseval "piscina" (p. 301); a very unsuitable position, as it doubtless derived its name from the fact that fish (q.v.) from the lake of Tiberias (or perhaps from the Mediterranean) were brought-to the city by that route, or that they were sold 'there (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 1054, who identifies it with the present gate of St. Stephen). *SEE JERUSALEM.*

Fish-Hook

(in the plur. ἡγῶδ τ/rysithorns [as often rendered] of fishing; Sept. at random λέβηται ἔμπυροι Vulg. equally so *olle ferventes*, both taking the term in the sense of pots, contrary to the synonymous τ/Ν[, "hooks," of the other hemistich), used figuratively of an instrument of control (^{<304D>}Amos 4:2), after the analogy of animals which were tamed by putting hooks and rings in their noses (comp. ^{<237D>}Isaiah 37:29; ^{<250H>}Ezekiel 39:4; ^{<380D>}Job 40:26; see Oedmann, *Sammnl.* v,- 5).¹ Others, as Doderlein (in loc.), prefer to retain the simple meaning of *thorns*, as referring to pastoral customs. *SEE FISHING.*

Fish-Pool

(ἡκρῶ] *berekah'*, a pool, as often elsewhere), a pond or reservoir in general; presumed by our translators at ^{<210H>}Song of Solomon 7:4 to be intended for fish (q.v.), such as we know were anciently constructed for the purpose of pleasure angling. *SEE FISHING* (above).

Fish-Spear

(μῦγD; | xī χi lit-, a prong of fishes; Sept. and Vulgate vaguely πλοία ὀλιεύων, *gurgustium piscium*), a harpoon or trident for spearing fish (^{<310D>}Job 41:2 [in the ^{<381C>}Hebrews 11:31]). *SEE FISHING.*

Fisk, Ezra, D. D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Shelburne, Mass., Jan. 10, 1785, graduated at Williams College in 1809, and was licensed in 1810. After preaching for some months, he was ordained as an evangelist, and labored chiefly among destitute congregations of Georgia; after which he engaged as missionary in Philadelphia. In 1813 he was chosen pastor of the Presbyterian church in Goshens, N. Y., where he continued for upwards of twenty years. He became a trustee of Williams College in 1823, and a director of the Theological Seminary at Princeton in 1825. He retired to Georgii in 1832 for his health and was appointed the following year professor of ecclesiastical history and Church government in the Western Theological Seminary, and moderator of the General Assembly. He removed to Philadelphia, and died Dec. 5, 1833. He published *An Oration delivered before the Society of Alumni of Williams College* (1825): *-A Lecture on the Inability of Sinners* (Phila. 1832): *A Farewell Sermon*

(1833) :-*Articles on Mental Science*, in *Church Advocate* (1832).-Sprague, *Annals*, 4:457.

Fisk, Pliny

a Congregational minister and missionary, was born at Shelburne, Mass., June 24, 1792. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1814, studied theology at Andover, entered the ministry in January, 1814, and preached for a time in Wilmington, Vt. Having determined to be a missionary, he was, with Mr. Levi Parsons, appointed by the American Board of Missions to the Palestine mission in September, 1818, and spent the winter traveling through the South, raising money for the missionary cause. With his colleague, he sailed from Boston for Smyrna, Nov. 3, 1819, and arrived at their port Jan..15, 1820. The two missionaries spent some time in Scio to study modern Greek, then visited the "seven churches" in Asia Minor, and finally settled in Smyrna. Early in 1822. Mr. Fisk accompanied Mr. Parsons to Egypt, where the latter died, Feb. 10. His successor, the Rev. J. King, met Mr. Fisk at Malta, and in April, 1823, they went, together with Mr. Wolff, by way of Egypt and the desert, to Judea. After visiting Jerusalem and Beyrout, they visited the principal cities in Northern Syria to "spy" out the land," and spent some part of 1824 at Damascus and-Aleppo studying Arabic. In May, 1825, he joined the mission already established at Beyrout, and died there on the 23d of October following. See Bond, *Life of Pliny Fisk* (Boston, 1828, 12mo). -*American Miss. Memorial*, p. 254;' Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 622.

Fisk, Samuel

SEE FISKE, SAMUEL

Fisk, Wilbur

first president of. the Wesleyan University, was born in Brattleboro, Vt., August 81, 1792. His parents were of the old Puritan stock, and he- was trained in habits of virtue and religion, especially by his mother. In 1809 he went to the Grammar School at Peacham, and in 1812 to the University of Vermont, where he passed A.B. in 1815. In 1818 he entered the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and soon became remarkable for piety and success in his ministry. His talents as a preacher were of a very high order; indeed, he has hardly been surpassed in this respect in the American pulpit. His health was feeble, however, from the beginning, and his

unwearied labors in the itinerant ministry were too great for him. In 1823 he was made presiding elder of the Vermont district, and in 1824 was chosen delegate to the Vermont Conference, a rare distinction for so young a man. From this time onward his life was devoted to the cause of Christian education in the Methodist Episcopal Church. When he entered the ministry in 1818 "there was not a single literary institution of any note under the patronage of the Church. A few years later, in 1824, he was appointed agent to collect funds for one which had been established in Newmarket, N. H.; but he declined the service because, as he said, it was not established on a permanent basis. Still he was anxious that one should be established, and through his efforts, with others, the academy at Wilbraham was commenced, and he was appointed its principal in 1826. The spirit which was thus aroused soon demanded an institution of a higher grade. The Northern and Eastern Conferences united to found the Wesleyan University at Middletown and Dr. Fisk naturally, and without a rival, was chosen its president in 1830. The part he had already taken in awaking the people to the subject, his devotion to it, and his abilities, made him more than even a leader in the cause of education in the Church. Students gathered to the institution from every part of the nation, and many soon went forth from it who, by his recommendation, became presidents, professors, and teachers in the rapidly multiplying colleges and seminaries under the patronage of the Church throughout the United States. His heart was in this work. He believed, too, that he was where Providence designed him to be. And when, in 1836, he was elected bishop, he declined the office, for he said, 'If my health would allow me to perform the work of the episcopacy I dare not accept it, for I believe I can do more for the cause of Christ where I am than I could do as a bishop.' Who shall say that his decision was not only honest, but wise; that his duties as an educator of the young, and the part he took in awaking the people to the great value of general education, were less important than the work of any bishop?" (*Centenary Memories*, in *The Methodist*, N. Y.). In 1828 he had been elected bishop of the Canada Conference, but declined the office. In 1829 he received the degree of D.D. from Brown University, and in the same year was elected president of Lagrange College, Alabama, and also professor in the University of Alabama, both which offices he declined. For many years his life was an incessant struggle with pulmonary disease, and in 1835-6 he travelled in Europe for the benefit of his health. He died at Middletown, Feb. 22, 1839. Among his writings are, *The Calvinistic Controversy* (N. Y. 18mo): -*Travels in Europe* (N. Y. 1838, 8vo):-

Sermons and Lectures on Universalism :-Reply to Pie7point on the Atonement, and other tracts and sermons.

Dr. Fisk was a saintly man, of the type of Fenelon, and endowed with some of Fenelon's best moral and mental traits-clearness and logical force; flexibility and adroitness in controversy; with earnest love of truth and goodness for the animating spirit of all his life and thought. As a preacher, few surpassed him in eloquence, none in fervor. As a teacher, he had that highest of all qualities, the power to kindle the enthusiasm of his pupils. Take him for all in all, he was a man of rare symmetry of character, moral and intellectual, of whom all whom he knew would be more willing to say, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright," than of any man of his time who held so high a place. Dr. Stevens describes him as follows: "Wilbur Fisk's person bespoke his character. It was of good size, and remarkable for its symmetry. His features were beautifully harmonious, the contour strongly resembling the better Roman outline, though lacking its most peculiar distinction, the *nasus aquilinus*. His eye was nicely defined, and, when excited, beamed with a peculiarly benign and conciliatory expression. His complexion was bilious, and added to the diseased indication of his somewhat attenuated features. His head was a model, not of great, but of well proportioned development. It had the height of the Roman brow, though none of the breadth of the Greek. There is a bust of him extant, but it is not to be looked at by any who would not mar in their memories the beautiful and benign image of his earlier manhood by the disfigurements of disease and suffering. His voice was peculiarly flexible and sonorous: a catarrhal disease affected it, but just enough, during most of his life, to improve its tone to a soft orotund, without a trace of nasal defect. Few men could indicate the moral emotions more effectually by mere tones. It was especially expressive in pathetic passages. His pulpit manner was marked in the introduction of the sermon by dignity, but dignity without ceremony or pretension. As he advanced into the exposition and argument of his discourse (and there were both in most of his sermons), he became more emphatic, especially as brilliant though brief illustrations ever and anon gleamed upon his logic. By the time he had reached the peroration his utterance became rapid, his thoughts were incandescent, the music of his voice rang out in thrilling tones, and sometimes even quivered with trills of pathos. No imaginative excitement prevailed in the audience as under Maffitt's eloquence, no tumultuous wonder as under Bascom's; none of Cookman's impetuous passion, or

Olin's overwhelming power, but a subduing, almost tranquil spell of genial feeling, expressed often by tears or half-suppressed ejaculations; something of the kindly effect of Summerfield combined with a higher intellectual impression. Fisk lived for many years in the faith and exemplification of Paul's sublime doctrine of Christian perfection. He prized that great tenet as one of the most important distinctions of Christianity. His own experience respecting it was marked by signal circumstances, and from the day he practically adopted it till he triumphed over death, its impress was radiant on his daily life. With John Wesley, he deemed this important truth promulgated, in any very express form, almost solely by Methodism in these days-to be one of the most solemn responsibilities of his Church, the most potent element in the experimental divinity of the Scriptures" (*Methodist Quarterly Review*, July, 1852, p. 446). See Holdich, *Life of Wilbur Fisk* (N.Y. 1840, 8vo); *Methodist Quarterly*, 1842, p. 579; Sherman, *New-England Divines*, p. 238; M'Clintock, *Lives of Methodist Ministers*(N. Y. 8vo; sketch of Fisk by the Rev. O. H. Tiffany, D.D.); Sprague, *Annals*, 7:576; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*; *Christian Review*, July 9, 1868; *Zion's Herald*, 7:400 sq. **SEE ALSO NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY.**

Fiske, John, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 26,1770, in Warwick, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College, 1791; entered the ministry May 6, 1794; and was ordained pastor in New Braintree Oct. 26, 1796, where he remained until his death, Mar. 15,1855. Dr. Fiske assisted largely in the founding of Amherst College. He published a *Spelling-book* (1807), and two sermons. - Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 367.

Fiske, Nathan Welby

an eminent Congregational minister, was born April 17, 1798, at Weston, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College 1817; was chosen tutor 1818, in which position he remained two years, and then entered the Theological Seminary at Andover. In Nov. 1823, he went to Savannah, and preached among the seamen and others not belonging to any church. He was chosen professor of languages in Amherst Collegiate Institution (afterwards Amherst College), 1824. A few years after, he was transferred to the chair of intellectual and moral philosophy, which he held until his death. In 1846, on account of ill health, he sailed (Nov. 5) for Palestine, and died in

Jerusalem May 27, 1847. Mr. Fiske published a translation of Eschenburg's *Manual of Classical Literature* (1836), which went through three editions, and was stereotyped for the fourth ed. (1843). A volume of his *Sermons* was published in 1850, and also *Memoirs of N. W. Fiskce, with Selections from his Sermons and other Writings*, by Heman Humphrey, D.D. (Amherst, 1850). The *New Englander* (Feb. 1850. p. 70) speaks of his sermons as follows: "They are eminently suggestive. Some of them, like that on the analysis of conscience, are fine specimens of philosophical analysis. Some, like that on the wonderfulness of man's mental constitution, and that on the fearfulness of man's mental constitution, lead the reader over a track almost untrodden by sermonizers, and yet presenting grounds for most powerful appeals. No thinking mind can fail to be enriched by the attentive reading of these discourses. They belong in many respects to the class of bishop Butler's sermons; yet with the bishop's strong reasoning and clear analysis of principles, they have much more of the direct and powerful application of the truth to the conscience, and are more imbued with the very essence of the doctrines of the cross."

Fiske, Samuel

a Congregational minister, was born in Shelburne, Mass., July 23, 1828, and was educated at Amherst College, where he graduated in 1848. After two years spent in teaching, he studied theology at Andover until 1852, when he became tutor at Amherst, where he remained until 1855, when he sailed for Europe and the East. His letters describing this journey were collected under the title of *Mr. Dunn Browne's Experiences in foreign Parts* (Boston, 1857, 12mo), and abound with wit, humor, and graphic power. . In 1857 he was ordained pastor of the Congregational church at Madison, Conn., where he was remarkably useful and successful. During the Civil War his patriotism led him to join the army; and failing to secure a chaplaincy, he entered the service as private, but soon rose to be captain. While in service he wrote *Mr. Dunn Brown's Experiences in the Army* (Boston, 1866, 12mo). Made prisoner at Chancellorsville, he spent some time in Libby prison, Richmond. He fell in the first battle of the Wilderness, May 6, 1864. His Christian life in the army was kept up as at home, and he was more than a chaplain could be to his men. He was a Christian officer, illustrating in camp, and on the march, and in battle the noblest Christian character. He decidedly rebuked all the vices of the army; he gently soothed the sick and wounded, prayed with the dying and over the dead. Touching memories of him have been recalled in our hospitals at the

mention of his name. 'Oh,' said one in Washington, 'he is the man who put his arm around me so kindly, and begged me to promise him that I would never utter another oath, and I never have.' Said another: 'Captain Fiske - oh yes; he helped me off the field after that dreadful battle, gave me his blanket, and spoke kind words of cheer that helped to keep me alive.' Multitudes could testify of his fidelity to them. It was his daily duty to care both for the bodies and the souls of all about him."--*New Englander*, January, 1866, art. iv; *Congregational Quarterly*, 1866, art. i.

Fistulae

pipes or *reeds* used in the administration of the wine in the Eucharist from the 8th. century to the 12th. The deacon held the cup in his own hand, a small reed or pipe was introduced into the wine, and the communicant drew up the wine into his mouth through this pipe. The object was to prevent the possibility of spilling any of the wine.

Fitch, Ebenezer, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, and president of Williams College, Mass., was born in Norwich Sept. 26, 1756, and graduated in Yale in 1777. After teaching for some time in Hanover, N. Y., he became tutor in Yale, and remained there till 1783, when he formed a mercantile connection, which proving disastrous, he returned to his former office, to which was added that of librarian. He was licensed to preach in 1787, and in 1791 became preceptor of the academy in Williamstown, Mass., of which, with the title of Williams College, he was appointed president in 1793. He resigned in 1815, and was installed pastor of the Presbyterian church, West Bloomfield, N. Y., which he resigned in 1828, after a zealous and efficient ministry. He died March 21, 1833. He published *A Baccalaureate Discourse*, 1799.-*Sprague, Annals*, iii, 511.

Fitches

Picture for Fitches

(i.e. VETCHES or *chick-pea*), the incorrect rendering, in the Auth. Vers., of two Heb. words. *SEE BOTANY*.

1. j xq, (*kettsa'h*, something *strewn*), which occurs only in ²³⁸⁵Isaiah 28:25, 27, where especial reference is made to the mode of threshing it; not with "a threshing instrument," gr'ym, /Wrj), but "with a staff" (hfm), because

the heavy-armed cylinders of the former implement would have crushed it. Although *ketsach*, in Chaldee **aj xḥi** (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 2101), is always acknowledged to denote some seed, yet interpreters have had great difficulty in determining the particular kind intended, some translating it *peas*, others, as Luther and the English version, *vetches*, but without any proof. Meibomius considers it to be the *white poppy*, and others a *black seed*. This last interpretation has the most numerous, as well as the oldest authorities in its support. Of these a few are in favor of the black poppy-seed, but the majority of a black seed common in Egypt, etc. (Celsius, *Hiesrobot.* ii, 70). The Sept. translates it **μελάνθιον**, the Vulg. *gith* (perhaps from the Heb. **dḡi** coriander; see Plautus, *Rud.* v, 3, 39), and Tremellius *melanthium*, while the Arabic has *shunez*. All these mean the same thing, namely, a very black-colored and aromatic seed, "*fennel-flower*" or "*black cumin*," still cultivated and in daily employment as a condiment in the East. Thus Pliny (xx, 17,71), "*Gith*, from the Greeks, others call *melanthion*, and still others *melanspermon*. The best is that of the most pungent smell, and blackest." By Dioscorides (iii, 93), or the ancient author who is supposed to have added the synonymes, we are informed that **μελάνθιον** was also called the "wild black poppy," that the seed was black; acrid, and aromatic, and that it was added to bread or cakes. Pliny also says, "The seed of the *melanthium* or *melanspermum* makes an excellent confection in the loaves" (xix, 8). *Mlfelanthium* is universally recognised by botanists to be the *Nigella*. Thus Bauhin Pinax, "*Nigella*, from the black color of the seed, is commonly called **μελάνθιον**." The *shunez* of the Arabs is, moreover, the same plant or seed, which is usually called "black cumin." So one kind of cumin is said by Dioscorides to have seeds like those of *melanthion* or *nigella*. It was commonly cultivated in Egypt, and P. Alpinus mentions it as "Suneg Egyptiis." The Arabs, besides *shunez*, also call it *hub-al-souda*, and the Persians *seah dana*, both words signifying *black seed*. One species, named *Nigella Indica* by Dr. Roxburgh, is called *kalajira* in India, that is, black zira or cumin, of the family of Ranunculaceae. "*Nigella sativa* is alone cultivated in India, as in most Eastern countries, and continues in the present day, as in the most ancient times, to be used both as a condiment and as a medicine" (*Illusto Himal. Byt.* p. 46). If we consider that this appears to have always been one of the cultivated grains of the East, and compare the character of *nigella* with the passages in which *ketsach* is mentioned, we shall find that the former is applicable to them all. Indeed, Rabbi Obadiah de Bartenora states that the barbarous or vulgar name of the

ketsach was *nielle*, that-is, *nigella*. The *Nigella sativa* is a garden plant, which commonly attains the height of an ell, with narrow leaves, like the leaves *offennel*, a blue flower, out of which is formed, on the very top of the plant, an oblong muricate capsule, the interior of which is, by means of thin membranes, separated into compartments containing a seed of a very black color not unlike the poppy, but of a pleasant smell, and a sharp taste not finlike pepper. The various species of *nigella* are herbaceous (several of them being indigenous in Europe, others cultivated in most parts of Asia), with their leaves deeply cut and linear, their flowers terminal, most of them having under the calyx leafy involucre which often half surround the flower. The fruit is composed of five or six capsules, which are compressed, oblong, pointed, sometimes said to be hornlike, united below, and divided into several cells and enclosing numerous angular, scabrous, black-colored seeds. From the nature of the capsules, it is evident that, when they are ripe, the seeds might easily be shaken out by moderate blows of a stick, as is related to have been the case with the *ketsach* of the text. **SEE THRESHING.**

Besides the *N. sativa*, there is another species, the *N. arvemmais*, which may be included under the term *ketsach*; but the seeds of this last-named plant are less aromatic than the other. They are annual plants belonging to the natural order Ranunculacece, and suborder Hellebores. The *nigella* forms a singular exception among the family to which it belongs, inasmuch as they are terrible poisons, while the *nigella* produces seeds that are not only wholesome and aromatic, but are in great reputation for their medicinal qualities. **SEE AROMATICS.**

2. In ³⁰⁴⁹Ezekiel 4:9, "fitches" are mentioned among the materials of the bread the prophet was bidden to make, but there it represents the Heb. word **tmSK** *kusse'meth*. This word is incorrectly translated in A.V. "rye" (q.v.) in ³¹¹²Exodus 9:32, and ³³²⁵Isaiah 28:25; but in the latter place, as in ³⁰⁴⁹Ezekiel 4:9, we have the marginal reading "' spelt," which is the true rendering of the word. The -root of **tmSK** is **µSK**; to shear, and the species of corn to which it-gives a name is the *Triticum spelta* of Linnous-in Greek ζέα; in Latin *far* and *ador*. "*Spelt* has a four-leaved blunted calix, small blossoms, with little awns, and a smooth, slender ear (as it were shorn), the grains of which sit so firmly in the husks that they must be freed from them by peculiar devices; it grows about as high as barley, and is extensively cultivated in the southern countries of Europe, in Egypt,

Arabia, and Palestine, in more than one species. The Sept. translate it by ὄλυρα, in Pliny arinca, which corresponds with the French *riguet*; and Herodotus. (ii, 36) observes that it was used by the Egyptians as for baking bread" (Kalisch ~~ama~~ Exodus 9:32). *SEE CEREALS.*

Five-Mile Act, Or Oxford Act

an act of the British Parliament, passed in 1665, which imposed an oath on all nonconformists, binding them at no time to endeavor any alteration of the government in either Church or State; and ordering that nonconforming ministers should neither live in, nor come within *five miles* (except in crossing the road) of any borough, city, or corporate town, or within five miles of any parish, town, or place in which they had been, since the Act of Oblivion, parson, vicar or lecturer, under a penalty of forty pounds, or six months' imprisonment, and being rendered incapable of teaching any school, or taking any boarders to be taught or instructed.-Baxter, *Church History of England*, ii, 632; Neal, *History of the Puritans* (Harpers' ed.), ii, 255.

Five Points

the five doctrines controverted between the Calvinists and Arminians, viz. predestination, extent of the atonement, grace, free-will, and final perseverance. The *quinquarticular-controversy* in England was a dispute which arose at Cambridge in 1594 respecting the above points. In 1626 two fruitless conferences were held on these points; and in 1630 bishop Davenant preached at court on these disputed matters, and thereby gave great offence to Charles I. The next year the controversy was revived at Oxford and in Ireland, of which archbishop Usher was then primate. The king issued certain injunctions concerning the bounds within which these points might be discussed. *SEE ARMINIANISM, CALVINISM; SEE DORT.*

Flaccus, Caius Norbanus

(Grecized Γάιος Νόρβανος Φλάκκος, Josephus, *Ant.* 16:6, 6), son of a somewhat notable consular Roman of the same name (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biogr.* s.v.), was consul with Octavianus in A.D. 51 (Tacitus, *Ann.* i, 54; Sueton. *Vit.* 3). While proconsul of Asia Minor, he promulgated the emperors decrees to the provincial magistrates in favor of the Jews

(Joseph. Ant. 16:6, 3-6); and when praeses of Syria he befriended Herod Agrippa till influenced by Aristobulus (ib. 18:6, 2-3).

Flacians

a name given to those who adhered, in the controversies among the German reformers, to Matthias Flacius (q.v.).

Flacius (Flach), Matthias

also called ILLYRICUS from his native country, an eminent Lutheran reformer, was born at Albona, in Illyria, about 1520. At sixteen he proposed entering a convent, but Baldo Lupetino, the provincial of the Franciscans, who had imbibed Protestant tendencies, advised him to study theology in the universities of Germany. Accordingly he went to Basle in 1539, to Tübingen in 1540, and in 1541 to Wittenberg, where he gave private lessons in Greek and Hebrew. In his travels he became acquainted with Grynsus, Leonard Fuchs, Eber, and finally with Luther himself, whose zealous disciple he soon became. He was after a while appointed professor of O.T. literature at Wittenberg, but, driven away by the issue of the Smalcaldic War in 1547, he went to Brunswick. Recalled by prince Maurice, he came back, but, having opposed Melancthon's *Leapsic Interim* **SEE ADIAPHORA AND INTERIM**, he went to Hamburg, and thence to Magdeburg, whence he published several writings against the Interim, though in other points, especially in the Osiandrian controversy, he sided with Melancthon. He was also for several years engaged in theological controversies with Major, Strigel, Schwenkfeld, etc. **SEE SYNERGISTIC CONTROVERSY**. About the same time he projected the *Magdeburg Centuries* **SEE CENTURIES**, of which great work he was the life and soul. In 1557 he was made professor of the newly-organized University of Jena, which became the stronghold of strict Lutheranism, and where he was chiefly instrumental in the drawing up of the *Slichsische Confutationsschrift*, to enforce Lutheran views. It, however, proved injurious both to the university and to himself, as it led the duke to establish a censorship, to which Flacius and his colleagues were unwilling to submit, and were dismissed in 1561.. He had made himself especially odious by the rash statement (in his discussion with Strigel at Weimar, 1560) that original sin is the very substance of man in his fallen state. He was accused, therefore, of Manicheism. After spending five years in Regensburg, he accepted a call to Antwerp, and from thence to Frankfort -

and Strasburg. Obligated to leave the latter city on account of his opinions, he returned to Frankfort, where he died in the hospital in 1575. The career of Flacius was, on the whole, a stormy and unhappy one. But, after all the abuse that has been heaped upon him, it cannot be denied that he was a consistent upholder of the doctrines which he learned originally from Luther. The writers in the Reformed interest have generally treated him too severely; an unfavorable view of him is given by Planck, *Geschichte des Protestant. Lehrbegriffs*. The best account of him is to be found in Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus u. seine Zeit* (Erlangen, 1859-61, 2 vols.), from a notice of which, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1862, p. 226), we make the following extracts: "If it was right for a sincere follower of Luther to espouse the cause of his deceased friend and teacher, and to show by the severest logic that the Lutheran Church was, under Melancthon's guidance, drifting away from its moorings, then Flacius is to be exonerated from the charge of uncharitableness, and his plea must be allowed, that the unhappy division was not chargeable to him who defended the old Wittenberg theology, but rather to him who introduced innovations. 'We say nothing now about the truth of the one or the other view; we only remark that Flacius was the undoubted champion of the genuine theology of Saxony, as taught by Luther. We cannot, therefore, uphold Luther and condemn Flacius. In theology we cannot say that what Luther, as the first reformer, had a right to teach, Flacius, his inferior in authority, had not a right to maintain against so great a man as Melancthon; for the theologian swears allegiance not to men, but to principles. Flacius could justly reply to all who thus reproached him, that if Melancthon was great, truth was greater.... But how stands the matter as it affects the intellectual and moral character of the two chief combatants? Flacius clearly had Luther's great authority on his side, and that was enough for him. Melancthon saw that the Genevan and Strasburg theologians entertained clearer and more scriptural views of the subject than Luther and the party of Flacius. With him the authority of Luther was not final. According to Flacius, all questions of theology and church usages were to be decided by the authority of the Bible and of Luther. According to Melancthon, they were to be decided by the authority of the Bible and of reason. Both were sincere and deeply in earnest. Both make out their points by irresistible logic. Schmidt, in the new Life of Melancthon just published by him, vindicates Melancthon's character in this controversy triumphantly. Preger has done the same for Flacius. Flacius shows more firmness and tenacity, Melancthon more conciliation and forbearance. The

former had such a reverence for truth, or for what seemed to be -truth, that he forgot the respect due to a great and good man. He was mercilessly but conscientiously contentious. The latter was so amiable and fond of peace that he would for the sake of it yield what he might have maintained. He was never a polemic, except by necessity... It is a somewhat remarkable fact that Flacius was incessantly persecuted, and often driven from place to place for teaching exactly what Luther taught. He was evidently a tenacious man, and born to be a polemic; but, notwithstanding his bad name for disputatiousness, he was far less violent and abusive in his language than his opponents, and more measured and unimpassioned than Luther. It was the sharpness of his logic, and the unsparing severity with which he exposed to the light of day any deviation from Luther, that so galled his opponents. They charged him, and perhaps not unjustly, with assuming to be the guardian of the Church. He did, indeed, endeavor to persuade princes and magistrates to watch over the purity of Christian doctrine, and confessed that he called every man to account, no matter what his rank or position was, who either openly or secretly attempted to destroy what Luther had built up. At the same time, he affirmed that he did it as a faithful son of the Church, doing only what every one was bound to do, namely, to guard its purity with all the power and skill he possessed. He furthermore maintained that, as the pupil and friend of Luther, he owed it to his memory to defend him and his doctrines against all assaults, even though they were made at Wittenberg itself, and by no less a man than Melancthon. He was undoubtedly governed by conscientious motives, however he may have erred both in matters of doctrine and of expediency; but when he trusted in princes to preserve the orthodoxy of the Church, he found, to his grief, that he trusted to a broken reed. Though unfortunate in his life, and a wanderer and fugitive in his old age, and apparently unsuccessful in the chief aim of his life, still he ranks third among the men of his age in his influence upon the doctrines of the old Lutheran Church. He has, indeed, been long almost forgotten, except as an ecclesiastical historian." The chief writings of Flacius are *Omnia Scripta Latina contra adiaphoristicas fraudes* edita (Magdeburg, 1550, 8vo):-*Osiandri de Justificatione Refutatio* (Francof. 1552, 4to):-*Catalogus Testam Veritatis*; etc. (Ba'e, 1556; Frainef. 1674, 4to):-Unses. Prim. *Ecclesie consensus de non scrutando divinae generationis Filii Des modo* (Bale, 1660, 8vo):-*Historia certaminum de primats- Papee* (Bale, 1554, 8vo).:-*Clavis Scripturae Sacrae* (Bale, 1567, 4to; Jenan 1675, fol.; a valuable Biblical and hermeneutical dictionary). See, besides the works already

noticed, Twesten, M. *Flaclus Illyrsicus* (Berlin, 1.844); Adami, *Vitee Theolog. Germ.*; Hoef. *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 17:808; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 4:410 sq.; Heppé, *Die confess. Entwicklung der altprotest. Kirche Deutschlands* (Marburg, 1854); *Stueian* u. Kritiken, 1855, 648; Schmidt, in *Zeitschrift f. d. histor. Theologie*, 1849; Dorner, *Geschichte d. prot. Theologie* (Munchen, 1867, 8 vo), 361-374; Gieseler, Ch. *History*, ed. Smith, vol. 4:§ 37;. and the articles *SEE ADIAPHORISTIC CONTROVERSIES*; *SEE SYNERGISTIC CONTROVERSY*.

Flag

(as the name of a plant) stands in the Auth. Vers. as the representative in part of two Heb. words. *SEE BOTANY*.

Picture for Flag

1. *Achu'* (Wj a; Sept. Grs-cizes ἄχι, ἄχει, βούτομον; *Vulg. locus palustris, carectaus-*), a word, according to Jerome (*Comment. in* ^{<3917>}Isaiah 19:7), of Egyptian origin, and denoting " any green and coarse herbage, such as rushes and reeds, which grows in marshy places" (comp. Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 67). III ^{<3918>}Job 8:11, it is asked, " Can the *achu* ("flag") grow without water?" It seems probable that some *apacsfie* plant is here denoted, as Celsius has endeavored to prove (*Herob.* i, 342), for the *achu* is mentioned with the *gome* or "papyrus." See the treatise of Hapoch, *De papyro*, etc. (Coburg, 1772; with the *Adlitaument.* ib. 1777). The word occurs once again in ^{<3919>}Genesis 12:2, 18, where it is said that the seven well-favored kine came .up out of the river and fed in an *achu* (" meadow"). Now it is generally well known that most of the plants which grow in 'water, as well as many of those which grow in its vicinity, are not well suited as food for cattle; some being very watery, others very coarse in texture, and some possessed of acrid and even poisonous properties. None, therefore, of the *Algxa* can be intended, nor any' species of *Butomus*, or "flowering rush" (as might be inferred from one rendering of the Sept.). The different kinds of Juencus, or rush, though abounding in such situations, are not suited for pasturage, and, in fact, are avoided by cattle. So are the majority of the Qqyperace, or sedge tribe; and also the numerous species of ('*arex*, which grow in moist situations, yet yield a very coarse grass, which is scarcely if ever touched by cattle. A few species; of *Cyperus* serve as pasturage, and the roots of some, of them are esculent and aromatic; but these must be dug up before cattle can feed on them.

Some species of *Scirpus*, or club-rush, however, serve as food for cattle: *S. cespitosus*, for instance, is the principal food of cattle and sheep in the highlands of Scotland from the beginning of March till the end of May, Varieties of *S. meritimus*, found in different countries, and a few of the numerous kinds of Cyperaceae common- in Indian pastures, as *Cyperasr dubius* and *hexastachkyss*, are also eaten by cattle. Therefore, if any specific plant is intended, as seems implied in what goes before, it is perhaps one of the edible species of scirpus or cyperus, perhaps *C. esculentmss*, which, however, has distinct Arabic names: or it may be a true grass; some species of panicum, for instance, which form excellent pasture in warm countries, and several of which grow luxuriantly in the neighborhood of water. But it is weal known to all acquainted with warm countries subject to excessive drought- that the only pasturage to which. cattle can resort is a green strip of different grasses, with some sedges, which runs along the banks of rivers or of pieces of water, varying more or less id breadth according to the height of the bank, that is, the distance of water from the surface. Cattle emerging-from rivers, which they may often be seen doing in hot countries, would naturally go to such green herbage as intimated in this passage of Genesis, and which, as indicated in ^{<181812>}Job 18:2, could not grow without water in a warm, dry country and climate. Kitto (*Pict. Bib. on Genesis*, 1. c.) identifies this sedge with *thie'*, [μαλιναθάλλη](#) of Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* 4:8, 12), which plant was much eaten by sheep and cattle.' There is, however, much doubt as to what the *malinathalla* denotes, as Schneider has shown. Theodotion, in ^{<181811>}Job 8:11, has [ἄχι](#); and [ἄχι](#) occurs in .the. Sept. (^{<2917>}Isaiah 19:7) also as the representative of [t/r](#)[]:(A. V. "paper reeds"), which word is explained by Gesenius, naked places without trees-the grassy places on the banks of the Nile. The same Greek word is used by the son of Sirach, Eccles. 11:16 ([ἄχι](#) or [ἄχει](#), for; the copies vary). As no similar name is known to be .plied to any plant or plants in Hebrew, endeavors have been made to find a similar one so applied in the cognate languages (see Jablonski, *Opusc.* i, 45; ii, 159, ed. Te-Water), and, as quoted by Dr. Harris (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, s.v.), the learned Chapellon says, "We have no radix for [Wj a](#); unless we derive it, as Schultens does (*Comment. in Job*, 1. c.), from the Arabic *achi*, to bind or join together." Hence it has been inferred that it might be someone of the grasses or sedges employed in former times, as some still are, for making ropes. But there is probably some other Arabic root which has not yet been ascertained, or which may have become obsolete; for there are numerous words in the Arabic language having reference to

greenness, all of which have *akh* as a common element. Thus *akhyas*, thickets, dark groves, places- full of reeds or flags, in which animals take shelter; *akhevas*, 'putting forth leaves; so *akhzilar*, greenness, verdure; *a/khchish!lb*, abounding in grass. These may be connected with *kah*, a common term for grass in Northern India, derived from the Persian, whence amber is called *kah- robehy* grass-attracter. **SEE REED.**

2. *Suph.* (אֲשׁוּפָה, Sept. ἔλαος, Vulg. *carectum*, *pelagus*) occurs frequently in the O. T. in connection with *yam*, "sea," to denote the "Red Sea" (q.v.). The term here appears to be used in a very wide sense to denote "weeds of any kind." The *yam-suph*, therefore, is the "sea of weeds," and perhaps, as Stanley (*S. and P.* p. 6, note) observes, *suph* "may be applied to any aqueous vegetation," which would include the arborescent coral growths for which this sea is celebrated, as well as the different algae which grow at the bottom: see Pliny (*H. N.* 13:25) and Shaw (*Travels*, p. 387, fol. 1738), who speaks of a "variety of *algae and fuci* that grow within its channel, and at low water are left in great quantities upon the sea-shore" (see also p. 384). The word *suph* in ^{<3116>}Jonah 2:5, translated "weeds" by the A. V., has, there can be no doubt, reference to "seaweed," and more especially to the long, ribbon-like fronds of the *Laminarie*, or the entangled masses of *Fuci*. In ^{<3116>}Exodus 2:3, 5, however, where we read that Moses was laid "in the *suph*, A. V. 'flags,' by the river's brink," it is probable that "reeds" or "rushes," etc., are denoted, as Rab. Salomon explains it, "a place thick with reeds." (See Celsius, *Hierob.* ii, 66.) The *yam-suph* in the Coptic version (as in ^{<3109>}Exodus 10:19; 13:18; ^{<3107>}*Psalms* 106:7,9, 22) is rendered "the *Sari-sea*." The word *sari* is the old Egyptian for a sedge of some kind. Jablonski (*Opusc.* i, 266) gives *Juncus* as its rendering, and compares a passage in Theophrastus (*Hist. Plant.* 4:8, § 2, 5) which thus describes the *sari*: "The *sari* grows in water about marshes and those watery places which the liver after its return to its bed leaves behind it; it has a hard and closely-twisted root, from which spring the *saria* (stalks) so-called." Pliny (*Hr. N.* 13:23) thus speaks of this plant: "The *sari*, which grows about the Nile, is a shrubby kind of plant (?), commonly being about two cubits high, and as thick as a man's thumb; it has the panicle (*coma*) of the papyrus, and is similarly eaten; the root, on account of its hardness, is used in blacksmiths' shops instead of charcoal." Sprengel (*Hist. Herb.* i, 78) identifies the *sari* of Theophrastus with the *Cyperusfastigiatus*, Linn.; but the description is too vague to serve as a sufficient basis for identification. There can be little doubt that *suph* is sometimes used in a general sense like

our English "weeds." It cannot be restricted to denote *algæ*, as Celsius has endeavored to show, because none of the proper *algæ* are found in the Nile. Lady Calcott (*Script. Herb.* p. 158) thinks the *Zostera marina* ("grass-wrack") may be intended, but there is nothing in favor of such an opinion. The *svph* of ^{<23916>}Isaiah 19:6, where it is mentioned with the *kaneh*, appears to be used in a more restricted sense to denote some species of "reed" or "tall grass." There are various kinds of *Cyperaceæ* and tall *Graminaceæ*, such as *A rundo* and *Saccharum*, in Egypt. **SEE WEED.**

Flag

(as a military term) is represented generally in Heb. by **ל גִּדְּ**, *de'gei*, such being those borne by the Israelitish camp during their march through the wilderness. Each three tribes had a banner of this description (^{<40152>}Numbers 1:52; 2:2 sq.; 10:14 sq.), of the color and form of which the Rabbins have many legendary stories (see Jonathan on Numbers ii; comp. Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 667 sq.). The tribe of Judah (together with Issachar and Zebulun) bore as a device a young lion (compare ^{<1449>}Genesis 42:9); the tribe of Reuben (with Simeon and Gad), a man (according to Jonathan, a stag, instead of the bullock, as a memento of the golden calf, ^{<14416>}Genesis 49:6); Ephraim (with Manasseh and Benjamin), a steer (boys, according to Jonathan); Dan (with Asher and Naphtali), an eagle (according to Jonathan, a cerastes; comp. ^{<14497>}Genesis 49:17), on their tribal standard. How the *field-ensigns* of the several families, which in those passages are called **ת/תאֵוִסִּיגִּס**, differed from these **מַיִל גִּדְּ** is not clearly defined. The assertion of colored pennants (Harmer, i, 478) is not sustained by proof. On the pretended motto upon the banner of the Maccabees, **SEE MACCABAEUS**. **סַנֵּה נֵס**, which is often taken for a banner; is a military signal raised upon a mountain as a telegraphic notice (^{<21335>}Isaiah 5:26; 13:2; 23:3; 30:17; 62:10, etc.; comp. Cicero, *Attic.* 10:17; Macrobian *Saturn.* i, 16), and may have usually consisted of a high pole with a streamer flying from its summit. Others regard it rather as a beacon fire- (**πυρσός**, **φρυκτός**; comp. Curtius, v, 2, 7; 7:7, 5, 13). See generally Faber, ii, 462 sq.; Jahn, II, ii, 462 sq.; Celsius, *De Vexillis Hebr.* (Upsal. 1727). To the Roman standards, *aquilæ* (Josephus, *War*, iii, 62; comp. Hermann, *ad Lucian. conscrib. hist.* p. 185), an allusion apparently occurs in ^{<14183>}Matthew 24:28. (On the Egyptian ensigns, see Wilkinson, i, 294.' Rosellini, II, iii, 230.) The Persians under Cyrus bore the same symbol (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 7:i, 4; but ^{<24718>}Ezekiel 17:3 is not in point, being a

reference to Chaldaean usages). See generally Lydii *Synt. sacr. de re milit.* iii, 7. **SEE BANNER.**

Flagellants

(*Lat. flagellare*, to scourge), a name given to certain fanatical sects from the 12th to the 15th century, who used the scourge as a means of purification. **SEE DISCIPLINE OF THE LASH.** They were also called *cruciferi*, *crucifratres*, because they held it their duty, as they said, to copy the sufferings of Christ; and *acephali*, because of their separation from the Roman Church authority. Their excesses were only the natural development of certain features of the Roman discipline **SEE PENANCE; SEE PENITENTIAL DISCIPLINE;** especially of the belief, springing from the system of indulgences, that the mercy of God could be propitiated by self-inflicted punishments. It is said that the first society of Flagellants appeared in Padua in the beginning of the 12th century. Amid the contests between the Guelphs and Ghibellines, cruelty and rapine were followed by remorse; and about 1260 public associations sprang up for the purpose of discipline, under the name of Flagellantes. In an edict of the marquis of Este and the people of Ferrara for their suppression, they are termed *Le Compagnie de' Rattuti*, and *Soxalitas Scopex sive Fustigationis*. Muratori has given a plate of the thongs which they employed against themselves (*Antiq. Ital. med. cevi*, 6:469). Self-scourging was practised in the open streets, and little regard was paid to decency. A hermit named Rainier, of Perugia, is named as the founder of the sect, and his success was wonderful. Vast bodies of men, girded with ropes, marched in procession, with songs and prayer, through the cities, and from one city to another, calling on the people to repent. All hostilities ceased. The momentary impression produced by these movements was profound, but it did not last long. From Italy the contagion passed over the Alps; large bodies wandered over Carniola, Austria, and even as far as Poland. In a few years they disappeared. Under the alarm of the great plague of the following century the Flagellants revived again. The plague reached Italy in 1347, and carried off throughout Europe millions of persons: 1,200,000 in Germany, where, in 1349, the Flagellants "arose afresh, with increased enthusiasm. They wandered through several provinces, whipping themselves, and propagating the most extravagant doctrines, namely, that flagellation was of equal virtue with the sacraments; that the forgiveness of all sins was to be obtained by it, exclusive of the merits of Christ; that the old law of Christ was soon to be abolished, and that a new law, enjoining

the baptism of blood, to be administered by whipping, was to be substituted in its place. Clement VI issued a bull against them (Oct. 20, 1349), and in many places their leaders were burned. They are again mentioned in the beginning of the 15th century as venting yet stranger and more mystical tenets in Thuringia and Lower Saxony. They rejected every branch of external worship, entertained some wild notions respecting the evil spirit, and held that the person who believes what is contained in the Apostles' Creed, repeats frequently the Lord's Prayer and the Ave Maria, and at certain times lashes his body severely as a voluntary punishment for the transgressions he has committed, shall obtain eternal salvation. The infection spread rapidly, and occasioned much disorder; for, by travelling in such numbers, they gave rise to seditious disturbances and to very many excesses. The shameful exposure of their persons, and their extortion of alms, rendered them so obnoxious to the higher clergy and to the more respectable classes, that several princes in Germany and Italy endeavored to suppress their irregularities, and the kings of Poland and Bohemia expelled them from their territories. A numerous list of these fanatics who were condemned to the flames is preserved by the German ecclesiastical historians. At Sangerhausen, in the year 1414, no fewer than ninety-one were burned" (*Encyc. Metrop.* s.v.). In the year 1399 a society of this character, the White Brethren (Bianchi), descended from the Alps into Italy, and were everywhere enthusiastically welcomed both by the clergy and the populace; but no sooner had they reached the papal territory than their leader was put to death, and the whole array dispersed. After this processions of Flagellants were led through Italy, Spain, and the south of France by the Dominican Vincentius Ferrentius, who may perhaps have been the secret instigator of the White Brethren. But such processions having been condemned at the Council of Constance, he also discontinued them (Gieseler, § 120). Gieseler gives extracts from the trial at Sangerhausen, 1414, with many of their articles of doctrine (*Church History*, § 120). See Boileau, *Histoire des Flagellans* (Paris, 1700, 12mo); Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* cent. 13:pt. ii, ch. iii; cent. 14:pt. ii, ch. v; cent. 15:pt. ii, ch. v; Forstemann, *Die christ. Geisslergesellschaften* (Halle, 1828); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 4:726 sq.; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* (Torrey's), v, 512.

Flagellation

SEE SCOURGE

Flagon

a word employed in the A. V. to render two distinct Hebrew terms.

1. *Ashisha'h*, *hvyvā* (^{<1069>}2 Samuel 6:19; ^{<1310>}1 Chronicles 16:3; ^{<2015>}Song of Solomon 2:5; ^{<2801>}Hosea 3:1). The real meaning of this word, according to the conclusions of Gesenius (*Theo. Heb.* p. 166), is a *cake* of pressed raisins (q.v.), such as are a common refreshment in the East, especially for travellers. **SEE CAKE.** He derives it from a root signifying to *compress*, and this is confirmed by the renderings of the Sept. (*λάγανον, ἀμορίτη, πέμματα*) and of the Vulgate (*simila*, but in Hos. *vinacia*, in Cant. *flores*, where the Sept. has *μύρα*), and also by the indications of the Targum Pseudojon. and the Mishna (*Nedarim*, 6, § 10). In the passage in Hosea there is probably a reference to a practice of offering such cakes before the false deities. The rendering of the A. V. is perhaps to be traced to Luther, who in the first two of the above passages has *ein NSssel Wein*, and in the last *Kanne Wein*; but primarily to the interpretations of modern Jews (e.g. Gemara, *Baba Bathra*, and Targum on Chronicles), grounded on a false etymology (see Michaelis, quoted by Gesenius, and the observations of the latter, as above). It will be observed that in the first two passages the words "of wine" are interpolated, and that in the last "of wine" should be "of grapes." **SEE FRUIT.**

2. *Nebbel*, *l bḥā* (^{<2724>}Isaiah 22:24), which is commonly used for a bottle (q.v.) or vessel, originally probably a skin, but in later times a piece of pottery (^{<2804>}Isaiah 30:14). But it also frequently (^{<1570>}Psalms 57:9, etc.) with the force of a musical instrument (A.V. generally "psaltery," but sometimes "viol"), a meaning which is adopted by the Targum, and the Arabic and Vulgate (*musici*), and Luther, and given in the margin of the A. V. The text, however, seems to have aimed to follow the rendering of the Sept. (confusedly *ἐπικρεμάμενοι*), and with this agree Gesenius (*Comment.* in loc.) and Furst (*Hebr. Handw.* s.v.), as being agreeable to the parallel *t/nḡai* bowls ("cups," Vulg. *crateroe*). **SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS; SEE PITCHER.**

Flake

is the rendering in the A. V. at ^{<18115>}Job 41:15 ("the *flakes* of his [i.e. leviathan's] flesh are joined together, *¶qbḪ*; *have chung*, i.e. are rigid), for *l Pmi* *mappal'*, something *pendulous* (elsewhere only ^{<1086>}Amos 8:6, for

refuse of grain, as that which falls away in winnowing, i.e. chaff), referring to the *dewlaps* or flabby parts on the belly of the crocodile (q.v.), which are firmly attached to the body, instead of loosely hanging as in the ox.

Flamboyant

Picture for Flamboyant

(Fr. *fambeau*=a torch), "a term applied by the antiquaries of France to the style of architecture which was contemporary in that country with the Perpendicular of England, from the flame like wavings of its tracery. It ought perhaps to be regarded as a vitiated Decorated rather than a distinct style, though some of its characteristics are peculiar, and it seldom possesses the purity or boldness of earlier ages; its rich works the intricacy and redundancy of the ornaments are sometimes truly surprising. One of the most striking and universal features is the waving arrangement of the tracery of the windows, panels, etc."

Flame

(prop. **bhī** ἰ *la hab*, φλόξ), the incandescent vapor of fire, with which latter term it is usually found connected in the Bible. The only thing respecting fire which calls for explanation here is its symbolical use. In this we may distinguish a lower and a higher sense: a lower when the reference is simply to the burning heat of the element, in which respect any vehement affection, such as anger, indignation, shame, love, is wont to be spoken of as a fire in the bosom of the individual affected (^{<39B>}Psalm 39:3; ^{<39B>}Jeremiah 20:9); and a higher, which is also by much the more common one in Scripture, when it is regarded as imaging the more distinctive properties of the divine nature. In this symbolical use of fire the reference is to its powerful, penetrating agency, and the terrible melting, seemingly resistless, effects it is capable of producing. So viewed, fire, especially a "flame [**hB**] of fire" (^{<39B>}Exodus 3:2), is the chosen symbol of the holiness of God, which manifests itself in a consuming hatred of sin, and can endure nothing in its presence but what is in accordance with the pure and good. There is considerable variety in the application of the symbol, but the passages are all explicable by a reference to this fundamental idea. God, for example, is called "a consuming fire" (^{<39B>}Hebrews 12:29; was **tbh** ἰ *ian* intense flame); to dwell with him is to dwell "with devouring fire" (^{<39B>}Isaiah 33:14); as manifested even in the glorified Redeemer, "his eyes

are like a flame of fire" (^{<41218>}Revelation 2:18); his aspect when coming for judgment is as if a fire went before him, or a scorching flame compassed him about (^{<4973>}Psalm 97:3; ^{<5308>}2 Thessalonians 1:8) in these, and many similar representations occurring. in Scripture, it is the relation of God to sin that is more especially in view, and the searching, intense, all-consuming operation of his holiness in regard to it. They who are themselves conformed to this holiness have nothing to fear from it; they can dwell amid its light and glory as in their proper element; like Moses, can enter the flame-enwrapping cloud of the divine presence, and abide in it unscathed, though it appear. in the eyes of others " like devouring fire on the top of the mount" (^{<4247>}Exodus 24:17,18). Hence we can easily explain why in Old Testament times the appearance of fire, and in particular the pillar of fire (enveloped in a cloud, as if to shade and restrain its excessive brightness and power), was taken as the appropriate form of the divine presence and glory; for in those times, which were more peculiarly the times of the law, it was the holiness of God that came most prominently into view; it was this which had in every form to be pressed most urgently upon the consciences of men, as a counteractive to the polluting influences of idolatry, and of essential moment to a proper apprehension of the covenant. But in the new, as well as in the old, when the same form of representation is employed it is the same aspect of the divine character that is meant to be exhibited. Thus, at the commencement of the Gospel era, when John the Baptist came forth announcing the advent of the Lord, he spoke of him as coming to baptize with fire as well as with the Spirit, not less to burn up the chaff with fire unquenchable than to gather in the wheat into his garner (^{<4011>}Matthew 3:11, 12). The language is substantially that of an Old Testament. prophet (^{<3012>}Malachi 3:2; 4:1); and it points, not, as is often represented, to the enlightening, purifying, love-enkindling agency of Christ, but to the severe and retributive effects- of his appearance. He was to be set for judgment as well as for mercy; for mercy indeed first, but to those who rejected the mercy, and hardened themselves in sin, also for judgment.' To be baptized with the Spirit of light, holiness, and love, is what should ever follow on a due submissions to his authority; but a baptism with fire the fire of divine wrath here (^{<4036>}John 3:36), growing into fire unquenchable hereafter should be the inevitable portion of such as set themselves in rebellion against him.

It is true that fire in its symbolical use. is also spoken of as purifying-the emblem of a healing process effected upon the spiritual natures of persons

in covenant with God. We read, not merely of fire, but of refiner's fire, and of a spirit of burning purging away the dross and impurity of Jerusalem (^{<38B>}Malachi 3:2; ^{<204>}Isaiah 4:4). Still it is a work of severity and judgment that is indicated; yet its sphere is, not thee unbelieving and corrupt world, but the mixed community" of the Lord's people, with many false members to be purged out, and the individual believer himself with an old man of corruption in his members to be mortified and cast off. The Spirit of holiness has a work of judgment to execute also there; and with respect to that it might doubtless be said that Christ baptizes each one of his people with fire. But in the discourse of the Baptist the reference is rather to different classes of persons than to different kinds of operation in the same person; he points to the partakers of grace on the one side, and to the children of apostasy and perdition on the other. Nor is the reference materially different in the emblem of tongues, like as of fire, which sat on the apostles at Pentecost, and in the fire that is said to go out of the mouth of the symbolical witnesses of the Apocalypse (^{<41B>}Acts 2:3; ^{<61B>}Revelation 11:5). In both cases the fire indicated the power of holiness to be connected with the ministrations of Christ's chosen witnesses-a, power that should, as it- were, burn up the corruptions of the world, consume the enmity of men's hearts, and prove a resistless weapon against the power and malice of the adversary. *COMPARE FIRE.*

Flamen

according to Vasro and Festus, from filamen, the band of white wool wrapped about the cap, was the title given to members of a college of Roman priests devoted severally to the service of a particular deity. " *Divisque. alias Sacerdotes, omnibus Pontyflces, singulis Flamines sunt,*" says Cicero (*De Leg.* ii, 8). Each received his distinctive name from that of the god to -whose service he was devoted-" *haorum singuli cognomen habent ab eo deo quoi sacrafaciunt* (Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* v, 84). Therea were two classes of flamens,

- (1.) those styled *firmines majaiores*, and always patricians, viz. the fl. dialis, martialis, and quirinalis, instituted by Numa, according to Livy (i, 20), to take charge of those religious services which had hitherto been functions of the kingly office; and
- (2.) the *fiamines majores*, who might be, and usually were plebeians, about twelves in number; and instituted at various times.

The flamens were in the earlier times nominated by the Comitia Curiata (in the case of the dialis three being designated), but after the enactment of the *Lex Domitia* (B.C. 104) they were named by the Comitia Tributa, and when thus nominated were received (*capit*) and inaugurated by the pontifex maximus, who always claimed paramount authority over them. The office was for life, but forfeitable for a breach of duty, or on the occurrence of some accident of ill omen while engaged in priestly functions. Their official dress was the apex, a sort of close-fitting cap, the laena, *χλαῖνα*. a thick woollen cloak (see Smith, *Dict. Antiq. s.v.*), and a laurel wreath. The highest in rank and honor was the flamen dialis, or priest of Jupiter, who must be the son of parents united in marriage by the ceremony of *confarreatio* (which rule probably applied to all the majores), and who was himself married by the same form to his wife, officially styled *flaminica*, whose aid was so indispensable to him in the performance of his priestly offices that, in the event of her death, he was forced to resign, since the flamen dialis could not marry again. He was subject to many restrictions—among others, was forbidden to leave the city for a single night (though this rule was somewhat modified by Augustus and Tiberius), or to sleep out of his bed for three consecutive nights; to touch or mount a horse, or look upon an army drawn up outside of the pomerium; nor could he take an oath, hence he could not be a consul or governor of a province, and was, it would appear, *summo jure*, excluded from all civil offices, and made *Jove adsiduum sacerdotem* (Liv. i, 20). Furthermore, he could not wear a ring *nisi pectus et casso*, whatever that may mean, or go out without his proper headdress, or allow a knot in his attire, touch flour, leaven, leavened bread, a dead body, a dog, a she-goat, ivy, beans, or raw flesh. Similar restrictions followed the actions of the *flaminica*. On the other hand, the flamen dialis enjoyed peculiar privileges, viz. exemption from parental control, an *ex officio* seat in the senate, a licitor, the right to use the *sellis cursilis* and the *toga proetexta*, the seat next below the *rex sacrificulus* at banquets, and the right of sanctuary for his house. His distinctive dress was the *albogalerus* (see Hope's *Costumes*, pl. 266). Of the *flamen martialis*, or priest of Mars, and then *flamen quirinalis*, or priest of Quirinus, less frequent mention is made, and of the *femines minores* but little is known beyond the names. The municipal towns also had flamens, and after it became a custom to deify the emperors, flamens were appointed, both in Rome and the provinces, to attend to their worship.—Smith, *Diet. Greek and Roman Antiq. S. v.*; Ramsay, *Man. Romans Antiq. s.v.*; Livy, i, 20; v, 52; Epit. 19:27:8; 29:38; 30:26; 31:50; 37:51; Tacitus,

Ann., iii, 58, 71'; 4:16; Plutarch, *Numsa*, 7, and *Quest. Ross.* p. 114, 118,, 119, 164-170 (ed. Reiske); Festus, *s.v. Maximae dignationes and majores flamines*; Aulus Gellius, 10:15, etc. (J. W. M.)

Flamingians

SEE MENNONITES

Flank

I **SK**, *kesel*, the *loin* of an animal (^{<1842>}Job 14:27, where fatness is noted as a sign of self-pampering); elsewhere in the plur. for the internal muscles of the loins near the kidneys, to which the fat adheres, Gr. **ψόαι** (Leviticus iii, 4, 10, 15; 4:9; 7:4); hence the viscera in general, umetaphorically for the inmost feelings C" loins," ^{<1808>}Psalm 38:8). *SEE REINS*.

Flash Of Lightning

(^{<2014>}Ezekiel 1:14. *SEE LIGHTNING*.)

Flatt

a name borne -by several theological writers of Germany.

I. JOHANN JAKOB, born at Balisgen in 1724, studied theology at Tübingen, and became tutor in that university in 1749. He was successively appointed deacon of Leonberg in 1753, of Tübingen in 1757, of St. Leonard's Church at Stuttgart in 1759, pastor in the latter city in- 1781, court preacher in 1783, counsellor of the Consistory in 1784, and abbot of Herrnb in 1791 He died Sept. 16, 1792. - His principal works are: *Meletemata philosophico-theologica ad melterias gravissimas (de imputatiome peccati Adamitici: —De vicaria Christi satisfactione: -De humanae Christi nature omnipraesentia* [Tub. 1759]):-*Untersuchung. v. d. Sunde wider d. Heiligen Geist* (Lpz. 1770).

II. JOHANN FRIEDRICH, son of the foregoing, was born at Tübingen Feb. 20, 1759, became professor of theology in the university of his native city in 1798, and died Nov. 24, 1821. His principal writings are *Versuche theolog.-kritisch-philosophischen Inhalts* (Lpz. 1785):-*Beistrage z. Bestimmung, etc. d. Causalitat* (Lpz. 1788) .-*Briefe, u. d. moralischen Erkenntnisgrunde der Religion* (Tub: 1789) :-*Vorlesungen u. christliche Moral*, herausgeg. v. Steudel (Tub. 1823) :-*Opuscula Academica*,

herausgeg. v. Susskind (Tub. 1826):-*Magazin für christliche Dogmatik u. Moral* (Tub. 1796-1810). Hoffmann and Kling have also published his *Vorlesungen u. d. Briefe a. d. Römer* (Tubing. 1825):-a. *d. Korinther* (1827):-a. *d. Galater und Epheser* (1828):-a. *d. Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher u. Philemon* (1829):a. *d. Timotheus s. Titus* (1831).-Doering, *Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands*, i, 408.

III. KARL CHRISTIAN, brother of the preceding, was born at Stuttgart in 1772. He became in 1812 high counsellor of the Consistoray and prebendary of Stuttgart, counsellor of the university in 1813, prelate in 1822, and general superintendent at Ulm in 1828. He resigned his office in 1842, and died in 1843. He wrote, in connection with Storr, *Lehrbuch d. chrstl. Dogmatik* (2d ed., 1813, 2 vols.; transl. by Schmucker, Staor and Flatt's *Biblical Theology*, Andover, 2d ed., 1836); and published, in connection with Ewald, the *Zeitschrift z. Nahrung christlichen Sinns* (1815-1819, 3 vols.).-Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.

Flattich, Johann Friedrich

a German theologian and educator, was born in 1713 at Beyhingen, near Ludwigsburg. After studying theology at Töbingen, he became in succession preacher of the garrison of Hohenasberg (1742), past-or of Metterzimmern (1747), and pastor at Munchingen (1760). At the latter place he died in 1797. - Flattich wrote a number of works and essays on education, as *Hausregeln, Vom Ehestand, Unterschiedliche Gedanken, Von der Auferziehung der Kinder*. Most of his works are collected in Ledderhose, *Leben and Schriften des J. F. Flattich* (3d edit. Heidelberg, 1856). He also enjoyed the reputation of being one of the most successful educators in Southern Germany, and was on intimate terms with many of the prominent men of that period. 'See Palmer, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:493; Volter, in Sebmid, *Encyklop. für das Erziehungs-und Unterrichts-wesen*, ii, 382. (A. J. S.)

Flavel, John

a nonconformist divine and writer of practical works, was born in Worcestershire, England, in 1627. He was in early life religiously educated by his father, and completed his public education at Oxford. Having devoted himself to the Gospel ministry, he was settled at Deptford in 1650 as curate to Mr. Walplate, and on his death succeeded to the rectory. In 1655 he accepted a unanimous and pressing call to remove to Dartmouth,

where he received a much smaller stipend, but had a larger field of usefulness. In 1662 he was ejected from his living for nonconformity; he did not, however, forsake his flock, but seized every opportunity of ministering-to their spiritual necessities.' His colleague dying soon after, the whole care devolved on him. On the execution of the Oxford Act he was compelled to remove five miles from Dartmouth, to Slapton, where he was out of the reach of legal disturbance, and where many of his former flock, in spite of the severity of the laws, resorted to him, and he at times stole into the town to, visit them. Once, while preaching in a wood, he was just entering on his discourse, when the soldiers suddenly rushed in and dispersed the conventicle. Several of the fugitives were apprehended and fined; but the remainder, rallying after the effects of their first surprise had subsided, conveyed Mr. Flavel to a more retired spot, where he resumed his sermon. In 1687, when James II dispensed with the penal laws, Mr. Flavel came forth from obscurity, and renewed his self-sacrificing labors. He took a lively interest in the proposed union between the Presbyterian and Independent churches, which was effected in 1601, and, like many a good man in those days, fondly anticipated from. that consummation a season of ecclesiastical peace and concord which never arrived. He died June 26, i 69 ., leaving behind him the name of a most faithful minister. Flavel's *writings* are valued more for their pungent and practical earnestness than for any other qualities. His *Whole Works* were published in London in 1820 (6 vols. 8vo). The American Tract Society publishes, in cheap form, his *Fountain of Life, Method of Grace, Christ knocking at the Door, On keeping the Heart, and Touchstone of Sincerity.*--*Jamieson, Religious Biography, s.v.; Jones, Christian Biography, s.v.; Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters, i, 340.*

Flavianus

patriarch of Antioch, was born of one of the best families in that city in the early part of the 4th century. Even while a layman he was an earnest opponent of Arianism. Theodoret (who gives a full account of Flavian) says that he, associated with another lay monk, Diodorus, "by night and day exhorted all men to be zealous in religion." He says also that " they were the first to devise the choir, and to teach them to sing the Psalms of David responsively" (*Hist. Eccles. ii, 24*). His zeal did not diminish after his ordination as priest by Meletius (q.v.), about A.D. 365 (?). When Meletius was banished from his see by Valens, Flavian remained to serve the churches in Antioch. But the Eustathian (q.v.) bishop Paulinus contested

the right of Meletius, and the churches were divided. On the death of Meletius, A.D. 381, Flavian was elected to succeed him, although (according to the accusation of Paulinus) he had bound himself by oath not to accept the office while the Eustathian bishop survived. The dispute was a fierce one; but at last, when Evagrius, successor of Paulinus, died, 390, Flavian was acknowledged by both the Eastern and Western churches. He was held in great respect: Chrysostom; who was his pupil, speaks very highly of him. He died A.D. 404. He treated the Messalians severely *SEE MESSALIANS*.--Socrates, *Hist. Eccl. bk. v, ch. xxiv*; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles. 8:24*; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl. ii, 24*; Cave, *Hist. Litt.*; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres* (Paris, 1860), 6:310. *SEE EUSTATHIUS*; *SEE MELETIUS*.

Flavianus Of Constantinople

was chosen bishop of that city, as successor to Proclus, A.D. 446 or 447. The emperor Theodosius was set against him from the beginning of his episcopate. Eutyches and his friends were very strong at court, but at a *Home Synod* at which Flavian presided (A.D. 448) at Constantinople, Eusebius of Dorylseum presented a formal complaint against Eutyches. Flavian, knowing the danger of attacking persons so powerful in court influence, at first sought to quiet the matter; but, as Eutyches was stubborn, the trial was had, and ended in his condemnation for heresy. The emperor was greatly offended, and, under the advice of Dioscurus, summoned a council at Ephesus (the Robber Council), at which Dioscurus presided, and where the most violent courses were pursued. Flavian was not only deposed, but so brutally beaten by the Egyptian attendants of Dioscurus that he died three days after (A.D. 449). The Council of Chalcedon named him martyr, *and* his name is to be found in the Roman martyrology, Feb. 18. See Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl. i, 8*; Neander, *Church History*, ii, 506 sq.; and arts. *SEE EUTYCHES*; *SEE EUTYCHIANISM*; *SEE EPHESUS, ROBBER COUNCIL OF*; *SEE EUSEBIUS OF DORYLLESM*.

Flavigny, Valerian De

a French; Hebrew scholar, was born at Villers-en-Prayres, near Laon, about the commencement of the 17th century; was made doctor of the Sorbonne in 1628, and in 1630 professor of Hebrew at the College of France. Flavigny was master of several Oriental languages, and was

considered one of the best critics of the Bible text of his time. He was engaged in a controversy with Abraham Echellensis (q.v.) and Gabriel Sionita with regard to the correctness of the polyglot of Le Jay, which was finally decided against him by a committee of the Sorbonne. He condemned the Copernican system as heretical in his *Expostulatio adversus thes'm*, etc. (Paris, 1666, 12nmo). He died April 29, 1674. Flavigny's writings on the text of the Bible are, *Epistole iv de inoenti Bibliorum opere septemlingui* (1636):-*Epistolce duce in quibus de ingenti Bibliorum opere quod nuper Lutetie Parisiorumprcodiit ac ei prefixa praefatione*, etc. (1646): - *Epistola in qua de libello Ruth Syriaco, quen Abr. Echellnsis insertun esse voluit inqgenti Bibliorum operi*, etc. (1647) :--*Eistola adversus Abr. Echellensem de libello Ruth, simulque sacrosancta veritas hebraica strenue defenditur atquepropugnatur* (1648):-*Disquisitio theologica, an, ut habet Capellanus, nonnulla sanctee Scriptures testimonia alio modo proferanztur a rabbinis quam nunc leguntur in voluminibus hebraicis* (1666). Flavigny published also a dissertation against the propositions of Louis of Cleves on the episcopacy and priesthood. He was also editor of the works of Guillaume de Saint-Amour, a divine of the 13th century.- Dupin, *Bibliothèque des Aut. ecclesiastiques*, 18:99; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biographie Generale*, 17:864; *Biographie Universelle*, 15:27.

Flax

Picture for Flax 1

הַתְּוֹפִי *pishtah'* (^{<100>}Exodus 9:31; ^{<200>}Isaiah 42:3; "tow," 43:17); and הַתְּוֹפִי *pishteh'* (rendered "flax" or "linen"); Greek **λίνον**. As regards the latter of these two Heb. terms, there is probably only one passage where it stands for the plant in its undressed state (Joshua ii, 6). Eliminating all the places where the words are used for the article manufactured in 'the *thread*, the *piece*, or the *made-up garment* (q.v. severally), we reduce them to two: ^{<100>}Exodus 9:31, certain, and Joshua ii, 6, disputed. In the former the flax of the Egyptians is recorded to have been damaged by the plague of hail. The word ל [בֹּף] there rendered "boll," is retained by Onkejos; but is rendered in the Sept. **σπερματίζον**, and in the *Vulg. folliculos germinabat*. Rosenmuller renders it "the globule or knob of ripening flax" (*Schol. ad loc.*). Gesenius makes it the *calix or corolla*; refers to the Mishna, where it is used for the calix of the hyssop, and describes this explanation as one of long-'steding among the ,more learned Rabbins (*Thes.* p. 261). **SEE BOLLED**. As the departure of the Israelites took place

in the spring, this passage has reference no doubt to the practice adopted in Egypt, as well as in India, of sowing grain partly *inl* the months of September and October, and partly in spring, so that the wheat might easily be in blade at the same time that the barley and flax were more advanced. From the numerous references to flax and linen, there is no doubt that the plant was extensively cultivated, not only in Egypt; but also in Palestine. Ritter (*Erd/cunde*, ii, 916; compare his *Vorhalle*, etc., p. 45-48) renders it probable that the cultivation of flax for the purpose of the manufacture of linen was by no means confined to these countries, but that, originating in India, it spread over the whole continent of Asia at a very early period of antiquity. For the culture of flax, low alluvial lands which have received deposits left by the overflowing of rivers are deemed the most favorable situations. To this circumstance Egypt must have been indebted for the superiority of her flax, so famous in the ancient world, and which gave to her more elaborate manufactures the subtlety of the most exquisite muslin, well meriting the epithet "woven air." Herodotus mentions (iii,47) as laid up in a temple at Lindus, in Rhodes, a linen corset which had belonged to Amasis, king of Egypt, each thread of which was composed of 360 strands or filaments. In length and in fineness of fibre no country could compete with 'the flax: which produced the "fine linen of Egypt," and which made the Delta "the great linen market of the ancient world" (Ksalisch). By annihilating this crop, the seventh plague inflicted a terrible calamity. It destroyed what, next to corn, formed the staple. of the country, and would only find its modern parallel in the visitation which should cut off a cotton harvest in America. That it was grown in Palestine even before the conquest of that country by the Israelites appears from ^{<0115>}Joshua 2:6, the second of the two passages mentioned above. There is, however, some difference of words / [ϑ;γτϑ] (Sept. *λινοκαλάμη*, Vulg. *stipuloe lini*, and so A. V. "stalks of flax"); Josephus speaks of *λίνοῦ ἀγκαλίδες*, armfuls or bundles of flax.; but Arab. Vers. "stalks of cotton." Gesenius, however, and Rosenmuller are in favor of the rendering "'stalks of flax." If this be correct, the place involves an allusion to the customs of drying the flax-stalks by exposing them to the heat of the sun upon the flat roofs of houses; and so expressly in Josephus (*Ant.* v, i, 2). **SEE STALK.**

Picture for Flax 2

In later times this drying was done in ovens. There is a decided reference to the raw material in the Sept. rendering of ^{<0134>}Leviticus 13:47 (*ἵματιῶ στυπυίνῳ*), and ^{<0154>}Judges 15:14 (*στυπίον*; comp. ^{<0151>}Isaiah 1:31). In

several other passages, as ^{<1838>}Leviticus 13:48, 52, 59; ^{<1821>}Deuteronomy 22:11; ^{<2413>}Jeremiah 13:1; ^{<3408>}Ezekiel 40:3; 44:17, 18, we find it mentioned as forming different articles of clothing, as girdles, cords, and bands. In ^{<1813>}Proverbs 31:13, the careful housewife "seeketh wool and flax, and worketh it willingly with her bands." The words of Isaiah (^{<2408>}Isaiah 42:3), "A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench," are evidently referred to in ^{<1023>}Matthew 12:20, where *λίνον* is used as the name of flax, and as the equivalent of *pishtah*. But there can be no doubt of this word being correctly understood, as it has been well investigated by several authors. (Celsius, *Hierobot.* ii, 283; Yates, *Texhrinum Ansiquorum*, p. 253). **SEE COTTON.**

Few plants are at once so lovely and so useful as the slender, upright herb, With taper leaves and large blue-purple flowers, from which are fashioned alike the coarsest canvas and the most ethereal cambric or lawn the sail of the ship and the fairy-looking scarf which can be packed into a filbert shell. It was of linen, in part at least, that the hangings of the tabernacle were constructed, white, blue, and crimson, with cherubim woven; and it was of linen that the vestments of Aaron were fashioned. When arrayed in all his glory, Solomon could put on nothing more costly than the finest linen of Egypt; and describing "the marriage of the Lamb," the seer of Patmos represents the bride as "arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints." As to Egypt, we have proof in the mummy-cloth being made of linen, and also in the representations of the flax cultivation in the paintings of the Grotto of El-Kab, which represent the whole process with the utmost clearness; and numerous testimonies might be adduced from ancient authors of the esteem in which the linen of Egypt was held (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* iii., 139). From these pictures, preserved at Beni Hassan, it would seem that the Egyptian treatment of the flaxplant was essentially the same as that which was pursued till quite lately by ourselves, which even now is only modified by machinery, and which is thus described by Pliny: "The stalks are immersed in water warmed by the heat of the sun, and are kept down by weights placed upon them, for nothing is lighter than flax. The membrane or rind becoming loose is a sign of their being sufficiently macerated. They are then taken out, and repeatedly turned over in the sun until perfectly dried, and afterwards beaten by mallets on stone slabs. The tow which is nearest the rind is inferior to the inner fibres, and is fit only for the wicks of lamps.' It is combed out with iron hooks until all the rind is removed. The inner part is

of a finer and Whiter quality. After it is made into yarn, it is polished by striking it frequently on a hard stone, moistened with water; and when woven-into cloth it is Again beaten with clubs, being always improved in propcstiam as it is beaten" (*Hist. Nat. 19:1*). The various processes employed in preparing the flax for manufacture into cloth are indicated in Scripture.

1. The drying process (see above).

2. The peeling of the stalks and separation of the fibres (the name of flax itself being derivable either, as Parkhurst, from **fvpP**; *pashat'*, to *strip*, peel, or as Gesenius, from **vvpP**; *pashash'*, 'to *separate* into parts).

3. The hackling (²³⁰⁹Isaiah 19:9; Sept. **λίνον τὸ σχιστόν**; see Gesenius, Lex. s.v. **qyrĕ**; and 'for the combs used in the process, comp. Wilkinsou, *Asnc. Egypt.* iii, 140). The flax, however, was not always dressed before weaving (see *Ecclus.* 11:4, where **ὀμόλινον** is mentioned as a species of clothing worn by the poor). That the s-se of the coarser fibres was known to the Hebrews may be inferred from the mention of *tow* (**tr[ḡ]** is-⁰⁷¹⁰Judges 16:9; ²⁰³¹Isaiah 1:31. That flax was anciently, one of the most important crops in Palestine appears from ²⁸⁰⁵Hosea 2:5, 9; that it continued to be grown and manufactured into linen in N. Palestine down to the Middle Ages se have the testimony of numerous Talmudists and Rabbins. At present it does not seem to be so much cultivated there as the cotton-plant. For the flax of ancient .Egypt, see Herodotus, ii, 37, 105; Cels. ii, p.). 285 sq.; Heerem, *Ideesm*, ii, 2, p. 368 sq. For that of modern Egypt, see Hasseiquist, *Jours-y*, p. 500; Ohvier, *Voyage*, iii, 297; Girard's *Observations in Descsript. de l'Lypte*, 17:98; Paul Lucas, *Voyages*, ii, 47. **SEE LINEN.**

Flea

Picture for Flea

(**v[rP]**), *parosh'*, from its *leaping*; a name found in the Arab. equivalent: see Bcobart, iii, 474, ed. Rosenm.) occurs only ⁰²⁴⁴1 Samuel 24:14 [15]; 26:20, where David thus addresses his persecutor Saul at the cave of Adullam: "After whom is the king of Israel come out? after whom dost thou pursue ?-after a flea ;" " The king of Israel is come out to seek a flea!" In both these passages our translation omits the force of the word **dj a**,

which is found in the Hebrew of each: thus, "to pursue after, to seek one or a *single* flea" (Sept. ψύλλος, Vulg. *pulex unus*). David's allusion to the flea displays great address. It is an appeal founded upon the immense disparity between Saul, as the king of Israel, and himself as the poor contemptible object of the monarch's laborious pursuit. Hunting a flea is a comparison in other ancient writings (Homer, *Il.* 10:378; Aristoph. *Nub.* i, 2; iii, 1) for much labor expended to secure a worthless result.- This insect, in the East, is often used as a popular emblem for insignificance (Roberts, *Oriental Illustrations*, p. 178). An Arabian author thus describes this troublesome insect: "A black, nimble, extenuated, hunch-backed animal, which, being sensible when any one looks on it, jumps incessantly, now on one side, now on the other, till it gets out of sight." The flea belongs to the Linns-san order *anptera* (Latreille, *smphonap* X tera; Kirby, *ophanaopera*). For a description of itself and congeners, see the *Penny Cyclopedia*, s.v. *Puleax*. Owing to the habits of the lower orders, fleas abound so profusely in Syria (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, ii, 94), especially during the spring, in the streets and dusty bazaars, that persons of condition always change their long dresses on returning home. There is a popular saying in - Palestine that " the king of the fleas keeps his court at Tiberias," though many other places in that region might dispute the distinction with that town (Kitto, *Physical History of Palestine*, p 421)..

Flehier, Esprit

a celebrated French. orator and prelate, was born June 10, 1612, at Pernes, near Avig. non. After studying in the college of the "Fathers of the Christian Doctrine," he went to Paris, and soon became known by a Latin poem on the famous carousal given by Louis XIV in 1662. His sermons and funeral orations soon raised him to such a pitch of reputation that the duke of Montausier recommended him to fill the office of reader to the dauphin. In 1673 he was chosen a member of the Academy, and in 1682 he was appointed almoner to the dauphiness. In 1685 he obtained the bishopric of Lavaur. When the monarch gave it to him, he said, "Do not be surprised that I have been so tardy in rewarding your merit; I was loth to be deprived of the pleasure of hearing you preach." In 1687 he was removed to the bishopric of Nismes. The Protestants of his neighborhood suffered greatly from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, but. Flebier administered his office so mildly and tenderly that he gained the love of even the Protestants. He died in February, 1710; and when Fenelon heard of his death, he cried out,." We have lost our master!" His *panegyimic en*

Tmu-senne is considered his masterpiece of eloquence. Among his writings are, *Les Paneryriques des Saints* (Paris, 1697, 2 vols. 12mo):- *Oraisoans Fsunsbres* (4to):-*Histoire de l'Empereur Theodoce le Greind* (Paris, 1679, 4to, and often 12mo): -*Vie'du Card. Ximenes* (2 vols. 12mo). They may all be found in the collection of his works, *Nuvres comphites, revues sur les manuscritat. de lauteur*, etc., (Nismes, 1782, 10 vols. 8vo).- *Biog. Universelle*, 15:35.

Flechiere, DE LA

SEE FLETCHER, JOHN

Fledgling

would be a proper rendering for **l z/G gozal'** (so called from its *peeping*; the Arab. and Syr. use essentially the same word in, the sense of *nestling*), a "young" bird, a. g. of the dove [squab], or pigeon (^{<0157>}Genesis 15:9), or eagle [eaglet] (^{<0521>}Deuteronomy 32:11. The' Greek corresponding term is **νεοσσός** ("young" pigeon, Luke ii, 24). . SEE BIRD.

Fleece

(**zGega**, no called from *shearing*, ^{<0524>}Deuteronomy 18:4; ^{<0522>}Job 31:20; or **hZgi** the fem. form, ^{<0057>}Judges 6:37, 39, 40), the wool of a sheep whether on the back .of the animal, or shorn of, or attached to the flayed skin, which last appears to have been the case in the passage last cited. The threshing-floor of Gideon appears to have been an open uncovered space, upon which the dews of heaven fell without interruption. SEE **THRESHING-FLOOR**. The miracle of Gideon's fleece consists in the dew having fallen one time upon the fleece, without any on the floor, and that at another time the fleece remained dry while the ground was wet with it. SEE **GIDEON**. It may appear a little improbable to us who inhabit northern climates where the dews, are inconsiderable, how Gideon's fleece in one night should contract such a quantity of water that when he came to wring it, a bowl-full was produced; but Kitto observes (*Pict. Bible*, note ad loc.), " We remember, while tramelling in Western Asia, to have found all the baggage, which had been left in the open air, so wet, when we came forth from the tent in the morning, that it seemed to have been exposed to heavy rain, and we could with difficulty believe that no rain had fallen. So also, when sleeping in the open air, the sheep-skin cloak which served for a

covering has been found in the morning scarcely less wet than, if it had been immersed in water." *SEE DEW.*

Fleetwood, William

bishop of Ely, and one of the most eloquent preachers of his time, s-as born January, 1656, in the Tower of London, and was educated at Eton and King's College, Canebridge. After having held the preferments of rector of St. Austin's and canon of Windsor, he was made bishop of St. Asaph in 1706, and was translated to Ely in 1714. He-died at Rottenham, Middlesex, Aug. 4, 1723. In politics he held liberal views. His principal works are, *An Essay on Miracles* (1701, 8vo):--*Inscriptionum Antiquarum Sylloge* (1691, 8vo):--*Chronicon Pretiosum, or an Account of English, Money* (1707) :-*Method of Devotion, translated from Jurieu* (1692; of which the 27th edition appeared in 1750):--*The Judgment of the Church of England concerning Lay Baptism* (1712):--*The Life and Miracles of St. Winfried* (1713). His sermons, etc., are gathered in *A complete Collection of the Sermons, Tracts, etc., of Bp. Fleetwood* (London, 1737, fol.); and there is a new edition of his *Whole Works* from the University Press (Oxford, 1854, 3 vols. 8vo).-*New Genesis Biog. Diet.* v, 373; Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, p. 604.

Fleming, Robert, Sen.

an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Yester in 1630. He studied philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, and divinity at St. Andrew's, under Rutherford. His first pastoral charge was at Cambuslang, in Clydesdale. He was one of four hundred ministers ejected by the Glasgow Act after the restoration of Charles II. He was imprisoned in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh, but was liberated in 1673, and went to Holland, where he succeeded Mr. Brown as pastor of the Scots congregation at Rotterdam. He died July 15, 1694, leaving behind him several works, of which the most remarkable is *The fulfilling of the Scriptures*, complete in three parts: 1. Providence; 2. in the word; 3. in the Church (Lond. 1726, 5th ed. fol.), with memoir of the author by D. Burgess.--Middleton, *Biog. Evang.* 4:69.

Fleming, Robert, Jun.

son of the above, was born at Cambuslang, and was educated at Leyden and Utrecht. In 1692 he became minister of the Scottish church at Leyden. In 1694 he succeeded his father at Rotterdam, and in 1698 became minister

at Lothbury, London, where he died in 1716. He wrote a remarkable *Discourse on the Rise and Fall of the Papacy*, the predictions of which have received a singular fulfilment. In this sermon, published in 1701, Fleming ventures his opinion that the French monarchy would be humbled in 1794, that the period of the fifth vial extended from 1794 to 1848, and that/in the last-mentioned year the papacy would receive its most signal blow, and that it would be followed by the destruction of the Turk. The sermon was reprinted in 1848. He published also *Christology, a Discourse concerning Christ* (Lond. 1705-8, 3 vols. 8vo), in which he maintains the eternal pre-existence of the human soul of Christ.-Jamieson, *Religious Biography*, p. 200; Dorner, *Person of Christ*, Edinb. transl., div. ii, vol. ii, p. 329.

Fleming, Thornton

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Williamsburg, Va., Oct., 1764; was converted at about twenty; entered the itinerant ministry in 1788. He was set off with the Pittsburg Conference from the Baltimore Conference in 1825, superannuated in 1834, and died at Elizabethtown, Pa., in 1846. He was fifty-eight years in the ministry, fifteen of which he was presiding elder. He possessed rare endowments as a man and a minister, and was widely useful in his life and labors.-*Minutes of Conferences*, 4:139; Stevens, *Hist. of the Methodist Episcopal Church*.

Flemingians Or Flamingians

SEE MENNONITES.

Flemming, Paul

a German poet and hymn maker, was born October 15, 1609, at Hartenstein, in Sch6nburg, and studied medicine at Leipsic. In 1633 he accompanied the embassy sent by the duke of Holstein to Russia, and in 1635 was attached to an embassy to Persia. He returned in 1639, and died in Hamburg April 2, 1640. His *Geistliche und weltliche Poemata* (Jena, 1642) contain many love songs, and also sacred poems; among them the beautiful hymn *In alien unseren Thates*, ' a translation of which is given in Miss Winkworth's *Lyra Germanica*, second series, p. 149. His life, with his select poems, was published by Schwab (Stuttgart, 1820). See Knapp, *Evangelischer Liederschatz* (Stuttg. 1837), and Miller, in the *Bibliothek deutscher Dichter des 17 Jahrhundert* (Lpz. 1822, 3 vols.).

Flentes

προσκλαίοντες, *mourners* or *weepers*, candidates for penance in the early Church. Their station was in the church porch, where they lay prostrate, begging the prayers of the faithful as they went in, and desiring to be admitted to do public penance in the church. **SEE PENITENTS.**

Flesh

I. ρCB; *basar* [Chald. ρCBi; *besar'*] (so called from its *plump* freshness), **σάρξ**, terms of extensive application in the O. and N.T. (see Gesenius, *Heb. Lex.*; Robinson, *N.T. Lexicon*; Wemyss, *Clavis symbolica*). They are applied generally to the whole animal creation, whether man or beast; or to all beings-whose material substance is flesh (^{<0063>}Genesis 6:13, 17, 19; 7:15, 16, 21; 8:17); and to the flesh of cattle, *meat*, as used for food (^{<0262>}Exodus 16:12; ^{<0079>}Leviticus 7:19; ^{<0104>}Numbers 11:4, 13). **SEE FOOD.** Specially:

1. All flesh, i.e. all men, the human race, mankind (^{<0062>}Genesis 6:12; ^{<0062>}Psalm 6:2; 145:21; ^{<2308>}Isaiah 40:5, 6; ^{<0066>}Luke 3:6; ^{<0070>}John 17:2; ^{<0017>}Acts 2:17; ^{<0024>}1 Peter 1:24; ^{<0022>}Matthew 24:22; ^{<0060>}Romans 3:20; ^{<0016>}Galatians 2:16);

2. "Flesh," or the body, as distinguished from "soul" or "spirit" (^{<0042>}Job 14:22; 19:26; ^{<0040>}Proverbs 14:30; ^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:18; ^{<0062>}John 6:52; ^{<0066>}1 Corinthians 5:5; ^{<0011>}2 Corinthians 4:11; 7; ^{<0065>}Colossians 2:5; ^{<0016>}1 Peter 4:6); *so* also "flesh and blood", **SEE BLOOD** as a periphrasis for the whole animal nature or man (^{<0014>}Hebrews 2:14);

3. Human nature, man (^{<0023>}Genesis 2:23, 24; ^{<0065>}Matthew 19:5, 6; ^{<0066>}1 Corinthians 6:16; ^{<0069>}Ephesians 5:29-31); spoken also of the incarnation of Christ (^{<0014>}John 1:14; 6:51; ^{<0060>}Romans 1:3; ^{<0015>}Ephesians 2:15; ^{<0022>}Colossians 1:22; ^{<0016>}1 Timothy 3:16; ^{<0067>}Hebrews 5:7; 10:20; ^{<0068>}1 Peter 3:18; ^{<0042>}1 John 4:2, 3; ^{<0007>}2 John 1:7);

4. As the medium of external or natural generation, and of consequent kindred, relationship (^{<0294>}Genesis 29:14; 37:27; ^{<0092>}Judges 9:2; ^{<0062>}2 Samuel 5:1; 19:13; ^{<0013>}John 1:13; ^{<0068>}Romans 9:8; ^{<0011>}Hebrews 2:11-14; 12:9); of one's countrymen (^{<0060>}Romans 9:3; 11:14; ^{<0023>}Acts 2:30; ^{<0023>}Galatians 4:23); also of any other person, a fellow-mortal (^{<2577>}Isaiah 57:17);

- 5.** "Flesh" is also used as a modest general term for the secret parts (^{<0171>}Genesis 17:11; ^{<0282>}Exodus 28:42; ^{<0852>}Leviticus 15:2, 3, 7, 16, 19; ^{<0231>}Ezekiel 23:20; ^{<0120>}2 Peter 2:10; ^{<0107>}Jude 1:7); in ^{<0151>}Proverbs 5:11, the "flesh" of the intemperate is described as being consumed by infamous diseases;
- 6.** Spoken of circumcision in the flesh, the external rite (^{<0171>}Genesis 17:11; ^{<0128>}Romans 2:28; ^{<0118>}2 Corinthians 11:18; ^{<0088>}Galatians 3:3; ^{<0021>}Ephesians 2:11);
- 7.** Spoken figuratively of human nature as opposed to the Spirit of God (^{<0018>}Genesis 6:3; ^{<0104>}Job 10:4; ^{<0310>}Isaiah 31:3; ^{<0504>}Psalms 56:4; ^{<0175>}Jeremiah 17:5; ^{<0167>}Matthew 16:17; ^{<0704>}2 Corinthians 10:4; ^{<0016>}Galatians 1:16); the unregenerate nature, the seat of carnal appetites and desires (*Meth. Quart. Rev.* April, 1861, p. 240 sq.), whether physical or moral (^{<0175>}Romans 7:5; 8:1, 4, 5, 8; Galatians v, 16,17; ^{<0018>}Ephesians 2:3); and as implying weakness, frailty, imperfection, both physical and moral (^{<0739>}Psalms 78:39; ^{<0161>}Matthew 26:41; ^{<0148>}Mark 14:38; ^{<0016>}John 3:6; ^{<0169>}Romans 6:19; ^{<0651>}1 Corinthians 15:50; ^{<0708>}2 Corinthians 10:3; ^{<0012>}Ephesians 6:12).

Other terms occasionally rendered "flesh" in the O.T. are **rae]** *sheer'* (from a similar idea of *fulness*), ^{<0736>}Psalms 73:26; 78:20, 27; ^{<0117>}Proverbs 11:17.; ^{<0535>}Jeremiah 51:35; ^{<0302>}Micah 3:2, 3 (elsewhere "food," "body," "kin"), which has more especial reference to the *muscle* or physical element, as food or a bodily constituent (see Weller, *Erklärung d. zwei hebr. W"rter. rCB; und rae]* Lpz. 1757); also **hj bfi]** *tibchah'*, a *slaughtered* carcass (^{<0251>}1 Samuel 25:11; i.e. "laughter," i.e. slaughter-house, ^{<0142>}Psalms 44:22; ^{<0112>}Jeremiah 12:3); and **μwhl i]** *lechum, food* (^{<0017>}Zephaniah 1:17; "eating," ^{<0123>}Job 20:23).

II. ESHPAR' (**רפּבּא**), an obscure Heb. word, found only in ^{<0069>}2 Samuel 6:19; ^{<0368>}1 Chronicles 16:3. The Sept. appears to understand by the term some peculiar sort of bread (**ἔσχαρίτης, ἄρτοκοπιακός** v. ar. **ἄρτοκοπικός**), and the Auth. Vers., following the Vulg. (*assastura bebulce carnis, pars assae carnis bubulae*, apparently with the absurd derivation from **vaefire**, and **rP**; *a bullock*), renders it "a good piece of (roasted) flesh." But there, can be little doubt that it was a certain measure of wine or drink (for **רפּבּ]** with **a** prosthetic), a *measure, cup.*, An approach to the truth was made by L. de Dieu, who, following the same

etymology, understands a portion of the sacrifice *measured out* (*Gesesius, Heb. Lex. s.v.*)- **SEE MEAT**.

FLESH. The word flesh (**rvB; σάρξ**) is used both in the O. and N.T. with a variety of meanings, physical, metaphysical, and ethical, 'the latter occurring especially in the writings of St. Paul.

I. Old Testament.— In the O.T. it designates

(1.) a particular part or parts of the body of man and of animals

(^{<002>}Genesis 2:21; 41:2; ^{<801>}Job 10:11; ^{<937>}Psalms 102:6);

(2.) is a more extended sense, the *whole body* (^{<949>}Psalms 16:9; 84:2) in contradistinction from the heart (**bl**) or soul (**vpn**)-the body, that is, as - possessed of a soul or spirit-(^{<871>}Leviticus 17:11; ^{<820>}Job 12:10). Hence it is also applied

(3.) to *all living things* having flesh (^{<063>}Genesis 6:13), and particularly to man and humanity as a whole, which is designated as "*all flesh*"

(^{<062>}Genesis 6:12). It is often connected

(4.) with the ideas of mutability, 'of degeneracy, and of weakness, which are the natural defects of the flesh proper. It is thus represented as the counterpart of the divine strength, as the opposite of -God or of the Spirit, as in ^{<438>}2 Chronicles 32:8, " With -him is *an -arm of flesh, but with as is the Lord our God to help us*" (see also ^{<310>}Isaiah 31:3; ^{<979>}Psalms 78:39). To this we can also add ^{<063>}Genesis 6:3 the only passage in the O. T. in which the word approaches to an ethical sense, yet without actually acquiring it. The peculiar *softness* of the flesh is also

(5.) the basis of the expression "*heart of flesh*" (**rcB;kl**), as opposed to "*heart of stone*" (^{<319>}Ezekiel 11:19).

(6.) The expression "*my flesh*" (oftener "*my flesh and bone*"), to indicate relationship' (^{<092>}Judges 9:2; ^{<387>}Isaiah 58:7), evidently refers to the physical and corporeal connection between persons sprung from a common father. In all these cases the O. T. only uses the word flesh in the physical and metaphysical senses.'

II. New Testament.-These senses of the word "flesh" are also found in the N.T.

(1.) As a same for the body, the exterior appearance of humanity, it easily passes on also to denote *external phenomena* in general, as opposed to what is inner and spiritual. So, when Christ says to the Jews, "*I judge not after the flesh,*" he means "the flesh is the rule by which you judge" ('(ⲉⲃⲱⲓ John 7:15; compare also ⲉⲃⲱⲃⲉ Philippians 3:3; ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ 2 Corinthians 5:16). In ⲉⲃⲱⲓ Romans 4:1, the *ethical* sense appears. The word "flesh" here denotes man's incapacity for good apart from divine aid. This impotence, both practical and spiritual is also expressed in other passages, as ins ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Romans 6:19; ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Matthew 16:17; and in ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Matthew 26:41, where the lower, earthly and sensual element in humanity, as opposed to the "spirit," is, as such, incapable of bearing trial and temptation. The root of this weakness *is in dwelling in the flesh* (ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Romans 7:18; 17:20), by which man is divided within himself as well as separated from God, inasmuch as he -has, on the one side, the self-conscious *spirit* (*νοῦς*), which submits to the divine law, and takes pleasure in this obedience, desiring all that is commanded, and avoiding all that is forbidden; and, on the other hand, the *flesh*, which, being inhabited by sin, seeks only for the lower satisfactions, thus inclining to evil rather than good, and opposed to the divine law (see ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Romans 7:7-25; 8:3). The "*sinful flesh*" (*σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας*) hinders the efficacy' of the divine law, so that, although it (the law) gains the assent of the "inner man," it is not fulfilled, because of this tendency of the flesh towards what is forbidden. Hence the "*being in the flesh*" means, in fact, such activity of the sinful passions (*παθήματα ἁμαρτιῶν*) of the organism (*ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν*) as results in death (ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Romans 8:8, 9). To live and act "*according to the flesh*" is to live and act sin-fully; the "carnal mind is enmity against God" (ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Romans 8:4, 5, 7, 12). The "*wisdom according to the flesh*" is a mistaken, Godless wisdom (ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ 1 Corinthians 1:26). All efforts, boasts, etc., having the flesh for object or for motive (*βουλευέσθαι στρατεύεσθαι, καυχᾶσθαι κατὰ σάρκα,* ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ 2 Corinthians 1:17; 10:2; 11:18), are foreign- to the life of the true Christian. The *lusts, desires, and works of the flesh* are sinful, and opposed to holy, divine impulses and actions (ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Galatians 5:16; ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Ephesians 2:3). To *crucify the flesh* and the works of the flesh is the great object of the Christian, which he attains through the power of the spirit of Christ which dwells in him (ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Galatians 5:25; ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Romans 8:11). The fleshly mind is the mistaken mind, leading away from Christ to pride, and consequently to error (ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Colossians 2:18, 19). Finally, to act according to the flesh is called to "be sold under sin" (ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Romans 7:12; comp. ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ 1 John 2:16; ⲉⲃⲱⲓⲉ Romans 8:3).

But "flesh" does not always denote sinfulness (see ^{<RB>}Romans 1:3; 9:5; ^{<RB>}1 Timothy 3:16; ^{<RB>}John 1:14). The flesh, in Christ, was not sinful; God sent him only "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, ^{<RB>}Romans 8:3). This sinless flesh, as the organ of the 'Word of life, contains the divine life, which is communicated to, men also living in the flesh, to redeem them from the death of sin, and to make them partakers of everlasting life (^{<RB>}John 6:51).

We see, then, that the meaning of the word flesh was, on the one hand, gradually extended from a physical to a metaphysical, and finally to an ethical sense. In the ethical use in the N.T., moreover, of the term "flesh," we do not find the idea of *essential sin* as lying in the flesh.. Flesh in itself is neither bad nor sinful. It is the living body the casket of the soul, containing within itself the interior and exterior organism of the senses, which, by its union with the spirit, conceives ideas, sensations, desires, and contains the so-called faculties of the soul with their divers functions. In the normal state, its whole activity is governed by the spirit, and in so far as the latter remains in unison with God from whom it proceeds, it is in turn governed by him. But sin, which disturbs this unison of the spirit with God, alters also the power of the spirit over the body. The ego oversteps the bounds of the divine life, moves no longer in harmony with the divine spirit, and, being no longer supported by the divine power, gradually becomes earthly and worldly, and all its functions partake of this character. The spirit endeavors, it is true, to bring the flesh under subjection to the higher laws, but does not succeed. It may, under the form of conscience, succeed in regaining some ground, but not in bringing back the state of abnegation and of detachment from the world, It is only through an immediate action on the part of God that the original relation of the flesh to the spirit is restored, the lost power regained, and the flesh brought back to its normal condition (*And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth*, John i, 14).

The original *source* of sin in man is neither to be found in the spirit, the organ of God's revelation within us, nor in the flesh, which is in turn the physical organ of the spirit. According to Scripture, it is the *heart*, the centre of our personality, in which all the influences, both godly and ungodly, meet in which the choice between them is made. If the heart then gives entrance to sin, permits any doubt of God's truth, any mistrust of his love and kindness, and thus lowers him to put *self* in his place (Genesis 3), the union between God and man ceases; the inner man loses his energy to

govern the **σάρξ**; the flesh starts s-p in opposition to the divine commands in its feelings and its desires. It asserts its independence. Self is made the centre. Hence hatred, strife., desire for worldly superiority. creating envy, and giving rise to all the "lusts of the flesh." That both selfishness and sensualism have their seat in the **σάρξ**, and that the actions of men are guided by one or the other, is clearly shown in the enumeration given by the apostle of the works of the flesh (^{<4159>}Galatians 5:19), which are clearly the effects of selfishness and of sinful passions; and that the word flesh, as used by Paul, is intended to signify both, is proved by the apostle's warning (^{<4153>}Galatians 5:13) not to use Christian liberty for "an occasion to the flesh," i.e. to satisfy the desires of the flesh, adding to it the recommendation "but by love serve one another." Whichever of the two is then especially alluded to when the Scriptures, and especially St. Paul, speak of the nature, the life, or the works of the flesh, the context will show. Sometimes both are equally active, sometimes the one only to the exclusion of the other. This is the only way in which we can arrive at a true appreciation of the meaning in each case. Those interpreters who, in view of the substitution of **σάρξ** for **σῶμα** and **μέλη**, consider it as meaning exclusively the bodily, sinful side of human nature, fall into the errors of the Manichoeans. See Tholuck, *Erneute Untersuchung i. σάρξ als Quelle d. Siinde* (Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken, 1855, 3); Stirn, *i. d. Tiib. Zeitschr.* 1834 (i. d. n. t. Anthropol.); Neander, *Planting and Training*, vol. ii; Kling, in Herzog. *Real-En2cykloppdie*; Campbell, *On Four Gospels*, diss. i, § 2.

Flesh And Blood

An expression employed by our Lord to denote (after an Oriental figure) "his Spirit," *represented* by his flesh and blood, as these again are *by* the sacramental bread and wine (Eden). *SEE EUCHARIST.*

Flesh-Hook

Picture for Flesh Hook

(**gl zḥi** *mazleg'*, and, **hgl zḥi** *mizlagah'*), an instrument used in the sacrificial services (^{<0123>}1 Samuel 2:13,14; ^{<0273>}Exodus 27:3; 38:3; ^{<0044>}Numbers 4:14; ^{<1387>}1 Chronicles 28:17; ^{<1446>}2 Chronicles 4:16), probably a many-pronged *fork*, bent backward to draw away the flesh. The priests required such an instrument that, if the flesh burnt too quickly, they might draw it out, and again throw it into the flame or upon the coals. The implement in ^{<0123>}1 Samuel 2:13, 14 (where the first or masc. form of the

above Heb. term is used), is stated to have been three-tined, and was apparently the ordinary fork with prongs for culinary purposes, such as was familiar likewise to the Greeks and Romans (*κρέαγμα*; see. Smith's *Diet, of Class. Antis.* s.v. Harpago).

Flesh-Pot

Picture for Flesh Pot

(*rcBhirysi*, *sir hab-basar'*, *pot of the flesh*, ^{ⲉⲗⲁⲃ}Exodus 16:3), probably a bronze vessel, standing on three legs, appropriated for culinary purposes among the Egyptians, such as we frequently see represented in the paintings of the tombs, with a fire lighted beneath it. *SEE POT.*

Fletcher, Alexander, D.D.

was born at the Bridge of Teith, Scotland, in 1787. He studied divinity in the University of Glasgow, and succeeded his father as minister of the secession church at the Bridge of Teith in 1807. In 1808 he came to London to supply the Presbyterian chapel in Miles's Lane, and his popularity soon became so great that a spacious building (Albion Chapel, Moorfields) was erected for him. Some indiscretion in a love affair caused him to be cut off from the Presbyterian Church, but did not injure his moral character. A great chapel in Finsbury Circus was built for him, where he preached for many years as an Independent, but both he and his church were finally admitted into the Presbyterian body. The University of Glasgow made him D.D. During thirty years of service he was one of the most popular dissenting ministers of London, especially for his Sunday-school addresses and sermons. He published a number of works, chiefly for children and youth, among *them*, *Scripture Sacred History* (16mo):-*Scripture Natural History* (16tno):-*The Christian Conqueror* (12mo):-*Guide to Family Devotions* (4to):-*Sermons for Children* (3 vols. 18mo):-*Warning to Evil Speakers* (12mo):-*Sabbath Remembrancer* (12mo):-*Sabbath-school Preacher* (12mo). It is computed that 70,000 copies of his *Guide to Family Devotions* were sold before his death. He died at his residence in Clapton, Sept. 30, 1860.-*The Christian World*, Oct. 5, 1860.

Fletcher, John

(FLECHIERE, JOHN W. DE LA), an early Methodist and saintly minister of the Church of England, was born Sept. 12, 1729, at Nyon, Vault, of a distinguished family. He was educated at Geneva, where he studied profoundly both in philology and philosophy. At an early period he was, to a certain extent, master of the French, German, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages: His parents intended him for the ministry, but he preferred the sword, and at twenty he entered the service of Portugal as captain. Peace returning, he went to England, and became tutor in the family of T. Hill, Esq., Shropshire. About 1755 he joined the Methodist society, and in 1757 he took orders in the Church of England. Through the influence of Rowland Hill, he received, three years after, a presentation to the living of Dunham, worth £400 a year; but, finding that in this place there was "*too much time and too little labor,*" he, with characteristic zeal and disinterestedness, accepted Madeley in preference, as, though the income was just the half of the other, it afforded a more extensive sphere of usefulness. This was a situation for which, by his energy of character and varied accomplishments, he was peculiarly adapted. The fact is, he was such a parish priest that it is surprising he was tolerated at all within the pale of the Church of England; he belonged more to the Methodists than to the Establishment, and he was too apostolical for those who are fondest of talking about apostolical succession. The country gentlemen resisted him for reproving some of their barbarous sports and pastimes, and even many of the clergy looked on him with an evil eye, as disturbing the quiet of their lifeless routine. Opposition was shown to him in, many quarters by refusals of admissions into houses-by placards posted on the doors of his chapel-and in a variety of other forms. But, unmoved by slander and undaunted by menaces, he pursued the onward tenor of his way, and did his Master's work according to the dictates of his conscience, whether men would hear or whether they would forbear. With incessant preaching he combined the most diligent pastoral labors. He went from house to house, sympathizing with the afflicted, helping the poor, ministering to the sick, and admonishing the vicious. His liberality to the poor is said, by his successor in the parish, to have been scarcely credible. He led a life of severe abstinence that he *might* feed the hungry; he clothed himself in cheap attire that he might cloth the naked; he sometimes unfurnished his house that he might supply suffering families with necessary articles. Thus devoted to his holy office, he soon changed the tide of opposition which had raged against

him, and won the reverence and admiration of his people, and many looked upon their homes as consecrated by his visits. In the summer of 1769 Mr. Fletcher visited France, Italy, and Switzerland. Towards the close of the summer he returned to England, when, at the request of Lady Huntingdon, he became president of her seminary for educating young men for the ministry at Treveces, in Wales. In 1770 he went there to reside, but shortly afterwards resigned, on account of some difference with Lady Huntingdon. Benson describes Fletcher at Treveccac in glowing terms: "The reader," he says, "will pardon me if he thinks I exceed; my heart kindles while I write. Here it was that I saw, shall I say, an angel in human flesh?' I should not far exceed the truth if I said so. But here I saw a descendant-of fallen Adam so fully raised above the ruins of the fall, that though by the body he was tied down to earth, yet. was his whole *conversation in heaven*; yet was his life from day to day *hid with Christ in God*. Prayer, praise, love, and zeal, all ardent, elevated above what one would think attainable in this state of frailty, were the elements in which he continually lived. Languages, arts, sciences, grammar, rhetoric, logic, even divinity itself, as it is called, were all laid aside when he appeared in the schoolroom among the students. And they seldom hearkened long before they were all in tears, and every heart caught fire from the flame that burned in his soul." 'On leaving Trevecca he resumed his missionary and pastoral labors, making Madeley his centre. But his health failed, and again he was obliged to visit Switzez-land. He derived great benefit from the change of climate, and, soon after his return to England in 1781, he married. Mr. Fletcher had for many years seen, with regret and pain, the neglected condition of poor Wbidren, and he opened a school-room for them in Madeley Wood, which was the lasts public work in which he was employed. On the 14th of August, 1785, he expired, in sure and certain hope of a joyful resurrection. In his life the primitive excellence of apostolical Christianity was emulated and illustrated; and if any man, since the apostolic time, has deserved the title of *seis-nt*, it is Fletcher. "For a time he fell into asceticism-, living on vegetables and bread, and devoting two whole nights each week to meditation And prayer, errors which he afterwards acknowledged. He received Wesley's doctrine of Perfection, and not only wrote in its defense, but- exemplified it through a life of purity, charity, and labor, which em-as as faultless, perhaps, as was ever lived by mortal man. Southey says: No age or country has ever produced a man of more fervent piety or more perfect charity; no Church has ever possessed a more apostolic minister' (*Life of Wesley*, ch. xxv). His preaching is described as greatly effective.

He spoke the English language not only with correctness, but with eloquence. There was, say's Gilpin, who heard him often, an energy in his discourse which was irresistible; to hear him without' admiration was impossible. Powerful-as are his writings, his preaching was mightier; ' his living word soared with an eagle's flight; he basked in the sun, carried his young ones on his wings, and seized the prey for his Master.' He was Wesley's most ardent coadjutor among the clergy; his counsellor, his fellow-traveler at times in his aemangelical itinerancy, an attendant at his Conferences, the champion of his theological views, and, above all, a saintly example of the life and power -of Christianity as taught by Methodism, read and known, admired and loved by Methodists throughout the world. Madeley, his vicarage, is familiar and dear to them next to Epworth itself" (Stevens, *Methodism*, i, ' 367, 422). He was eminent, also, as a controversial writer, for point, directness, acuteness, and logical skill. He wrote largely upon the Calvinistic controversy, against Toplady and others and his writings, especially his *Checks to Antinomiasmisssm*, are essential to the thorough study of that controversy. "Written as -detached pamphlets, and abounding in contemporary and personal references, the *Checks* could not possibly have the consistence and compactness of a thorough treatise on the difficult questions of the great Quinquarticular Controversy.' But they comprehend, nevertheless, nearly every important thesis of the subject. Its highest philosophical questions-theories of the freedom of the will, prescience, fatalism-are elaborately discussed by them, as in the *Remarks on Top lady's Scheme of Necessity*, and the *Answer to Toplady's Vindication of Decrees*. The scriptural argument is thorough; and exegetical expositions are given in detail, as in the *Discussion of the ninth Chapter to the Romans*, and the *View of St. Paul's Doctrine of the first Chapter to the Ephesians*. No writer has better balanced the apparently contradictory passages of Scripture on the question. The popular argument has never, perhaps, been more effectively drawn out. No polemical works of a former age are so extensively circulated as these *Checks*. They are read more to-day than they were during the excitement of the controversy. They control the opinions of the largest and most effective body of evangelical clergymen on the earth. They are staples in every Methodist publishing-house. Every Methodist preacher is supposed to read them as an indispensable part of his theological studies, and they are found at all points of the globe whither Methodist preachers have borne the cross. They have been. more influential in the denomination than Wesley's own controversial writings on the subject; for he was content to

pursue his itinerant -cork, replying but briefly to the Hills, and leaving the contest to Fletcher" (Stevens, *History of Methodism*, ii, 53-55). His *Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense* is an admirable, and, in some respects, novel treatise on the doctrine of universal depravity. Mr. Fletcher's English style is a marvel of purity and precision, considering that he acquired the language after twenty. His writings have been collected in several editions in England, and also in America, under the title, *The Works of the Rev. John Fletcher* (New York, Methodist Book Concern, 4 vols. 8vo). For 'his life, see Gilpin's account, prefixed to Fletcher's *Portrait of St. Paul*; and Benson's *Life of the Rev. J. W. de la Flechiere* (New York, 1833, 12mno). See also Stevens, *History of Methodism*, vols. i and ii; Jones, *Christians Biography; New York Review*, i, 76.

Fletcher, Joseph, D.D

an Independent minister. was born at Chester in 1784. He entered Hoxton Academy in 1803, and the University of Glasgow in the following year. In 1807 he became minister of the Independent chapel at Blackburn, being at the same time engaged as theological tutor in an academy, and in 1823 he accepted a call as minister at Stepney. He died in 1843. His principal writings were edited by the Rev. Joseph Fletcher, under the title *Of Select Works and Memoirs* (London, 1846, 3 vols. 8vo), including the *Memoir*, vol. i, *essay on Romanism and Puseyism*, vol. ii; *Sermons*, vol. iii.. There appeared separately, *A Discourse (Romans 8 b) on Spirituality of Mind* (London, 1824, 2d. ed. 8m-o): — *A Discourse* (~~1818~~ 1 John 2:18) *on the Prophecies concerning Antichrist* (Lond. 1825, 8vol):-*Discourse* (~~1812~~ Jude 1:21), *the Christian's Hope of Mercy* (Lond. 1832, 8vo).-Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, s.v.

Fleury, Claude

an eminent French historian and divine, was born in Paris Dec. 6, 1640. He was educated as an advocate at the College of Clermont, and became a counsellor of the Parliament of Paris in 1658, but subsequently took orders, and, acquiring a great reputation for learning, he was appointed in 1674 preceptor to the "princess of Conti, and afterwards associated with Fenelon in educating the young dukes of Burgundy, Anjou, and Berri. He was made member of the Academy in 1696, and in 1707 obtained from Louis XIV the priory of Argenteuil, where he resided till 1716, when he left it to become confessor to Louis XV. He died July 14, 1723, greatly

respected for his learning and his virtues. His reputation rests chiefly upon his *Church History*, in twenty volumes, the first of which was published in 1691, and the last in 1722, ending with the year 1414. This work, as Fleury says in the preface, was meant to be rather a *popular* history than one of research and erudition; but yet it is a clear and generally fair account of the progress of Christianity, and evinces a large amount of the proper talent of the historian. It is written from the Gallican stand-point. "Fleury writes diffusely and in the spirit of a monk, but with taste and skill, in mild temper and strong love for the Church and Christianity, and with a view always to edify as well as to instruct. He follows the order of time, though not slavishly, prefacing some of his volumes with general characteristics. He also defends antiquity and the Gallican ecclesiastical constitution, without, however, surrendering at all the credit of the Church, its general tradition, or the necessity of the pope as its head. His principal concern is with doctrine, discipline, and practical piety" (Schaff, *Apost. Church*, § 26).

Fleury, as a writer of Church history, is not at all in favor with Ultramontanists; a specimen of their feeling towards him is given by the *Univers* (Paris) for July 8, 1856, which calls him "the worthless and hateful Fleury, so ardent and furious in his calumnies and spite against the pope !" His *Church History* was continued by Fabri, but feebly, down to A.D. 1598. The best edition is *Histoire Ecclesiastique avec continuation par Fabri et Gouget* (Paris, 1769-74, 36 vols.; indexes, 4 vols.; in all, 40 vols. 12mo). A very good recent edition is that of Didier (Paris, 1840, 6 vols. 8vo). A translation by Herbert, up to the 9th century, was published in London (1727, 5 vols. 4to); and a partial translation by Rev. J. H. Newman appeared in 1842-44 (3 vols. 8vo). The *Abrege de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique de Fleury*, published at Berne in 1776, is ascribed to Frederick the Great. His other writings were very numerous; the most important are, *Mcaeurs des Chretiens* (Paris, 1682):--*Mours des Israelites* (Paris, 1681), which was translated and published, with additions, by Dr. Adam Clarke (Manchester, 1805; New York, 1836):--*Institution du droit ecclesiastique* (Paris, 1771, 2 vols. 12mo):--*Discours sur les libertes de l'Eglise Gallicane*. His minor works are collected in Martin's edition of (*Euvres de 'abbe Fleury* (1837, imp. 8vo), to which is prefixed a life of Fleury. Jortin translated his *Discourse on Eccles. History. from 600 to 1100* (see Jortin, *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, Lond. 1773, v, 72 sq.). See also Dupin, *Ecclesiast. Writers*, cent. xvii; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 17:916; Dowling, *On the Study of Ecclesiastical History*, ch. iii.

Fliedner, Theodor

a German philanthropist, was born at Eppstein, Rhenish Prussia, in 1800, where his father was pastor. His early education was conducted by his father, and he entered the ministry with some misgiving, rather doubting his fitness, and choosing rather the function of teacher. But in 1820 a call to the pastorate of the little village community of Kaiserswerth, a small town on the Rhine, opened his way, and he diffidently began his work in the place now forever associated with his name, and which became, under his hand, the centre of an influence approaching that of Wesley himself, whose power of endurance, faith, and incessant labor Fliedner rivalled. The inhabitants of Kaiserswerth were chiefly supported by a large manufactory, which failed in 1822. Fliedner devoted himself to the work of helping his flock instead of being supported by them. "Never did a man begin to ask for help with a heavier heart, nor with worse success, till a brother pastor at Elberfeldt took him home to dinner, and told him that the three requisites for his work were patience, impudence, and a ready tongue." The receipt, to which Fliedner added much prayer and much faith, proved so successful that he was spoken of before his death as the most accomplished beggar ever known in Germany. England, America, and many distant regions learned to pour their contributions into his wallet, and often his worst necessities were relieved by what seemed almost miraculous unsolicited gifts, which exactly answered the demands upon him." In 1823 he visited England on a begging excursion, and there became acquainted with Elizabeth Fry and with her benevolent movements. *SEE FRY, ELIZABETH*. On his return he examined the prisons of his neighborhood, and found them in a wretched state. "The convicts were crammed together in narrow, dirty cells, often in damp cellars without light or air; boys who had fallen into crime from thoughtlessness were mixed up with hoary, cunning sinners; young girls with the most corrupt old women. There was absolutely no classification; even accused persons waiting for trial, who might soon be released again as innocent, were placed with criminals who might be undergoing a lengthened term of imprisonment. There was as good as no supervision at all; as long as the jailers allowed no one to escape, they had fulfilled their duty." For more than two years Fliedner tried to bridge the gulf which lay between this criminal class and the rest of the community in his own person, visiting, teaching, reorganizing, and in 1826 he founded the first German society for improving prison discipline. " Seeking a matron for the female wards at Dusseldorf, he found his wife,

whose parents refused to let her take the position first offered to her, but approved her acceptance of the young pastor himself, although the second involved all the duties of the first. In 1833 he took a poor creature released from prison into a summer-house in his garden, and so practically started a scheme which had for some time been in his mind, to provide a refuge for such women as desired to reform on the expiration of their sentences. A friend of Mrs. Fliedner's came to take charge of this minute beginning, and assumed the title of deaconess. The summerhouse gave way to a house, the deaconess got companions, and the establishment grew. Then the thought of founding an order of deaconesses for the care of the sick poor dawned upon him. He bought a house in 1836, having no money, but a vast amount of faith. The same may be said of all his subsequent enlargements of his borders. His hospital was started with one table, some broken chairs, a few worn knives and two pronged forks, worm-eaten bedsteads, seven sheets, and four severe cases of illness. The effort soon flourished under royal favor." In 1838 Fliedner first sent deaconesses from his establishment to work in other places; they spread, fresh mother-houses multiplied, till now there are 139 stations. (For statistics, *SEE DEACONESSES*, vol. ii, p. 709.) In 1849 he visited America, and travelled widely. He founded a "house" at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. "In the course of his life Fliedner established at Kaiserswerth schools, training colleges for middle-class school-mistresses as well as for governesses, a lunatic asylum, a boy's school, and a training college for schoolmasters. The hospital, the asylum, the schools, are all utilized for the training of deaconesses, whom Fliedner frequently taught himself by the example of his wonderful gifts for interesting the young. Comical stories might be told of his doings in his infant-schools, where he would fall prostrate by way of illustration of the story of Goliath, distribute bread and honey to fix the excellence of the heavenly manna on the children's minds, or suddenly send a boy under the table to vivify his tale of the fall of a traveller over a precipice. His labors lasted till his death. He died at Kaiserswerth, Oct. 4, 1864, worn out by journeys' in Germany, France, Great Britain, and America. which had brought on disease of the lungs To the very last day of his life, he continued, in spite of painful weakness, to exhort those near him to a re-ali-ious and earnest life, took keen interest in the details of daily work going on around him, and died a day or two after taking the communion with his whole establishment and family, including two sons,' whose entrance into the Church he specially rejoiced to see." Fliedsner published (after 1836) annual reports of his institution, and a monthly periodical called *Der*

Asrmeaund Krasmkensfreund. He also wrote a work, in four volumes, on the martyrs of the Evangelical Church, *Bech der Martyrer unat anderer Glaubenszeagen der evangel. Kirche vons den Aposteln bis auf unsere Zeit*, 1852-1860, 4 vols.-London *Quarterly Review*, April, 1868, p. 247; *Spectator*, April. 11, 1868; Winkworth, *Life of Pastor Fliedner* (Lond. 1867); Appleton, *Am. Cyclop.* (1864), p. 377.

Flies

SEE FLY

Flinn, Andrew, D D.

a Presbyterian minister was born in Maryland in 1773, graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1799, and was licensed to preach by Orange Presbytery in 1800. In 1803 he became pastor of the Presbyterian church at Fayetteville, and in 1811 he was installed pastor of a new church, expressly organized for him, in Charlestons, S. C. Here he gained a brilliant and solid reputation, which was soon widely diffused throughout the country. He was one of the most impressive and attractive preachers of his day." He died Feb. 24, 1820. He printed a few occasional sermons.-Sprague, *Annals*, 4:276. '

Flint

(vwmlj i *challassish'*, from its *smoothness*, ^{<19408>}Psalm 104:8; ^{<2807>}Isaiah 50:7; "rock," ^{<18319>}Job 28:9; frequently with the accompaniment rwx, a rock, ^{<18885>}Deuteronomy 8:15; 32:13; once for rx itself, ^{<26109>}Ezekiel 3:9; "sharp stone," ^{<10025>}Exodus 4:25), 'any hard stone, especially of a silicious character, as quartz or granite; but in mineralogical science it is applied only to silicious nodules. In the three passages first cited above the reference is to God's bringing water and oil out of the naturally barren rocks of the wilderness for the sake of his people. In Isaiah the word is used metaphorically to signify the firmness of the prophet is resistance to his persecutors. So also in, ^{<21638>}Isaiah 5:28 we have *like flsnt*, in reference to the hoofs of horses. In 1 Mace. 10:73, κόχλαξ is translated flint, and in Wisd. 11:4 the expression ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου is adopted from ^{<18885>}Deuteronomy 8:15 (Sept.). SEE ROCK. 'Flints abound in nearly' all the plains and valleys through which the Hebrews marched during thee forty years of wandering.' In the northward desert, low hills' of chalk occur, as

well as frequent tracts of chalky soil, for the most part overspread with flints. In the western desert Burckhardt saw some large pieces of flint perfectly oval three to four feet in length, and about a foot and a half in breadth. This desert presents to the traveller's view its immense expanse of dreary country, covered with black flints, with here and there some hilly chains rising from the plain. *SEE DESERT.*

Flint, Abel, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born Nov., 1765, at Windham, Conn.. He graduated at Yale in 1785, and in 1786 was elected tutor in Brown University, where he remained until 1790, and on April 20, 1791, was installed pastor of the Second Church, Hartford. He was chosen secretary of the Connecticut Missionary Society at its organization, June, 1798, and held the office for twenty-four years. In January, 1824, He was dismissed from his pastoral charge on account of his failing health, and (died March 7, 1825. Dr. Flint published *A Treatise on Surveying*, and several occasional discourses. He assisted in compiling *The Hartford Selection of Hymns*, and was also assistant editor of the *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine* for seven years. Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 273.

Float

Picture for Float 1

Picture for Float 2

(oalsy in' the plur. **t/rbD** *obesath'* drifts, ^{<1089>}1 Kings 5:9; **t/dspʃi** *raphsodoth'*, of uncertain derivation, ^{<14215>}2 Chronicles 2:15; Sept. in both passages **σχεδίαι**, as also in 1 Esdr. v, 55), a *raft* for conveying bulky substances by water. Two methods of conveying wood is- floats appear to have been practiced in ancient times. The first was by pushing single trunks of trees into the water, and suffering them to be carried along by the stream this was commonly adopted with regard to firewood. The other was ranging a umber of planks close to each other in regular order, binding them together, and steering them down the current: this was probably the most ancient practice. The earliest ships, or boats, were nothing more than rafts, or a collection of deals and planks bound together. 'They were called **σχεδίαι** by the Greeks, and *rates* by the Romans. The ancients Ventured out to sea with them on piratical expeditions, as weal as to carry on commerce, and after the invention of ships they were still retais-ed for the

transportation of soldiers (Scheffer, *De Milit. Nav. Vet.*). Solomon, it appears from the above passages, entered into a contract with Hiram, king of Tyre, by which the latter was to cause cedars for the use of the Temple to be cut down on the western side of Mount Lebanon, above Tripolis, and to be floated to Jaffa. At present no streams run from Lebanon to Jerusalem, and the Jordan, the only river in Palestine that could bear floats, is at a considerable distance from the cedar forest. Time wood, therefore, must have been brought along the coast by sea to Jaffa. The Assyrian monuments represent men crossing rivers on inflated skins *SEE FERRY* and in basket-boats, precisely as described by ancient authors (Herod. i, 194); and in the same region transportation and travelling is still largely carried on by means of floats, some of them open rafts, and others with an awning or cabin. *SEE NAVIGATION*.

Flock

(usually and properly *rdēe'der*, *ποίμνη* [or dimin. *ποιμνίον*, a "little flock," like *āycjæ chasiph'*, I Kings 20:27]; occasionally *hnqjñj mikneh'*, *cattle*, as generally rendered; frequently *ˆaæ*, *sheep* collectively, as commonly rendered; also *ty[rñj*" *marith'*, ^{<H12>}Jeremiah 10:21, *pasture*, as elsewhere rendered; and *t/rTyIi* *ashteroth'* [q.v.], ^{<H13>}Deuteronomy 7:13; 28:4,18, 51, i.e. *Venuses*, ewes for breeding). *SEE FOLD*; *SEE PASTURAGE*; *SEE SHEEP*.

Flock

the correlative term to "pastor." "The way in which this term, or the language which implies it, invariably occurs in Scripture (^{<H14>}1 Peter 5:2; ^{<H15>}John 21:15), points out to the people that they are not properly the minister's flock (which would exalt him into the mediator between them and God), but Christ's." Eden, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.

Flodoard

(*Flodoardus* or *Frodoardus*) OF RHEIMS, a French chronicler, was born at Epernay in 894, and became canon of Rheims. He was persecuted by count Heribert for opposing the raising of his unqualified son Hugo to the archbishopric of Rheims, and was imprisoned for several months. -After the death of the count, Hugo the son did justice to Flodoardus. He died March 28, 966. He wrote *Chronica* or *Annales*, a chronicle of France from

919 to 966, published by Pithou (Paris, 1588). He also wrote a *Historia Ecclesie Remensis*, in four books, giving an account of the prelates who had presided over its affairs (printed by Colvener, Douay, 1617). Both these works, as far as extant, are given in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 135, together with the *Opuscula Metrica* of Flodoard, including his *Triumphus Christi*, a sort of Church History in verse.—Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* ⁽¹⁷⁾*Genesis 17:936; Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature*, ii, 565.

Floh, Jacob Hendrik

was born in the year 1758, at Crefeld. He studied theology in the Baptist seminary in Amsterdam, He was invited in 1783 to take charge of the Baptist church at Enschede. Here he labored between forty and fifty years. He was a man of extensive knowledge and of a ready wit, and was indefatigable in his labors. He contributed greatly to promote the cause of education in the section of the country where he was located. Several valuable essays were written by him on the subject of education. One, on the *Best Theory of Punishments and Rewards in Schools*, received the prize from the Maatschappij tot nut van 't algemeen. Several works on other subjects were written by him. One, on the *Indissoluble Connection between Virtue and true Happiness*, was crowned by the same society. Another, on a kindred subject, we deem worthy of mention here: *National Happiness cannot Exist without national Virtue*. For a few years Floh allowed himself to be drawn aside from his ministerial vocation to engage in political life. In 1796 he was chosen representative of the people in the National Convention at the Hague. In 1798 he was chosen secretary of the first chamber of the representative body of the Batavian people. He acquitted himself in these positions with great credit. His theological views were Latitudinarian. His principal works are, *Proeve eener beredeneerde verklaring der geschiedenis van's Heilands verzoeking in de woestijn*, Deventer, 1790; *lets over bedestonden*, 1817. His attack on the Heidelberg Catechism, as teaching, in the answer to the fifth question, a doctrine dangerous to the state, made in the National Assembly at the Hague, was regarded as highly injudicious, and excited great indignation. It elicited a triumphant reply from the pen of Ewaldus Kist, one of the most highly esteemed ministers of the Reformed Church. Floh attempted no reply. It was thought that he was himself convinced by the moderate and judicious reply of Kist. We may add in honor of Floh that this attack of his was regarded as an exception to his otherwise impartial conduct as a public representative. He died at Enschede in March, 1830. See B. Glasius,

Godgeleerd Nederland, i Deel, blz. 467 en very.; Ypey en Dermont's *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Her-cormde Kerk*, iv Deel, blz. 206 en very. (Breda, 1827). (J. P. W.)

Flohr, George Daniel

a minister of the Lutheran Church, was a native of Germany, born in 1759. He died in Wytheville, Va., in 1826. He studied medicine in Paris, and was one of the throng that witnessed the execution of Louis XVI. The accidental but tragical death of an individual in the crowd standing near him, part of whose mangled body was thrown upon his person, most deeply affected him, and so operated upon his mind as to lead him to change all his purposes and plans for the future. This was the turning-point in his character. A train of serious thought was awakened which resulted in his conversion, and subsequent consecration to the work of the ministry. Soon after he came to America, and pursued the study of theology under the direction of the Rev. William Carpenter, Madison County, Va. After his licensure to preach the Gospel, he engaged in successful missionary service in south-western Virginia, but subsequently took charge of several congregations in Wythe County, among whom he faithfully labored till his death. Mr. Flohr exercised an extraordinary influence not only upon the members of his church, but upon all classes of society. When difficulties occurred in the community they were always referred to him for adjustment, and from his decision scarcely any one ever thought of an appeal. The basis of this influence was the unlimited confidence which every one had in his personal worth and Christian integrity. So far as his professional engagements allowed, Mr. Flohr was devoted to study. His acquaintance with the German and French was extensive and thorough, and his attainments in Latin and Greek considerable. The only work of his ever published was a posthumous volume of sermons. (M. L. S.)

Flood

(the rendering of several Heb. words *SEE RAIN*, but especially of **ל** **W****B****m****j** *mabbul'*, **κατακλυσμός**), an event related in the book of Genesis (ch. vii and viii), by which, according to the usual interpretation of the description, the whole world was overwhelmed and every terrestrial creature destroyed, with the exception of one human family and the representatives of each species of animal, supernaturally preserved in an ark, constructed by divine appointment for the purpose. *SEE ARK*.

1. The successive stages of its progress were in order and at intervals as follows. In the 600th year of his life, Noah was commanded to enter the ark, taking with him his wife, and his three sons with their wives. One week afterwards, on the 17th day of the 2d month (answering nearly to our November), there began a forty-days' rain, and the fountains of the great deep were broken up, so that its waters rose over the land until all the high hills under the whole heavens were covered. Fifteen cubits (twenty-seven feet) upward did the waters prevail (rise). On the 17th day of the 7th month (about April), or 150 days after the deluge began, the ark rested on the mountains of Ararat, or Armenia, the waters having begun to abate. They continued to decrease till the 1st day of the 10th month (July), when the tops of the mountains were visible. Forty days after this, Noah sent forth a raven from the ark, which never returned. He next (apparently after seven days) sent forth a dove, which came back. Seven days afterwards he dispatched the dove again to ascertain the state of the earth, and in the evening she returned with an olive-leaf in her mouth. After an interval of seven days the dove was sent forth a third time, and returned no more. On the first day of the 1st month of the new year (Sept.-Oct.) the waters were dried from off the earth, and on the 27th day of the 2d month, (Nov.) Noah came out of the ark, built an altar, and offered sacrifice. *SEE NOAH.*

2. The truth of the Mosaic history of the deluge is confirmed by the tradition of it which universally obtained. A tradition of the deluge, in many respects accurately coinciding with the Mosaic account, has been preserved almost universally among the ancient nations. It is a very remarkable fact concerning the deluge that the memory of almost all nations begins with the history of it, even of those nations which were unknown until they were discovered by enterprising voyagers and travellers; and that traditions of the deluge were kept up in all the rites and ceremonies Of the Gentile world; and it is observable that, the farther we go back, the more vivid the traces appear, especially in those countries which were nearest to the scene of action. Such narratives have formed part of the rude belief of the Egyptians, Chaldaeans, Greeks, Scythians, and Celtic tribes. They have also been discovered among the Peruvians and Mexicans, the aborigines of Cuba, North America, and the South-Sea Islands. *SEE ARARAT.*

3. The account furnished by the sacred historian is circumstantially distinct, and the whole is expressly ascribed to divine agency: but in several of the lesser particulars secondary causes, as rain, "the opening of the windows of

heaven" (~~COOZE~~Genesis 7:11), and the "breaking up of the fountains of the great deep," are mentioned, and again the effect of wind in drying up the waters (~~COOZE~~Genesis 8:1). It is chiefly to be remarked that the whole event is represented as both commencing and terminating in the most gradual and quiet manner, without anything at all resembling the catastrophes and convulsions often pictured in vulgar imagination as accompanying it. When the waters subsided, so little was the surface of the earth changed that the *vegetation* continued uninjured; the olive-trees remained from which the dove brought its token. We allude particularly to these circumstances in the narrative as being those which bear most upon the probable nature and extent of the event, which it is our main object in the present article to examine, according to the tenor of what little evidence can be collected on the subject, whether from the terms of the narrative, or from other sources of information which may be opened to us by the researches of science. See Cockburn, *Inquiry into the Truth and Certainty of the Mosaic Deluge* (London, 1750).

The evidence which geology may disclose, and which can in any degree bear on our present subject, must, from the nature of the case, be confined to indications of superficial action attributable to the agency of water, subsequent to the latest period of the regular geological formations, and corresponding in character to a temporary inundation of a quiet' and tranquil nature, of a depth sufficient to cover the highest mountains and, lastly (as indeed this condition implies), extending over the whole globe; or, if these conditions should not be fulfilled, then indications of at least something approaching to this, or with which the terms of the description may be fairly understood and. interpreted to correspond. (See Prof. Hitchcock, on - "The Historical and Geological Deluges compared," in the *Bib. Repos.* January, 1837; April, 1837; April, 1838; also Brown's translation of "twelve dissertations" [on the Flood] out of Le Clerc [Commentary, i, 66-70, 1710] on Genesis, London, 1696.) Of those geological facts which seem to bear at all upon such an inquiry, the first, perhaps, which strikes us is the occurrence of what was formerly all included under the common name of *diluvium*, but which more modern research has separated into many distinct classes. The general term may, however, not in aptly describe superficial accumulations, whether of soil, sand, gravel, or loose aggregations of larger blocks, which are found to prevail over large tracts of the earth's surface, and are manifestly superinduced over the deposits of different ages, with which they have no

connection. An examination of the contents of this accumulated detritus soon showed the diversified nature of the fragments of which it is composed in different localities. The general result, as bearing on our present subject, is obviously this: the traces of currents, and the like, which the surface of the earth does exhibit, and which *might* be ascribed to diluvial action of some kind, are certainly not the results of *one universal* simultaneous submergence, but of *many distinct*, local, aqueous forces, for the most part continued in action for long periods, and of a kind precisely analogous to such agency as is now at work. While, further, many parts of the existing surface show no traces of such operations; and the phenomena of the volcanic districts prove distinctly that 'during the enormous periods which have elapsed since the craters were active, no deluge could possibly have passed over them without removing all those lighter portions of their exuviae which have evidently remained wholly untouched since they were ejected. Upon the whole, it is thus apparent, that we have no evidence whatever of any great aqueous revolution at any comparatively recent period having affected the earth's surface over any considerable tract: changes, doubtless, may have been produced on a small scale in isolated districts.' The phenomena presented by caves containing bones, as at - Kirkdale and other localities, are not of a kind forming any breach in the continuity of the analogies by which all the changes in the surface are more and more seen to have been carried on, But a recent simultaneous influx of water covering the globe, and ascending above the level of the mountains, must have left 'indisputable traces of its influence, which not only is' not the case, but against which we have seen *positive* facts standing out. Such traces must especially be expected to be found in the masses of human remains which such a deluge must have imp bedded in the strata of soil and detritus, if these were formed by that event. Now it is quite notorious that no bed indisputably attributable to diluvial action has ever been found containing a single bone or tooth of the human species. We must therefore contend that *no evidence hems yet been adduced* of any deposit which can be identified with the Noachian deluge. *SEE GEOLOGY.*

Apart from the testimonies of geology, there are other sciences which must be interrogated on such a subject. These are, chiefly, terrestrial physics, to assign the possibility. of a supply of water to stand all over the globe five miles in depth above the level of the ordinary sea; natural history, to count the myriads of species of living creatures to be preserved and continued in the ark; mechanics, to construct such a vessel; with some others -not less

necessary' to the case. But we have no space to enter more minutely on such points: the reader will find them most clearly and candidly stated in Dr. Pye Smith's *Geology and Scripture*, etc., p. 130, 2d edit. **SEE ARK.**

Let us now glance at the nature and possible solutions of the difficulty thus presented. We believe only two main solutions have been attempted. One is that proposed by Dr. Pye Smith (ib. p. 294), who expressly contends that there is no real contradiction between these facts and the description in the Mosaic record, *when the latter is correctly interpreted*. This more correct interpretation then refers, in the first instance, to the proper import of the Scripture terms commonly taken to imply the *universality* of the deluge. These the author shown by a large comparison of similar passages, are only to be understood as expressing a *great extent*; often, indeed, the very same phrase is applied to a very limited region or country, as in ^{<0456>}Genesis 41:56; ^{<0125>}Deuteronomy 2:25; ^{<0115>}Acts 2:5, etc. Thus, so far as these expressions are concerned, the description may apply to a local deluge. Next, the destruction of the whole existing human race does not by any means imply' this universality, since, by ingenious considerations as to the multiplication of mankind at the alleged era of the deluge, the author has shown that they probably had not extended beyond a comparatively limited district of the East. A local destruction of animal life would also allow of such a reduction of the numbers to be included in the ark as might obviate objections on that score; and here again the Oriental idiom may save the necessity of the literal supposition of every actual species being included. This is a consideration of very great importance when we take into account the countless varieties of animated beings for which the ark itself made no provision, such as reptiles, insects, and even fishes, which could not exist in the brackish waters, even if they survived the collisions of the flood.. The other difficulties above alluded to, arising from kindred sciences, such as the lack of water, the effect of so large an accession of water upon the temperature and upon the rotation of the earth, the unfitness of such a place as the ark for the long confinement of so many animals, the actual existence of trees in different parts of the world older than. the deluge, and the impossibility of preserving even vegetable life for so long a time under water, are all likewise obviated by the supposition of a local deluge. Again, the difficulties in the way of the descent of so many animals from so lofty, bleak, and craggy a mountain as Ararat, and their dissemination thence over all the world, are obviated in this way, by supposing that it was on one of its lower eminences that the ark grounded, as it floated by the force

of the southerly irruption towards the great mountain barriers of Armenia. Lastly, this author suggests considerations tending to fix the region which may have been the scene of the actual inundation described by Moses in about that part of Western Asia where there is a large district now considerably depressed below the level of the sea (see the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1867, p. 465): this might have been submerged by the joint action of rain, and an elevation of the bed of the Persian and Indian Seas. Finally, he quotes the opinions of several approved divines in confirmation of such a view, especially as -hearing upon all the essential religious instruction which the narrative is calculated to convey.

The only other mode of viewing the subject is that which, accepting the letter of the scriptural narrative, makes the deluge strictly universal; and allowing (ass they *must* be allowed) all the difficulties, not to say contradictions, in a natural sense, involved in it, accounts for them all by *supernatural* agency. In fact, the terms of the narrative, strictly taken, may perhaps be understood throughout as representing the whole event, from beginning to end, as entirely of a miraculous nature. If so, it may be said, there is an end to all difficulties or question, since there are no limits to omnipotence, and one miracle is -not greater than another. In a word, if we suppose the flood to have been miraculously produced, and all the difficulties thus overcome, we must also suppose that it was not only miraculously terminated also, but every trace and mark of it supernaturally effaced and destroyed. Now, considering the immense amount of supernatural agency thus rendered necessary, this- hypothesis has appeared to some quite untenable. Dr. Pye Smith, in particular (whom no one will suspect of any leaning to scepticism), enlarges on the difficulty (p. 157, and note), and offers some excellent remarks on the general question of miracles (p. 84-89); and there can be no doubt that, however plausible may be the assertion that all miracles are alike, yet the idea of supernatural agency to so enormous an amount as in the present instance is, to many minds at least, very staggering, if not wholly inadmissible. In fact, in stretching the argument to such an extent, it must be borne in mind that we may be trenching upon difficulties in another quarter, and not sufficiently regarding the force of the evidence on which any miracles are supported.

SEE MIRACLE.

If we look to the actual tenor of the whole narrative as delivered by Moses (Genesis 7 and 9), we shall observe that the manifest immediate purport of it is the same as that of the rest of the early portion of his history, viz. as

forming part of the introduction TO THE LAW. Thus we find, in the first instance, the narrative dwelling on the distinction of clean and unclean beasts (^{<0002>}Genesis 7:2); afterwards on the covenant With Noah; the promise of future enjoyment of the earth and its fruits; the prohibition of eating blood; the punishment of murder (^{<0004>}Genesis 9:4, etc.); all constituting, in fact, some of the rudiments out of which the Mosaic law was framed, and which were thus brought before the Israelites as forming an anticipatory sanction for it. Regarded in a Christian light, the narrative is important solely in respect to the applications made of it in the New Testament, and these are only of the following kind: it is referred to as a warning of Christ's coming (^{<0008>}Matthew 24:38; ^{<0077>}Luke 17:27); as an assurance of judgment on sin (^{<0005>}2 Peter 2:5); and of God's long-suffering; while the ark is made a type of baptism and Christian salvation (^{<0001>}1 Peter 3:20); and, lastly, Noah is set forth as an example of faith (^{<0007>}Hebrews 11:7). In these applications no reference is made to the physical nature of the event, nor even to its literal universality. They are all allusions, not to the event abstractedly, but only in the way of *argument with the parties addressed in* support of *other* truths; an appeal to the Old Testament addressed to those who already believed in it-in the first of the instances cited, to the Jews in the others, to *Jewish* converts to Christianity (compare ^{<0001>}1 Peter 1:1, and ^{<0001>}2 Peter 3:1). Indeed, if the terms "earth" (*/yā*) and "heavens"

(*μῦθος*) be referred in the Mosaic -narrative itself to the visible extent of *land* and superincumbent arch of *sky* (as they often signify), all direct statement of the universality of the deluge over the surface of the globe will at once disappear. - That it was coextensive with the spread of the human race at the time is indeed demanded by the conditions of the sacred history *SEE ANTEDILUVIANS*;- but there is no evidence that the population before the flood was either so extensive or so widely disseminated as many have imagined, calculating upon the inapposite rate of modern increase and later usages. On the contrary, it appears that even after the deluge the inhabitants were still so greatly inclined to cluster around one native centre that the catastrophe of Babel was requisite in order to induce a fulfilment of the divine behest that mankind should "fill the earth." Undoubtedly, if read from the present advanced stage of the world's history, it would be impossible to understand the language otherwise than of an absolute universality; for, now that every region of the world is known, and known to be more or less occupied by man and beast, it must have been in the

strictest sense a world-embracing catastrophe which could be described as enveloping in a watery shroud every hill under the whole heaven, and destroying every living thing that moved on the face of the earth. But here it must be remembered, the sacred narrative dates from the comparative infancy of the world, when but a limited portion of it was peopled or known; and it is alsias one of the most- natural, as well as s-most fertile sources of error, respecting. the interpretation of such early records, that one is apt to overlook the change of circumstances, and contemplate what is written from a modern point of view. Hence thee embarrassments so often felt, and the misjudgments sometimes actually pronounced, respecting those parts of Scripture which speak of the movements of the heavenly bodies in language suited to the *apparent*, but at variance, as has now been ascertained, with the real phenomena. In such cases it is forgotten that the Bible was not intended to teach the truths of physical science, or point the way to discoveries in the merely natural sphere. Of things in these departments of knowledge it uses the language of common life. So, whatever in the scriptural account of the deluge touches on geographical limits or matters strictly physical, ought to be taken with the qualifications inseparable ‘from the bounded horizon of men’s views and relations’ at the time. Accordingly, there were not wanting theological writers who, long before any geological fact, or well-ascertained fact of any sort in physical science, had appeared to shake men’s faith in a strictly universal deluge, actually, put the interpretation now suggested as competent upon the narrative of the deluge. Thus Poole, who flourished in the middle of the 17th century, says in his *Synopsis* on ^{<0079>}Genesis 7:19: “It is not to be supposed that the entire globe of the earth was covered with water, Where was the need of overwhelming those regions in which there were no human beings? It would be highly unreasonable to suppose that mankind had so increased before the deluge as to have penetrated to all the corners of the earth. It is, indeed, not probable that they had extended beyond the limits of Syria and Mesopotamia. It would be absurd to affirm that the effects of the punishment inflicted upon men alone applied to places in which there were no men.” Hence he concludes that “if not so much as the hundredth part of the globe was overspread with water, still the deluge would be universal, because the extirpation took effect upon all the part of the world which was inhabited.” In like manner Stillingfleet, a writer of the same period, in his *Origines Sacrae* (book 3, chapter 4), states that “he cannot see any urgent necessity from the Scripture to assert that the flood did spread over all the surface of the earth. The flood was

universal as to mankind; but from thence follows no necessity at all of asserting the universality of it as to the globe of the earth, unless it be sufficiently proved that the whole earth was peopled before the flood — which I despair of ever seeing proved.” Indeed, this view dates much farther back than the comparatively recent time when these, authors lived; for while bishop Patrick himself took the other and commoner view, we find him thus noting in his commentary on ^{<0079>}Genesis 7:19: “There were those anciently (i.e., in the earlier ages), and they have their successors now, who imagined the flood was not universal — ἄλλ' ἐν ᾧ οἱ τότε ἄνθρωποι ἔκουν — but only there where men then dwelt; as the author of the *Questiones ad Orthodoxos* tells us, Quaest. 34.” It is certain, therefore, that this is not a question between scientific naturalists on the one side, and men of simple faith in Scripture on the other. Apart from the cultivation or the discoveries of science, we have two classes of interpreters of Scripture, one of which find no reason to believe in more than a restricted universality, while the other press the language to its farthest possible extent — take it, not as descriptive of God’s judgment upon the earth, in so far merely as it was occupied by men, but with reference to the globe at large, and to an event in its natural history. See Offerhaus, *De diluvio Noetico* (Franeck. 1694); Hardt, *Historia diluvii Noachi* (Helmst. 1728); Diecke, *Ueber die Sundfluth* (St. Gall, 1861); Rendell, *History of the Flood* (Lond. 1851, 1864). **SEE DELUGE.**

Floor

(ἄρβυλοῦ; ἄλων), prop. a level or open *area* (as the “place” or *square* around the gates of Oriental cities, ^{<1220>}1 Kings 22:10; ^{<480>}2 Chronicles 18:9); hence usually the spot, well-beaten and smooth, on which grain is trodden out by cattle in the East, i.e., the “barn-floor”, or “threshing-floor.” **SEE THRESHING.** For the floor of rooms, **SEE HOUSE**; for that of court-yards, **SEE PAVEMENT.**