

729. Faith and Works, Luther on

SOURCE: Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 74–76. Copyright © 1958 by Rutgers, The State University. Used by permission.

[p. 74] “The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:17). For the Word of God cannot be received and honored by any works, but by faith alone. Hence it is clear that, as the soul needs the Word alone for life and justification, so it is justified by faith alone and not by any works. For if it could be justified by any other means, it would have no need of the Word, nor consequently of faith...

The first care of every Christian ought to be, to lay aside all reliance on works, and strengthen his faith alone more and more, and by it grow in the knowledge, not of works, but of Christ Jesus, who has suffered and risen again for him; as Peter teaches, when he makes no other work to be a Christian one. Thus Christ, when the Jews asked Him what they should do that they might work the works of God, rejected the multitude of works, with which He saw that they were puffed up, and commanded them one thing only, saying: “This [p. 75] is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom He hath sent, for him hath God the Father sealed” (John 6:27, 29)...

But you ask how it can be the fact that faith alone justifies, and affords without works so great a treasure of good things, when so many works, ceremonies, and laws are prescribed to us in the Scriptures. I answer: Before all things bear in mind what I have said, that faith alone without works justifies, sets free, and saves.

And now let us turn to the other part, to the outward man. Here we shall give an answer to all those who, taking offense at the word of faith and at what I have asserted, say: “If faith does everything, and by itself suffices for justification, why then are good works commanded? Are we then to take our ease and do no works, content with faith?” Not so, impious men, I reply; not so. That would indeed really be the case, if we were thoroughly and completely inner and spiritual [p. 76] persons; but that will not happen until the last day, when the dead shall be raised. As long as we live in the flesh, we are but beginning and making advances in that which shall be completed in a future life. On this account the Apostle calls that which we have in this life, the first fruits of the Spirit (Rom. 8:23). In future we shall have the tenths, and the fullness of the Spirit. To this part belongs the fact I have stated before, that the Christian is the servant of all and subject to all. For in that part in which he is free, he does not works, but in that in which he is a servant, he does all works. Let us see on what principle this is so...

True are these two sayings: Good works do not make a good man, but a good man does good works. Bad works do not make a bad man, but a bad man does bad works. Thus it is always necessary that the substance or person should be good before any good works can be done, and that good works should follow and proceed from a good person. As Christ says: “A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit” (Matt. 7:18). Now it is clear that the fruit does not bear the tree, nor does the tree grow on the fruit; but, on the contrary, the trees bear the fruit and the fruit grows on the trees...

Here is the truly Christian life; here is faith really working by love; when a man applies himself with joy and love to the works of that freest servitude, in which he serves other voluntarily and for naught; himself abundantly satisfied in the fullness and riches of his own faith.

730. Falling of Stars (1833), Astronomer’s Eyewitness Description of

SOURCE: Denison Olmsted, "Observations on the Meteors of November 13th, 1833," *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, 25 ([Jan.?] 1834), 363, 365, 366, 386, 393, 394.

[p. 363] The morning of November 13th, 1833, was rendered memorable by an exhibition of the phenomenon called SHOOTING STARS, which was probably more extensive and magnificent than any similar one hitherto recorded...

Probably no celestial phenomenon has ever occurred in this country, since its first settlement, which was viewed with so much admiration and delight by one class of spectators, or with so much astonishment and fear by another class...

[p. 365] The reader may imagine a constant succession of fire balls, resembling sky rockets, radiating in all directions from a point in the heavens, a few degrees south—east of the zenith, and following the arch of the sky towards the horizon... The balls, as they travelled down the vault, usually left after them a vivid streak of light, and just before they disappeared, exploded, or suddenly resolved themselves into smoke. No report or noise of any kind was observed, although we listened attentively...

The spectator was presented with meteors of various sizes and degrees of splendor: some were mere points, but others were larger and brighter than Jupiter or Venus; and one, seen by a credible witness before the writer was called, was judged to be nearly as large as the moon. The flashes of light, although less intense than lightning, were so bright as to awaken people in their beds. One ball that shot off in the northwest direction, and exploded a little northward of the star Capella, left, just behind the place of explosion, a phosphorescent train of peculiar beauty...

[p. 386] The meteors began to attract notice by their unusual frequency or brilliancy, from *nine to twelve o'clock* in the evening, were most striking in their appearance, from *two to five*, arrived at their maximum, in many places, about *four o'clock*, and continued till rendered invisible by the light of day...

[p. 393] The meteors moved either in right lines, or in such apparent curves as, upon optical principles, can be resolved into right lines...

[p. 394] The meteors, as seen by most observers, appeared to proceed from a fixed point in the heavens... Those who marked its position among the fixed stars, observed it to be in the constellation Leo, in which it appeared stationary, accompanying that constellation in its diurnal progress.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Olmsted's characterization of the 1833 shower as the most magnificent hitherto recorded is still true, for no shower has equaled it since. Fisher in 1934 said it was "the most magnificent meteor shower on record" (W. J. Fisher, "The Ancient Leonids," *The Telescope*, 1 [October, 1934], 83).]

731. Falling of Stars (1833)—a Billion Shooting Stars

SOURCE: Peter M. Millman, "The Falling of the Stars," *The Telescope*, 7 (May–June, 1940), 57.

To understand the use of the word shower in connection with shooting stars we must go back to the early morning hours of Nov. 13, 1833, when the inhabitants of this continent [of North America] were in fact treated to one of the most spectacular natural displays that the night sky has produced. This was a real shower of shooting stars in every sense of the word [see No. 742n]. For nearly four hours the sky was literally ablaze... [Careful scientific accounts indicate that] more than a billion shooting stars appeared over the United States and Canada alone.

732. Falling of Stars (1833), Described as "Stars Falling"

SOURCE: W. J. Fisher, "The Ancient Leonids," *The Telescope*, 1 (October, 1934), 79, 80.

[p. 79] In the early morning of November 13, 1833, the people of the United States were waked by early risers to turn out and see the stars fall. And fall they did—silently,

singly, in bursts and sheaves, tiny [p. 80] ones and balls like the moon. All the observers saw that the meteors darted away from a single point in the sky; the meteors “were like the ribs of a gigantic umbrella.”

733. Falling of Stars (1833)—Extent of Shower

SOURCE: Denison Olmsted, *Letters on Astronomy, Addressed to a Lady: in Which The Elements of the Science Are Familiarly Explained in Connexion With Its Literary History* (1840 ed.), pp. 348, 349.

[p. 348] The shower [of meteors on Nov. 12–13, 1833] pervaded near- [p. 349] ly the whole of North America, having appeared in nearly equal splendor from the British possessions on the north to the West-India Islands and Mexico on the south, and from sixty-one degrees of longitude east of the American coast, quite to the Pacific Ocean on the west. Throughout this immense region, the duration was nearly the same...

Soon after this remarkable occurrence, it was ascertained that a similar meteoric shower had appeared in 1799, ... on the morning of the twelfth of November; and ... on the morning of the same thirteenth of November, in 1830, 1831, and 1832.

734. Falling of Stars (1833), Like Crab Apples Shaken From Tree

SOURCE: J. T. Buckingham, “The Meteoric Shower,” *The New-England Magazine*, 6 (Jan.–June, 1834), 47, 48.

[p. 47] Neither language, nor the pencil, can adequately picture [p. 48] the grandeur and magnificence of the scene [the meteoric shower of Nov. 13, 1833]... It may be doubted, whether any description has surpassed, in accuracy and impressiveness, that of the old negro in Virginia, who remarked—“It is awful, indeed, sir,—it looked like ripe crab-apples falling from the trees, when shaking them for cider.”

735. Falling of Stars (1833), Observed in California

SOURCE: Robert G. Cleland, *This Reckless Breed of Men*, pp. 292, 293. Copyright 1950 by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 292] The great meteor shower of the night of November 12–13, 1833, ... found Walker’s company camped in the lonely expanse of the San Joaquin Valley, and for hours “the air appeared to be completely thickened with meteors falling toward the earth.” ... The horses tried re- [p. 293] peatedly to stampede; and until Walker explained the nature of the phenomenon, some of the superstitious trappers were probably as panic-stricken as the frantic horses.

736. Falling of Stars (1833), Pictured in American Indian Records

SOURCE: Garrick Mallery, “Picture-Writing of the American Indians,” [U.S.] Bureau of Ethnology, *Tenth Annual Report ... to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1888–’89* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893), p. 723. [FRS No. 103.]

The five winter counts [chronological records in picture writing naming each year (winter) by an outstanding event] next cited all undoubtedly refer to the magnificent meteoric display of the morning of November 13, 1833, which was witnessed throughout North America and which was correctly assigned to the winter corresponding with that of 1833–’34. All of them represent stars having four points, except The-Swan, who draws a globular object followed by a linear track.

<<figure 1219 goes here>>

Fig. 1219.—It rained stars. Cloud-Shield’s Winter Count, 1833–’34. White-Cow-Killer calls it “Plenty-stars winter.”

<<figure 1220 goes here>>

Fig. 1220.—The stars moved around. American-Horse’s Winter Count, 1833–’34 shows one large four-pointed star as the characterizing object and many small stars, also four-pointed.

<<figure 1221 goes here>>

Fig. 1221.—Many stars fell. The-Flame’s Winter Count, 1833–’34. The character shows six stars above the concavity of the moon.

<<figure 1222 goes here>>

Fig. 1222.—Dakotas witnessed magnificent meteoric showers; much terrified. The-Swan’s Winter Count, 1833–’34.

Battiste Good calls it “Storm-of-stars winter,” and gives as the device a tipi with stars falling around it. This is presented in Fig. 1223. The tipi is colored yellow in the original and so represented in the figure according to the heraldic scheme.

737. Falling of Stars (1833)—Prophetic Description Fulfilled

SOURCE: [Henry Dana Ward], in *The New York Journal of Commerce*, Nov. 14 [i.e. 16], 1833, p. [2].

At the cry, “look out of the window,” I sprang from a deep sleep, and with wonder saw the East lighted up with the dawn, and METEORS. . . . I called to my wife to behold; and while robing, she exclaimed: “See how the stars fall” I replied, “That is the wonder;” and we felt in our hearts, that it was a sign of the last days. For, truly, “the stars of heaven fell *unto the earth*, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken by a mighty wind.”—Rev. 6.13 . . . This language of the prophet has always been received as metaphorical. . . . [It] was literally fulfilled in the phenomenon of yesterday, so as no man before yesterday had conceived to be possible that it should be fulfilled. . . . And how did they fall? Neither myself nor one of the family heard any report; and were I to hunt through nature for a simile, I could not find one so apt to illustrate the appearance of the heavens as that which St. John uses in the prophecy, before quoted. “It rained fire” says one.—Another, “it was like a shower of fire.” Another, “it was like the large flakes of falling snow, before a coming storm, or large drops of rain before a shower.” I admit the fitness of these for common accuracy; but they come far short of the accuracy of the figure used by the prophet. “The stars of heaven fell unto the earth;” they were not sheets, or flakes, or drops of fire; but they were what the world understands by the name of “Falling Stars;” and one speaking to his fellow in the midst of the scene, would say; “See how the stars fall;” and he who heard, would not pause to correct the astronomy of the speaker, any more than he would reply, “the sun does not move,” to one who should tell him, “the sun is rising.” The stars fell “Even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind.” Here is the exactness of the prophet. The falling stars did not come, as if from *several* tress shaken, but from *one*: those which appeared in the east fell toward the East; those which appeared in the north fell toward the North; those which appeared in the west fell toward the West; and those which appeared in the south, (for I went out of my residence into the Park,) fell toward the South; and they fell, not as the *ripe* fruit falls. Far from it. But they *flew*, they WERE CAST, like the unripe fruit, which at first refuses to leave the branch; and, when it does break its hold, flies swiftly, *strait off*, descending; and in the multitude falling some cross the track of others, as they are thrown with more or less force. Such was the appearance of the above phenomenon to the inmates of my house. I walked into the Park with two gentlemen of Pearl Street, feeling and confessing that, this scene had never been figured to our minds by any book or mortal, save only by the prophet.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract is taken from the semiweekly edition, dated Saturday morning, Nov. 14, but Saturday was 16th, and page 2 (probably from the daily) is dated the 15th. Henry Dana Ward, an Episcopal minister, who later became an associate of William Miller (see Millerites), is identified as the author of the extract in the Millerite journal *Signs of the Times*, 6 (Oct. 11, 1843), 62, 63.]

738. Falling of Stars (1833) Regarded as Forerunner of the Last Day

SOURCE: *The Portland [Maine] Advertiser* (semiweekly ed.), Nov. 29, 1833, p. 2 (col. 1, dated Nov. 27), quoting *The Old Countryman* as reprinted in the New York Star.

Old Countryman, published in that city [New York], ... is a weekly paper, heretofore devoted to English news—to “flash, frolic and fun;” a kind of sporting chronicle, but the editor [Henry J. Pickering] has turned from “his flash, frolic and fun,” and prognosticates seriously as follows:—

We pronounce the Raining Fire which we saw on Wednesday morning last an awful *type*—a sure forerunner—a merciful sign of that great and dreadful day which the inhabitants of the earth will witness when the SIXTH SEAL SHALL BE OPENED.

That time is just at hand—described not only in the *New Testament* but in the *Old*; and a more correct picture of a *fig tree casting its leaves when blown by a mighty wind*, it was not possible to behold...

Many things *now* occurring upon the earth tend to convince us that we are in the *latter days*. This exhibition we deem to be a type of an awful day fast hurrying upon us. This is our sincere opinion; and what we think we are not ashamed to tell.

739. Falling Stars (1833), Regarded as Sign of Second Advent

SOURCE: Frederick Douglass, *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (New York: Pathway Press, 1941), p. 117. (Original edition 1855.)

I witnessed this gorgeous spectacle, and was awe-struck. The air seemed filled with bright descending messengers from the sky. It was about daybreak when I saw this sublime scene. I was not without the suggestion, at the moment, that it might be the harbinger of the coming of the Son of Man; and in my then state of mind I was prepared to hail Him as my friend and deliver. I had read that the “stars shall fall from heaven,” and they were now falling. I was suffering very much in my mind... I was looking away to heaven for the rest denied me on earth.

740. Falling of Stars (1833), Seen as Shower From Meteor Swarm With a Period of 33 Years

SOURCE: W. J. Fisher, “The Ancient Leonids.” *The Telescope*, 1 (October, 1934), 80–82, 84.

[p. 80] Among the widespread multitudes who turned out in the small hours [of Nov. 13, 1833, to “see the stars fall”] there were some scientific observers, who saw not only the divergence point (known since then as the radiant of those meteors), but also noted that it rose as the hours passed, remaining fixed in the Sickle of the constellation Leo. One of these scientific men, Professor Denison Olmsted of Yale College, collected all the observations, qualitative and quantitative, that press reports and correspondence could bring in, to make a paper for the *American Journal of Science*. This paper [see No. 730] was the beginning of meteoric astronomy, and the radiant was its capital discovery. This radiant Olmsted interpreted to mean that the fiery paths of the meteors were really parallel lines in the high atmosphere...

[p. 81] Since the radiant of the November shower is in Leo, we call them [these meteors] Leonids. Also it was immediately noted that brilliant meteor showers had been observed in Europe on November 13, 1831, and November 12, 1832; the great traveler von Humboldt had seen one at Cumana in Venezuela on November 12, 1799, and the first government astronomer of the United States, Andrew Ellicott, had seen one in the Florida Straits on the same night. Re- [p. 82] search showed that, like the meteors of 1833, this shower of 1799 was observed over a great range in latitude and longitude, so

that neither was a local phenomenon. Almost the same day of the month in 1833, 1832, 1831, 1799; the widespread areas of observation; and the general observation at widely separated points of identical celestial positions for the radiant of 1833, independent of the hour—these facts urged upon all minds that here was a new realm of planetary astronomy, that we had the sun, the planets, the comets, the asteroids, and now the innumerable little meteors and their swarms as members of the solar system...

[H. A. Newton of Yale] collected all available reports of star showers, and reduced their apparitions to the sidereal year of 1850. He found ... thirteen dates, from 902 A.D. to 1833 A.D., agreeing with November 11–14, 1850—our Leonids... [p. 84] Newton deduced that the cycle of the Leonids is 33.25 years.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The question has often been asked: How can an event in nature, especially a recurrent one, be regarded as a sign, or fulfillment of prophecy? In the columns of the *Review and Herald* a century ago (Jan. 29, 1861, p. 84) Uriah Smith editorially commented that an event can be identified as such when it notably fulfills the specifications of the prophecy at the time predicted, regardless of the number of occurrences at other times. He gave this explanation again, in regard to the darkening of the sun, in an editorial of May 23, 1878, p. 164. See No. 571n, where reference is made to later articles by other writers setting forth the view that the "what" and "when" of fulfillment outweigh the "how" and "how many." Some of these writers also contended that the validity of the "signs" (plural) is even strengthened by their repetition and distribution over various parts of the world. They cite as an example the unprecedented series of notable Leonid star showers, which included those seen in 1799 in South America and in 1832 and 1866 in Europe and parts of Asia and Africa, in addition to those seen in 1833 and 1867 in North America. The peak of this series was the incomparable shower of 1833.]

741. Falling of Stars (1833)—Subsequent Returns of Same Meteor Swarm, Then Shift of Orbit Away From Earth

SOURCE: James C. Hickey, *Introducing the Universe* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1952), pp. 85, 86. Used by permission of the publishers and Dodd, Mead & Company, New York.

[p. 85] Not until 1833 was it proved that meteors in general—those that vanish after a brief flash as well as those that reach the earth only partially consumed—had a cosmical origin, though observations by two German students, Brandes and Benzenberg, had suggested this as early as 1798. On November 12 [–13], 1833, there occurred a shower of shooting stars which startled observers over a wide area in the Americas and brought stark fright to thousands. The meteors fell so thickly that they were likened to snowflakes in a storm. Several careful watchers noted that they seemed to radiate from a point in the constellation of Leo. It was soon proved that this radiant was the direction in space from which the meteors came. They travelled in parallel lines, the apparent spreading being an effect of perspective. If the radiant had been a point in the atmosphere, its position would have changed when seen from widely separated stations. It did not change, therefore the meteors must come from outside the atmosphere. Because the radiant was in Leo the meteors were soon called Leonids.

Examination of records showed that unusual displays of mid-November meteors had occurred at intervals of about thirty-three years. Astronomers concluded that the particles which caused these showers travelled about the sun in a broad elliptical path extending out beyond the orbit of Uranus. Meteors are strung all along this track, but in one place there is a great swarm of them. The earth crosses the track annually in November and always gathers in a few Leonids; about three times in a century it used to encounter the main swarm.

On the basis of historical research and theoretical work it was confidently predicted that there would be another great Leonid display in 1866. Europe did have a shower in

November of that year, but it was less brilliant than the one of 1833. In 1867 another display was seen in the United States. The reason why showers occurred in two successive years was that the Leonid swarm was of such great length that it took more than twelve months to cross the earth's orbit, so our globe had an opportunity to plough through it twice.

There were great hopes for 1900, but to the intense disappointment of astronomers nothing happened that year. In 1901 there was a fair showing, but it was far below expectations. The mathematicians sharpened their pencils and went to work on the problem. They decided that the main swarm of the Leonids had been switched off its old course by the gravitational attraction of Jupiter, Saturn and Uranus, so that it no longer crossed the orbit of the earth. They were confirmed in this opinion when the Novembers of 1933 and 1934 passed with no display worthy to be called a shower. Such is the story of the lost Leonids.

742. Falling of Stars (1833), Unmatched by Later Meteor Showers

SOURCE: Peter M. Millman, "The Falling of the Stars," *The Telescope*, 7 (May-June, 1940), 60.

Shower	Meteors per hour One Observer	Average distance Between Individual Particles
Leonids, 1833	60,000	20 miles
" 1866	6,000	45 "
" 1931	80	200 "
Andromedes, 1872	4,000	35 "
" 1855	12,000	25 "
Giacobinids, 1933	15,000	25 "
Perseids [average year]	50	200 "
Average night [no shower]	10	400 "

[EDITORS' NOTE: A meteor "shower" is not necessarily a spectacular tempest of falling stars like the incomparable one of 1833. Millman explains that in ordinary usage it means any fall of meteors, regardless of numbers, encountered as the earth intercepts one of the numerous swarms of meteoric particles that travel in orbits around the sun (p. 59). Shower meteors are characterized by (1) the appearance of radiating from a single area in the sky, (2) occurrence on the same date (or several successive days) each year, and (3) speed and color characteristic of the particular shower—the swifter meteors being hotter, and therefore brighter, than those of slower swarms (Reginald L. Waterfield, *A Hundred Years of Astronomy*, p. 475).]

743. Falling of Stars (1866)—Return of Leonid Meteors Seen in Beirut

SOURCE: Henry Harris Jessup, *Fifty-Three Years in Syria*, Vol. 1, pp. 316, 317. Copyright 1910 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 316] On the morning of the 14th [of November, 1866, at Beirut, Lebanon], at three o'clock, I was roused from a deep sleep by the voice of one of our young men calling: "The stars are all coming down." ... The meteors poured down like a rain of fire. Many of them were large and vari-coloured, and left behind them [p. 317] a long train of fire.

One immense green meteor came down over Lebanon seeming as large as the moon, and exploded with a loud noise, leaving a green pillar of light in its train. It vain to attempt to count them and the display continued until the dawn when their light was obscured by the King of Day... The Mohammedans gave the call to prayer from the minarets, and the common people were in terror.

744. Falling of Stars (1866)—Return of Leonid Meteors Seen in England

SOURCE: *The Times* (London), Nov. 15, 1866, p. 8.

In the night between Tuesday and yesterday they who chose to watch, and were not discouraged by the doubts of astronomers, were rewarded with a spectacle which cannot be imagined or forgotten... First one meteor then another shot across the sky... Then they appeared faster than he [the spectator] could count them... Some struck the sight, like sparks from a forge, everywhere at once. Some seemed to fall, over trees or houses, bright to the last, but with the ruddy hues of the lower atmosphere. Look where we would it was the same... The heavens seemed alive with this unwonted host. There were times when it seemed as if a mighty wind had caught the old stars, loosed them from their holdings, and swept them across the firmament. The OLYMPIAN [Jove] Himself might have been supposed on his throne launching his bolts against an offending or forgetful world.

745. Falling of Stars (1899 and 1933 Leonids), Hit-and-miss Recurrence of Leonids

SOURCE: Reginald L. Waterfield, *A Hundred Years of Astronomy* (London: Duckworth, 1938), pp. 474, 475. Used by permission.

[p. 474] In 1899 an unfortunate thing happened. An astronomical prediction to which the press had given the widest publicity completely failed to come off... The expected event was the return of the great shooting star shower of 1833 and 1866. Records of many of its returns at this same interval had been traced back to A.D. 902 and there had seemed no reason to suppose that it should now suddenly fail. It is true that Johnstone Stoney and A. M. W. Downing, Superintendent of the Nautical Almanac Office, had realized the possibility of disappointment and issued a warning to that effect... It appeared from the investigations of these authors that the portion of the swarm we had traversed in 1866 had in the meantime suffered considerable deflection at the hands of Saturn and Jupiter. But whether on this account the shower would fail to materialize, would clearly depend on the volume of space which the main swarm occupied—a point on which there was complete ignorance.

Since the disaster of 1899 astronomers have approached the prediction of shooting star showers with greater humility...

[In 1933 the orbit of the swarm] had again been deflected by the planets, so that it once more lay close to the earth's orbit. But as there was a considerable interval between the arrival of the swarm and the arrival of the earth at the crossing point, it was impossible to say whether a super-display of shooting stars would occur: everything would depend on the unknown extension of the swarm. Actually the November shower of 1933 and of the years preceding and following it were only slightly above the [annual] average. There is, however, no reason to suppose that the swarm, which for upwards of a thousand years has periodically terrified or delighted humanity, has worn itself out. It is

simply a question of “hit or miss”; and though we [p. 475] *missed* the last two times, we may have better luck in 1966 or 1999.

746. Falling of Stars (1899 and 1932 Leonids)—Return Showers

Unpredictable

SOURCE: Fletcher G[uard] Watson, *Between the Planets* (rev. ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 95–97. Copyright 1941, 1956 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 95] This great display [of November 12–13, 1833] and the others that occur from time to time present some of the most interesting but tantalizing information we have about the occupants of interplanetary space. We know nothing of these [swarms of particles] . . . until we collide with them and have a great meteor shower. Even afterward we cannot accurately trace their paths through space to predict when we may encounter them again, for when between the planets they are invisible to us. The earth is playing a game of cosmic blindman’s buff with them; only if by chance we meet one of these swarms of particles does a brilliant meteor shower result, otherwise we go swinging around the sun, completely ignorant of where or how the meteor swarms are moving. . . .

[p. 96] Astronomers and laymen alike were anticipating [in the 1899 return of the Leonid meteors] the greatest display of celestial fireworks of their lives. Alas! they were disappointed. Between 1866 and 1899 the meteors passed near both Saturn and Jupiter; these planets pulled the particles aside so that the earth passed through only the fringes of the swarm. As 1932 approached and the possibility of another shower was apparent, [p. 97] many people hoped that some perturbation had swung the particles into their previous orbit. As in 1899, the meteors came at the rate of one a minute, but compared to the earlier displays this was disappointing. It is not likely that we shall again witness great displays from this stream. The earth is a mere speck in space, which the meteors can easily pass without striking. The chances that as the perturbations change the meteors’ orbit they will again collide with the earth are about equal to the chance that a searchlight capriciously playing over a crowd will again shine on a particular person.

747. Famine, in Syria in Reign of Claudius

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* ii. 8; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 127. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Caius had not completed four years of sovereignty when Claudius succeeded him as Emperor. In his time famine seized the world (and this also writers with a purpose quite other than ours have recorded in their histories), and so what the prophet Agabus had foretold, according to the Acts of the Apostles, that a famine would be over the whole world, received fulfillment.

748. Fasting, in Lent, Differing Customs of

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 131.

The fasts before Easter will be found to be differently observed among different people. . . . Some wholly abstain from things that have life: others feed on fish only of all living creatures: many together with fish, eat fowl also, saying that according to Moses, these were likewise made out of the waters. Some abstain from eggs, and all kinds of fruits: others partake of dry bread only; still others eat not even this: while others having fasted till the ninth hour, afterwards take any sort of food without distinction. And among various nations there are other usages, for which innumerable reasons are assigned.

749. Federated Churches

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 689–691.

[p. 689] *History*. The Federated Church represents one of the forms under which two or more churches in a community have united for the joint prosecution of their work. The organization of united churches of the various types in rural and village communities is an interesting phase of religious development upon which some light is thrown by the census of religious bodies. The consolidation of church activities in places where the maintenance of two or more churches was found to be impracticable, or at least ineffective, is due largely to two factors, namely, the changes that are taking place in the ideals of church service and changes in local economic conditions.

While at one time in the development of the church denominational rivalries were so intense as to preclude organic union on any basis, today less emphasis is placed on ancient creeds and other historic causes of separation. Further- [p. 690] more, the conviction is growing among all denominations that the message of the gospel is in part social, as well as individual.

This change is well expressed by a modern church historian: “Not a rescue by individual salvation only, but the establishment of a reign of righteousness among men, has become increasingly the ideal ***. Emphasis is therefore placed on service in preventative and reformatory effort.” This ideal makes possible the union of two or more churches under certain circumstances, where a narrow adherence to creeds might widely separate them.

Changing economic conditions have fostered the new attitude, especially in the rural regions. The outlook of country people has been broadened by the enlarged opportunities afforded by better transportation facilities, consolidated schools, rural free delivery of mail, and the increased use of the telephone and radio. Not the least of the factors contributing toward this closer relationship is the campaign of education in community spirit which has been conducted by various social welfare agencies.

When, therefore, by reason of changes occasioned by the flow of population from country to city, reduced local economic prosperity, or increased cost of church maintenance, an organized religious body becomes too weak to be effective, union with another local church in like circumstances seems the natural and logical step. The result has been the rise of the united churches in various forms.

In 1906 and 1916 these churches were included, without discrimination, in the data for Independent Churches. However, in 1926, a definite segregation was made and the Federated Churches were given separate presentation.

As here used, the term “united church” indicates a church whose membership, either regular or associate, is composed of elements representing different denominations, the elements in some cases being organized churches and in others individuals. The four types or groups of united churches found in the United States, as reported to the Census of Religious Bodies, in the order of their importance, are:

1. *Denominational united*, a type in which one or more of the uniting churches has given up its denominational allegiance in order to merge with another church and has accepted the denominational connection with the other.
2. *Federated*, a type in which each of the combining units retains its connection with its own denominational body.

3. *Undenominational*, a type in which union results in an organized church not connected with any denominational body.
4. *Affiliated*, a type resembling the undenominational church in control of its local affairs, but having an attenuated connection with a denominational body, usually for ministerial supply and distribution of benevolences only.

first and fourth groups are more or less closely identified with their denominations, their statistics have been included in the denominational totals. The third, or undenominational group, has been included in the statistics for Independent Churches.

erated Churches, however, since each maintains relations with more than one of the established denominations, cannot well be consolidated with any denominational group, and they are therefore given independent presentation in this report. There is further reason for making these churches the subject of a special presentation in that the federation of churches is of particular interest as affording a solution to a vexing problem—the problem of what to do with those churches in a rural group which are too weak to be efficient and yet are staunchly loyal to their denominations.

The term “community church” is not employed as a classifying term in the census reports, because a study of the word disclosed that its use was ambiguous, more than half a dozen different usages being noted. The same diversity in use was found in regard to the term “union church.”

Federated Churches are those made up of two or more denominational organizations, each maintaining a separate membership and perhaps some separate activities. The Federated Church acts as one body, however, in the holding of religious services and, usually, in the maintenance of a Sunday school and in most or all social activities. The different denominational units of which the Federated Church is composed are closely identified with their respective denominations, not only by retention of their distinctive membership, but also by the common practice in each unit of recognizing its missionary obligations and sending to its own denominational board contributions for home and foreign missions, etc., and [p. 691] of keeping such property as it may own in the hands of its own trustees. They are united for local purposes only, in calling and paying a minister, in the holding of services, and in maintaining a common Sunday school. The distinguishing characteristics of this type of church are, therefore, that the two or more units enter into an agreement to conduct most of their activities as a single church, but to preserve the organic integrity of each denominational group.

The first Federated Church is said to have been formed in Massachusetts in 1887. Its formation appears to have been due to economic pressure, as the two churches which united were unable to finance their operations separately and made the experiment of joining for local activities. The experiment proved successful.

Church leaders who were alarmed at the overchurched situation in the rural sections of New England were quick to recognize the possibilities of this type of united church and not only lent their influence to prevent the organization of additional competing churches, but actively cooperated in the formation of Federated Churches. In fact, it is stated that the first Federated Church in Vermont, organized in 1899, was formed at the suggestion of denominational leaders. Both official and local leadership have played important parts in the organizing of this type of church, but it is probable that local necessity and a deeper sense of the church's responsibility for its immediate environment have been the determining factors in a majority of cases.

Federated Churches were formed at first only in New England, but by the year 1912 they had spread to many other parts of the country. The schedules returned for the 1936 census show 508 Federated Churches, located in 42 States of the Union. Of the total number reporting, 244, or 48 percent, were found in New England and the Middle Atlantic States, and 184, or 36.2 percent, in the North Central States. Thirty-three such churches were located in the Pacific States, while 26 were in the South and 21 in the Mountain States.

Of the whole number, only 82 churches, or less than 17 percent, were reported as being located in urban territory, which includes all cities or incorporated places having 2,500 inhabitants or more in 1930, while 426 churches, or more than 83 percent, were in rural territory, which comprises the remainder of the country.

Doctrine. Each unit, or constituent part, of the Federated Church retains in its entirety the doctrine of the denominational body to which it adheres; and the membership requirements of each unit correspond exactly to those of the denomination.

Organization. In order to function as a single body, the Federated Church has, besides officials of the ordinary church of the denominational type, a joint committee which is in charge of the general activities of the church. This committee is generally representative of the units comprising the church, although in some churches it is selected without reference to such representation. Frequently important officers, such as elders and deacons, are chosen by the units separately.

In many Federated Churches the minister is chosen alternately from the different denominations represented by the units constituting the church; in others there is an agreement to procure the minister from one denomination only; while still others agree to disregard the denomination of the minister in making a choice.

Sunday schools are generally held in common. Of the 508 Federated Churches reporting to the Census Bureau, 484 reported Sunday schools, which were almost always held jointly.

The great majority of the churches have two denominational units only, as, for example, a Congregational unit and a Methodist unit. About 10 percent of the total number have three denominational units, but the churches composed of more than three such units are comparatively few.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1936), 88,411 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 254).]

750. Flood, Babylonian Account of, in Gilgamesh Epic

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 68, 70, 71. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 68] The next great mythological text to be described is that generally known as the Epic of Gilgamesh. This also, like the Enuma Elish, has had a long literary history, and its Akkadian form, which rests upon Sumerian sources, may be assigned to the beginning of the second millennium B.C. The poem consists of twelve tablets, some of which are in a fragmentary condition; the best-preserved is the eleventh tablet containing the well-known Babylonian version of the Flood myth...

[p. 70] The death of Enkidu causes Gilgamesh to set out on the quest for some way of escaping his friend's fate and avoiding the terrible doom of death. According to ancient tradition the only mortal who had been granted the gift of immortality by the gods was his ancestor Utnapishtim, the sole survivor of the Flood. Gilgamesh now determines to find Utnapishtim and learn from him the secret of immortality. Tablets IX to XI contain

the account of the adventures which befell Gilgamesh on his perilous journey in search of Utnapishtim...

Thus Gilgamesh arrives at last at 'the mouth of the rivers', the place which the gods had assigned to Utnapishtim and his wife for their eternal dwelling; he lays before his ancestor the object of his quest and asks how he had acquired the gift of immortality. In answer, Utnapishtim relates to him the story of the Flood, and it should be noted here that the Assyrian version which has become the standard form of the myth differs in many details from what we know of the earlier [p. 71] Sumerian version which is connected with the creation myth. Utnapishtim tells Gilgamesh that when he dwelt in the ancient city of Shurippak the gods decided to destroy mankind by a flood [see No. 751]. The plan was supposed to be secret, but Ea, being friendly to mankind, revealed the secret by repeating the words of the gods to the reed-hut, which passed them on to Utnapishtim. Acting on Ea's instructions Utnapishtim built a ship of strange shape and dimensions, for it would seem to have been a perfect cube; it had six decks, and its floor plan was divided into nine parts; but it is possible that the measurements relate to the hold of the ship.

Some scholars have held that in shape the ship was like a giant *kuffah*, or circular boat such as has been used for transport on the Euphrates from time immemorial. Utnapishtim gathered into the ship his possessions, his family, and all kinds of cattle and wild beasts. The Flood lasted seven days, till 'all of mankind had returned to clay'. The ship grounded on Mt. Nisir, and after waiting seven days Utnapishtim sent out in succession a dove, a swallow, and a raven. When the raven did not return Utnapishtim opened the ship and let out all its living freight; he then offered sacrifices, and we are told that the gods smelled the savour of the sacrifices and gathered like flies about the sacrificer.

Then follows a description of the scene in the assembly of the gods, where Ishtar laments the destruction of her people, and blames Enlil for the Flood; she swears by her necklace of lapis never to forget the days of the Flood. Enlil is enraged at the escape of some of mankind, and accuses Ea of having betrayed the secret of the gods. Ea appeases Enlil, and Enlil then declares that Utnapishtim and his wife shall be like the gods and live for ever at the mouth of the rivers. Here ends Utnapishtim's story of the Flood; he then goes on to tell Gilgamesh that his quest is hopeless, and shows him that he cannot even contend with sleep, how much less with death. The circumstances under which Utnapishtim had been granted immortality are unique and cannot be repeated.

751. Flood, a Babylonian Account of, in Gilgamesh Epic (Text)

SOURCE: Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (2d. ed., 1954), pp. 1, 13–15, 80–88. Copyright 1949 by The University of Chicago. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 1] The Gilgamesh Epic, The longest and most beautiful Babylonian poem yet discovered in the mounds of the Tigro-Euphrates region, ranks among the great literary masterpieces of mankind. It is one of the principal heroic tales of antiquity and may well be called the *Odyssey* of the Babylonians...

[p. 13] It has long been recognized that the Gilgamesh Epic constitutes a literary compilation of material from various originally unrelated sources, put together to form one grand, more or less harmonious, whole...

[p. 14] When this process of compilation began, and when the "first edition" of the Gilgamesh Epic appeared, cannot be stated with [p. 15] certainty. The tablets of the Ninevite recension, which forms the main base of our knowledge of the epic, date from

the reign of Ashurbanipal, i.e., from the seventh century B.C.; the fragment from the city of Ashur is probably two or three hundred years older; while the pieces discovered at Hattusas belong approximately to the middle of the second millennium B.C. The oldest portions of the epic are the Meissner fragment and the two tablets now in the museums of the University of Pennsylvania and Yale University; these tablets are inscribed in Old Babylonian and therefore go back to the First Babylonian Dynasty. But even these are probably copies of older originals... The date of the composition of the Gilgamesh Epic can therefore be fixed at about 2000 B.C. But the material contained on these tablets is undoubtedly much older, as we can infer from the mere fact that the epic consists of numerous originally independent episodes, which, of course, did not spring into existence at the time of the composition of our poem but must have been current long before they were compiled and woven together to form our epic...

[p. 80; Extract from Tablet XI]:

8. Utnapishtim said to him, to Gilgamesh:
9. "Gilgamesh, I will reveal unto thee a hidden thing,
10. Namely, a secret of the gods will I tell thee.
11. Shurippak—a city which thou knowest,
12. [And which] is situated [on the bank of] the river Euphrates—
13. That city was (already) old, and the gods were in its midst.
14. (Now) their heart prompted the great gods [to] bring a deluge.
15. [There was (?)] Anu, their father;
16. Warlike Enlil, their counselor;
17. Ninurta, their representative;
18. Ennugi, their vizier;
19. Ninigiku, (that is,) Ea, also sat with them.
20. Their speech he repeated to a reed hut:
21. 'Reed hut, reed hut! Wall, wall!
- [p. 81] 22. Reed hut, hearken! Wall, consider!
23. Man of Shurippak, son of Ubara-Tutu!
24. Tear down (thy) house, build a ship!
25. Abandon (thy) possessions, seek (to save) life!
26. Disregard (thy) goods, and save (thy) life!
27. [Cause to] go up into the ship the seed of all living creatures.
28. The ship which thou shalt build,
29. Its measurements shall be (proportionately)
30. Its width and its length shall be equal.
31. Cover it [li]ke the subterranean waters.'
32. When I understood this, I said to Ea, my lord:
33. '[Behold], my lord, what thou hast thus commanded,
34. [I] will honor (and) carry out.
35. [But what] shall I answer the city, the people, and the elders?'
36. Ea opened his mouth and said,
37. Speaking to me, his servant:
38. 'Thus shalt thou say to them:
39. [I have le]arned that Enlil hates me,
40. That I may no (longer) dwell in yo[ur ci]ty,

41. Nor turn my face to the land of Enlil.
42. [I will therefore g]o down to the *apsû* and dwell with Ea, my [lor]d.
43. [On] you he will (then) rain down plenty;
44. [... of b]irds (?), ... of fishes.
45. [...] harvest-wealth.
46. [In the evening the leader] of the storm(?)
- [p. 82] 47. Will cause a wheat-rain to rain down upon you.'
48. As soon as [the first shimmer of mor]ning beamed forth,
49. The land was gathered [about me].
- 50.–53. (Too fragmentary for translation)
54. The child [brou]ght pitch,
55. (While) the strong brought [whatever else] was needful.
56. On the fifth day [I] laid its framework.
57. One *ikû* was its floor space, one hundred and twenty cubits each was the height of its walls;
58. One hundred and twenty cubits measured each side of its deck.
59. I 'laid the shape' of the outside (and) fashioned it.
60. Six (lower) decks I built into it,
61. (Thus) dividing (it) into seven (stories).
62. Its ground plan I divided into nine (sections).
63. I drove water-stoppers into it.
- [p. 83] 64. I provided punting-poles and stored up a supply.
65. Six *shar* of pitch I poured into the furnace,
66. (And) three *shar* of asphalt [I poured] into it.
67. Three *shar* of oil the basket-carriers brought:
68. Besides a *shar* of oil which the saturation (?) (of the water-stoppers) consumed,
69. Two *shar* of oil [which] the boatman stowed away.
70. Bullocks I slaughtered for [the people];
71. Sheep I killed every day.
72. Must, red wine, oil, and white wine,
73. [I gave] the workmen [to drink] as if it were river water,
74. (So that) they made a feast as on New Year's Day.
75. I [...] ointment I put my hands.
76. [...] ... the ship was completed.
77. Difficult was [the ...].
78. ... above and below.
79. [...] ... its two-thirds.
80. [Whatever I had I] loaded aboard her.
- [p. 84] 81. Whatever I had of silver I loaded aboard her;
82. Whatever I [had] of gold I loaded aboard her;
83. Whatever I had of the seed of all living creatures [I loaded] aboard her.
84. After I had caused all my family and relations to go up into the ship,
85. I caused the game of the field, the beasts of the field, (and) all the craftsmen to go (into it).

86. Shamash set for me a definite time:
87. ‘When the leader of the sto[rm(?)] causes a destructive rain to rain down in the evening,
88. Enter the ship and close thy door.’
89. That definite time arrived:
90. In the evening the leader of the sto[rm(?)] caused a destructive rain to rain down.
91. I viewed the appearance of the weather;
92. The weather was frightful to behold.
93. I entered the ship and closed my door.
94. For the navigation (?) of the ship to the boatman Puzur-Amurri
95. I intrusted the mighty structure with its goods.
96. As soon as the first shimmer of morning beamed forth,
97. A black cloud came up from out the horizon.
98. Adad thunders within it,
99. While Shullat and Hanish go before,
100. Coming as heralds over hill and plain;
101. Irragal pulls out the mooring posts;
102. Ninurta comes along (and) causes the dikes to give way;
[p. 85] 103. The Anunnaki raised (their) torches,
104. Lighting up the land with their brightness;
105. The raging of Adad reached unto heaven
106. (And) turned into darkness all that was light.
107. [...] the land he broke (?) like a po[t (?)].
108. (For) one day the tem[pest blew].
109. Fast it blew and [...].
110. Like a battle [it ca]me over the p[eople].
111. No man could see his fellow.
112. The people could not be recognized from heaven.
113. (Even) the gods were terror-stricken at the deluge.
114. They fled (and) ascended to the heaven of Anu;
115. The gods cowered like dogs (and) crouched in distress (?).
116. Ishtar cried out like a woman in travail;
117. The lovely-voiced Lady of the g[ods] lamented:
118. ‘In truth, the olden time has turned to clay,
119. Because I commanded evil in the assembly of the gods!
120. How could I command (such) evil in the assembly of the gods!
121. (How) could I command war to destroy my people,
122. (For) it is I who bring forth (these) my people!
123. Like the spawn of fish they (now) fill the sea!’
124. The Anunnaki-gods wept with her;
125. The gods sat bowed (and) weeping.
126. Covered were their lips ...
127. Six days and [six] nights
128. The wind blew, the downpour, the tempest, (and) the flo[od] overwhelmed the land.
129. When the seventh day arrived, the tempest, the flood,
130. Which had fought like an army, subsided in (its) onslaught.

- [p. 86] 131. The sea grew quiet, the storm abated, the flood ceased.
135. I opened a window, and light fell upon my face.¹⁹² [Note 192: On the transposition of this line see Schott in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, XLII, 139–40.]
132. I looked upon the sea, (all) was silence,
133. And all mankind had turned to clay;
134. The ... was as level as a (flat) roof.
136. I bowed, sat down, and wept,
137. My tears running down over my face.
138. I looked in (all) directions for the boundaries of the sea.
139. At (a distance of) twelve (double-hours) there emerged a stretch of land.
140. On Mount Nisir the ship landed.
141. Mount Nisir held the ship fast and did not let (it) move.
142. One day, a second day Mount Nisir held the ship fast and did not let (it) move.
143. A third day, a fourth day Mount Nisir held the ship fast and did not let (it) move.
144. A fifth day, a sixth day Mount Nisir held the ship fast and did not let (it) move.
145. When the seventh day arrived,
146. I sent forth a dove and let (her) go.
147. The dove went away and came back to me;
148. There was no resting-place, and so she returned.
149. (Then) I sent forth a swallow and let (her) go.
150. The swallow went away and came back to me;
151. There was no resting-place, and so she returned.
152. (Then) I sent forth a raven and let (her) go.
153. The raven went away, and when she saw that the waters had abated,
[p. 87] 154. She ate, she flew about, she cawed, (and) did not return.
155. (Then) I sent forth (everything) to the four winds and offered a sacrifice.
156. I poured out a libation on the peak of the mountain.
157. Seven and (yet) seven kettles I set up.
158. Under them I heaped up (sweet) cane, cedar, and myrtle.
159. The gods smelled the savor,
160. The gods smelled the sweet savor.
161. The gods gathered like flies over the sacrificer.
162. As soon as the great goddess arrived,
163. She lifted up the great jewels which Anu had made according to her wish:
164. ‘O ye gods here present, as surely as I shall not forget the lapis lazuli on my neck,
165. I shall remember these days and shall not forget (them) ever!
166. Let the gods come near to the offering;
167. (But) Enlil shall not come near to the offering.
168. Because without reflection he brought on the deluge
169. And consigned my people to destruction!’
170. As soon as Enlil arrived
171. And saw the ship, Enlil was wroth;
172. He was filled with anger against the gods, the Igigi:
173. ‘Has any of the mortals escaped? No man was to live through the destruction!’
174. Ninurta opened his mouth and said, speaking to warrior Enl[il]:
175. ‘Who can plan things without Ea?’

176. For Ea alone understands every matter.’
177. Ea opened his mouth and said, speaking to warrior Enlil:
178. ‘O warrior, thou wisest among the gods!
 [p. 88] 179. How, O how couldst thou without reflection bring on (this) deluge?
180. On the sinner lay his sin; on the transgressor lay his transgression!
181. Let loose, that he shall not be cut off; pull tight, that he may not ge[t (too) loose].
182. Instead of thy sending a deluge, would that a lion had come and diminished mankind!
183. (Or) instead of thy sending a deluge, would that a wolf had come and dim[inished] mankind!
184. (Or) instead of thy sending a deluge, would that a famine had occurred and [destroyed] the land!
185. (Or) instead of thy sending a deluge, would that Irra had come and smitten mankind!
186. (Moreover,) it was not I who revealed the secret of the great gods;
187. (But) to Atrahasis I showed a dream, and so he learned the secret of the gods.
188. And now take counsel concerning him.’
189. Then Enlil went up into the ship.
190. He took my hand and caused me to go aboard.
191. He caused my wife to go aboard (and) to kneel down at my side.
192. Standing between us, he touched our foreheads and blessed us:
193. ‘Hitherto Utnapishtim has been but a man;
194. But now Utnapishtim and his wife shall be like unto us gods.
195. In the distance, at the mouth of the rivers, Utnapishtim shall dwell!’
196. So they took me and caused me to dwell in the distance, at the mouth of the rivers.”

752. Flood—Babylonian Accounts of

SOURCE: John Bright, “Has Archaeology Found Evidence of the Flood?” *BA*, 5 (December, 1942), 60, 61.
 Used by permission.

[p. 60] Most of the diverse traditions of a Deluge have come to us wholly independent of archaeology, collected chiefly through the labors of students of folklore and comparative religion. But our knowledge of the most important of all, the Babylonian (or more properly the Sumerian) we owe almost entirely to archaeology...

1. That the Babylonians had a story of the flood similar [*sic*] in its details to the Genesis story has been known since ancient times through the writings of Berossus. Berossus was a Babylonian of the third century B.C. who composed a history of his own country on the basis of records and traditions at his disposal. Although his actual work has not survived, fragments of it have been quoted in the writings of later Greek historians. Among these fragments is the Babylonian story of the Flood, in which the adventures of the hero, Xisuthrus, are closely parallel to those of the Biblical Noah.
2. It was not, however, until the English excavators at Nineveh in 1853 stumbled upon what turned out to be the palace and library of Assurbanapal (king of Assyria in the seventh century B.C.) that an ancient version of the story was found. Among the many thousands of tablets of every description there was the Gilgamesh Epic, a long poem in

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

twelve tablets, one of which was the Babylonian story of the Deluge. The discovery of this tablet was first announced by George Smith in 1872 and created unprecedented excitement in the scholarly and religious world.

This story bears the closest resemblance, albeit with numerous differences in detail, to Gen. 6–9... [See Nos. 750, 751.] Another fragment of the same story, also found at Nineveh, differs in that the hero is called Atrahasis.

[p. 61] 3. The above account presumably dates from the reign of Assurbanapal (668–626 B.C.) and is thus considerably later than the oldest Hebrew version of the same narrative. But by the end of the last century the discovery of bits of several older versions had forced the conclusion that the text in Assurbanapal's library was but a copy of much more ancient originals [see No. 750]...

How then did the Hebrews in Palestine get their Flood tradition? Two alternatives present themselves. (1) They learned it from the Canaanites in Palestine, who, in turn, learned it from Mesopotamia [*sic*]. While this view has been generally held by scholars, it is becoming increasingly difficult. We now know a great deal about the early traditions of the Canaanites, and as far as we now know they had no tradition anything like this. (2) The second alternative now appears increasingly more probable—the ancestors of the Hebrews in Palestine brought the story with them when they migrated from Mesopotamia in the Patriarchal Age.

The story in Genesis 6–9 is thus but one among many, and is clearly related to yet older traditions. But the most significant thing about it is not its historical antecedents or its archaeological basis. Its actual significance lies in its religious outlook. In Genesis the Flood is not caused by mere chance or the whim of capricious, brawling gods. It is brought about by the One God in whose hands even natural catastrophe is a means of moral judgment. In the Biblical story alone is a relation between the Flood and the moral order of our world clearly drawn.

753. Flood, Babylonian and Hebrew Accounts of—Relationship

SOURCE: Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (2d ed., 1954), pp. 267–269. Copyright 1949 by The University of Chicago. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 267] The arguments which have been advanced in support of the contention that the biblical account rests on Babylonian material are quite indecisive.

Finally, there is a third way of accounting for the analogies between the Hebrew and the Babylonian versions of the deluge, viz., that they revert to a common source of some kind. This source need not at all have sprung from Palestinian soil but may very well have originated in the land of Babylonia, where, indeed, the Book of Genesis localizes the home of postdiluvian mankind (11:1–9) and whence Abraham emigrated to Palestine (11:27–12:5). Such a source is a very distinct possibility, especially since we know that a number of different deluge versions were current in the Tigris-Euphrates area; but for the present, at least, this explanation can be proved as little as the rest...

[p. 268] As in the case of the creation stories, we still do not know how the biblical and Babylonian narratives of the deluge are related historically. The available evidence proves nothing beyond the point that there is a genetic relationship between Genesis and the Babylonian versions. The skeleton is the same in both cases, but the flesh and blood and, above all, the animating spirit are different. It is here that we meet the most far-reaching divergences between the Hebrew and Mesopotamian stories.

The main Babylonian flood legend, in particular, is “steeped in the silliest polytheism,” to quote the words of Dillmann. The gods are divided in their counsel, false to one another and to man; they flee in consternation to the highest heaven and cower like dogs in their distress; they quarrel and lie and gather over the sacrificer like a swarm of hungry flies! In the Babylonian accounts the moral or ethical motive is almost completely absent... At any rate, in the Babylonian stories it is nowhere emphasized that the gods were actuated by moral ideals or that the flood was a divine visitation on human corruption. Rather, considering that the gods were intent on destroying the whole human race without discrimination between the just and the unjust, it is apparent that the gods were prompted more by caprice than by a sense of justice. It is true, the deluge hero was saved by a friendly deity because of his piety; but that was done clandestinely, through trickery, and against the decree of the gods in council.

In the biblical story, on the other hand, the flood is sent by [p. 269] the one omnipotent God, who is just in all his dealings with the children of men, who punishes the impenitent sinner, even if it means the destruction of the world, but who saves the just with his powerful hand and in his own way. In Genesis the deluge is clearly and unmistakably a moral judgment, a forceful illustration of divine justice meting out stern punishment to a “faithless and perverse generation” but delivering the righteous.

754. Flood, Babylonian Story of, and the Old Testament Differences

SOURCE: Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (2d ed., 1954), pp. 224–230. Copyright by The University of Chicago. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 224] The most remarkable parallels between the Old Testament and the Gilgamesh Epic—in fact, the most remarkable parallels between the Old Testament and the entire corpus of cuneiform inscriptions from Mesopotamia—are found in the deluge accounts of the Babylonians and Assyrians, on the one hand, and the Hebrews, on the other. With the study of this material we therefore enter a field which, a priori, should prove most fruitful in our examination of the genetic relationship between the Mesopotamian records and our Old Testament literature. Here, if anywhere, we should expect to find evidence enabling us to decide the question whether any part of the Old Testament has been derived from Babylonian sources...

The Book of Genesis, consonant with Hebrew monotheism, attributes the sending of the deluge to the one and only true God recognized in the Old Testament, while the cuneiform tablets represent a multitude of divinities as engaged in bringing about this fearful catastrophe. In the Sumerian inscription from Nippur it is stated that the deluge was decreed by the assembly of the gods. But their decision, even though evidently approved by all, at least formally, did not receive the wholehearted support of all the divinities of the pantheon...

[p. 225] As the cause for the cataclysm, the Old Testament emphasizes the moral depravity of the human race. Man could have averted this unparalleled destruction of life if he had conformed his ways to the will of his Maker, but instead of that he followed his own inclinations. The whole bent of the thoughts of his heart was never anything but evil. The earth was corrupt before God and was filled with violence because of man, for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth (Gen. 6:1–13).

In the Gilgamesh Epic the reason for the deluge is not nearly so apparent as it is in the Book of Genesis. The opening lines of the flood story contained in the epic state simply that the heart of the great gods prompted them to bring a deluge (Tablet XI:14). From this passage one might get the impression that the flood was due to divine caprice. But

according to Ea's speech toward the close of the account, where he reprimands Enlil for this thoughtless and unjustifiable destruction, the flood was sent because of the sin of man...

[p. 226] In the Book of Genesis the deluge is a righteous retribution for the sins of the ungodly, while pious Noah and his family are spared, with the full knowledge and the express purpose of Him who sent the flood... But in the cuneiform inscriptions the destruction is intended for all alike, for the just as well as for the unjust, without any exception whatsoever... Had it not been for Ea's intervention, Enlil, in his rashness, would have destroyed [p. 227] all human and animal life without discrimination and thus would have defeated the very purpose for which, according to the Babylonian creation stories, mankind and the animals had been created, viz., to supply the wants of the gods. Whether Enlil, like Jupiter in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (i. 250ff.), had planned a new creation of men after the deluge is not indicated in any of the Babylonian flood stories at our disposal. But, whatever may be said about the wisdom of Enlil's scheme, there was little justice in it...

[p. 228] The manner in which the impending cataclysm was announced to the deluge hero in the Babylonian stories differs widely from the way in which it was revealed to Old Testament Noah... [p. 229] Utnapishtim was not told expressly, in the Gilgamesh Epic, that a deluge would be sent in which all mankind was to perish, but he was told enough so that he could draw the necessary conclusions. This revelation was made not only without the knowledge of Enlil, the real author of the flood, but it was also quite contrary to his plan, according to which "no man was to live through the destruction" (Tablet XI:173).

In Genesis, on the other hand, Noah apparently received a direct communication; there is no indication that the will of God was conveyed to him through the medium of a dream. Furthermore, the disclosure was made by the Lord himself, and was therefore in [p. 230] full accord with his purpose. The God who caused the flood also saved his faithful servant by informing him of the approaching catastrophe and by ordering the building of an ark. However, all available accounts agree that the impending peril was divinely announced to the hero of the deluge.

The Period of Grace

According to Gen. 6:3, man was granted a period of grace extending over one hundred and twenty years, during which he had an opportunity to amend his sinful ways and to avert the threatened destruction (cf. 1 Pet. 3:20). There is no mention in the biblical text that the intended punishment was announced to Noah's contemporaries. But that this was done may be taken for granted; for, had it not been disclosed to mankind, there would have been little meaning in giving them a period of grace, particularly since they were apparently permitted to go unpunished during all this time. And since Noah was the only person who had found favor in the sight of God, it is an obvious conclusion that he was intrusted with the task of communicating the decision of God to his fellow-men (cf. II Pet. 2:5).

In the Gilgamesh Epic there was no thought of granting mankind an opportunity to repent. There the planned destruction of the human race was a zealously guarded secret of the gods. It was such an inviolable secret that even as great a divinity as Ea did not dare to communicate it directly to his favorite, Utnapishtim, but felt compelled to resort to a subterfuge, by warning the latter in a dream from which he could guess the contents

of the gods' decree. And when Utnapishtim, in his dream, inquired of his divine overlord what he should answer his fellow-citizens when asked about the purpose of the building and provisioning of the boat, Ea instructed him to deceive them, lest they should learn the truth and likewise escape.

755. Flood, Biblical and Babylonian Accounts of

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 70, 71. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 70] *Both the Hebrew and the Babylonian Account Go Back to a Common Source of Fact, Which Originated in an Actual Occurrence.* This view seems clearly the correct explanation of the genetic affiliations between them. A. T. Clay's conclusion is significant:

Assyriologists, as far as I know, have generally dismissed as an impossibility the idea that there was a common Semitic tradition, which developed in Israel in one way, and in Babylonia in another. They have unreservedly declared that the Biblical stories have been borrowed from Babylonia, in which land they were indigenous. To me it has always seemed perfectly reasonable that both stories had a common origin among the Semites, some of whom entered Babylonia, while others carried their traditions into Palestine.⁶³ [Note 63 gives the source as A. T. Clay, *The Origin of Biblical Traditions. Yale Oriental Series*, XII (1923), p. 150.]

[p. 71] Archeological excavations have not only revealed that Mesopotamia had well-known traditions of a universal flood, but evidence uncovered from Syrian-Palestinian sites and from the Amarna Letters show that when the Israelites entered Canaan they found people there in close touch with the Babylonian civilization out of which Abraham their progenitor came and using the Babylonian language and script is a lingua franca. The Hebrews scarcely lived an isolated life, and it would be strange indeed if they did not possess similar traditions as other Semitic nations.

These common traditions among the Hebrews are reflected in the true and authentic facts given them by divine inspiration in their sacred writings. Moses very likely was conversant with their traditions. If he was, inspiration enabled him to record them accurately, purged of all their crude polytheistic incrustations and to adapt them to the elevated framework of truth and pure monotheism. If he was not, the Spirit of God was able to give him the revelation of these events apart from the need of any oral or written sources. In either case supernatural inspiration was equally necessary, whether to purge the perverted polytheistic tradition and refine it to fit the mold of monotheism or to give an original revelation of the authentic facts apart from oral or written sources.

756. Flood, Extensive Traditions of

SOURCE: John Bright, "Has Archaeology Found Evidence of the Flood?" *BA*, 5 (December, 1942), 56, 58, 59. Used by permission.

[p. 56] The Hebrews were by no means the only ancient people who preserved a tradition of a great Deluge. Indeed, such a story is to be found in a hundred varying forms in countries as far separated as Greece, Mesopotamia, India, Malaya, Polynesia, and the Western Hemisphere—where it is diffused from Tierra del Fuego (islands off the southern tip of South America) to the Arctic Circle. (A useful compilation of these stories is in Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament*, 1923. pp. 46–143.) No two of these accounts are alike in detail, and most of them bear but the faintest resemblance to Genesis 6–9. Yet common to most of them is the recollection of a great flood which in the ancient past covered all, or a great part of the earth, and in which all but a select few were drowned. These few it may be added, usually escaped in a boat or by taking refuge on a high mountain or in a tree. While some of the stories are no doubt exaggerations of local

catastrophes such as pluvial inundations, tidal waves and the like, and others perhaps false inferences from such phenomena as marine fossils found far from the sea, it is difficult to believe that so remarkable a coincidence of outline as exists between so many of these widely separated accounts can be accounted for in this way. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that many of them are recollections of a common event, or at least are diffused from a common tradition...

Have the excavations in ancient cities uncovered evidences of the flood?

[p. 58] ... The Mesopotamian flood strata, then, represent purely local inundations of the type which still occur when the Euphrates River bursts its banks.

We are at least able to conclude, then, that either Mesopotamian archaeology has yielded no trace of Noah's Flood, or else the Genesis narrative is but an exaggeration of a flood of purely local significance. But this latter alternative is difficult to hold in the light of the wide diffusion of the Flood tradition. Unless we are to explain the remarkable [p. 59] similarity between Flood stories from lands as far removed from one another as India and America on the basis of pure coincidence, some diffusion of tradition from a common original, or originals, must be assumed.

757. Flood—Fossils Buried by Violence in Moving Sediments

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 275. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Fishes are found in profusion in the Devonian, often great sedimentary "graveyards," indicating violent deposition, and often in fresh-water deposits. It is obvious that fish do not normally die and become fossilized in such conditions as these but usually are either destroyed by scavengers or float on the surface until decomposed. The whole aspect of the fossil fish beds bespeaks violent burial in rapidly moving deltaic sediments.

758. Flood—Geological Facts Versus Interpretations of Them

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 118. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The decision then must be faced: either the Biblical record of the Flood is false and must be rejected or else the system of historical geology which has seemed to discredit it is wrong and must be changed...

But this [latter] position need not mean at all that the actual observed data of geology are to be rejected. It is not the facts of geology, but only certain interpretations of those facts, that are at variance with Scripture. These interpretations involve the principle of uniformity and evolution as a framework for the historical evaluation of the geological data. But, historical geology is only one of the many branches of geologic science.

759. Flood—Geological Uniformity or Catastrophe?

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 137. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The claim is merely made that it is *possible* to interpret geology in terms of slow processes acting over long time periods—not that it is *necessary* to do so. One may, in fact, read at length in Lyell and in works of the other early uniformitarian geologists without finding more than essentially this claim. *Uniformitarianism, in other words, has simply been assumed, not proved. Catastrophism has simply been denied, not refuted.*

But as a matter of fact it is not even true that uniformity is a *possible* explanation for most of the earth's geologic formations, as any candid examination of the facts ought to reveal.

760. Flood—Not a Local Event in Mesopotamia

SOURCE: John Bright, "Has Archaeology Found Evidence of the Flood?" *BA*, 5 (December, 1942), 57, 58. Used by permission.

[p. 57] At Ur Woolley found a continuous occupation from the Early Dynastic back through the Obeid period. In the middle of the Obeid level he found a stratum of river mud or deposit some ten feet thick—conclusive proof that a deluge had interrupted the occupation of the place, at least temporarily, during the fourth millennium. Woolley is confident that he has here the evidence of Noah's flood (see, for example, his *Ur of The Chaldees*, 1929, p. 29) and his assurance is enthusiastically shared by most of the popular handbooks which deal with the subject.

(It may be of interest to point out also that Woolley seems to have dug some five pits in all down through the early strata of occupation at Ur, but in only two of them did he find evidence of the flood. The logical inference from such a situation is that the flood in question simply did not cover the whole city of Ur, but only a part of it. [p. 58] ... Therefore its importance as a historical catastrophe has been vastly over-emphasized by the excavator for reasons which are unfortunately all too obvious.—[Woolley's] Editor.)

...

Do any of these levels [at Ur and elsewhere] represent the Flood of Genesis 6–9? It would appear that the answer must be made in the negative. There are several reasons for this. (1) No two of the inundation levels as yet discovered can be dated in the same period (unless it be those at Ur and Nineveh, and even this is far from certain). (2) Further, all seem to be inundations of a purely local character. Sites nearby show no evidence of flooding at all... (3) It should also be noted that at Ur, at least, the levels both before and after the flood level were of the same general civilization. In other words there is no such break in the continuity of culture as would occur if a deluge of giant proportions wiped out an entire population. The Mesopotamian flood strata, then, represent purely local inundations of the type which still occur when the Euphrates River bursts its banks.

We are at least able to conclude, then, that either Mesopotamian archaeology has yielded no trace of Noah's Flood, or else the Genesis narrative is but an exaggeration of a flood of purely local significance. But this latter alternative is difficult to hold in the light of the wide diffusion of the Flood tradition.

761. Flood, Rocks Stratified by

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 258, 265. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 258] One thing seems absolutely certain, if the Biblical record of the Flood is true, as we strongly affirm it to be; the Noachian Deluge was a cataclysm of absolutely enormous scope and potency and must have accomplished an immense amount of geologic work during the year in which it prevailed over the earth. There seems no reasonable alternative to either rejecting the Bible account as of no historical value whatever or else acknowledging the fact that many of the earth's present rock strata must have been produced by the Flood ...

[p. 265] The picture then is of awesome proportions. The vast "waters above the firmament" poured forth through what are graphically represented in the Scriptures as the "floodgates of heaven," swelling the rivers and waterways and initiating the erosion and transportation of vast inland sediments. At the same time, waters and probably magmas were bursting up through the fractured fountains of the great subterranean deep. In the seas, these "fountains" not only belched forth their waters and volcanic materials, but the

corresponding earth displacements must have been continually generating powerful tsunamis ["tidal waves"].

This tremendous complex of forces, diastrophic and hydrodynamic, must beyond any question have profoundly altered the antediluvian topography and geology of the earth's crust. Powerful currents, of all directions and magnitudes and periods, must have been generated and made to function as agents of immense eroding, transporting, and depositional potency. Under the action of this combination of effects, almost any sort of deposit or depositional sequence becomes possible and plausible. An immense variety of sediments must finally have been the result, after the Flood had run its course.

762. Flood, Versus Uniformitarianism and Evolution.

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 328, 329. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 328] The Flood itself appears to have been due to a combination of meteorologic and tectonic phenomena. The "fountains of the great deep" emitted great quantities of juvenile water and magmatic materials, and the "waters above the firmament," probably an extensive thermal atmospheric blanket of water vapor, condensed and precipitated torrential rains for a period of forty days.

We realize that such a thorough reorganization of the geologic data raises many questions and must be subject to modification and revision in many details. Nevertheless, we believe that this type of analysis comes much more realistically to grips with all the basic data than does the commonly accepted theory of uniformitarianism.

But the latter theory will undoubtedly die hard, mainly because it is the chief bulwark of evolutionism, and evolution is the great "escape mechanism" of modern man. This is the pervasive philosophic principle by which man either consciously or sub-consciously seeks intellectual justification for escape from personal responsibility to his Creator and escape from the "way of the Cross" as the necessary and sufficient means of his personal redemption.

Numerous objections will, therefore, be raised to our exposition of Biblical-geological catastrophism, most of them ostensibly on the basis that various types of deposits and geologic phenomena are difficult to reconcile with Biblical chronology...

[p. 329] The data actually at hand in such cases can be understood quite satisfactorily in terms of Biblical catastrophism. But, in the last analysis, it is likely that on questions so fundamental and basically emotional and spiritual as these, each man will continue to believe as he "wants" to believe. We can only show that those who want to believe the Bible can do so in full confidence that the actual data of geology are consistent with such a belief, even though the apparent weight of scholarly opinion for the past century has been on the side of those who want to believe otherwise.

763. Foot Washing, and Maundy Thursday

SOURCE: Paul Tschackert, "Foot-Washing," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 4, pp. 339, 340. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 339] *Foot-washing*: A religious ceremony practised at various times in different branches of the Church. The use of sandals among the Eastern natives required frequent washing of the feet, and to perform this office for others was considered a mark of hospitality. At the Last Supper Jesus washed the feet of his disciples (John xiii. 5-10) to indicate that he who was not purified by him had no part with him. The postapostolic age understood the example thus given to be mandatory. Augustine (*Epist. ad Januarium*)

testifies that it was followed on Maundy Thursday by the Church of his day. St. Bernard in his sermon *De coena Domini* recommends foot-washing as “a daily sacrament for the remission of sins.” In the Greek Church also it was regarded as a “mystery.” Yet it nowhere became a general, public, solemn, ecclesiastical act...

The Church of England at first carried out the letter of the command [evidently the “Mandatum,” the washing of the feet of twelve men by a priest or bishop on Maundy Thursday]; but the practise afterward fell into disuse. The Anabaptists declared most decidedly in favor of foot-washing, appealing to John xiii. 14, and also to 1 Tim. v. 10, considering it as a sacrament instituted by Christ himself, “whereby our being washed by the blood of Christ and his example of deep humiliation is to be impressed upon us” (Confession of the United Baptists or Mennonites, 1660). The Moravians with the love-feasts revived also the foot-washing, yet without strictly enforcing it or confining it to Maundy Thursday. It was performed not only by the leaders toward their followers, but also by the latter among themselves, during the singing of a hymn explanatory of the symbol. This prac- [p. 340] tise was finally abolished by the Moravian Synod in 1818.

764. Foot Washing, Annual Observance of, in Holy Week

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), p. 195. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

The ancient rite of the *Mandatum*, the washing of the feet ... is prescribed by the rules of the Roman Missal...

From ancient times, all religious superiors, bishops, abbots, and prelates, performed the Maundy; so did the popes at all times. As early as 694 the Synod of Toledo prescribed the rite. Religious superiors of monasteries washed the feet of those subject to them, while the popes and bishops performed the ceremony on a number of clergy or laymen (usually twelve). In medieval times, and in some countries up to the present century, Christian emperors, kings, and lords washed the feet of old and poor men whom they afterward served at a meal and provided with appropriate alms.

In England, the kings used to wash the feet of as many men as they themselves were years old. After the Reformation, Queen Elizabeth I still adhered to the pious tradition; she is reported to have used a silver bowl of water scented with perfume when she washed the feet of poor women on Maundy Thursday. Today, all that is left of this custom in England is a distribution of silver coins by royal officials to as many poor persons as the monarch is years old.

765. Foot Washing, at Last Supper, Luther on

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by William Hazlitt (London: H. G. Bohn, 1857), p. 98. [FRS No. 44.]

The reason that Christ washed not his own, but his disciples' feet, whereas the high-priest in the law washed not others' but his own, was this: the high-priest in the law was unclean, and a sinner like other men, therefore he washed his own feet, and offered not only for the sins of the people, but also for his own. But our everlasting High-priest is holy, innocent, unstained, and separate from sin; therefore it was needless for him to wash his feet, but he washed and cleansed us, through his blood, from all our sins.

Moreover, by this his washing of feet he would show, that his new kingdom which he would establish should be no temporal and outward kingdom, where respect of persons was to be held, as in Moses' kingdom, one higher and greater than the other, but where one should serve another in humility, as he says: “He that is greatest among you, let him

be your servant;” which he himself showed by this example, as he says, John, xiii.: “If I your Lord and Master have washed your feet, then ought ye to wash one another’s feet.”

766. Foot Washing—Catholic Writer Recognizes Biblical Command

SOURCE: John Milner, Letter 11, To James Brown, Esq., in his *The End of Religious Controversy in a Friendly Correspondence Between a Religious Society of Protestants, and a Roman Catholic Divine* (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1897), p. 90.

If any intelligent Pagan, who had carefully perused the New Testament, were asked, which of the ordinances mentioned in it, is most explicitly and strictly enjoined? I make no doubt but he would answer that it is, *The washing of feet*. To convince yourself of this, be pleased to read the first seventeen verses of St. John, c. xiii. Observe *the motive* assigned for Christ’s performing the ceremony, there recorded; namely, his “love for his disciples;” next *the time* of his performing it; namely, when he was about to depart out of this world: then *the stress* he lays upon it, in what he said to Peter, *If I wash thee not thou hast no part, with me*: finally, *his injunction*, at the conclusion of it, *If I your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another’s feet*. I now ask, on what pretence can those who profess to make *Scripture alone* the rule of their religion, totally disregard this institution and precept? Had this ceremony been observed in the church when Luther and the other first Protestants began to dogmatize, there is no doubt but they would have retained it: but, having learnt from her that it was only figurative, they acquiesced in this decision, contrary to what appears to be the plain sense of Scripture.

767. Foot Washing, Zinzendorf on

SOURCE: A. G. Spangenberg, *Leben des Herrn Nicolaus Ludwig Grafen und Herrn von*

Zinzendorf und Pottendorf (Life of Lord Nicolaus Ludwig ... Zinzendorf), part 3, ([Barby]: [n.n.], 1772), chap. 3, sec. 8, pp. 548, 549. German.

[p. 548] Jesus washed the feet of His disciples and expressly said: “If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another’s feet,” etc. He [Zinzendorf] took these words as they read, and was of the opinion that in a living church of Christ, foot washing could not rightfully be omitted... He was confirmed in this opinion by the excuses of certain separatistically inclined people who abstained from the Lord’s Supper and, upon being reminded that it was established by Christ, he used to answer: “If all establishments originated by Him should be retained, why, then, not foot-washing which the Lord commanded in plain words? ...

[p. 549] I have, as it is well known, introduced foot washing again; and it has been with me until this hour one of the most agreeable and respectable acts.

768. Forgeries and Interpolations, Ancient Complaints of

SOURCE: Rufinus, *Epilogue to Pamphilus the Martyr’s Apology for Origen*, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 3, pp. 422, 426.

[p. 422] Whenever they [the heretics] found in any of the renowned writers of old days a discussion of those things which pertain to the glory of God so full and faithful that every believer could gain profit and instruction from it, they have not scrupled to infuse into their writings the poisonous taint of their own false doctrines; this they have done, either by inserting things which the writers had not said or by changing by interpolation what they had said, so that their own poisonous heresy might more easily be asserted and authorized by passing under the name of all the church writers of the greatest learning and renown; they meant it to appear that well-known and orthodox men

had held as they did. We hold the clearest proofs of this in the case of the Greek writers; and this adulteration of books is to be found in the case of many of the ancients; but it will suffice to adduce the testimony of a few...

[p. 426] Origen in his letter complains with his own voice that he has suffered such things at the hands of the heretics who wished him ill, and similar things have happened in the case of many other orthodox men among both the dead and the living, and ... in the cases adduced, men's writings are proved to have been tampered with in a similar way.

769. Forgeries and Interpolations—Ignatius' Epistles

SOURCE: *Introductory Note* [from early Edinburgh edition] to *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians*, in *ANF*, Vol. 1, pp. 46, 47.

[p. 46] The epistles ascribed to Ignatius have given rise to more controversy than any other documents connected with the primitive Church. As is evident to every reader on the very first glance at these writings, they contain numerous statements which bear on points of ecclesiastical order that have long divided the Christian world; and a strong temptation has thus been felt to allow some amount of prepossession to enter into the discussion of their authenticity or spuriousness. At the same time, this question has furnished a noble field for the display of learning and acuteness, and has, in the various forms under which it has been debated, given rise to not a few works of the very highest ability and scholarship. We shall present such an outline of the controversy as may enable the reader to understand its position at the present day.

There are, in all, fifteen Epistles which bear the name of Ignatius. These are the following: One to the Virgin Mary, two to the Apostle John, one to Mary of Cassobelae, one to the Tarsians, one to the Antiochians, one to Hero, a deacon of Antioch, one to the Philippians; one to the Ephesians, one to the Magnesians, one to the Trallians, one to the Romans, one to the Philadelphians, one to the Smyrnaeans, and one to Polycarp. The first three exist only in Latin: all the rest are extant also in Greek.

It is now the universal opinion of critics, that the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which were at various dates, and to serve special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated Bishop of Antioch.

But after the question has been thus simplified, it still remains sufficiently complex. Of the seven Epistles which are acknowledged by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 36), we possess two Greek recensions, a shorter and a longer. It is plain that one or other of these exhibits a corrupt text, and [p. 47] scholars have for the most part agreed to accept the shorter form as representing the genuine letters of Ignatius...

But although the shorter form of the Ignatian letters had been generally accepted in preference to the longer, there was still a pretty prevalent opinion among scholars, that even it could not be regarded as absolutely free from interpolations, or as of undoubted authenticity.

770. Forgeries and Interpolations, Used as Authority

SOURCE: John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, "The Vatican Council," in his *History of Freedom and Other Essays*, ed. by John Neville Figgis and Reginald Vere Laurence (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), p. 513. Used by permission.

The resources of mediaeval learning were too slender to preserve an authentic record of the growth and settlement of Catholic doctrine. Many writings of the Fathers were

interpolated; others were unknown, and spurious matter was accepted in their place. Books bearing venerable names—Clement, Dionysius, Isidore—were forged for the purpose of supplying authorities for opinions that lacked the sanction of antiquity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Certain patristic interpolations and forged documents contributed to the growth and acceptance of the exaggerated claims of the papacy. As a former Jesuit points out: "For instance, the Roman theologians for centuries appealed to the false decretals [see No. 884] and to the interpolated text of St. Cyprian's *De Unitate Ecclesiae* as to authentic documents witnessing to the belief of the universal Church with regard to the Papacy, and the learned never dared call in question such momentous evidences, though on other and reasonable grounds well inclined to do so." (Giorgio Bartoli, *The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910], p. 105).]

771. French Revolution—Calendar, Described

SOURCE: "French Republican Calendar," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 1961 ed., Vol. 9, pp. 804, 803. Copyright 1961 by Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission.

[p. 804] By the new [French Republican] calendar the year of 365 days was divided into 12 months of 30 days each, every month being divided into three periods of ten days, each of which were called *decades*, and the tenth, or last, day of each decade being a day of rest... Five days of the 365 ... were set aside for national festivals and holidays and were called *Sans-culottides*. They were to fall at the end of the year, *i.e.*, on the five days between Sept. 17 and 21 inclusive... [The extra leap-year day] was to be the last of the *Sans-culottides*...

The republican ... [calendar] was officially discontinued on Jan. 1, 1806.

[p. 803, Sections from Table:]

			An III 1794- 95
I	22 Sept.	1794
Vendeémiaire			
I Brumaire	22 Oct.	"
I Frimaire	21 Nov.	"
I Nivoése	21 Deéc.	"
I Pluvioése	20 Janv.	1795
I Ventoése	19 Feévr.	"
I Germinal	21 Mars	"
I Floreéal	20 Avr.	"
I Prairial	20 Mai	"
I Messidor	19 Juin	"
I Thermidor	19 Juil.	"
I Fructidor	18 Aouét	"
<hr/>			
I Sans-culottides	17 Sept.	1795
6 "	22 "	"

772. French Revolution.—Calendar, Establishment of

SOURCE: Duvergier, trans. in John Hall Stewart, ed., *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, pp. 508, 509, 511, 512 (Duvergier, v. 6, pp. 208, 209, 294–301). Copyright 1951 by The Macmillan Company and used with their permission.

[p. 508] Decree Establishing the French Era

5 October, 1793 (14 Vendémiaire, Year II) ...

[Translator's note:] The first serious step in revising the calendar was taken with the passing of the present decree, which should appeal to modern advocates of calendar reform. It represented an attempt to abolish a terminology and chronology associated with the Christian religion, to apply the decimal system to time calculations, and to inject further into the daily life of Frenchmen those principles of simplicity, order, and uniformity which were so characteristic of most of the revolutionary creations.

1. The French era shall date from the establishment of the Republic on 22 September, 1792, of the common era, the day when the sun reached the true autumnal equinox ...
2. The common era is abolished for civil uses.
3. The beginning of every year is established at midnight, beginning the day on which the true autumnal equinox falls for the Paris Observatory.
- [p. 509] 4. The first year of the French Republic began at midnight, 22 September, 1792, and ended at midnight, separating 21 from 22 September, 1793.
5. The second year began on 22 September, 1793, at midnight...
7. The year shall be divided into twelve equal months, of thirty days each, after which five days, not belonging to any month, follow to complete the ordinary year; such days shall be called *complementary days*.
8. Each and every month shall be divided into three equal parts, of ten days each, called *décades*, and distinguished from one another as first, second, and third...
11. The day, from midnight to midnight, shall be divided into ten parts or hours, each part into ten others, and so on up to the smallest commensurable portion of its duration. The present article shall be effective for public documents only from the first day of the first month of the third year of the Republic...

[p. 511] Decree Establishing the New Calendar

24 November, 1793 (4 Frimaire, Year II). ...

[Translator's note:] In this definitive decree, the work on the revolutionary calendar was completed. The first eight and the last six articles have been omitted here because they are identical with the corresponding articles of the decree of 5 October. The two articles and the instruction here reproduced are significant because they introduced the new terminology for the months and for the extra days at the end of the year...

The calendar lasted until 1806. Its ultimate failure may be ascribed partly to its antireligious character, partly to the fact that it reduced the number of days of rest in each month, but chiefly to the reluctance of the people to take the trouble to learn and use the new system.

[Text of decree, p. 512]

9. The names of the days of the decade shall be *primidi, duodi, tridi, quartidi, quintidi, sextidi, septidi, octidi, nonidi, décadi*.

The names of the months shall be for the Autumn, *vendémiaire, brumaire, frimaire*; for the Winter, *nivôse, pluviôse, ventôse*; for the Spring, *germinal, floréal, prairial*; for the Summer, *messidor, thermidor, fructidor*.

The last five days shall be called the *sans-culottides*.
10. The ordinary year shall receive one day more, as the position of the equinox necessitates, in order to maintain the coincidence of the civil year with the celestial

movements. Said day, called *day of the Revolution*, shall be placed at the end of the year, and shall constitute the sixth of the *sans-culottides*.

The period of four years, at the end of which such addition of a day is ordinarily necessary, shall be called *the franciade*, in memory of the Revolution which, after four years of effort, has guided France to republican government.

The fourth year of the *franciade* shall be called *sextile*.

773. French Revolution—“Dechristianization” Movement, 1793—

Contemporary Account

SOURCE: E. L. Higgins, *The French Revolution as Told by Contemporaries* (Boston: Houghton, 1938), pp. 329, 330. Copyright 1938 by E. L. Higgins. Used by permission.

(Durand de Maillane [*Histoire de la Convention nationale* (Paris, 1825)], 181–182.)

[p. 329] The changing of the calendar was the prelude to the abolition of Christianity. The commune proposed this impious act to the Convention, and the Convention, becoming a party to it, decreed the replacement of the Catholic cult by the cult of Reason. This deplorable scandal, addresses in honor of atheism, and indecent abjurations, for the most part forced, figured in the official report sent to the authorities and to the armies. The poet Chénier composed a hymn in which, as a faithful disciple of Voltaire, he made open warfare upon the religion of Jesus Christ.

The Convention decreed the singing of Chénier’s hymn in the metropolitan church, acclaiming the new Goddess of Reason. The rest of this hymn may be judged by the first strophe:

“Descends, ô Liberté fille de la nature.

Le peuple a reconquis son pouvoir immortel
Sur les pompeux débris de l’antique imposture;
Ses mains relèvent ton autel.”

I failed to witness the more than scandalous scenes in the Church of Notre Dame, where an actress of the opera was worshipped as a divinity, and I must say that most of the members of the Convention refused to be present at this. A large number even stopped attending the Assembly after the Bishop of Paris was brought to the bar to declare that he was an impostor, that he had never been anything else, and that the people were rejecting Christianity. His example was followed by priests and Protestant ministers in the Convention, who mounted the tribune to abdicate their religious offices. Some of the deputies became so disgusted and indignant that they ceased to appear in this dishonored Convention. The Montagnards perceived their absence, however, [p. 330] and forced them to return. They were compelled to listen daily to the most scandalous addresses, and to the recital of profanations committed by the imitators of the commune in the departments.

774. French Revolution — “Dechristianization” Movement, 1793—

Destruction of Religious Objects

SOURCE: Alphonse de Lamartine, *History of the Girondists*, Vol. 3 (New York: Harper, 1850), p. 298.

In La Vendée, the representatives Lequinio and Laigrelot persecuted even the wax merchants who furnished the candles for the ceremonies of worship. At Nantes large piles lighted upon the public place, burned the statues, images, and sacred books. Deputations of patriots came at each sitting of the Convention to bear as tribute the spoils of the altar. The towns and neighboring villages of Paris ran occasionally to bring also to the

Convention, upon chariots, reliquaries of gold—mitres, chalices, pyx, patera, and chandeliers of their churches. Banners planted in this heap of spoils piled up in irregular masses were inscribed—*Destruction of fanaticism* The people were avenged by their power to insult what they had so long adored: confounding the Deity himself in their resentments against his worship.

775. French Revolution — “Dechristianization” Movement, 1793— Goddess of Reason

SOURCE: Alphonse de Lamartine, *History of the Girondists*, Vol. 3 (New York: Harper, 1850), pp. 298, 299.

[p. 298] The Commune [of Paris] desired to replace the ceremonies of religion by other spectacles, to which the people flocked as they do to all novel sights. The profanation of sacred places—the parody of mysteries—the *éclat* of pagan rites—were the attractions to these pomps. It was believed that after many ages there was now a sweeping out of these dark vaults, and that a flood of light, liberty, and reason was entering.

But sincerity of purpose was utterly wanting at these *fêtes*. There was no adoration at these meetings—no soul at these ceremonies. Religions do not spring up in the marketplace at the voice of legislators or demagogues. The religion of Chaumette and the Commune was merely a popular opera transferred from the theater to the tabernacle.

The inauguration of this worship took place at the Convention on the 9th of November. Chaumette, accompanied by the members of the Commune, and escorted by a vast crowd, entered the apartment to the sounds of music and the chorus of patriotic hymns. He conducted by the hand one of the handsomest courtesans of Paris, the idol being half covered with a long blue veil... Lequinio presided.

Chaumette, advancing toward him, raised the veil which covered the courtesan, and her beauty striking the multitude, he exclaimed, “Mortals recognize no other divinity than Reason, of which I present to you the loveliest and purest [p. 299] personification.”

776. French Revolution — “Dechristianization” Movement, 1793— Sacrilege at Lyon

SOURCE: Aimé Guillon de Montléon, *Histoire de la ville de Lyon pendant la révolution* (“History of the City of Lyon During the French Revolution”) (Baudoin, Paris: 1824), Vol. 2 (Vol. 10 of Collection des Memoires relatives à la Révolution Française), pp. 346, 347. The second portion is taken from the translation in E. L. Higgins, *The French Revolution as Told by Contemporaries* (Boston: Houghton, 1938), p. 330. Copyright 1938 by E. L. Higgins. Used by permission.

[p. 346] Our proconsuls suppressed, beginning early at 8 o’clock, the vestiges of Catholic religion Lyon still adhered to in the rites of the clergy ... The cult of these priests was abolished; and the temples ... passed into the hands of most brazen ungodly. But Chalier’s bust, crowned with flowers, was already set on a palanquin covered with the tricolor. Beside the bust were placed an urn, supposedly holding his ashes, and a pigeon with which he supposedly amused himself in his prison. Four Jacobins of Paris [p. 347] lifted the triumphal palanquin to their shoulders. A horde of clubmen and lewd women followed shouting: “Down with the aristocrats, long live the Republic, long live the guillotine” They were followed by a group of bandits carrying sacred vessels waving them in the air as drunk lewd women and enraged demons would do. Amid the throng was an ass dressed in a cope and wearing a mitre on his head and some other objects of the Catholic cult on his back; a crucifix, the Bible, and the gospel were attached to his tail...

[Higgins, p. 330] The infamous procession, preceded by warlike music, filed through the city and finally came to a halt at the Place des Terreaux before an altar of turf that had been prepared. The image and urn of Chalier were respectfully deposited; the audience knelt around about them in a circle; and the three representatives came forward one after another to kneel before the fetish and address to it in loud tones their individual invocations...

After these three orisons a brazier was lighted; the audience ceremoniously surrounded it; and the Gospel and crucifix were detached from the donkey's tail and thrown into the flames. The donkey was then given something to drink from the chalice, what, I do not know; and the wafers of the Host, which were said to have been consecrated, were trampled under foot.

777. French Revolution — Religious Restrictions Relaxed

SOURCE: John Adolphus, *The History of France*, Vol. 2 (London: George Kearsley, 1803), pp. 316, 318, 319.

[p. 316] Religion also occupied a conspicuous share in the deliberations of the legislative bodies. The horrors experienced by catholic priests during the reign of terror were exchanged only for a more tranquil, though not less systematic, persecution under the system of philosophy. None of the laws which imposed oaths and declarations on professors of all persuasions, even on those whose tenets did not allow them to take an oath, were repealed; but, instead of *noyades* and the *guillotine*, the fashionable penalties of *seclusion* and *deportation* were applied. As reporter of a committee, to which the revision of the laws respecting public worship and its ministers had been referred, Camille Jourdan made a most able and luminous statement [17th June] of the wrongs and oppressions to which an unoffending body of men had been subjected; and proved, that, under pretence of preserving freedom, the different legislatures had taken from all the adherents of the catholic faith the essentials requisite to freedom of worship; and he particularly instanced the laws for preventing the use of bells, as precluding the possibility of convoking the people in large districts, and depriving them of one integral part of that form of worship to which the majority of the nation were attached...

[p. 318] Dubruel [26th June] moved a resolution for repealing the laws which inflicted the penalty of deportation or seclusion on those priests who refused to take the oaths, and those which subjected to penalties all who harboured such priests...

[p. 319] Finally, laws were framed, in conformity to Dubruel's propositions. Priests were exempted from all obligatory forms, except a promise of submission to the government of the French republic.

778. Friday—Moslem Day of Worship, but Not of Rest (Koran on)

SOURCE: *The Holy Qur-an*, Sūra lxii. 9–10, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, pp. 1547, 1548. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 1547] 9. O ye who believe
When the call is proclaimed
To prayer on Friday
(The Day of Assembly),
[p. 1548] Hasten earnestly to the Remembrance
Of God, and leave off
Business (and traffic):⁵⁴⁶²
That is best for you

If ye but knew
10. And when the Prayer
Is finished, then may ye
Disperse through the land,
And seek of the Bounty
Of God: and celebrate
The Praises of God
Often (and without stint):
That ye may prosper.

[Note 5462:] The idea behind the Muslim weekly “Day of Assembly” is different from that behind the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday) or the Christian Sunday. The Jewish Sabbath is primarily a commemoration of God’s ending His work and resting on the seventh day (*Gen. ii. 2; Exod. xx. 11*: We are taught that God needs no rest, nor does He feel fatigue (ii 255). The Jewish command forbids work on that day but says nothing about worship or prayer (*Exod. xx. 10*); our ordinance lays chief stress on the remembrance of God. Jewish formalism went so far as to kill the spirit of the sabbath, and call forth the protest of Jesus: “the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath” (*Mark ii. 27*). But the Christian Church, although it has changed the day from Saturday to Sunday, has inherited the Jewish spirit: witness the Scottish Sabbath; except in so far as it has been secularised. Our teaching says: ‘When the time for Jumua Prayer comes, close your business and answer the summons loyally and earnestly, meet earnestly, pray, consult and learn by social contact: when the meeting is over, scatter and go about your business.’

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Note 5462 is not part of the Koran; it represents simply the view of the translator.]

779. Friends (Quakers)

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 705–707.*

[p. 705] *History*. The religious situation in England during the first half of the seventeenth century has been described as “a hurly-burly of religious polemics.” The civil war, the unsatisfactory social and business conditions, the rival claims of the adherents of the different ecclesiastical forms and creeds, and the discussions as to the respective rights of pastors and people caused thoughtful men of the country to become utterly dissatisfied with church and state, and, indeed, with almost every existing institution.

It was in the midst of this period, in 1624, that George Fox was born, in Fenny Drayton, Leicestershire. He was a sober-minded serious youth, and early had his mind turned to religious matters. After severe mental and spiritual struggles, he was led to emphasize the spiritual side of Christianity. While external forms of religion were not ignored, he taught the necessity of divine power within the man to enable him to live according to the will of God, the direct communication of this will to the individual believer in Christ, and the necessity of a perfect consistency between the outward life and the religious profession. This was unfamiliar teaching to most persons in that day of rigid adherence to creeds and of great formalism in religious observances. Fox soon gathered around him a band of preachers who, with himself, spread their doctrines far and wide in Great Britain, and later extended their missionary efforts to Ireland, the Continent of Europe, the West Indies, and North America, in which countries, particularly America, they gained many adherents. It does not seem to have been their intention to establish a new branch of the church, but, almost before they knew it, an organization had developed.

At first they called themselves “Children of Truth” or “Children of Light,” also “Friends of Truth,” and finally the name which was given to them was the “Religious Society of Friends,” to which was frequently added “commonly called Quakers.” This

last name was applied to them by a justice in response to an address, in which George Fox called on him to “tremble at the Word of the Lord.”

[p. 706] Many of the extreme charges against them, as, for example, those with regard to the disturbance of public worship, were greatly exaggerated. At the same time their refusal to attend the services of the Established Church, to support it by the payment of tithes, or to take oaths of any kind, and their uncompromising attitude toward much of the religious preaching of the day created a great deal of bitterness against them and brought upon them severe persecution. Heavy fines were imposed upon them; their property was confiscated; and, worst of all, they were subjected to long imprisonments in the horrible jails of the time. Nevertheless, they increased in numbers, until by the close of the seventeenth century they were one of the most important bodies of dissenters in England.

With the cessation of persecution, about the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Friends relaxed their missionary zeal, paid more attention to the discipline of their members, and gradually settled down into a comparatively quiet existence. So far, however, was this discipline carried, in its minute supervision of the actions of members, that their numbers declined, and some have expressed a wonder that the society continued to exist at all. About the middle of the nineteenth century a new movement began, and since that time the great majority of the Friends have either dropped or modified many of the old customs and external forms.

The first recorded visit of any Quakers to America was that of two women, Ann Austin and Mary Fisher, who arrived in Massachusetts from the Barbados in 1656. They were immediately put under arrest, subjected to a brutal examination to see whether they were witches, and finally shipped back to Barbados. Two days after their departure a vessel arrived with eight more Quakers, and these were forcibly returned to England. Severe laws were enacted and heavy penalties provided for those who knowingly brought into the community that “cursed sect of heretics lately risen up in the world which are commonly called ‘Quakers,’ who take upon them to be immediately sent of God and infallibly assisted by the Spirit to speak and write blasphemous opinions, despising government and the order of God in church and commonwealth,” etc. Notwithstanding these laws, the Quakers continued to come, and at last the situation improved, although it was not until 1724 that their appeals to the Royal Privy Council in England were sustained. A few years later laws were enacted in their favor.

The Friends had almost as trying an experience in Virginia as in Massachusetts, and they suffered certain persecutions in Connecticut. In Rhode Island, however, they were received more cordially and were held in high regard, several of the early Governors being members of the society. In New York, New Jersey, and Maryland there were many Friends. The culmination of their influence was reached in Pennsylvania, under the charter given to William Penn in return for a debt due by the Crown to his father, Admiral Penn.

The society continued to grow during the first half of the eighteenth century but drew more within itself in view of the general disturbances resulting from the colonial wars and the political situation, and Friends were discouraged from membership in the assembly or from holding any public office. These conditions led to the establishment, in 1756, of the first “meeting for sufferings” in America, whose object was to extend relief and assistance to members of the society who might suffer from the Indians or other enemies on the frontier, and in general to look out for the interests of the society. The

relation of the Friends to the Indians was one of cordial interest, following the position taken not only by William Penn, but also by George Fox.

With regard to slavery, the early attitude of the Friends was one of toleration, although they insisted that the slaves should be treated humanely. A development, however, was inevitable, and in 1688 the German Friends, at a meeting in Germantown, Pa., protested against the "traffic in the bodies of men" and considered the question of the "lawfulness and unlawfulness of buying and keeping Negroes." The question continued to be agitated, and, chiefly through the efforts of John Woolman, in 1758, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting directed a "visitation" of all who held slaves and decided that all who should "be concerned in importing, selling, or purchasing slaves" should be forbidden to sit in meetings held for deciding matters of discipline. In 1776 slaveholders were to be "disowned" if they refused to manumit their slaves, and by the close of the eighteenth century personal ownership of slaves by acknowledged members of the society had ceased, except where slaves were held by trustees and State laws did not allow them to be set free. In the transition, however, care was taken that feeble or incapable persons should not suffer.

In the disturbances that preceded the Revolution the Friends were in hearty sympathy with the desire of their fellow citizens to obtain redress of grievances, [p. 707] but since, from religious principle, they took no part in warlike measures, and refused to serve in the Army, or to pay taxes levied for warlike purposes, they were subjected to very great misapprehension and suffering, and their property was often seized to pay for recruits or for the meeting of taxes. Some, indeed, supported the Revolution actively. These were disowned or seceded and were known as the "Free" or "Fighting" Quakers. This small body soon dwindled away. After the close of the war the Friends loyally sustained the new government.

The early part of the nineteenth century was marked by divisions on doctrinal points, resulting in separations more or less serious. The most important of these was that popularly known as the "Hicksite" in 1827-28. This was followed by the "Wilburite" in 1845 and the "Primitive" a little later.

During the years following there was a period of considerable ministerial activity, ministers traveling up and down the country, visiting the congregations and holding meetings, to some extent, with the public.

As the slavery question came up more prominently the Friends appeared in the front rank of the antislavery forces, and their poet, John Greenleaf Whittier, did perhaps as much as anyone to make current the Quaker conception of Christianity. As the Civil War drew on, they endeavored to maintain their ground in favor of peace, although not a few members of the different branches were found in the Army. The close of the war brought relief, and a Peace Association of Friends in America was organized, which put lecturers into the field, issued tracts, and started a monthly publication, the Messenger of Peace. It is to be noted that the movement for international arbitration received perhaps its strongest impulse from the annual gatherings at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., under the auspices of a Friend.

During the past two or three decades, chiefly as a result of the Five Years Meeting, there has been a strong tendency toward greater unity of effort in the fields of home and foreign missions, Bible schools, education, evangelistic work, philanthropy, and social reform. This is true of all branches of the society. The relations to other bodies of

Christians have become closer, and Friends have joined with other churches in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and similar organizations.

Doctrine. The Orthodox Friends, who are by far the most numerous branch, [they were in 1936; see editors' note], have never adopted a formal creed. Their doctrine agrees in all essential points with the doctrine of the great body of the Christian Church, but they differ from other denominations in the following important respects: (1) The great importance attached to the immediate personal teaching of the Holy Spirit, or "Light Within," or "Inner Light"; (2) the absence of all outward ordinances, including baptism and the Supper, on the ground that they are not essential, were not commanded by Christ, and, moreover, tend to draw the soul away from the essential to the nonessential and formal; (3) the manner of worship and appointment of ministers; (4) the doctrine of peace or nonresistance, in accordance with which no Friend can consistently fight or directly support war.

Organization. The organization of the Society of Friends includes monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, each being a purely business organization. The monthly meeting is either a single congregation, or includes two or more congregations, called variously, weekly, local, or preparative meetings. The monthly meetings in a certain district combine to form a quarterly meeting, and the quarterly meetings in a wider territory constitute a yearly meeting.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This general statement for the Friends is given in the 1936 *CRB* under "Society of Friends (Orthodox)." However, there is not now any body of Friends identical with this group. There have been combinations and recombinations, and at the present time the largest two organizations are the Five Years Meeting of Friends, with a 1959 membership of 68,399, and the Religious Society of Friends (General Conference), with a 1958 membership of 31,473 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 54, 55, 255).]

780. Fundamentalism — Origin of Name

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 36. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

"Fundamentalism" is an effort to reaffirm the fundamentals of the Christian faith, in vigorous reaction and protest against liberal theology. The name is taken from a series of twelve booklets entitled *The Fundamentals* of which about three million copies were distributed throughout the English-speaking world by two wealthy laymen, Milton and Lyman Stewart. The series constituted a popular defense of conservative Protestantism.

781. Fundamentalism, Sketch of

SOURCE: Bernhard W. Anderson, *Rediscovering the Bible* (New York: Association Press, 1951,) pp. 14–17. Copyright 1951 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 14] The reaction [to modernism] came in the form of a movement known as fundamentalism. Beginning during the period 1910–20 on an organized interdenominational basis, it was led by conservative Protestants who felt that "modernists" were "throwing out the baby with the bath" in their streamlining of the Christian faith. The historian will point out precedents for this movement in the sterile orthodoxy which set in shortly after the outburst of the Protestant Reformation, and in the decadent [p. 15] Calvinism which persisted in America, especially in rural areas, throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Fundamentalism as such, however, is a distinctly twentieth century phenomenon, and is properly regarded as essentially a reactionary protest against the excesses of the modernizing of the Bible. Precipitated by the crisis occasioned by the introduction of the theory of evolution, it was aimed at restoring and preserving the fundamentals of the Faith. The movement gained national and even international attention through the "heresy" investigation of Harry Emerson

Fosdick in 1923, and the infamous Scopes “monkey” trial at Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925 where the anti-evolution case was championed eloquently by William Jennings Bryan. Even yet, fundamentalism is a powerful force in the American religious scene. Young people become familiar with crusading fundamentalism through the “Youth for Christ” movement or, on the college campus, through the “Inter-Varsity Fellowship.”

The key “fundamental” of the faith, according to this group, is the inerrancy of Scripture. In the words of a representative statement, it is “an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of the Holy Scripture as to keep them from error.” This means that the words of the Bible are the very words of God himself. The writers of the Bible were mere passive secretaries who mechanically transcribed the divine words, these words being the media for conveying the thoughts of the Infinite Intelligence who knows everything past, present, and future. Because God is literally the author of Holy Scripture, the whole Bible “from cover to cover” is held to be absolutely infallible...

[p. 16] To the credit of fundamentalism it should be said that these [p. 17] conservative Christians have been sincere and devout in their attempt to defend the fundamentals of Christianity behind a Maginot line of biblical literalism. As we have observed, liberalism tended to veer away from the main stream of evangelical Christianity and to become a “modernism” carried along by the current of secularism. Thus one may say that fundamentalists, in their dogmatic way, have been making a valid protest against a secularized Christianity which failed to remember Paul’s advice: “Be not conformed to this world...” The protest, however, has had little effect on the real frontiers of theological thinking.

782. Fundamentalism, Viewed as a Failure in Contest With Modernism

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, “Theological Education,” *Bulletin of Fuller Theological Seminary*, 4 (Oct., Nov., Dec., 1954), 4. Used by permission of the author.

For decades fundamentalism has proved itself impotent to change the theological and ecclesiastical scene. Its lack of influence has relegated it to the peripheral and subsidiary movements of Protestantism. Wherever fundamentalism and modernism came into test in theological struggle, fundamentalism lost every major battle in the historical field. It has demonstrated little power to crack the social situation challenging the church today. The motivating loyalty to fundamentalism on the part of many Christians lies in its orthodoxy, its faithfulness to the Word of God. However, the judgment of history on fundamentalism is that it has failed.

2

783. Fundamentalists, Believe in Second Advent

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 59, 60. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 59] Those who “love His appearing” should close ranks and stand together on the great fundamentals of the Word of God. A monument to American Fundamentalism is the series of twelve small volumes, published in 1909–11, financed by two laymen and sent to every Protestant minister in America. The purpose of *The Fundamentals* was to unite those who stood squarely on the fundamentals of the faith and to make a powerful

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

statement in face of the inroads of liberalism. Included in the circle of defenders of the faith were not only dispensationalists like R. A. Torrey, A. T. Pierson, J. M. Gray, C. I. Scofield and A. C. Gaebelein, but non-dispensationalists like W. G. Moorehead, W. J. Erdman, H. W., Frost and C. R. Eerdman, and even postmillennialists James Orr, B. B. Warfield, and E. Y. Mullins. Why can such unity not be demonstrated today?

Ten years later, the Fundamentalist movement within the Northern Baptist Convention was organized. Describing the first Fundamentalist convention held in Buffalo in 1920, Curtis Lee Laws wrote, “The movement ... was in no sense of premillennialist movement, but in every sense a [p. 60] conservative movement. Premillennialists were much in evidence because premillennialists are always sound on the fundamentals, but eschatological questions did not enter into any of the Buffalo controversies. Standing solidly together in the battle for the re-enthronement of the fundamentals of our holy faith were premillennialists, postmillennialists, premillennialists and nomillennialists. Fortunately the conservative group contains no one who repudiates the blessed doctrine of the second coming of our Lord, but the group does contain those who differ radically with one another concerning the whole millennial question.”

3

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.