

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Lazarus - Levites

by James Strong & John McClintock

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

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

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

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

Laz'arus

(Λάζαρος, an abridged form of the Heb. name *Eleazar*, with a Greek termination, which in the Talmud is written רז[ל] [see Bynaeus, *De morte Chr.* 1:180; comp. Josephus, *War*, 5:13, 7; Simonis, *Onomast. N.* p. 96; Fuller, *Miscell.* 1:10; Suicer, *Thesaur.* 2:205]. It is proper to note this here, because the parable which describes Lazarus in Abraham's bosom has been supposed to contain a latent allusion to the name of Eliezer, whom, before the birth of Ishmael and Isaac, Abraham regarded as his heir [see Geiger, in the *Jüd. Zeitschr.* 1868, p. 196 sq.], the name of two persons in the N.T.

1. An inhabitant of Bethany, brother of Mary and Martha, honored with the friendship of Jesus, by whom he was raised from the dead after he had been four days in the tomb (^{<B10>}John 11:1-17). A.D. 29. This great miracle is minutely described in John 11 (see Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). The credit which Christ obtained among the people by this illustrious act, of which the life and presence of Lazarus afforded a standing evidence, induced the Sanhedrim, in plotting against Jesus, to contemplate the destruction of Lazarus also (^{<B20>}John 12:10). Whether they accomplished this object or not we are not informed, but the probability seems to be that when they had satiated their malice on Christ they left Lazarus unmolested. According to an old tradition in Epiphanius (*Haer.* 66:34, p. 652), he was thirty years old when restored to life, and lived thirty years afterwards. Later legends recount that his bones were discovered A.D. 890 in Cyprus (Suicer, *Thesaur.* 2:208), which disagrees with another story that Lazarus, accompanied by Martha and Mary, traveled to Provence, in France, and preached the Gospel in Marseilles (Fabricius, *Codex Apocr. N. Test.* 3:475, and *Lux evang.* p. 388; Thilo, *Apocryph.* p. 711; see Launoii *Dissert. de Lazari appulsu in Provinciam*, in his *Opera*, 2:1).

“The raising of Lazarus from the dead was a work of Christ beyond measure great, and of all the miracles he had hitherto wrought undoubtedly the most stupendous. ‘If it can be incontrovertibly shown that Christ performed one such miraculous act as this,’ says Tholuck (in his *Commentar zum Evang. Johannis*), ‘much will thereby be gained to the cause of Christianity. One point so peculiar in its character, if irrefragably established, may serve to develop a belief in the entire evangelical record.’ The sceptical Spinoza was fully conscious of this, as is related by Bayle (*Dict.* s.v. Spinoza). It is not surprising, therefore, that the enemies of

Christianity have used their utmost exertions to destroy the credibility of the narrative. The earlier cavils of Woolston and his followers were, however, satisfactorily answered by Lardner and others, and the more recent efforts of the German neologists have been ably and successfully refuted by Oertelius, Langius, and Reinhard, and by H. L. Heubner in a work entitled *Miraculorum ab Evangelistis narratorum intempretat. grammatico-historica* (Wittenb. 1807), as well as by others of still more recent date, whose answers, with the objections to which they apply, may be seen in Kuinoel." See also Flatt, in *Mag. für Dogmat. Und Moral.* 14:91; Schott, *Opusc.* 1:259; Ewald, *Lazarus für Gebildete Christusverehrer* (Berl. 1790); and the older monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index Programmatunn*, p. 49; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 169. The rationalistic views of Paulus (*Kritisch. Kommentar*) and Gabler (*Journal f. Auserl. Theol. Lit.* 3:235) have been successfully refuted by Strauss (*Leben Jesu*), and the mythological dreams of the latter have been dissipated by a host of later German writers, and the reality of the story triumphantly established (see especially Neander, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*; Stier and Olshausen, ad loc.). The last modification of Strauss's theory (*Die Halben und die Ganzen*, p. 79 sq., Berl. 1865) has been demolished by Hengstenberg (*Zeitschr. f. Protestant. u. Kirche*, p. 39 sq., 1868); comp. Spith (*Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* p. 339, 1868) and Holzmann (*ibid.* p. 71 sq., 1869). The views of Paulus have just been revived in the lively romance of M. E. Rénan, entitled *Vie de Jesus*; and the latter's theory of a *pious fraud* has been completely demolished by Ebrard, Pressense, and Ellicott, in their works on our Lord's life. See also the *Studien und Krit.* 2:1861; Watson, *Lazarus of Bethany* (London, 1844).
SEE JESUS; SEE MARY.

2. A beggar named in the parable of Dives (دڤس) Luke 16:20-25) as suffering the most abject poverty in this life, but whose humble piety was rewarded with ultimate bliss in the other world; the only instance of a proper name in a parable, and probably selected in this instance on account of its frequency. He is an imaginary representative of the regard which God exercises towards those of his saints whom the world spurns and passes unnoticed; by others, however, he has been considered a real personage, with which accords the old tradition that even gives the name of the rich man as being *Dobruk* (see F. Fabri, *Evagat.* 1:35 sq.). Some interpreters think he was some well-known mendicant of Jerusalem (see Seb. Schmid, *Fascic. disputat.* p. 878 sq.), and have attempted to define his disease (see

Wedel, *Exercit. Med.* cent. 2, dec. 2, No. 2; Bartolini, *Morb. bibl.* 100, 21) with the success that might be expected (S. G. Feige, *Doe morte Laz.* [Hal. 1733]).

The history of this Lazarus made a deep impression upon the Church, a fact illustrated by the circumstance to which Trench calls attention, "that the term *lazar* should have passed into so many languages, losing altogether its signification as a proper name" (On *Parables*, p. 459, note). Early in the history of the Church Lazarus was regarded as the patron saint of the sick, and especially of those suffering from the terrible scourge of leprosy. "Among the orders, half military and half monastic, of the 12th century, was one which bore the title of the Knights of St. Lazarus (A.D. 1119), whose special work it was to minister to the lepers, first of Syria, and afterwards of Europe. The use of *lazaretto* and *lazar-house* for the leper hospitals then founded in all parts of Western Christendom, no less than that of *lazzarone* for the mendicants of Italian towns, are indications of the effect of the parable upon the mind of Europe in the Middle Ages, and thence upon its later speech. In some cases there seems to have been a singular transfer of the attributes of the one Lazarus to the other. Thus in Paris the prison of St. Lazare (the Clos S. Lazare, so famous in 1848) had been originally a hospital for lepers. In the 17th century it was assigned to the Society of Lazarists, who took their name, as has been said, from Lazarus of Bethany, and St. Vincent de Paul died there in 1660. In the immediate neighborhood of the prison, however, are two streets, the Rue d'Enfer and Rue de Paradis, the names of which indicate the earlier associations with the Lazarus of the parable.

"It may be mentioned incidentally, as there has been no article under the head of DIVES, that the occurrence of this word, used as a quasi-proper name, in our early English literature, is another proof of the impression which was made on the minds of men, either by the parable itself, or by dramatic representations of it in the mediaeval mysteries. It appears as early as Chaucer ('Lazar and Dives,' Sompnoure's Tale) and Piers Ploughman ('Dives in the deyntees lyvede,' l. 9158), and in later theological literature its use has been all but universal. In no other instance has a descriptive adjective passed in this way into the received name of an individual. The name *Nimeusis*, which Euthymius gives as that of the rich man (Trench, *Parables*, 1. c.), seems never to have come into any general use." See Klinkhardt, *De homine divite et Lazaro* (Lipsise, 1831); Walker,

Parable of Lazarus (Lond. 1850); *Meth. Quar. Rev.* July and Oct. 1859; *Jour. Sac. Lit.* April, July, and Oct. 1864. **SEE PARABLE.**

Lazarus

a noted French prelate, flourished in the first half of the 5th century. It is supposed that he was raised to the archbishopric of Aix in 408, and resigned in 411, at the death of Constantine. In 415 he distinguished himself among the most zealous adversaries of Pelagius, and of his disciple Coelestius, for we find that the Council of Diospolis, in the meeting of Dec. 20, 415, condemned the errors attributed to Pelagius, and denounced by Lazarus, then archbishop of Aix, and by Heros, bishop of Aries. Pelagius having succeeded in persuading the Eastern bishops that he did not hold the condemned doctrines, Lazarus and Heros addressed further memorials against him to the bishops of Africa, who were on the eve of holding the Council of Carthage. Here Pelagius and Nestorius were finally condemned. The letters of pope Zosimus, who favored Pelagius, are full of bitterness against Lazarus. See Augustine, *Epistolae*, passim, et *Gesta Pelagii*; Marinu Mercator, *Commonitorium*; Zosimi *Epistolae*, a J. Sirmondo editae; *Gallia Christ.* vol. 1, col. 299; *Hist. Lit. de la France*, 2:147; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 29:43. (J. N. P.)

Leach

SEE HORSE-LEECH.

Leach, James,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stafford County, Va., July 15, 1791. He was educated in Hampden Sidney College, Va., studied divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, Va., and was licensed by the Winchester Presbytery Oct. 10, 1818. He was a predestinarian of the order of Augustine and Calvin. His ordination and installation took place soon after his call, Sept. 27, 1819, and in 1824 he was transferred from Berkeley to Hanover by the Presbytery. At the disruption of the Church he took sides with those opposed to the Old-School party, believing the action of the Assembly of 1837 unconstitutional as well as injudicious. He died Sept. 4, 1866. — Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1869, p. 442.

Leacock Hamble James,

a missionary of the Church of England, was born at Cluff's Bay, Barbadoes, Feb. 14.1795. His family was descended from a noble English ancestry. Slaves were an element of respectability in Barbadoes, and his father had many. Young Leacock received his early education at Codrington College, Barbadoes. Through Dr. Coleridge, bishop of Barbadoes and Leeward Islands, he became reader in his native parish, and in connection studied with his pastor, Rev. W. M. Harte. and obtained deacon's orders in January, 1826. While acting as assistant priest of St. John's Church he became very decided in his religious views, and extended the privileges of the Church to all the parish's slaves, at the same time liberating all his own slaves. The hatred and open reproach of the whites even the bishop could not calm. Leacock was transferred to the island of St. Vincent, and then to Nevis, where he became rural dean and pastor of St. Paul's Church, Charlestown. He there fought polygamy with success. But soon reverses came—difficulty with the bishop, insurrections of the slaves, and fall of property. He left for the United States, and settled in Lexington, Ky., in 1835. His confirmation, neglected in his youth, here took place on arrival. He fell into the society of such men as Dr. Coit, Dr. Cooke, Amos Cleaver, and found many friends in Transylvania University. He gained a livelihood by teaching until 1836, when he became pastor of a new congregation, St. Paul's. Difficulty soon arose here also, and led to his removal. His friends scattered to different parts of the Union. Bishop Otey stationed him in Franklin parish, Tenn. Soon after, urged by friends, he preached six months to a new congregation in Louisville, Ky.; he then returned to his old parish. He bought a small farm in New Jersey, near the city of New Brunswick, and settled on it in 1840. He now preached in different places — for a few Sundays in and about Bridgeport, Conn.; then he supplied the winter service of the absent pastor of Christ Church, New Brunswick. In 1841 his personal appearance in the West Indies recovered for him some of his property there. He returned to the States, and was appointed to two small stations near his farm. In 1843 he became rector of St. Paul's Church, Perth Amboy. In 1847 his health and property called him to the West Indies again. By a letter from bishop Doane, bishop Parry's reception was such that he decided to remain, and in 1848 his Perth Amboy congregation accepted his resignation. He revisited the island of Nevis, and, at the peril of his life, preached vehemently against some of the immoral practices prevalent there. In 1852 he preached again for one year

in St. Peter's Church, Speightstown, Barbadoes. In 1854 he preached in St. Leonard's Chapel, Bridgetown. On July 15, 1855, he became the first volunteer to the West Indian Church Association for the furtherance of the Gospel in Western Africa (recently formed by bishop Parry), sailed for England, visited and prepared there, reached Africa, and landed at Freetown, Sierra Leone, Nov. 10. Aided by the bishop of Sierra Leone and colonel Hill, its governor, he founded at length a station, the Rio Pongas. At Tintima village he gained over one out of the five hostile negro chiefs. An educated black coming with him from Barbadoes, John H. A. Duport, and a converted negro chief, Mr. Wilkinson, aided him greatly; the latter gave him a site for his dwelling and chapel. Ill health drove the missionary to Freetown to recruit. Returning, he opened a school for boys, with an attendance which increased to forty. He was aided with money, books, and clothing from England, and his congregations in Perth Amboy, Kentucky, and Tennessee. His territory soon widened, the natives became favorable, and the school increased. Again sickness drove him to his friends in Sierra Leone. Against their advice, and that of the bishop of Barbadoes, he returned to his post. He seemed to recover, and laid plans for future efforts; but died August 20, 1856. As a result of his labors, a large missionary field was opened. His biography is written by Rev. Henry Caswall, D.D. (London, 1857, 12mo), a friend, and English secretary of the society under which he acted.

Lead

(*trp*[*ophe'reth*, from its *dusty* color, in pause *trp*[*o*^{<0250>} Exodus 15:10; ^{<0612>}Numbers 31:22; ^{<8924>}Job 19:24; Jer. 6:29; ^{<3728>}Ezekiel 22:18, 20; 27:12; ^{<8870>}Zechariah 5:7,8; Sept. *μόλιβδος*), a well-known metal, generally found in veins of rocks, though seldom in a metallic state, and most commonly in combination with sulphur. Although the metal itself was well known to the ancients and to the Hebrews, yet the early uses of lead in the East seem to have been comparatively few, nor are they now numerous. One may travel far in Western Asia without discovering a trace of this metal in any of the numerous useful applications which it is made to serve in European countries. We are not aware that any native lead has been yet found within the limits of Palestine. But ancient lead mines, in some of which the ore has been exhausted by working, have been discovered by Mr. Burton in the mountains between the Red Sea and the Nile; and lead is also said to exist at a place called Sheff, near Mount Sinai (Kitto, *Phys. Hist. Pal.* p. 73).

The ancient Egyptians employed lead for a variety of purposes, but chiefly as an alloy with more precious metals. On the breasts of mummies that have been unrolled there is frequently found in soft lead, thin and quite flexible, the figure of a hawk, with extended wings, emblematical of Re, or Phra, the sun. Specimens of lead have also been discovered among the Assyrian ruins (Layard's *Nin. and Bab.* p. 357); and a bronze lion is found attached to its stone base by means of this metal (Bonomi, *Nineveh*, p. 325).

The first scriptural notice of this metal occurs in the triumphal song in which Moses celebrates the overthrow of Pharaoh, whose host is there said to have "sunk like *lead*" in the waters of the Red Sea (^{<0250>}Exodus 15:10). That it was common in Palestine is shown by the expression in Ecclesiasticus 47:18, where it is said, in apostrophizing Solomon, "Thou didst multiply silver as *lead*;" the writer having in view the hyperbolic description of Solomon's wealth in ^{<1107>}1 Kings 10:27: "The king made the silver to be in Jerusalem as *stones*." It was among the spoils of the Midianites which the children of Israel brought with them to the plains of Moab, after their return from the slaughter of the tribe (^{<0612>}Numbers 31:22). The ships of Tarshish supplied the market of Tyre with lead, as with other metals (^{<3572>}Ezekiel 27:12). Its heaviness, to which allusion is made in ^{<0250>}Exodus 15:10, and Ecclesiasticus 22:14, caused it to be used for weights, which were either in the form of a round flat cake (^{<3817>}Zechariah 5:7), or a rough unfashioned lump or "stone" (ver. 8); stones having in ancient times served the purpose of weights (comp. ^{<0611>}Proverbs 16:11). This fact may perhaps explain the substitution of "lead" for "stones" in the passage of Ecclesiasticus above quoted; the commonest use of the cheapest metal being present to the mind of the writer. If Gesenius is correct in rendering *Ēna* and, by "lead," in ^{<0707>}Amos 7:7, 8, we have another instance of the purposes to which this metal was applied in forming the ball or bob of the plumb-line. See PLUMB-LINE. Its use for weighting fishing-lines was known in the time of Homer (*Il.* 24:80). In ^{<4728>}Acts 27:28, a plummet (*βολίς*, in the form *βολίζω*, to *heave the lead*) for taking soundings at sea is mentioned, and this was, of course, of lead.

But, in addition to these more obvious uses of this metal, the Hebrews were acquainted with another method of employing it, which indicates some advance in the arts at an early period. Job (^{<3824>}Job 19:24) utters a wish that his words, "with a pen of iron and lead, were graven in the rock

forever.” The allusion is supposed to be to the practice of carving inscriptions upon stone, and pouring molten lead into the cavities of the letters, to render them legible, and at the same time preserve them from the action of the air. Frequent references to the use of leaden tablets for inscriptions are found in ancient writers. Pausanias (9:31) saw Hesiod’s *Works and Days* graven on lead, but almost illegible with age. Public proclamations, according to Pliny (13:21), were written on lead, and the name of Germanicus was carved on leaden tablets (Tacitus, *Anni.* 2:69). Euty chius (*Ann. Alex.* p. 390) relates that the history of the Seven Sleepers was engraved on lead by the *cadī*. The translator of Rosenmüller (in *Bib. Cath.* 27:64) thinks, however, that the poetical force of the scriptural passage has been overlooked by interpreters. “Job seems not to have drawn his image from anything he had actually seen executed: he only wishes to express in the strongest possible language the durability due to his words; and accordingly he says, ‘May the pen be iron, and the ink of lead, with which they are written on an everlasting rock,’ i.e. Let them not be written with ordinary perishable materials.” The above usual explanation seems to be suggested by that of the Septuagint, “that they were sculptured by an iron pen and lead, or hewn into rocks.” **SEE PEN.**

Oxide of lead is employed largely in modern pottery for the formation of glazes, and its presence has been discovered in analyzing the articles of earthen-ware found in Egypt and Nineveh, proving that the ancients were acquainted with its use for the same purpose. The A. V. of Ecclesiasticus 38:30 assumes that the usage was known to the Hebrews, though the original is not explicit upon the point. Speaking of the potter’s art in finishing off his work, “he applieth himself to *lead* it over,” is the rendering of what in the Greek is simply “he giveth his heart to complete the smearing,” the material employed for the purpose not being indicated. **SEE POTTERY.**

In modern metallurgy lead is employed for the purpose of purifying silver from other mineral products, instead of the more expensive quicksilver. The alloy is mixed with lead, exposed to fusion upon an earthen vessel, and submitted to a blast of air. By this means the dross is consumed. This process is called the cupelling operation, with which the description in ^{<3228>}Ezekiel 22:1822, in the opinion of Mr. Napier (*Met. of Bible*, p. 20-24), accurately coincides. “The vessel containing the alloy is surrounded by the fire, or placed in the midst of it, and the blowing is not applied to the fire, but to the fused metals. . . . When this is done, nothing but the perfect

metals, gold and silver, can resist the scorifying influence.” In support of his conclusion he quotes ²⁴⁶⁸Jeremiah 6:28-30, adding, “This description is perfect. If we take silver having the impurities in it described in the text, namely, iron, copper, and tin, and mix it with lead, and place it in the fire upon a cupell, it soon melts; the lead will oxidize and form a thick coarse crust upon the surface, and thus consume away, but effecting no purifying influence. The alloy remains, if anything, worse than before...The silver is not refined, because ‘the bellows were burned’ — there existed nothing to blow upon it. Lead is the purifier, but only so in connection with a blast blowing upon the precious metals.” An allusion to this use of lead is to be found in Theoghis (*Gnom.* 1127 sq., ed. Welcker), and it is mentioned by Pliny (33:31) as indispensable to the purification of silver from alloy. Comp. also ^{348B}Malachi 3:2, 3. *SEE METAL.*

By modern artificers lead is used with tin in the composition of solder for fastening metals together. That the ancient Hebrews were acquainted with the use of solder is evident from the description given by the prophet Isaiah of the processes which accompanied the formation of an image for idolatrous worship. The method by which two pieces of metal were joined together was identical with that employed in modern times; the substances to be united being first clamped before being soldered. No hint is given as to the composition of the solder, but in all probability lead was one of the materials employed, its usage for such a purpose being of great antiquity. The ancient Egyptians used it for fastening stones together in the rough parts of a building. Mr. Napier (*Metallurgy of the Bible*, p. 130) conjectures that “the solder used in early times for lead, and termed lead, was the same as is now used — a mixture of lead and tin.” See *SOLDER.*

Leade Or Leadly, Jane,

all English mystic, founder of the *Philadelphians*, was born in the county of Norfolk in 1623. According to her own accounts she was convicted of sin in her sixteenth year by a mysterious voice whispering in her ear, and found peace in the grace of God three years after. Her parents, whose name was Ward, seriously opposed Jane’s firm religious stand, and, having decided to withdraw from the parental roof, she removed in 1643 to London to join a brother of hers living there. She had spent a year in the English metropolis, constantly growing in grace and in the knowledge of Christian truths, when a summons came to her from her parents to return home, which request was at once obeyed. Shortly afterwards she was

married to William Leade, a pious, noble-hearted man, with whom she lived happily, blessed with a family of four daughters, until 1670, when William was suddenly removed at the age of forty-nine. From the time of her earliest conversion she had shown signs of a mystical tendency; she found the greatest delight in seeking private communion with God; now the loss of her husband drew her still further away from the world, and she became a confirmed mystic. As early as 1652, Dr. Pordage (q.v.) and his wife, together with Dr. Thomas Bromley (q.v.), had succeeded in gathering a congregation of mystics of the Jacob Böhme (q.v.) type, but the pestilence of 1655 had necessitated separation, and they were just gathering anew at London when Jane Leade was deprived of the earthly association of her husband. She joined them readily, and soon became one of the leading spirits of this new mystical movement, and rose until she finally became the founder of a distinct mystical school known as the *Philadelphians* (q.v.). As her motive for joining Pordage, she assigned certain secret divine revelations and visions which she claimed to have had in the spring of 1670, and shortly after she actually brought before the society a set of laws which she professed to have received of the Lord, in like manner as Moses had been entrusted with the Ten Commandments. (For a complete copy, see *Zeitschriftf. hist. Theol.* 1865, p. 187 sq.) A still stronger hold she gained upon the society and upon the people at large by the publication of some of her writings in 1683, when she was enabled to send them forth by the pecuniary aid of a pious lady who believed in Jane Leade's divine mission. Her great object in publishing her writings (consisting of eight large octavo volumes very scarce at present — like those of Jacob Bohme though less original, abounding in emblematic and figurative language, and very obscure in style) was evidently to spread her peculiar views, and by these means to form a society of all truly regenerated Christians, from all denominations, which should be the visible Church of Christ upon earth, and be thus awaiting the second coming of the Lord, which she claimed to have been informed by revelation was near at hand (for 1700). She was led to seek the establishment of a distinct organization by the movements of the German Pietists and Chiliasts at this period. In 1690, Kilner, of Moscow, agitated this subject still further by an effort to establish a *patriarchal and apostolical society* of true and persecuted Christians, and in 1696 Mrs. Petersen, in her *Anleitung z. Verständniss d. Offenbarung*, and again in 1698 in *Der geistliche Kampf* (Halle, 8vo), called upon the regenerate Christians to separate from the world and to form a new Jerusalem. In 1695, Jane Leade, together with her

friends Bromley and Pordage, removed to carry out these projects in London, and proposed a new society, to consist only of Christians, who, without separating from the different churches to which they belonged, should form a pure and undefiled Church of true Christians, to be governed only by God's will and the Holy Spirit, and who should hasten the second coming of Christ and the beginning of the millennium. So successful was this effort that by 1702 the *Philadelphians*, as they now called themselves, were able to send missionaries to Germany and Holland with a view to making proselytes; and, although they failed to accomplish their object immediately, the idea which constituted it took ground and spread, especially in Germany. Conrad Brüsske of Offenbach, a disciple of Beverley, Dr. Horch of Marburg, and Dr. Kaiser of Stuttgart, labored to propagate it; the latter wrote a number of works on the subject under the name of Timotheus Philadelphus, and established a Philadelphian community at Stuttgart. An approximate estimate of the extent of Jane Leade's influence on Germany and Holland may be obtained by a reference to the extensive list of her correspondents in those countries (comp. *Zeitsch. f. hist. Theol.* 1865, p. 222, note 38). Many, without being outwardly members of this and similar societies, were evidently favorable to them. But some enthusiasts, as Gebhard, Wetzell, Eva von Buttlar, etc., caused the movement to fall into discredit. The scattered elements of the divers societies were afterwards reunited by count Zinzendorf, and formed part of the Moravian institution. But to return to Jane Leade herself. In 1702 she felt that her end was near at hand. She wrote out her funeral discourse, to be read at her grave, and made all manner of preparations for departure. One of the strangest features of this period of her life is her study of the writings of cardinal Petrucci and of Richard of Samson. She died Aug. 19, 1704. The most noted of her works are, *The Wonders of God's Creation manifested in the Variety of eight Worlds, as they were made known experimentally to the Author* (Lond. 1695, 24mo): — *The Tree of Faith, or the Tree of Life, springing up in the Paradise of God* (Lond. 1696, 24mo). See G. Arnold, *Kirchenhistorie*, vol. 2; Gichtel, *Theosophiapractica*; Poiret and Arnold, *Gesch. d. Mystik*; Corrodi, *Kritische Gesch. des Chiliasmus*, 3:403-421; Gobel, *Gesch. d. Christl. Lebens*, vols. 2 and 3; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. 4, cent. 17, sec. 2, pt. 2, ch. 7, § 5; Lee, *Life of Jane Leade*; J. W. Joeger, *Dissert. de Vita et Doctrina Jance Leadce*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:251; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 30:50; Hochhuth, *Gesch. der philadelphischen Gemeinden*. Part I, *Jane Leade und die Philadelphier in England*, in the

Zeitschrift für Hist. Theolog. 1865, p. 172-290. *SEE PHILADELPHIANS.* (J. H.W.)

Leaders

This term has a technical significance as applied to leaders of religious classes in the original Methodist societies, and in the Methodist churches of the present day. *SEE CLASS-MEETINGS.* The leader's office is one of pastoral help. It therefore involves great responsibility, and requires for the proper discharge of its duties a deep religious experience, combined with a capacity to instruct believers in the practical details of religious truth, to console the afflicted, to encourage the despondent, to guide the erring, and, in short, both by precept and example, to lead Christians and penitents forward in the pathway of holiness. Leaders are expected to meet the several members of their classes weekly for religious worship and conversation, to visit those who are detained by sickness, and to take all suitable means for aiding the religious life and progress of those under their care. They are also required to meet their pastors weekly, to report respecting the welfare of the members and probationers attached to their classes. *SEE LEADERS MEETINGS* and *SEE PROBATIONERS.* In some cases women are appointed leaders, more especially of classes composed of females or of children. That the office of class-leader has been greatly helpful to the pastorate in those churches which have employed it does not admit of question. Hence it is a recognised obligation of pastors in those churches not only to select the best persons for the office, but also to aid them in acquiring the best qualifications for its useful exercise. To aid in the task of instructing leaders various tracts and small books have been published. See Tract list of the Methodist Episcopal Church. (D. P. K.)

Leaders' Meetings

As an essential part of the Wesleyan system of subpastoral superintendence by means of class-leaders, *SEE LEADERS,* an organized meeting was appointed to be held weekly under the above title. A leaders' meeting is composed of the itinerant ministers of any circuit or station, and all persons regularly in office as leaders or stewards. *SEE STEWARDS.* In England, the powers of leaders' meetings have been considerably enlarged since such meetings were instituted by Mr. Wesley. "They have now a veto upon the admittance of members into the society, when appealed to in such cases by any parties concerned: they possess the power of a jury in the trial of

accused members: without their consent, no leader or steward can be appointed to office, or removed from it, excepting when the crime proved merits exclusion from membership, in which case the superintendent can at once depose the offender from office, and expel him from the society. Without their consent, in conjunction with the trustees of the chapel in which their meeting is attached, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper cannot be administered in the said chapel; and the fund for the relief of poor and afflicted members of the society is distributed under their direction and management. Regular leaders' meetings have from the beginning been found essential to the pastoral care and spiritual prosperity of our societies, as well as to the orderly transaction of their financial concerns. The ministers are directed attentively to examine, at each meeting, the entries made in the class-books in reference to the attendance of members, in order that prompt and timely measures may be adopted in cases which, on inquiry, shall appear to demand the exercise of discipline, or the interposition of pastoral exhortation and admonition" (Grindrod's *Compendium of Wesleyan Methodism*). In the Methodist Episcopal Church leaders' meetings have no judicial or veto powers as described above. They are held monthly, or at the call of the pastor. Their usual business embraces the following items:

- a.** That the leaders have an opportunity "to inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly and will not be reprov'd."
 - b.** That the pastor may examine the several class-books, and ascertain the Christian walk and character of each member of the Church, and learn what members of the flock especially need his watchcare and counsel.
 - c.** To inquire into the religious state of all persons on trial, and ascertain who *can* be recommended by the leader for admission into full connection, and who should be discontinued.
 - d.** To examine the several leaders respecting their "method of leading their classes."
 - e.** To recommend to the quarterly conference suitable candidates for appointment as local preachers. The leaders' meeting also becomes to pastors a convenient and appropriate body of men with whom they can take counsel from time to time respecting many minor matters of Church interest in reference to which advice or co-operation may seem desirable.
- SEE CLASS-MEETINGS.* (D. P. K.)

Leaf

a term occurring in the Bible, both in the singular and plural, in three senses.


1. LEAF OF A TREE (prop. **ἠλίε**; *aleh'*, so called from springing up; Gr. **φύλλον**; also **ρφή** *ophi'*, foliage [^{<9442>}Psalm 104:12], or in Chald. the top of a tree [^{<2049>}Daniel 4:9,11,18], and **ārf**, *to'reph*, a fresh leaf [^{<3570>}Ezekiel 17:9] “plucked off” [^{<0081>}Genesis 8:11]). The olive-leaf is mentioned in [^{<0081>}Genesis 8:11. Fig-leaves formed the first covering of our parents in Eden. The barren fig-tree (^{<4219>}Matthew 21:19; ^{<4113>}Mark 11:13) on the road between Bethany and Jerusalem “had on it nothing but *leaves*.” The fig-leaf is alluded to by our Lord (^{<4832>}Matthew 24:32; ^{<4133>}Mark 13:28): “When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh.” The oak-leaf is mentioned in [^{<2303>}Isaiah 1:30, and 6:13. Leaves, the organs of perspiration and inhalation in plants, are used symbolically in the Scriptures in a variety of senses; sometimes they are taken as an evidence of grace (^{<3003>}Psalm 1:3), while at others they represent the mere outward form of religion without the Spirit (^{<4219>}Matthew 21:19). Their flourishing and their decay, their restoration and their fragility, furnish the subjects of numerous allusions of great force and beauty (^{<0335>}Leviticus 26:36; [^{<2303>}Isaiah 1:30; 34:4; ^{<2483>}Jeremiah 8:13; ^{<2042>}Daniel 4:12, 14, 21; ^{<4113>}Mark 11:13; 13:28; ^{<6212>}Revelation 22:2). The bright, fresh color of the leaf of a tree or plant shows that it is richly nourished by a good soil, hence it is the symbol of prosperity (^{<3003>}Psalm 1:3; ^{<2478>}Jeremiah 17:8). A faded leaf, on the contrary, shows the lack of moisture and nourishment, and becomes a fit emblem of adversity and decay (^{<1835>}Job 13:25; [^{<2306>}Isaiah 64:6). Similar figures have prevailed in all ages (see Wemyss, *Symbol. Dictionary*, s.v.). In Ezekiel’s vision of the holy waters, the blessings of the Messiah’s kingdom are spoken of under the image of trees growing on a river’s bank; there “shall grow all trees for food, whose leaf shall not fade” (^{<3572>}Ezekiel 47:12). In this passage it is said that “the fruit of these trees shall be for food, and the leaf thereof for medicine” (*margin, for bruises and sores*). With this compare John’s vision of the heavenly Jerusalem (^{<6211>}Revelation 22:1, 2): “In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life...and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.” There is probably here an allusion to some tree whose leaves were used by the Jews as a medicine or ointment; indeed, it is very likely that many plants and

leaves were thus made use of by them, as by the old English herbalists.
SEE TREE OF LIFE.

2. LEAF OF A DOOR ([l xətse'la, a *side*, in ^{<1064>}1 Kings 6:34 [where the latter clause has, prob. by error, [l q̄, *ke'lang*, a curtain], means the *valve* of a folding door; so also t l D, *de'leth*, a *door* [^{<2381>}Isaiah 45:1]). *SEE DOOR.*

3. LEAF OF A BOOK (t l D, *de'leth*, a *door-valve*, as above, hence perhaps a fold of a roll [^{<2482>}Jeremiah 36:23], like our *column* of a volume). *SEE BOOK.*

League

(tyr  *berith'*, a *contract* or “covenant;” also r b j ; *chabar'* [^{<2712>}Daniel 11:23], to “*join*” in alliance; th j ; *karath'*, to *cut*, i.e. “*make*” a league), a political confederacy or treaty. That the Hebrews, surrounded on every side by idolatrous nations, might not be seduced to a defection from Jehovah their king, it was necessary that they should be kept from too great an intercourse with those nations by the establishment of various singular rites; but, lest this seclusion from them should be the source of hatred to other nations, Moses constantly taught them that they should love their *neighbor*, i.e. every one with whom they had intercourse, including foreigners (^{<1222>}Exodus 22:21; 23:9; ^{<1834>}Leviticus 19:34; ^{<1608>}Deuteronomy 10:18, 19; 24:17, 18; 27:19; comp. ^{<2105>}Luke 10:25-37). To this end, he showed them that the benefits which God had conferred upon them in preference to other nations were undeserved (^{<1806>}Deuteronomy 7:6-8; 9:4-24). But, although the Hebrews individually were debarred from any close intimacy with idolatrous nations by various rites, yet as a nation they were permitted to form treaties with Gentile states, with the following exceptions:

(1.) The *Canaanites*, including the *Philistines*; with these nations the Hebrews were not permitted to enter into any alliance whatever (^{<1232>}Exodus 23:32, 33; 34:12-16; ^{<1806>}Deuteronomy 7:1-11; 20:1-18). The Phoenicians, although Canaanites, were not included in this deep hostility, as they dwelt on the northern shore of the country, were shut up within their own limits, and did not occupy the land promised to the patriarchs.

(2.) The *Amalekites*, or Canaanites of Arabia, were also destined to hereditary enmity, unceasing war, and total extermination (^{<02708>}Exodus 17:8, 14; ^{<02517>}Deuteronomy 25:17-19, ^{<00003>}Judges 6:3-5; ^{<00001>}1 Samuel 15:1, 33; 27:8, 9; 30:1, 17, 18).

(3.) The *Moabites* and *Ammonites* were to be excluded forever from the right of treaty or citizenship with the Hebrews, but were not to be attacked in war, except when provoked by previous hostility (^{<00019>}Deuteronomy 2:9-19; 23:3-6; ^{<00002>}Judges 3:12-30; ^{<00047>}1 Samuel 14:47; ^{<00002>}2 Samuel 8:2; 12:26). With the Midianitish nation at large there was no hereditary enmity, but those tribes who had conspired with the Moabites were ultimately crushed in a war of dreadful severity (^{<00217>}Numbers 25:17,18; 31:1-18). Yet those tribes which did not participate in the hostilities against the Hebrews were included among the nations with whom alliances might be formed, but in later times they acted in so hostile a manner that no permanent peace could be preserved with them (^{<00006>}Judges 6:1-40; 7:1-25; 8:1-21). No war was enjoined against the Edomites; and it was expressly enacted that, in the tenth generation, they, as well as the Egyptians, might be admitted to citizenship (^{<00014>}Numbers 20:14-21; ^{<00004>}Deuteronomy 2:4-8). The Edomites also, on their part, conducted themselves peaceably towards the Hebrews till the time of David, when their aggressions caused a war, in which they were overcome. From that time they cherished a secret hatred against the Hebrews (^{<00003>}2 Samuel 8:13,14). War had not been determined on against the Amorites on the east of the Jordan; but, as they not only refused a free passage, but opposed the Hebrews with arms, they were attacked and beaten, and their country fell into the hands of the Hebrews (^{<00021>}Numbers 21:21-35; ^{<00004>}Deuteronomy 1:4; 2:24-37; 3:1-18; 4:46-49; ^{<00013>}Judges 11:13-23). Treaties were permitted with all other nations, provided they were such as would tend to the public welfare. David accordingly maintained a friendly national intercourse with the kings of Tyre and Hamath, and Solomon with the kings of Tyre and Egypt, and with the queen of Sheba. Even the Maccabees, those zealots for the law, did not hesitate to enter into compact with the Romans. When the prophets condemn the treaties which were made with the nations. they did so, not because they were contrary to the Mosaic laws, but because they were impolitic and ruinous measures, which betrayed a want of confidence in Jehovah their king. The event always showed in the most striking manner the propriety of their rebukes (^{<02704>}2 Kings 17:4; 18:20, 21; 20:12, 13; ^{<00005>}2

Chronicles 20:35-37; 28:21; ^{<0100>}Isaiah 7:2; 30:2-12; 31:1-3; 36:4-7; 39:1-8; ^{<0103>}Hosea 5:13; 7:11; 12:1; ^{<0105>}Jeremiah 37:5-10). **See Alliance.**

League of Cambray

is the name of the league entered into (A.D. 1508) between pope Julius II, the emperor Maximilian, and the kings of France and Navarre, to make war, by the aid of both spiritual and temporal arms, against the republic of Venice. *SEE JULIUS II; SEE MAXIMILIAN; SEE VENICE.*

League and Covenant

SEE COVENANT, SOLEMN LEAGUE AND.

League, Holy

SEE HOLY LEAGUE.

League of Smalcalde

SEE SMALCALDE.

Le'äh

(Heb. *Leah'*, *hal* *eweary*; Sept. Λεία, Vulg. *Lia*), the eldest daughter of the Aramaean Laban, and sister of Rachel (^{<0106>}Genesis 29:16). Instead of the latter, for whom he had served seven years, Jacob took her through a deceit of her father, who was unwilling to give his younger daughter in marriage first, contrary to the usages of the East (^{<0102>}Genesis 29:22 sq.; compare Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 1:138 sq.). B.C. 1920. She was less beautiful than her younger sister (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 1:19, 7), having also weak eyes (*twkriμyāp* [Sept. ὀφθαλμοὶ ἄσθενεῖς, Vulg. *lippis oculis*, Auth. Vers. "tender-eyed," ^{<0107>}Genesis 29:17; comp. the opposite quality as a recommendation, ^{<0102>}1 Samuel 16:12), which probably accounts for Jacob's preference of Rachel both at first and ever afterwards, especially as he was not likely ever to love cordially one whom he did not voluntarily marry (comp. ^{<0100>}Genesis 30:20). *SEE RACHEL.* Leah bore to Jacob, before her sister had any children, six sons, namely, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah (^{<0103>}Genesis 29:32 sq.), Issachar, and Zebulon (^{<0107>}Genesis 30:17 sq.; compare 35:23); also one daughter, Dinah (^{<0102>}Genesis 30:21), besides the two sons borne by her maid Zilpah, and reckoned as hers, namely, Gad and Asher (^{<0100>}Genesis 30:9), all within the

space of seven years, B.C. 1919-1913. *SEE CONCUBINE; SEE SLAVE.* “Leah was conscious and resentful (chap. 30) of the smaller share she possessed in her husband’s affections; yet in Jacob’s differences with his father-in-law his two wives appear to be attached to him with equal fidelity. In the critical moment when he expected an attack from Esau, his discriminate regard for the several members of his family was shown by his placing Rachel and her children hindermost, in the least exposed situation, Leah and her children next, and the two handmaids with their children in the front. Leah probably lived to witness the dishonor of her daughter (ch. 34), so cruelly avenged by two of her sons, and the subsequent deaths of Deborah at Bethel, and of Rachel near Bethlehem.” Leah appears to have died in Canaan, since she is not mentioned in the migration to Egypt (^{<ORF>}Genesis 46:5), and was buried in the family cemetery at Hebron (^{<ORF>}Genesis 49:31). *SEE JACOB.*

Leake, Lemuel Fordham,

a minister of the Presbyterian (O. S.) Church, was born in Chester, Morris County, N. J., and was educated at Princeton College, class of 1814. After graduation he taught two years, then studied theology at Princeton Seminary, was licensed by the Newton Presbytery Oct. 7, 1818, and became pastor of the churches of Oxford and Harmony in 1822. In 1825 he resigned this position, and labored for the missionary interests of the Church. In 1831 he was called to Chartiers Church, at Canonsburg, as successor to Dr. M’Millan, and there he labored until 1850, when he became president of Franklin College, New Athens, Ohio. Later he removed to Zelienople, Pa.; thence to Waveland, Ind. He died Dec. 1, 1866. — Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac*, 1867. p. 168.

Leaming, Jeremiah, D.D.

an Episcopal clergyman, was born at Middletown, Conn., in 1717, graduated at Yale College in 1745, and, after entering the ministry, quickly rose to distinction. He was at one time spoken of for the office of first bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. He died at New Haven, Conn., in 1804. Among his publications are *A Defence of Episcopal Government of the Church: — Evidences of the Truth of Christianity*; etc. — Allibone, *Dict. British and American Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Leander

ST., a Spanish prelate, flourished towards the close of the 6th century. He died March 13, 601 (according to some, Feb. 27, 596). He was a son of Severianus, governor of Carthage, and brother of Fulgentius, bishop of that city, and of St. Isidore of Seville, who succeeded him as bishop of Seville. Leander especially distinguished himself by his zeal against the Arians. Among his converts was Hermenigilde, eldest son of Leuvigilde, king of the Goths. Upon the defeat of the former by the latter Leander was sent into exile, but he was recalled in the same year, and converted Reccarede, second son of the king. After the death of Leuvigilde he assembled at once the third Council of Toledo, and caused Arianism to be solemnly condemned. For his services in making Spain an adherent of the faith of Rome he was specially rewarded by Gregory I. The cathedral of Seville claims to possess his remains, and he is commemorated on the 13th of March. He wrote a number of works, of which there are yet extant *De Institutione Virginum et conteanptu mundi* (to be found in the *Codex Regularum* of St. Benedict of Amiane, published by Holstenius, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. 12). It is a letter to his sister, St. Florentine: — *Homilia in laudler Escclesiae*, etc. (Labbe, *Concil.* vol. 5), a discourse on the conversion of the Goths, pronounced at the third Council of Toledo. Leander is considered as the originator of the Mozarabic rite completed by St. Isidore. St. Gregory the Great dedicated to Leander his dissertations on Job, which he had undertaken by his advice. See St. Isidore, *De Viis illustribus*, etc.; St. Gregory the Great, *Epist.* and *Dialog.*; St. Gregory of Tours, *Hist.* vol. 5; Baronius, *Annales*; Dom Mabillon, *Annales Ordinis Benedicti*, etc.; Baillet, *Vies des Saints*, 1, Mar. 13; Dom Ceillier, *Hist. d. Auteurs sacres*, 17:115, etc.; Dom Rivet, *Hist. Litteraire de la France*; Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacree*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:55; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 6:388.

Leang-Oo-Tee

emperor of China, and founder of the Leang dynasty, usurped the throne about A. D. 502. Through devotion to the doctrines of Fo and mysticism of the bonzes (priests of Fo or Buddha), he neglected the care of the empire. He was dethroned by one of his officers, Heoo-King, and died soon after (549).

Lean' noth

(Heb. *le-annoth'*, ת/נ[י] for *answering*, i.e. singing; Sept. τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι, Vulg. *ad respondendum*), a musical direction occurring in the title of Psalm 88, and denoting that it was to be chanted in the manner indicated by the associated terms. *SEE PSALMS, BOOK OF.*

Learning

skill in any science, or that improvement of the mind which were gain by study, instruction, observation, etc. An attentive examination of ecclesiastical history will lead us to see how greatly learning is indebted to Christianity, and that Christianity, in its turn, has been much served by learning. "All the useful learning which is now to be found in the world is in a great measure owing to the Gospel. The Christians, who had a great veneration for the Old Testament, have contributed more than the Jews themselves to secure and explain those books. The Christians, in ancient times, collected and preserved the Greek versions of the Scriptures, particularly the Septuagint, and translated the originals into Latin. To Christians were due the old Hexapla; and in later times Christians have published the Polyglots and the Samaritan Pentateuch. It was the study of the Holy Scriptures which excited Christians from early times to study chronology, sacred and secular; and here much knowledge of history, and some skill in astronomy, were needful. The New Testament, being written in Greek, caused Christians to apply themselves also to the study of that language. As the Christians were opposed by the pagans and the Jews, they were excited to the study of pagan and Jewish literature, in order to expose the absurdities of the Jewish traditions, the weakness of paganism, and the imperfections and insufficiency of philosophy. The first fathers, till the 3d century, were generally Greek writers. In the 3d century the Latin language was much upon the decline, but the Christians preserved it from sinking into absolute barbarism. Monkery, indeed, produced many sad effects; but Providence here also brought good out of evil, for the monks were employed in the transcribing of books, and many valuable authors would have perished if it had not been for the monasteries. In the 9th century the Saracens were very studious, and contributed much to the restoration of letters. But, whatever was good in the Mohammedan religion, it is in no small measure indebted to Christianity for it, since Mohammedanism is made up for the most part of Judaism and Christianity. If Christianity had been suppressed at its first appearance, it is extremely probable that the

Latin and Greek tongues would have been lost in the revolutions of empires, and the irruptions of barbarians in the East and in the West, for the old inhabitants would have had no coiascientious and religious motives to keep up their language; and then, together with the Latin and Greek tongues, the knowledge of antiquities and the ancient writers would have been destroyed...As religion has been the chief preserver of erudition, so erudition has not been ungrateful to her patroness, but has contributed largely to the support of religion. The useful expositions of the Scriptures, the sober and sensible defenses of revelation, the faithful representations of pure and undefiled Christianity — these have been the works of learned, judicious, and industrious men. Nothing, however, is more common than to hear the ignorant decry all human learning as entirely useless in religion; and, what is still more remarkable, even some, who call themselves preachers, entertain the same sentiments. But to such we can only say what a judicious preacher observed upon a public occasion, that if all men had been as unlearned as themselves, they never would ye have had a text on which to have displayed their ignorance” (Jortin’s *Sermons*, vol. 7, Charge I). See More, *Hints to a Young Princess*, 1:64; Cook, *Miss. Ser. on* ^{<407B>}Matthew 6:3; Stennett, *Ser. on* ^{<403A>}Acts 26:24, 25. **SEE KNOWLEDGE.**

Leasing

(bzK; *kazab'*, ^{<394D>}Psalms 4:2; v. 6), an old English word equivalent to *lying* or *lies*, as the term is elsewhere rendered.

Leather

Picture for Leather

(r/[, *or*, ^{<2006>}2 Kings 1:6, properly *skin*, as elsewhere rendered, i.e. on a person or animal, also as taken off, *hide*, sometimes as prepared or tanned, ^{<813>}Leviticus 11:32; 13:48 sq.; ^{<0620>}Numbers 31:20; in the N.T. only in the adj. **δερμάτινος**, “leathern,” ^{<409A>}Matthew 3:4; lit. *of skin*, as in the parallel passage, ^{<4006>}Mark 1:6). A girdle of leather is referred to in the above passage (^{<2006>}2 Kings 1:6) as characteristic of Elijah, which, with the mantle of hair, formed the humble attire that the prophets usually wore. In like manner John the Baptist had his raiment of camels’ hair and a leathern girdle about his loins (^{<409A>}Matthew 3:4). Strong and broad girdles of leather are still much used by the nomade tribes of Western Asia (see Hackett’s *Illustr. of Script.* p. 96). **SEE SKIN; SEE DRESS.**

We learn from the monuments [see cut on page 308] that the ancient Egyptians were well acquainted with the various processes of tanning and working in leather, and from them the Hebrews undoubtedly derived their knowledge of the art of preparing leather for a variety of useful purposes. It appears that the Egyptian tan was prepared in earthen vessels, and that the workmen could preserve skins either with or without the hair. The preparation of leather was an important branch of Egyptian industry (see Wilkinson's *Egyptians*, 2:93, 99, 105). Leather appears to have been used by the ancient Assyrians in some cases for recording documents upon (Layard's *Nineveh*, 2:147). **SEE TANNER.**

Leaven

In the Hebrew we find two distinct words, both translated *leaven* in the common version of the Bible. This is unfortunate, for there is the same distinction between **raʕ** *seor'*, and **/mḅ**; *chamets'*, in the Hebrew, as between *leaven* and *leavened bread* in the English. The Greek ζύμη, appears to be used only in the former sense, and it is doubtful if it applies to a liquid. Chemically speaking, the "ferment" or "yeast" is the same substance in both cases; but "leaven" is more correctly applied to solids, "ferment" both to liquids and solids.

1. raʕ *seir'*, occurs only five times in the Scriptures, in four of which (^{<Q215>}Exodus 12:15, 19; 13:7; ^{<R21>}Leviticus 2:11) it is rendered "leaven," and in the fifth (^{<Q104>}Deuteronomy 16:4) "leavened *bread*." It seems to have denoted originally the *remnant* of dough left on the preceding baking, which had fermented and turned acid; hence (According to the *Lexicon* of Dr. Avenarius, 1588) the German *sauler*, English *sour*. Its distinctive meaning therefore is *fermented* or *leavened mass*. It could hardly, however, apply to the murk or lees of wine.

2. /mḅ; *chamets'*, ought not to be rendered "leaven," but *leavened bread*. It is a more specific term than the former, but is confounded in our translation with it. In ^{<Q118>}Numbers 6:3, the cognate noun is applied to wine as an adjective, and is there properly translated "*vinegar of wine*." In this last sense it seems to correspond to the Greek ὄξος, a sort of acid wine in very common use among the ancients, called by the Latins *posca*, *vinum culpatum* (Adam, *Rom. Antiq.* p. 393; Jahn, *Bibl. Archceol.* § 144). This

species of wine (and in hot countries pure wine speedily passes into the acetous state) [see DRINK] is spoken of by the Talmudists, who inform us that it was given to persons about to be executed, mingled with drugs, in order to stupefy them (^{<B106>}Proverbs 31:6; *Sanhedrin*, folio 43, 1, c. vi). This serves to explain ^{<A234>}Matthew 27:34. A sour, fermented drink used by the Tartars appears to have derived its name *kumiss* from the Hebrew *chamets'*. From still another root comes also **hXm**_i *matstsah'* (*sweet*, “without leaven” [^{<B101>}Leviticus 10:11]), *unleavened* (i.e. bread, though in several passages “bread” and “cakes” are *also* expressed). In ^{<A137>}Exodus 13:7, both *seör´* and *chamets'* occur together, and are evidently distinct: “*Unleavened bread (matstsah´)* shall be eaten during the seven days, and there shall not be seen with the *fermented bread (chamets´)*, and there shall not be seen with thee *leavened dough (seör´)* in all thy borders.” See WINE.

The organic chemists define the process of fermentation, and the substance which excites it, as follows: “*Fermentation* is nothing else but the putrefaction of a substance containing no nitrogen. *Ferment*, or yeast., is a substance in a state of putrefaction, the atoms of which are in a continual motion” (Turner’s *Chemistry*, by Liebig). This definition is in strict accordance with the views of the ancients, and gives point and force to many passages of sacred writ (^{<B712>}Psalm 79:21; ^{<A116>}Matthew 16:6, 11, 12; ^{<A185>}Mark 8:15; ^{<A171>}Luke 12:1; 13:21; ^{<A115>}1 Corinthians 5:5-8; ^{<A110>}Galatians 5:9). *Leaven*, and fermented, or even some readily fermentible substances (as honey), were prohibited in many of the typical institutions both of the Jews and Gentiles. The Latin writers use *corruptus* as signifying *fermented*; Tacitus applies the word to the fermentation of wine. Plutarch (*Romans Quaest.* 109:6) assigns as the reason why the priest of Jupiter was not allowed to touch *leaven*, “that it comes out of corruption, and corrupts that with which it is mingled.” See also Aulus Gellius, 8:15. The use of leaven was strictly forbidden in all offerings made to the Lord by fire, as in the case of the meat-offering (^{<A211>}Leviticus 2:11), the trespass-offering (^{<A172>}Leviticus 7:12), the consecration-offering (^{<A212>}Exodus 29:2; ^{<A182>}Leviticus 8:2), the Nazarite-offering (^{<A115>}Numbers 6:15), and more particularly in regard to the feast of the Passover, when the Israelites were not only prohibited on pain of death from eating leavened bread, but even from having any leaven in their houses (^{<A215>}Exodus 12:15,19) or in their land (^{<A137>}Exodus 13:7; ^{<A144>}Deuteronomy 16:4) during seven days, commencing with the 14th of Nisan. The command was rigidly enforced by

the zeal of the Jews in later times (compare Mishnah, *Pesach*. 2:1; Schöttgen, *Horae Hebraicoe*, 1:598). It is in reference to these prohibitions that Amos (4:5,) ironically bids the Jews of his day to “offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving *with leaven*.” Hence, likewise, even honey was prohibited (^{<RB1>}Leviticus 2:11) on account of its occasionally producing fermentation. In other instances, where the offering was to be consumed by the priests and not on the altar, leaven might be used, as in the case of the peace-offering (^{<RB3>}Leviticus 7:13) and the Pentecostal loaves (^{<RB7>}Leviticus 23:17). It is to be presumed also that the shew-bread was unleavened, both, *á fortiori*, from the prohibition of leaven in the bread offered on the altar and because, in the directions given for the making of the shew-bread, it is not specified that leaven should be used (^{<RB5>}Leviticus 24:5-9); for, in all such cases, what is not enjoined is prohibited. Jewish tradition also asserts that the shewbread was without leaven (Josephus. *Ant.* 3:6, 6; Talm. *Minchoth*, 5:2, 3). On ^{<RB1>}Leviticus 2:11, Dr. Andrew Willet observes, “They have a spiritual signification, because ferment signifieth corruption, as St. Paul applieth (^{<RB8>}1 Corinthians 5:8). The honey is also forbidden because it had a leavening force” (Junius, *Hexapla*, 1631). On the same principle of symbolism, God prescribes that *salt* shall always constitute a part of the oblations to him (^{<RB1>}Leviticus 2:31) on account of its antiseptic properties. Thus St. Paul (comp. ^{<RB6>}Colossians 4:6; ^{<RB2>}Ephesians 4:29) uses “salt” as preservative from corruption, on the same principle which leads him to employ that which is *unfermented* (ἄζυμος) as an emblem of purity and uncorruptedness. **SEE PASSOVER.**

The Greek word ζύμη, rendered “leaven,” is used with precisely the same latitude of meaning as the Hebrew *seor'*. It signifies *leaten, sour dough* (^{<RB3>}Matthew 13:33; 16:12; ^{<RB1>}Luke 13:21). Another quality in leaven is noticed in the Bible, viz., its *secretly penetrating and diffusive* power; hence the proverbial saying, “a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump” (^{<RB8>}1 Corinthians 5:6, ^{<RB9>}Galatians 5:9). In this respect it was emblematic of moral influence generally, whether good or bad, and hence our Savior adopts it as illustrating the growth of the kingdom of heaven in the individual heart and in the world at large (^{<RB3>}Matthew 13:33). Leaven, or ferment, is therefore used tropically for *corruptness, perverseness*, of life, doctrine, heart, etc. (^{<RB6>}Matthew 16:6, 11; ^{<RB5>}Mark 8:15; ^{<RB2>}Luke 12:1; ^{<RB1>}1 Corinthians 5:7, 8; comp. ^{<RB6>}Colossians 4:6; ^{<RB2>}Ephesians 4:29). The idea seems to have been familiar to the Jews; compare Otho, *Lex Rabbin. Talm.* p. 227. They even employed leaven as a figure of the inherent

corruption of man: “Alexander, when he had finished his prayers, said, Lord of the universe, it is clearly manifest before thee that it is our will to do thy will: what hinders that we do not thy will? The leaven which is in the mass (*Gl.*, The evil desire which is in the heart)” (*Babyl. Berachoth*, 17:1; ap. Meuschen, *N.T. ex Talmude ill.*). We find the same allusion in the Roman poet Persius (*Sat.* 1:24; compare Casaubon’s note, *Comment.* p. 74). See Wernsdorf, *De fermento herodis* (Alt. 1724). **SEE UNLEAVENED BREAD.**

“The usual *leaven* in the East is dough kept till it becomes sour, and which is kept from one day to another for the purpose of preserving leaven in readiness. Thus, if there should be no leaven in all the country for any length of time, as much as might be required could easily be produced in twenty-four hours. *Sour dough*, however, is not exclusively used for leaven in the East, the *lees of wine* being in some parts employed as yeast” (Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, 1:161). In the Talmud mention is made of leaven formed of the $\mu\upsilon\rho\pi\omega\varsigma \text{ I } \zeta \text{ } \hat{\text{I}} \text{ WQ}$ *bookmakers' paste* (*Pesach.* 3:1). As the process of producing the leaven itself, or even of leavening bread when the substance was at hand, required some time, unleavened cakes were more usually produced on sudden emergencies (^{<01806>}Genesis 18:6; ^{<07019>}Judges 6:19). **SEE BAKE; SEE BREAD,** etc.

Leb'ana

(^{<1078>}Nehemiah 7:48). **SEE LEBANAH.**

Leb'anah

(Heb. *Lebanah'* $\text{hnb} \text{ I}$], the *moon* as being white, as in ^{<2760>}Song of Solomon 6:10, etc.; Sept. in ^{<1525>}Ezra 2:45 $\Lambda\beta\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}$; Chaldaistically written *Lebana'* $\text{anb} \text{ I}$] in most MSS. in ^{<1078>}Nehemiah 7:48, Sept. $\Lambda\beta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}$ Auth. Vers. “Lebana”; Vulg. in both passages *Lebanaz*), one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. B.C. ante 536.

Leb'anon

the loftiest and most celebrated mountain range in Syria, forming the northern boundary of Palestine, and running thence along the coast of the Mediterranean to the great pass which opens into the plain of Hamath. The range of *Anti-Lebanon*, usually included by geographers under the same general name, lies parallel to the other, commencing on the south at the

fountains of the Jordan, and terminating in the plain of Hamath. The two are in fact but a northern partitions of the great central ridge or back-bone of the entire country. *SEE PALESTINE.*

I. The Name. — In the O. Test. these mountain ranges are always called [^]nbj] *Lebanon'*, to which, in prose, the art. is constantly prefixed, [^]wobLbi; in poetry the art. is sometimes prefixed and sometimes not, as in ^{<2348>}Isaiah 14:8, and ^{<2349>}Psalms 29:5. The origin of the name has been variously accounted for. It is derived from the root [^]bj ; “to be *white*.” [^]wobLhirhiis thus emphatically “The White Mountain” of Syria. It is a singular fact that almost uniformly the names of the highest mountains in all countries have a like *meaning*—*Mont Blanc*, *Himalaya* (in Sanscrit signifying “snowy”), *Ben Naeris*, *Snowdon*, perhaps also *Alps* (from *alb*, “white,” like the Latin *albus*, and not, as commonly thought, from *alp*, “high”). Some suppose the name originated in the white snow by which the ridge is covered a great part of the year (Bochart, *Opera*, 1:678; Gesenius, *Thlesaurus*, p. 741; Stanley, *S. and P.* p. 395). Others derive the name from the whitish color of the limestone rock of which the great body of the range is composed (Schulz, *Leitungen des Hochsten*, 5:471; Robhison, *Biblic. Res.* 2:493). The former seems the more natural explanation, and is confirmed by several circumstances. Jeremiah mentions the “snow of Lebanon” (18:14); in the Chald. paraphrase agj]æwf “snow mountain,” is the name given to it, and this is equivalent to a not uncommon modern Arabic appellation, *Jebel eth-Thelj* (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, l. c.; Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr.* p. 18). Others derive the name Lebanon from λιβανός, “frankincense,” the gum of a tree called λίβανος (Reland, *Palest.* p. 312; Herod. 1:183), which is mentioned among the gifts presented by the magi to the infant Savior (^{<4021>}Matthew 2:11). This, however, is in Hebrew hnwbj] *Lebonah* (^{<2338>}Exodus 30:34; ^{<2306>}Isaiah 60:6). The Greek name of Lebanon, both in the Septuagint and classic authors, is uniformly Λίβανος (Strabo, 16:755; Ptol. 5:15). The Septuagint has sometimes Ἀντιλίβανος instead of Λίβανος (^{<8107>}Deuteronomy 1:7; 3:25; ^{<8108>}Joshua 1:4; 9:1). The Latin name is *Libanus* (Pliny, 5:17), which is the reading of the Vulgate. It would appear that the Greek and Roman geographers regarded the name as derived from the snow. Tacitus speaks of it as a remarkable phenomenon that snow should lie where there is such intense heat (*Hist.* 5:6). Jerome writes, “*Libanus λευκασμός id est, claudor interpretatur*” (*Adersus Jovianum*, in *Opera*, 2:286, ed. Migne); he also notes the identity

of the name of this mountain and *frankincense* (in *Osee*, in *Opera*, 6:160). Arab geographers call the range *Jebel Libnon* (Abulfeda, *Tab. Sgr.* p. 163; Edrisi, p. 336, edit. Jaubert). This name, however, is now seldom heard among the people of Syria, and when used it is confined to the western range. Different parts of this range have distinct names — the northern section is called *Jebel Akkur*, the central *Sunnin*, and the southern *J. ed-Druze*. Other local names are also used.

The *eastern range*, as well as the western, is frequently included under the general name *Lebanon* in the Bible (^{<0004>}Joshua 1:4; ^{<000B>}Judges 3:3); but in ^{<000B>}Joshua 13:5 it is correctly distinguished as "*Lebanon toward the sunrising*" (ⲙⲙⲛⲏⲓⲓⲛ ⲓⲛⲏⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲗⲟⲩⲏⲛ, Sept. **Λίβανον ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου**, and translated in the Vulg. *Libani quoque regio contra orientean*). The southern section of this range was well known to the sacred writers as HERMON, and had in ancient times several descriptive titles given to it — Sirion, Shenir, Sion; just as it has in modern days — *Jebel esh-Sheik*, *J. eth-Thelj*, *J. A ntâr*. Greek writers called the whole range **Ἀντιλίβανος** (Strabo, 16, p. 754; Ptolemy, 5:15), a word which is sometimes found in the Sept. as the rendering of the Hebrew *Lebanon* (ut supra). Latin authors also uniformly distinguish the eastern range by the name *Antilibanus* (Pliny, 5:20). The name is appropriate, describing its position, lying "opposite" or "over against" Lebanon (Strabo, 1. c.). Yet this distinction does not seem to have been known to Josephus, who uniformly calls the eastern as well as the western range Aivano; thus he speaks of the fountains of the Jordan as being near to Libanus (*Ant.* 5:3, 1), and of Abila as situated in Libanus (19:5, 1). The range of Anti-Lebanon is now called by all native geographers *Jebel esh-Shurky*, "East mountain," to distinguish it from Lebanon proper, which is sometimes termed *Jebel el-Ghurby*, "West mountain" (Robinson, *Biblical Res.* 2:437; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria*, p. 4).

To insure greater definiteness, and to prevent repetition, the name *Lebanon* will be applied in this article to the *western range*, and *Anti-Lebanon* to the *eastern*.

II. Physical Geography. —

Picture for Lebanon 1

1. Lebanon. —

(1.) *Limits.* The mountain-chain of Lebanon commences at the great valley which connects the Mediterranean with the plain of Hamath (anciently called “the entrance of Hamath,” ⁰⁶⁴⁸Numbers 34:8), in lat. 34° 40', and runs in a southwestern direction along the coast, till it sinks into the plain of Acre and the low hills of Galilee, in lat. 33°. Its extreme length is 110 geographical miles, and the average breadth of its base is about 20 miles. The highest peak, called *Dahar el-Kudib*, is about 25 miles from the northern extremity, and just over the little cedar grove; its elevation is 10,051 feet (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 170). From this point the range decreases in height towards the south. The massive rounded summit of Sunnin, 23 miles from the former, is 8500 feet high. Jebel Keniseh, the next peak, is 6824 feet; and Tomat Niha, “the Twin-peaks,” the highest tops of southern Lebanon, are about 6500 feet. From these the fall is rapid to the ravine of the river Litany, the ancient Leontes.

The chain of Lebanon, or at least its higher ridges, may be said to terminate at the point where it is thus broken through by the Litany. But a broad and lower mountainous tract continues towards the south, bordering the basin of the Huleh on the west. It rises to its greatest elevation about Safed (Jebel Safed), and at length ends abruptly in the mountains of Nazareth, as the northern wall of the plain of Esdraelon. This high tract may very properly be regarded as a prolongation of Lebanon.

Some writers regard the Litany as marking the southern limit of Lebanon; and it would seem that the ancient classical geographers were of this opinion (Smith, *Dict. of G. and R. Geog.* s.v. Libanus; Kitto, *Physical Hist. of Pal.* p. 32). Diodorus Siculus describes Lebanon as extending along the coast of Tripolis, Byblus, and Sidon (*Hist.* 19:58); and the Litany falls into the sea a few miles south of Sidon. The notices of Ptolemy are somewhat indefinite, and represent the two chains of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon as commencing at the Mediterranean — the former on the north, the latter on the south (*Geog.* 5:15). Strabo is more definite and less accurate: “There are two mountains which inclose Coele-Syria lying parallel to each other. The commencement of both these mountains, Libanus and Anti-Libanus, is a little way above the sea. Libanus rises from the sea near Tripolis and Theoprosopon, and Anti-Libanus from the sea near Sidon. They terminate somewhere near the Arabian mountains, which are above the district of Damascus and the Trachones. . . . A hollow plain lies between them, whose breadth towards the sea is 200 stadia, and its length from the sea to the interior about twice as much. Rivers flow

through it, the largest of which is the Jordan" (16:754). According to Pliny the chains begin at the sea, but they run from south to north (*I. N.* 5:17; compare Ammian. Marcel. 14:26). Cellarius merely repeats these ancient authors (*Geog.* 2:439). Reland shows their errors and contradictions, but he cannot solve them, though he derived some important information from Maundrell (*Palaest.* p. 317 sq.; comp. *Early Trav. in Pal.* Bohn, p. 483). Rosenmiiller (*Bib. Geog.* 2:207, Clark), Wells (*Geog.* 1:239), and others, only repeat the old mistakes. The source of these errors may be seen by an examination of the physical geography of the district east of Tyre and Sidon. There can be no doubt that the range of Lebanon, viewed in its physical formation, extends from the entrance of Hamath to the plain of Acre; but between the parallels of Tyre and Sidon it is cut through by the chasm of the Litany, which drains the valley of Coele-Syria. That river enters the range obliquely on the eastern side, turns gradually westward, and at length divides the main ridge at right angles. Here, therefore, it may be said, in one sense, that the chain terminates; and though on the south bank of the Litany another chain rises, and runs in the line of the former, it is not so lofty, its greatest height scarcely exceeding 3000 feet. Ancient geographers thought Lebanon terminated on the north bank of the Lithny; and as that river drains the valley of Coele-Syria, which lies between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, they naturally supposed that the chain on the south bank of the Litany was the commencement of the latter range. Here lies the error, which Dr. Porter was among the first to detect, by an examination of the general conformation of the mountain ranges from the summit of Hermon (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 11:52; Porter, *Damascus*, 1:296).

Anti-Lebanon is completely separated from this western range by a broad and deep valley. The great valley of the Jordan extends northward to the western base of Hermon, in the parallel of the chasm of the Litany. From this point a narrower valley, called wady el-Teim, runs northward, till it meets an eastern branch of Coele-Syria. These three valleys, forming a continuous line, constitute the western boundary of Anti-Lebanon. No part of that chain crosses them (Robinson, 2:438). The southern end of the plain of Coele-Syria is divided by a low ridge into two branches. Down the eastern branch runs wady el-Teim, conveying a tributary to the Jordan (*Bib. Sac.* 1. c.; Robinson, 3:428430); down the western runs the Litany. The latter branch soon contracts into a wild chasm, whose banks are in some places above a thousand feet high, of naked rock, and almost

perpendicular. At one spot the ravine is only 60 feet wide, and is spanned by a natural bridge, at the height of about 100 feet above the stream. Over it rise jagged walls of naked limestone, pierced with numerous caves. The scenery is here magnificent; as one stands on this arch of nature's own building, he can scarcely repress feelings of alarm. The cliffs almost meet overhead; rugged masses of rock shoot out from dizzy heights, and appear as if about to plunge into the chasm; the mad river far below dashes along from rapid to rapid in sheets of foam. In wild grandeur this chasm has no equal in Syria, and few in the world. Yet, from a short distance on either side, it is not visible. The mountain chain appears to run on in its course, declining gradually, but without any interruption. The ridge, in fact, has been cleft asunder by some terrible convulsion, and through the cleft the waters of Coele-Syria have forced their way to the Mediterranean instead of the Jordan, which is the natural outlet. It will thus be seen that the ridge on the south bank of the Litany is the prolongation of that on the north, and is a part of Lebanon (Robinson, 2:438); and that the chasm of the Litany, though the drain of Coele-Syria, is no part of that valley. Neither Coele-Syria, therefore, nor Anti-Lebanon, at any point, approaches within many miles of the Mediterranean (*Handbook for S. and P.* p. 571; Robinson, 3:420 sq.; Van de Velde, *Travels*, 1:145 sq.).

(2.) *Western Aspect.* — The view of Lebanon from the Mediterranean is exceedingly grand. On approaching, it appears to rise from the bosom of the deep like a vast wall, the wavy top densely covered with snow during winter and spring, and the two highest peaks capped with crowns of ice on the sultriest days of summer. The *western slopes* are long and gradual, furrowed from top to bottom with deep rugged ravines, and broken everywhere by lofty cliffs of white rock, and ragged banks, and tens of thousands of terrace walls, rising like steps of stairs from the sea to the snow-wreaths. "The whole mass of the mountain consists of whitish limestone, or at least the rocky surface, as it reflects the light, exhibits everywhere a whitish aspect. The mountain teems with villages, and is cultivated more or less almost to the top; yet so steep and rocky is the surface, that the tillage is carried on chiefly by means of terraces, built up with great labor, and covered above with soil. When one looks upward from below, the vegetation on these terraces is not seen, so that the whole mountain side appears as if composed of immense rugged masses of naked whitish rock, severed by deep wild ravines, running down precipitously to the plain. No one would suspect among these rocks the existence of a vast

multitude of thrifty villages, and a numerous population of mountaineers, hardy, industrious, and brave” (Robinson, 2, d493; comp. Volney, *Travels*, 1:272 sq.).

On looking *down* the western slopes from the brow of one of the projecting bluffs, or through the vista of one of the glens, the scenery is totally different; it is now rich and picturesque. The tops of the little stairlike terraces are seen, all green with corn, or straggling vines, or the dark foliage of the mulberry. The steeper banks and ridge-tops have their forests of pine and oak, while far away down in the bottom of the glens, and round the villages and castellated convents, are large groves of gray olives. The aspect of the various sections of the mountains is, however, very different, the rocks and strata often assuming strange, fantastic shapes. At the head of the valley of the Dog river are some of the most remarkable rock formations in Lebanon. Here numbers of little ravines fall into the main glen, and their sides, with the intervening ridges, are thickly covered with high peaks of naked limestone, sometimes rising in solitary grandeur like obelisks, but generally grouped together, and connected by narrow ledges like arched viaducts. In one place the horizontal strata in the side of a lofty cliff are worn away at the edges, giving the whole the appearance of a large pile of cushions. In other places there are tall stalks, with broad tops like tables. In many places the cliffs are ribbed, resembling the pipes of an organ, or columnar basalt. A single perch of clear soil can scarcely be found in one spot throughout the whole region, but every minute patch is cultivated, even in grottoes and under natural arches (Porter’s *Damascus*, 2:289). The highest peaks of the range are naked, white, and barren. A line drawn at the altitude of about 6000 feet would mark the limits of cultivation. Above that line the shelving sides and rounded tops are covered with loose limestone debris, and are almost entirely destitute of vegetable life.

The western base of Lebanon does not correspond with the shore-line. In some cases bold spurs shoot out from the mountains, and dip perpendicularly into the sea, forming bluff promontories, such as the “Ladder of Tyre,” Promontorium Album, or “White Cape,” the well-known pass of the Dog River, and the Theoprosopon, now called Ras esh-Shuk’ah. In other places the mountains retire, or the shore-line advances (as at Beyrut and Tripolis), leaving little sections of fertile plain, varying from half a mile to three miles in width. This was the territory of the old Phoenicians, and on it still lie the scattered remains of their once great

cities. *SEE PHOENICIA*. From the promontory of Theoprosopon a low ridge strikes northward along the shore past Tripolis, separated from the main chain by a narrow valley. When it terminates, the coast-plain becomes much wider, and gradually expands, till it opens at the northern base of Lebanon into the valley leading to the "entrance of Hamath" (Robinson, 3:385).

(3.) *Eastern Declivities*. — From the east Lebanon presents a totally different aspect. It does not seem much more than half as high as when seen from the west. This is chiefly owing to the great elevation of the plain extending along its base, which is on an average about 3000 feet above the level of the sea (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 175). The ridge resembles a colossal wall, its sides precipitous, and thinly covered, in most places, with oak forests. There are very few—only some two or three—glens furrowing them. The summit of the ridge, or backbone, is much nearer the eastern than the western side; and extending in gentle undulations, white with snow, far as the eye can see to the right and left, it forms a grand object from the ruins of Ba'albek, and still more so from the heights of Anti-Lebanon. A nearer approach to the chain. reveals a new feature. A side ridge runs along the base of the central chain from the town of Zahleh to its northern extremity, and is thinly covered throughout with forests of oak intermixed with wild plum, hawthorn, juniper, and other trees. A little south of the parallel of Sunnîn this ridge is low and narrow, and the Bukti'a is there widest. Advancing northwards the ridge increases in height, and encroaches on the plain, until, at the fountain of the Orontes ('Ain el'Asy), it attains its greatest elevation, and there the plain is narrowest. From this point southwards to where the road crosses from Ba'albek to the Cedars, the central chain is steep, naked, and destitute of vegetation, except here and there a solitary oak or blasted pine clinging to the rocks (Porter's *Damascus*, 2:303 sq. Robinson, 3:530 sq.).

The side ridge above described sinks down in graceful wooded slopes into wady Khâled, which drains a part of the plain of Hums, and falls into Nahr el-Kebir. The main chain also terminates abruptly a little farther west, and its base is swept by the waters of the Kebir, the ancient river Eleutherus (Robinson, 3:558-60).

(4.) *Rivers*. — Lebanon is rich in rivers and fountains, fed by the eternal snows that crown its summit, and the vapors which they condense. The "streams from Lebanon" were proverbial for their abundance and beauty in

the days of the Hebrew prophets (⁽²⁰¹⁵⁾ Song of Solomon 4:15), and its “cold-flowing waters” were types of richness and luxury (⁽²¹⁸⁴⁾ Jeremiah 18:14). Some of them, too, have obtained a classic celebrity (see Reland, *Palaest.* p. 269, 437). They are all small mountain torrents rather than rivers. The following are the more important:

- 1.** The Eleutherus (now Nahr el-Kebir), rising in the plain of Emesa, west of the Orontes, sweeps round the northern base of Lebanon, and falls into the Mediterranean midway between Tripolis and Aradus. Strabo states that it formed the northern border of Phoenicia and Coele-Syria (16:753; Robinson, 3:576).
- 2.** The Kadisha, or sacred river,” now generally called Nahr Abu-Aly, has its highest sources around the little cedar grove, and descends through a sublime ravine to the coast near Tripolis. At one spot its glen has perpendicular walls of rock on each side nearly 1000 feet high. Here, on opposite banks, are two villages, the people of which can converse across the chasm, but to reach each other requires a toilsome walk of two hours. In a wild cleft of the ravine is the convent of Kanobin, the chief residence of the Maronite patriarch (*Handbook for Syr. and Pal.* p. 586).
- 3.** The Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim), famous in ancient fable as the scene of the romantic story of Venus and Adonis. Killed by a boar on its banks, Adonis dyed with his blood the waters, which ever since, on the anniversary of his death, are said to run red to the sea (Lucian, *De Syria ulea*, 6; Strabo, 15:170). Adonis is supposed to be identical with Tammuz, for whom Ezekiel represents the Jewish women as weeping (8:14). “The source is a noble fountain beside the ruins of a temple of Venus, and near the site of Apeca, now marked by the little village of Afka (Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 3:55; Porter, *Damascus*, 2:297; Ritter, *Pal. und Syr.* 4:558). The Adonis falls into the sea a few miles south of the Biblical Gebal.
- 4.** The Lycus flumen, now Nahr el-Kelb, or “Dog River,” rises high up on the flank of Sunnin, and breaks down through a picturesque glen. At its mouth is that famous pass on whose sculptured rocks Assyrian, Egyptian, Roman, and French (!) generals have left records of their expeditions and victories (Robinson, 3:618; *Handbook*, p. 407 sq.; Strabo, 16:755).

5. The Magoras of Pliny (v. 17) is probably the modern Nahr Beyrut.
6. The Tamyras or Damuras (Strabo, 16:756; Polybius, v. 68) rises near Deir el-Kamr, the capital of Lebanon. It is now called Nahr ed-Dammfir.
7. The Bostrenus of ancient authors appears to be identical with Nahr el-Awaley, though some doubt this.
8. The Leontes has already been mentioned. The lower section of it is now generally termed Kasimlyeh, and the upper section Litsiny. Its chief sources are at Chalcis and Ba'albek; but a large tributary flows down from the ravine of Zahleh, and is the only stream which descends the eastern slopes of Lebanon. *SEE LEONTES.*

2. *Anti-Lebanon.* —

(1.) *Peaks.* — The center and culminating point of Anti-Lebanon is HERMON. From it a number of ranges radiate, like the ribs of a half-open fan. The first and loftiest runs north-east, parallel to Lebanon, and separated from it by the valley of Coele-Syria, whose average breadth is about six miles. This ridge is the backbone of Anti-Lebanon. Where it joins Hermon it is broad, irregular, intersected by numerous valleys and little fertile plains, and covered with thin forests of dwarf oak. Its elevation is not more than 4500 feet. Advancing northwards, its features become wilder and grander, oak-trees give place to juniper, and the elevation increases until, above the beautiful plain of Zebedany—which lies embosomed in its very center it attains a height of about 7000 feet (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 175). From this point to the parallel of Ba'albek there is little change in the elevation or scenery. Beyond the latter it begins to fall, and declines gradually until at length it sinks down into the great plain of Hamath, eight miles east of Riblah, and sixteen south of Emesa. With the exception of the little upland plains, and a few of the deeper valleys, this ridge is incapable of cultivation. The sides are steep and rugged, in many places sheer precipices of naked, jagged rock, nearly 1000 feet high. They are not so bare or bleak, however, as the higher summits of Lebanon. Vegetation is abundant among the rocks; and though the inhabitants are few and far between, immense flocks of sheep and goats are pastured upon the mountains, and wild beasts — bears, boars, wolves, jackals, hyenas, foxes are far more abundant than in any other part of Syria or Palestine (Porter, *Damascus*, 2:315).

The lowest and last of the ridges that radiate from Hermon runs nearly due east along the magnificent plain of Damascus, and continues onward to Palmyra. Its average elevation is not more than 3000 feet, and it does not rise more than about 700 feet above the plain, though some of its peaks are much higher. Its rock is chalky, almost pure white, and entirely naked—not a tree, or shrub, or patch of verdure is anywhere seen upon it. It thus forms a remarkable contrast to the rich green of the plain of Damascus. From the central range to this ridge there is a descent, by a series of broad, bare terraces or plateaus, supported by long, continuous walls of bare, whitish limestone, varying from 100 to 1000 feet in height. Nothing could be more dreary and desolate than the scenery on these steppes. The gravelly soil, in many places thickly strewn with flints, is as bare as the cliffs that bound them. Yet they are intersected by several rich and beautiful glens, so deep, however, that their verdure and foliage can not be seen from a distance. Towards the east these steppes gradually expand into broad upland plains, and portions of them are irrigated and tilled. On them stand the small but ancient towns of Yabrud, Nebk, Jerud, etc., around which madder is successfully cultivated.

(2.) *Rivers.* — Anti-Lebanon is the source of the four great rivers of Syria: 1. The Orontes (q.v.), springing from the western base of the main ridge, beside the ruins of Lybo, flows away northward through a broad, rich vale, laving in its course the walls of Emesa, Hamath, Apamea, and Antioch. 2. The Jordan (q.v.), Palestine's sacred river, bursting from the side of Hermon, rolls down its deep, mysterious valley into the Sea of Death. 3. The Abana, the "golden-flowing" stream of Damascus (*Chrysorrhoea*, Pliny, v. 16; also called *Bardines*, Steph. Byz.; see ABANA), rises on the western side of the main ridge, cuts through it and the others, and falls into the lake east of the city. 3. The Leontes (q.v.), Phoenicia's nameless stream, has its two principal fountains at the western base of Anti-Lebanon, beside Chalcis and Ba'albek (Porter, *Damascus* 1:11: Robinson, 3:498, 506). The only other streams of Anti-Lebanon are (4) the Piharpar, now called el-Awaj, rising on the eastern flank of Hermon (*SEE PHARPAR*), and (5) the torrent which flows down the fertile glen of Helbon (q.v.) into the plain of Damascus.

3. These parallel ranges enclose between them a fertile and well-watered valley, averaging about fifteen miles in width, which is the Coele-Syria (Hollow Syria) of the ancients, but is called by the present inhabitants, by way of pre-eminence, el-Bekaa, or "the Valley." This is traversed through

the greater portion of its length by the river Litâny, the ancient Leontes. It is the “valley of Lebanon” (𐤆𐤍𐤊𐤏𐤃𐤏 mentioned in ^{<6117>}Joshua 11:17; 12:7, and later “the plain of Aveii” (𐤏𐤁𐤀𐤏 alluded to by Amos (Amos 1:5), where also Solomon constructed one of his palaces (^{<117>}1 Kings 7:2; 9:9; 10:17; ^{<2104>}Song of Solomon 7:4). *SEE COELESYRIA.*

III. Natural Science. —

1. The *geology* of Lebanon has never been thoroughly investigated. Dr. Anderson, who accompanied the United States expedition under lieutenant Lynch, is the only man who has attempted anything like a scientific examination of the mountains. We are much indebted to his *Reconnaissance*, embodied in Lynch’s *Official Report*. The German traveler Russegger also supplies some facts in his *Reisen* (vol. 3). Tristram, in his *Land of Israel* (s. f.) has considerably enlarged our knowledge of the geology as well as natural history of Lebanon.

The main ridges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon are composed of Jura limestone, hard, partially crystallized, and containing few fossils. The strata have been greatly disturbed. In some places they are almost perpendicular; in others tilted over, laying bare veins and detached masses of trap. In the southern part of Lebanon, near Kedesh and Safed, are many traces of recent disturbance. From the earliest ages earthquakes have been frequent and most destructive in that region. The earthquake of 1837 buried thousands of the inhabitants of Safed beneath the ruins of their houses (Robinson, 2:422 sq.; *Handb.* p. 438). In the upper basin of the Jordan, and along the eastern flank of Hermon, trap rock abounds; the latter is the commencement of the great trap-fields of Hauran (Porter, *Damascus*, 2:240 sq.).

Over the Jura limestone there is in many places a more recent cretaceous deposit; its color is gray, and sometimes pure white. It is soft, and abounds in flints and fossils, ammonites, echinites, ostraea, chenopus, nerinea, etc., often occurring in large beds, as at Bhamdun above Beyrut. Fossil fish are also found imbedded in the rock near the ancient Gebal (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 321). These cretaceous deposits occur along the whole western flank of Lebanon, and the lower eastern ranges of Anti-Lebanon are wholly composed of them (D’Arvieux, *Memoires*, 2:393; Elliot, *Travels*, 2:257; Volney, 2:280).

Extensive beds of soft, friable sandstone are met with both in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. According to Anderson, the sandstone is of a more recent period than the cretaceous strata. This change in the geological structure gives great variety to the scenery of Lebanon. The regular and graceful outlines of the sandstone ridges contrast well with the bolder and more abrupt limestone cliffs and peaks, while the ruddy hue and somber pine forests of the former relieve the intense whiteness of the latter.

Coal has been found in the district of Metn, east of Beyrit, but it is impure, and the veins are too thin to repay mining. Iron is found in the central and southern portions of Lebanon, and there is an extensive salt marsh on one of the eastern steppes of Anti-Lebanon (Porter, *Damascus*, 1:161; *Handbook*, p. 363; Volney, 1:281; Burckhardt, p. 27).

2. The *Botany* of Lebanon, like the geology, is to a great extent unknown. It appears to be very rich in the abundance, the variety, and the beauty of the trees, shrubs, and flowers of these noble mountains. The great variety of climate, from the tropical heat of the Jordan valley at the base of Hermon, to the eternal snows on its summit, affords space and fitting home for the vegetable products of nearly every part of the globe. The forests of Lebanon were celebrated throughout the ancient world. Its cedars were used in the temples and palaces of Jerusalem (1 Kings 6; ^{<101>}2 Samuel 5:11; ^{<130>}Ezra 3:7; ^{<234>}Isaiah 14:8; Josephus, *War*, v. 5, 2), Rome (Pliny, *H. N.* 13:11), and Assyria (Layard, *Nin. and Bob.* p. 356, 644); and the pine and oak were extensively employed in ship-building (^{<370>}Ezekiel 27:4-6). **SEE CEDAR.** On these mountains we have still the cedar, pine, oak of several varieties, terebinth, juniper, walnut, plane, poplar, willow, arbutus, olive, mulberry, carob, fig, pistachio, sycamore, hawthorn, apricot, plum, pear, apple, quince, pomegranate, orange, lemon, palm, and banana. The vine abounds everywhere. Oleanders line the streams, and rhododendrons crown the peaks higher up, with the rock-rose, ivy, berberry, and honeysuckle. The loftiest summits are almost bare, owing to the cold and extreme dryness. There are even here, however, some varieties of low prickly shrubs, which lie on the ground like cushions, and look almost as sapless as the gravel from which they spring. Many of the flowers are bright and beautiful — the anemone, tulip, pink, ranunculus, geranium, crocus, lily, star of Bethlehem, convolvulus, etc. Thistles abound in immense variety. The *cereals* and *vegetables* include wheat, barley, maize, lentils, beans, peas, carrots, turnips, potatoes, melons, pumpkins, cucumbers, tobacco, cotton, and numerous others.

Irrigation is extensively practiced, and wherever water is abundant the crops are luxuriant. Probably in no part of the world are there more striking examples of the triumph of industry over rugged and intractable nature than along the western slopes of Lebanon. The steepest banks are terraced; every little shelf and cranny in the cliffs is occupied by the thrifty husbandman, and planted with vine or mulberry (Robinson, 3:14,21, 615; Porter, *Damascus*, 2:283; *Handbook*, p. 410,413).

3. Zoology. — Considerable numbers of wild beasts still inhabit the retired glens and higher peaks of Lebanon, including jackals, hyenas, wolves, bears, and panthers (^{<249>}2 Kings 14:9; ^{<208>}Song of Solomon 4:8; ^{<317>}Habakkuk 2:17). *SEE PALESTINE.*

Anti-Libanus is more thinly peopled than its sister range, and it is more abundantly stocked with wild beasts. Eagles, vultures, and other birds of prey may be seen day after day sweeping in circles round the beetling cliffs. Wild swine are numerous, and vast herds of gazelles roam over the bleak eastern steppes. *SEE ZOOLOGY.*

IV. Climate. — There are great varieties of climate and temperature in Lebanon. In the plain of Dan, at the fountain of the Jordan, the heat and vegetation are almost tropical, and the exhalations from the marshy plain render the whole region unhealthy. The seminomads who inhabit it are as dark in complexion as Egyptians. The thermometer often stands at 98° Fahr. in the shade on the site of Dan, while it does not rise above 32° on the top of Hermon. The coast along the western base of Lebanon, though very sultry during the summer months, is not unhealthy. The fresh sea-breeze which sets in in the evening keeps the night comparatively cool, and the air is dry and free from miasma. Snow never falls on the coast, and it is very rarely seen at a lower elevation than 2000 feet. Frost is unknown. In the plains of Coele-Syria (3000 feet) and Damascus (about 2300 feet), snow falls more or less every winter, sometimes eight inches deep on the streets and terraced roofs of Damascus, while the roads are too rough and hard with frost for traveling. The main ridges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon are generally covered with snow from December to March, sometimes so deeply that the roads are for weeks together impassable. During the whole summer the higher parts of the mountains are cool and pleasant, the air is extremely dry, and malaria is unknown. From the beginning of June till about the 20th of September rain never falls, and clouds are rarely seen. At the latter date the autumn rains begin, generally

accompanied with storms of thunder and vivid lightning. January and February are the coldest months. The barley harvest begins, on the plain of Phoenicia, about the end of April, but in the upper altitudes it is not gathered in till the beginning of August. During the summer, in the village of Shumlan, on the western declivity of Lebanon, at an elevation of 2000 feet, in the hottest part of the day the thermometer does not rise above 830 Fahr., and in the night it usually goes down to 760. From June 20th to August 20th the barometer often does not vary a quarter of an inch; there are few cloudy days, and scarcely even a slight shower. At Bludan, in Anti-Lebanon, with an elevation of 4800 feet, the air is extremely dry, and the thermometer never rises in summer above 82° Fahr. in the shade. The nights are cool and pleasant. The *sirocco* wind is severely felt along the coast and on the western slopes of Lebanon, but not so much in Anti-Lebanon. It blows occasionally during March and April. *Dew* is almost unknown along the mountain ridges, but in the low plains, and especially at the base of Hermon, it is very abundant (^{<B13B>}Psalm 133:3).

Picture for Lebanon 2

V. Historical Notices. — Lebanon is first mentioned as a boundary of the country given by the Lord in covenant promise to Israel (^{<B100>}Deuteronomy 1:7; 11:24). To the dwellers in the parched and thirsty south, or on the sultry banks of the Nile, the snows, and streams, and verdant forests of Lebanon must have seemed an earthly paradise. By such a contrast we can understand Moses's touching petition, "I pray thee let me go over and see the good land that is beyond Jordan, that goodly mountain, and Lebanon" (^{<B85>}Deuteronomy 3:25). The mountains were originally inhabited by a number of warlike, independent tribes, some of whom Joshua conquered on the banks of Lake Merom (11:2-18). They are said to have been of Phoenician stock (Pliny, 5:17; Eusebius, *Onom.* s.v.; compare 1 Kings 5). Further north were the Hivites (^{<B7B>}Judges 3:3), and the Giblites, and Arlites, whose names still cling to the ruins of their ancient strongholds. **SEE GIBLITE, ARKITE.** The Israelites never completely subdued them, but the enterprising Phoenicians appear to have had them under their power, or in their pay, for they got timber for their fleets from the mountains, and they were able to supply Solomon from the same forests when building the Temple (^{<B1B>}1 Kings 5:9-11; ^{<B70>}Ezekiel 27:9 sq.). At a later period we find the king of Assyria felling its timber for his military engines (^{<B4B>}Isaiah 14:8; 37:24, ^{<B116>}Ezekiel 31:16), and it is mentioned on

the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.). Diodorus Siculus relates that in like manner Antigonus, having collected from all quarters hewers of wood, and sawyers, and ship-builders, brought down an immense quantity of timber from Libanus to the sea to build himself a navy (19:58). The same fact that this mountain was the famous resort for timber, whether for architectural, naval, or military purposes, appears from the Egyptian monuments, where the name is found in the corrupted form of *Lemanon* (Wilkinson, *Egyptians*, 1:403). It is there represented as a mountainous country, inaccessible to chariots, and abounding in lofty trees, which the affrighted mountaineers, having fled thither for refuge, are engaged in felling, in order to impede the advance of the invading Egyptian army.

Picture for Lebanon 3

During the conquests of David and the commercial prosperity of the nation under Solomon, the Jews became fully acquainted with the richness, the grandeur, and the luxuriant foliage of Lebanon, and ever after that mountain was regarded as the emblem of wealth and majesty. Thus the Psalmist says of the Messiah's kingdom, "The fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon" (^{<49726>}Psalm 72:16); and Solomon, praising the beauty of the Bridegroom, writes, "His countenance is as Lebanon, excellent as the cedars" (^{<2185>}Song of Solomon 5:15). Isaiah also predicts of the Church, "The glory of Lebanon shall be given to it" (^{<3312>}Isaiah 35:2; compare ^{<2813>}Isaiah 60:13; ^{<2845>}Hosea 14:5, 6). Indeed, in Scripture, Lebanon is very generally mentioned in connection with the cedar-trees with which it abounded; but its wines are also noticed (^{<2848>}Hosea 14:8); and in ^{<2341>}Song of Solomon 4:11; ^{<2847>}Hosea 14:7, it is celebrated for various kinds of fragrant plants. Lebanon is greatly celebrated both in sacred and classical writers, and much of the sublime imagery of the prophets of the Old Test. is borrowed from this mountain (e.g. ^{<4295>}Psalm 29:5, 6; 104:16-18; ^{<2498>}Song of Solomon 4:8, 15; ^{<2123>}Isaiah 2:13; ^{<3812>}Zechariah 11:1, 2).

Anti-Lebanon seems to have been early brought under the sway of Damascus, though amid its southern strongholds were some fierce tribes who preserved their independence down to a late period (^{<4359>}1 Chronicles 5:19-23; Josephus, *Ant.* 13:11, 3; Strabo, 16, p. 755, 756).

During the reign of the Seleucidae several large cities were founded or rebuilt in these mountains as Laodicea at the northern end of Anti-Lebanon, Chalcis at its eastern base, Abila in the wild glen of the Abana (^{<4081>}Luke 3:1). *SEE ABILA*. At the commencement of our era, Lebanon,

with the rest of Syria, passed into the hands of Rome, and under its fostering rule great cities were built and beautiful temples erected. The heights on which Baal-fires had burned in primeval times, and the groves where the rude mountain tribes worshipped their idols, became the sites of noble buildings, whose ruins to this day excite the admiration of every traveler. Greece itself cannot surpass in grandeur the temples of Ba'albek and Chalcis. There are more than thirty temples in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon (Porter, *Handbook*, p. 454, 457, 557, 411; comp. Robinson, 3:438, 625).

During the wars of the Seleucidae, the Romans, and the Saracens, the inhabitants of Lebanon probably remained in comparative security. When, under the Muslem rule, Christianity was almost extirpated from the rest of Syria, it retained its hold there; and the *Maronites* (q.v.), who still occupy the greater part of the range, are doubtless the lineal descendants of the old Syrians. The sect originated in the 7th century, when the monk Maron taught them the Monothelitic heresy. In the 12th century they submitted to the pope, and have ever since remained devoted Papists. They number about 200,000. The *Druses* (q.v.), their hereditary foes, dwell in the southern section of the range, and number about 80,000. The jealousies and feuds of the rival sects, fanned by a cruel and corrupt government, often desolate "that goodly mountain" with fire and sword. Anti-Lebanon has a considerable Christian population, but they are mixed with Mohammedans, and have no political status. The whole range is under the authority of the pasha of Damascus.

The American missionaries have established several schools among the people of Lebanon, and for some years past pleasing success has attended their efforts in the mountain, which, however, were almost wholly interrupted by the violent outbreak among the Druses in 1860, ending in a wholesale massacre of the Christians. On the suppression of this, a Maronite governor was appointed over the district by the Turkish government, under the protectorate of the five great European powers.

V. Literature. — Robinson, *Biblical Researches*, 3:344, 345, 439; Kitto, *Pictorial History of Palestine*, Introd. p. 32-35, 55; Reland, *Palaestina*, 1:311; Rosenmüller, *Biblisches Alterthum*, 2:236; Raumer, *Palastina*, p. 29-35; D'Arvieux, *Memoires*, 2:250; Volney, *Voyage en Syrie*, 1:243; Seetzen, in Zach's *Monatl. Correspond.* June, 1806; Burckhardt, *Travels in Syr.* p. 1 sq.; Richter, *Wallfahrten*, p. 102, etc.; Irby and Mangles,

Travels, p. 206-220; Buckingham, *Arab Tribes*, p. 468 sq.; Fisk, in *Missionary Herald*, 1824; Elliot. *Travels*, 2:276; Hogg, *Visit to Alexandria, Jerusalem, etc.*, 1:219 sq., 2:81 sq.; Addison, *Palmyra and Damascus*, 2:43-82; Ritter's *Erdkunde*, 17, div. 1; Robinson's *Researches*, new edit., 3:584-625; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 205-253; 1848, p. 1-23, 243-262, 447-480, 663-700; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 55; Kelly's *Syria and Holy Land*, p. 76-165; Porter, *Damascus* (Lond. 1855); Thomson, *Land and Book*, vol. 1; Van de Velde, *Travels*, etc., vol. 1; Churchill, *Lebanon* (London, 1853, 1862); also *Druses and Maronites* (Lond. 1862); Tristram, *Land of Israel* (London. 1865); Palmer, in the *Quarterly Statement of the "Palestine Exploration Fund,"* April, 1871, p. 107 sq. **SEE PALESTINE.**

Leb' aöth

(Heb. *Lebasth'*, **t/ab|** *lionesses*; Sept. **Λαβαώθ**), a city in the southern part of Judah, i.e. Simeon (^{<652>}Joshua 15:32); elsewhere more fully BETH-LAEBATH (^{<696>}Joshua 19:6); also BETH-BIREI (^{<348>}1 Chronicles 4:31). The associated names in all these passages suggest a location in the wild southwestern part of the tribe, possibly at the ruined site marked on Van de Velde's *Map* as *Sbeta*, on wady Suniyeh, not very far from Elusa, towards Gaza.

Lebbae'us

(**Λεββαῖος**), a surname of Judas or Jude (^{<408>}Matthew 10:3), one of the twelve apostles; a member, together with his namesake "Iscariot," James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, of the last of the three sections of the apostolic body. The name Judas only, without any distinguishing mark, occurs in the lists given in ^{<166>}Luke 6:16; ^{<413>}Acts 1:13; and in ^{<342>}John 14:22 (where we find "Judas not Iscariot" among the apostles), but the apostle has been generally identified with "Lebbeus whose surname was Thaddaeus" (**Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς θαδδαῖος**) (^{<408>}Matthew 10:3; ^{<488>}Mark 3:18), though Schleiermacher (*Critical Essay on St. Luke*, p. 93) treats with scorn any such attempt to reconcile the lists. In both the last quoted places there is considerable variety of reading, some MSS. having both in Matthew and Mark **Λεββαῖος, θαδδαῖος** alone, others introducing the name **Ἰούδας**, or *Judas Zelotes*, in Matthew, where the Vulgate reads *Thaddaeus* alone, which is adopted by Lachmann in his Berlin edition of 1832. This confusion is still further increased by the tradition preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* 1:13) that the true name of Thomas

(the twin) was Judas (Ἰούδας ὁ καὶ θωμᾶς), and that Thaddaeus was one of the “seventy,” identified by Jerome *in Matthew 10* with “Judas Jacobi,” as well as by the theories of modern scholars, who regard the “Levi” (Λευὶς ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου) of ~~4024~~Mark 2:14: Luke v. 27, who is called “Lebes” (Λεβῆς) by Origen (*Cont. Cels.* 1. 1, § 62), as the same with Lebb’aus. The safest way out of these acknowledged difficulties is to hold fast to the ordinarily received opinion that Jude, Lebbaeus, and Thaddaus were three names for the same apostle, who is therefore said by Jerome (*in Matthew 10*) to have been “trionimus,” rather than introduce confusion into the apostolic catalogues, and render them erroneous either in excess or defect. *SEE THADDAEUS.*

The interpretation of the names Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus is a question beset with almost equal difficulty. The former is interpreted by Jerome “hearty,” *corculum*, as from **bl** *ęcor*, and Thaddaeus has been erroneously supposed to have a cognate signification, *honop ectorosus*, as from the Syriac **dTi** *pectus* (Lightfoot, *Horae Heb.* p. 235; Bengel, ~~400B~~*Matthew 10:3*), the true signification of **dTi** being *mamma* (Angl. *teat*) (Buxtorf, *Lex. Talnm.* p. 2565). Winer (*Realwörterb.* s.v.) would combine the two, and interpret them as meaning *ierzensakind*. Another interpretation of Lebbaeus is *the young lion* (*leunculus*), as from **aybæ** *leo* (Schleusner, s.v.), while Lightfoot and Baumg. — Crusius would derive it from *Lebba*, a maritime town of Galilee mentioned by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v. 19), where, however, the ordinary reading is *Jebba*. Thaddaeus appears in Syriac under the form *Adai*; hence Michaelis admits the idea that *Adai*, Thaddaeus, and Judas may be different representations of the same word (4:370), and Wordsworth (*Gr. Test.* in ~~400B~~*Matthew 10:3*) identifies Thaddaeus with Judas, as both from **hdwb** “to praise.” Chrysostom (*De Prod. Jud.* 1. 1, 100, 2) says that there was a “Judas Zelotes” among the disciples of our Lord, whom he identifies with the apostle. *SEE JUDE.*

Lebeuf, Jean

a French priest and antiquary, was born at Auxerre on March 6, 1687, and became a priest in the cathedral of his native place. Later he made an antiquarian visit through France, and in 1740 was chosen a member of the Academy of Inscriptions, for which he wrote many memoirs. He died in 1760. Lebeuf published several dissertations on French history, for a list of which. see Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.* ~~010B~~*Genesis 30:84.*

Lebi, Lebiyah

SEE LION.

Leblond, Gaspard Michelt

a noted French ecclesiastic and antiquary, was born at Caen Nov. 24, 1738, and, after entering the priesthood, became abbot of Vermort. Later he lived in Paris as keeper of the Mazarin Library. He was also a member of the Institute, and wrote several archaeological treatises. He died June 17, 1809. See Hooper, *Noev. Biog.* ^{<1319>} *Genesis* 30:97.

Lebon, Joseph

a noted French priest and politician, was born Sept. 25, 1765, at Arras; pursued his studies under the Brethren of the Oratory, and entered their order afterwards; then taught rhetoric at one of their colleges; but upon the outbreak of the Revolution he caught the intoxication of the hour, and finally became one of the worst Terrorists, mingling beastly profligacy with unquenchable bloodthirstiness. He was particularly severe upon the clergy, more especially monastics; but when the reaction set in he suffered for his conduct death-punishment by the guillotine in 1795, at Amiens. See Lacroix's *Pressense, Religion and the Reign of Terror*, p. 200, 407.

Lebonah

SEE FRANKINCENSE.

Lebo'nah

(Heb. *Lebonah'*, [hn/bl](#)] *frankincense*, as often; Sept. [Λεβωνά](#)), a town near Shiloh, north of the spot where the Benjamite youth were directed to capture the Shilonite maidens at the yearly festival held "on the north side of Bethel, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem" (^{<17219>} *Judges* 21:19). The earliest modern mention of it is in the Itinerary of the Jewish traveler hap-Parchi (A.D. cir. 1320), who describes it under the name of *Lubin*, and refers especially to its correspondence with the passage in *Judges* (see Asher's *Benjamin of Tudela*, 2:435). Brocardus mentions it as a very handsome village, by the name of *Lemna*, four leagues south of Nablus, on the right hand of the road to Jerusalem (chap. 7, p. 178). The identity of this place was again suggested by Mandrell, who calls it *Leban* (*Trav.* p. 86). It is no doubt the *Lubban* visited by Dr.

Robinson on his way from Jerusalem to Nablûs (*Bib. Researches*, 3:90). He describes the khan el-Lubban as being now in ruins; but near by is a fine fountain of running water. From it a beautiful oval plain extends north about fifteen minutes, with perhaps half that breadth, lying here deep among the high rocky hills. About the middle of the western side, a narrow chasm through the mountain, called wady el-Lubban, carries off the waters of the plain and surrounding tract. The village of Lubban is situated on the north-west acclivity, considerably above the plain. It is inhabited; has the appearance of an old place; and in the rocks above it are excavated sepulchers (comp. De Saulcy, *Narrative*, 1:94, 95; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 130; Wilson, 2:292 sq.; Bonar, p. 363; Mislin, 3:319; Porter, *Handbook*, p. 330; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 330; Tristram, p. 160).

Lebrija, Aelius Antonius Of

(or LEBRIXA, vulgarly *Nebrissensis*, from Lebrixa or Lebrija, the old Nebrissa, on the Guadalquivir), “un humanista de prima nota,” the Erasmus of Spain, was born at that place in 1442 according to Munnoz (Nichol. Anton and Cave say 1444). He studied in his native city, and afterwards went to the University of Salamanca. In 1461 he went to Italy to perfect himself in the classics. He visited the best schools, heard the most renowned teachers, and made great proficiency in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, etc., and even in theology, jurisprudence, and medicine. After ten years thus employed he returned to Spain, intending to effect a reformation, and with the special aim of promoting classical learning, in the universities of that country. He first labored in an unofficial way, and as teacher in the college of San Miguel at Seville; but Salamanca was the object of his ambition. His lessons met with great success, and he soon became popular throughout Spain. He contributed very largely to the expulsion of barbarism from the seats of education, and to the diffusion of a taste for elegant and useful studies. He also published a large number of philological works, such as Latin, Greek, and Hebrew grammars, and especially a Latin lexicon, which was enthusiastically received by the universities of all countries. He likewise applied philology to theology, and by that means caused it to make a great progress: in order to correct the text of the Vulgate, he compared it with the older texts, the Hebrew and Greek originals, and was one of the chief writers on the Polyglot of the Alcala, prepared under the direction of cardinal Ximenes. This course naturally brought him into conflict with the scholastics, whose system had to his day prevailed. He was charged with having approached the intricate subject of

theology without any knowledge of it, and to have undertaken an unprecedented labor on the mere strength of his philological talents. The Inquisition interfered, and part of his Biblical works were prohibited. He, however, protested against this measure in his *Apologia*, addressed to his protector, cardinal Ximenes, and had it not been for the interference of the latter, and of other influential friends at the court, he would no doubt have suffered severely (compare his *Apologia*, in *Antonii Bibl. Lisp. Vet.* 2:310 sq.); as it was, he was appointed, in 1513, professor of Latin literature at the newly established University of Alcala de Henares (*Complutum*), and here was suffered to end his days in peace. He died July 2, 1522, according to Munnoz. Most of his works are still extant, among them a history of the reign of Ferdinand the Catholic, made by order of that prince, under the title *Decades duae*, etc. (posthumously edited, 1545). See Nicolai Antonii *Bibliotheca Hispana* (Romans 1672), p. 104 A, 109 B; Du Pin, *Nouv. Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles.* 14:120-123; Guil. Cave, *Scriptor. eccl. Historia litter.* (Genevse, 1694), Appendix, p. 116 B, 118 A; Hefele, *Cardinal Ximenes*, p. 116, 124, 379, 458; Munnoz, *Elogio de Antonio de Lebrija*, in the *Memorias de la real Academia de la Historia*, 3:1-30; Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 8:265; M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, p. 61, 75, 105. (J. H. W.)

Lebrun, Pierre

a French theologian, born at Brignolles in 1661, was professor in several colleges, and died June 6, 1729. He wrote, among other works, a *Critical History of Superstitious Practices which have Seduced the People* (1702).

Lebuin Or Liafwinn

a noted colleague of Gregory in his mission among the inhabitants of Friesland. According to his painstaking biographer, Hunebald, a monk of the convent of Elnon in the 10th century (in Surius, 6:277, and in Pertz, 2:360), Lebuin was a native of Brittany, and joined Gregory at Utrecht, having been directed to do so in a dream. Gregory sent him on a mission to the neighboring people, and gave him the Anglo-Saxon Marchelin or Marcellin as assistant. They preached with great success, and soon established a church at Wulpen, on the eastern shore of the Yssel, and another at Deventer. These churches afterwards closing by an invasion of the Saxons, Lebuin courageously resolved to go as a missionary among that nation, and went to Marklo, one of their principal cities; later he went

further north, towards the Weser, and there was well received by an influential chief named Folkbert, who seems to have been a Christian. Folkbert advised him not to visit Marklo during the reunion which was held there yearly to discuss the general interests of the nation, but to conceal himself in the house of one of his friends, Davo. Lebuin, however, did not abide by this counsel, and went to the assembly. Being aware how “omnis concionis illius multitudo ex diversis partibus coacta primo suorum proavorum servare contendit instituta, numinibus videlicet suis vota solvens ac sacrificia,” he appeared in the midst of the assembled warriors dressed in his priestly robes, the cross in one hand and the Gospel in the other, and announced himself as an envoy of the Most High, the one true God and creator of all things, to whom all must turn, forsaking our idols: “but,” said he, at the close of his address, “if you wickedly persist in your errors, you will soon repent it bitterly, for in a short time there will come a courageous, prudent, and strong monarch of the neighborhood who will overwhelm you like a torrent, destroying all with fire and sword, taking your wives and children to be his servants, and subjecting all who are left to his rule.” This discourse greatly excited the Saxons against him; but one of them, Buto, took his part, and Lebuin was permitted to depart unharmed. He now returned to Friesland, and rebuilt the church of Deventer, where he remained until his death. When Liudger built a third time the church which had been again destroyed during an invasion of the Saxons in 776, the remains of Lebuin were discovered. Lebuin is not to be mistaken for Livin, the pupil of Augustine, who went to evangelize Brabant towards the middle of the 7th century. The biography of Livin, believed to have been written by Boniface, cannot for a moment be considered as referring to the apostle of Germany. It is full of legends, and of no historical value. See F. W. Rettberg, *K. Gesch. Deutschlands*, 2:405, 536, 509. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:266; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kitchen-Lexikon*, 6:401 sq.

Le'cah

(Heb. *Lecah'*, חֲכַל עֵרֶפֶר for חֲכַל עֵרֶר *a journey*, but according to Fürst, *annexation*; Sept. Ἀηχά v. r. Ἀηχάδ and Ἀηχάβ; Vulg. *Lecha*), a place in the tribe of Judah founded by Er (or rather, perhaps, by a son of his named Lecah), the first-named son of Shelah (^{<1302>}1 Chronicles 4:21). As Mareshah is stated in the same connection to have been founded by a member of the

same family, we may conjecture that Lecah (if indeed a town) lay in the same vicinity, perhaps westerly.

LecÈne, Charles,

a French Protestant theologian, was born in 1647 at Caen, in Normandy. After studying theology at Sedan, Geneva, and Saumur, he was in 1672 appointed pastor at Honfleur. In 1682 he supplied for one year the Church of Charenton, but was accused of Pelagianism by Sartre, pastor of Montpellier. Unable to obtain from the Consistory of Charenton a certificate of orthodoxy such as he desired, he appealed to the next national synod, where he was warmly sustained by Allix, but the revocation of the Edict of Nantes suddenly put an end to the discussion. Lecene went to Holland, and there connected himself with the Arminians. He then went to England, but, refusing to be reordained, and being, moreover, strongly suspected of Socinianism, he was unable to accomplish anything there, and returned to Holland, where he remained until 1697. He then went again to England, and settled at London. He vainly tried to found an Arminian Church in the English metropolis. He died in 1703. Lecene was, even by his theological adversaries, considered a very learned theologian. A plan of his for the translation of the Bible was taken up by his son, Michel Lecene (Amst. 1741, 2 vols. folio): *Projet d'une nouvelle version Francoise de la Bible* (Rotterdam, 1696, 8vo; translated, *An Essay for a new Translation of the Bible, wherein is shown that there is a necessity for a new Translation*, 2d ed., to which is added a table of the texts of Scripture [Lond. 1727, 8vo]). He wrote *De l'Etat de l'homme apres le peche et de sa predestination asu salut* (Amsterd. 1684, 12mo): — *Entretiens sur diverses matieres de theologie*, etc. (1685, 12mo): — *Conversations sur diverses matieres de religion* (1687, 12mo). See Colani, in *Revue de Theologie*, 7:343 sq., 1857; Hoefer. *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 29:185; and the sketch in the *Avertissement de sa traduction de la Bible* (Amst. 1742, 2 vols. folio). (J. H. W.)

Leckey, William,

a Presbyterian minister in Ireland, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He made himself conspicuous by the part he took in the Blood plot — an attempt, after the Restoration, to complicate the Nonconformists and the government by warring against Romanism. He was imprisoned May 22, 1663, and, refusing to conform, was condemned

to death, and executed on July 15 at Gallows Green, near Dublin. Leckey was a fine preacher and an able scholar, a fellow of the College of Dublin, which high school petitioned for his life. This request was granted upon the conformity of Leckey, which, as we have seen above, he refused. See Reid, *Hist. of the Presbyterian Ch. in Ireland*, 2:275-282. Leclerc, David, a Protestant theologian, was born at Geneva Feb. 19, 1591. He studied at Geneva, Strasburg, and Heidelberg, and in 1615 went to England to perfect himself in the study of Hebrew. He subsequently returned to his native place, and in 1618 was appointed professor of Hebrew at the university. He was ordained for the ministry in 1628, and died April 21, 1654. He wrote *Quaestiones sacrae, in quibus multa Scripturae loca variaque linguae sacrae idiomata explicantur, etc.; accesserunt similium argumentorum diatriba Steph. Clerici* (Amst. 1685, 8vo): — *Orationes (13), conspectus ecclesiasticus et poemata; accedunt Steph. Clerici Dissertationes philologicae* (Amsterd. 1687, 8vo): — a Latin translation of Buxtorf's *Synagogue* (Basle, 1641, 8vo and 4to); etc. See *La Vie de David Leclerc*, in his *Questiones sacrae*; Senebier, *Hist. Littéraire de Geneve*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:195.

Leclerc, James Theodore

a Swiss Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Geneva Nov. 25, 1692. He became pastor and professor of Oriental languages in that city in 1725, and died in 1758. He wrote, *Preservatif contre le Fanatisme, ou Refutation des pretendus Inspires de ce Siecle, trad. du Latin de Sam. Turretin* (Geneva 1723, 8vo): it is a work against the prophets of the Cevennes: — *Supplément au Preservatif contre le Fanatisme* (Geneva 1723, 8vo): — *Les Psaumes traduits en Français sur l'original Hebreu* (Geneva 1740 and 1761, 8vo). See Senebier, *Hist. Littéraire de Geneve*; Haag, *La France Protestante*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:200. (J. N. P.)

Le Clerc, John

(1), first martyr of the Reformation in France, a mechanic by trade, was born at Meaux towards the close of the 15th century. He was brought to the knowledge of divine truth by reading the N.T. translated into French by Lefevre d'Étaples, and in his zeal for the cause he dared to post on the door of the cathedral a bill in which the pope was called antichrist. For this offense he was condemned to be whipped in Paris and at Meaux, was

branded on the forehead, and exiled. He retired to Rosoy, then to Metz in 1525, where he continued to work at his trade, wool-carding. Here he one day broke the images which the Romanists intended to carry in procession. Instead of trying to hide himself, he boldly confessed his deed, and was condemned to fearful bodily punishment. His right hand was cut off, his nose torn out, his arm and breast torn with red-hot pincers, and his head encircled with two or three bands of red-hot iron; amid all his torments he sung aloud the verse of Psalm 115, "Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands." He was finally thrown into the fire, and thus died. His brother Peter, also a wool-carder, was chosen by the Protestants of Meaux for their pastor, and fell a victim to persecution in 1546. See Haag, *La France Protestante*, vol. 6; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Genérale*, 30:193; Browning. *History of the Huguenots*, 1:23.

Le Clerc, John

(2). *SEE CLERC, LE.*

Leclerc, Laurent José

a French priest. was born in Paris Aug. 22, 1677, studied theology, and was then admitted into the community of the preachers of St. Sulpice, was licensed by the Sorbonne in 1704, and taught theology at Tulle and at Orleans. In 1722 he became principal of the theological seminary at Orleans, and died May 6, 1736. He published, besides other works, *A Critical Letter on Bayle's Dictionary*. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:201.

Lecomte, Louis

a French Jesuit, was born at Bordeaux about the middle of the 17th century. He was sent as missionary to China in 1685, and, after a stay of some years in the mission of Shensee (Chensi), returned to France, and published in 1696 *Memoirs on the present State of China*, a work which was censured by the faculty of theology. He died in 1729.

Lectern, Or Lettern

Picture for Lectern

(Lat. *lectorium* or *lectricium*), a reading-desk or stand properly movable, from which the Scripture "*lessons*" (*lectiones*), which form a portion of

the various churchservices, are chanted or read in many churches. “he lectern (also called *pulpitum*, *ambo*, *suggestus*, *pyrgus*, *tribunal*, *lectricium*, or, most frequently, *lectorium*), of very ancient use, is of various forms and of different materials, and is found both in Roman Catholic churches and in the cathedrals and college-chapels of the Church of England. Originally they were made of wood, but later they were frequently also made of stone or metal, and sometimes in the form of an eagle (the symbol of St. John the Evangelist), the outspread wings of which form the frame supporting the volume. In Scotland, during the last century, the precentor’s desk was commonly called by that name, and pronounced *lectern*. See Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, vol. 6, s.v.; Walcott, *Sac. Archceol.* p. 345. **SEE EAGLE.**

Lecticarii

the same as the *copiatoe*. They were called *lecticarii* from the fact that they *carried the corpse* or bier at funerals. **SEE COPIATAE.**

Lectionarium

or LESSONS. Of the many real and supposed meanings of the expression *lectio* (**ἀνάγνωσις, ἀνάγνωσμα**), we have here only to consider the liturgical. In this sense it is used to designate the reading, which, together with singing, prayers, preaching, and the administration of the sacraments, constitutes public worship.

This part of worship is adopted from the Jews, and, like that of the synagogues, was at first restricted to the reading of their sacred books (O.T.). The first record we find of the reading of the N.-Test. Scriptures in the churches is in Justin, *Apol.* 1, cap. 67. But the fact of the reading of the Bible in general from the earliest times is clearly established by passages of Tertullian (*Apolog.* cap. 39; *De aninza*, cap. 9), Cyprian (*Ep.* 24,33, edit. Oberth. 34), Origen (*Contra Cels.* 3:45, ed. Oberth. 50), etc. It is self-evident that the canonical books and the homologoumena were those most generally read. But that lessons were occasionally read also from the Apocrypha and Antilegomena is shown by the yet remaining lists of *libri ecclesiastici* and **ἀναγινωσκόμενα**, i.e. of such books as, although not recognised as authorities in matters of faith, are still permitted to be read in the churches. Other writings, especially *acta martyrum*, and sermons of some of the most distinguished fathers, came afterwards to be also read to the people. The number of pieces (*lectiones*) read at each service varied;

the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (2, 100:57) mentions four; two was the minimum one from the Gospels, the other from the epistles or other books, including those of the O.T. *SEE PERICOPAE*. At first the portions to be read, at least on every ordinary Sunday, were taken in succession in the sacred books (*lectio continua*), but afterwards special portions were appointed to be read on certain Sundays, and the selection was made by the bishop, until at last a regular system of lessons was contrived, which is the base of the one still used at present in churches where the strictly liturgical service is adhered to. For feast-days, at first, special lessons were appointed (for instance, the account of the resurrection on Easter: see Augustine, *Serm.* 139, 140). But it is not known at what time the plan which forms the basis of the present system was first adopted. Yet Ranke (*Das Kirchl. Perikopensystem*, Berl. 1847) gives us good reasons for thinking that tradition may be correct in representing Jerome as the author of the ancient list of lessons known under the name of “comes,” and as the originator of the system in the Western Church.

Such lists, indicating the portions of Scripture to be read in public assemblies on the different days of the year, are named *lectionaria* (sc. volumina) or *lectionarii* (libri); Greek, ἀναγνωστικά εὐαγγελιστάρια, ἐκλογάδια (they are also called *evangeliarium et epistolare*; *evangqelia ctum epistolis*; *comes*). In Latin the principal are the “*Lect. Gallicanum*,” in Mabillon, *Liturg. Gallic.*, the “*comes*” of Jerome; the “*Calendarilnu Romanunz*” (edit. Fronto, Par. 1652); the “*Tabula antiquarum lectionum*,” in Pauli, *Ad missas*, in Gerbert, *Monzum. liturg. Alen.* 1:409. See Augusti, *Denkwüdigk.* vol. 6; *Handb. der chr. Arch.* 2:6; Ranke, *Das Kirchl. Perikopensystem*; Palmer, *Orig. Lit.* I, 1:10; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* 14:3, § 2; Procter, *History of Book of Common Prayer*, p. 216 sq.; Martene, *De Ant. Eccles. Rit.* 4:5, 1 sq.; Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, 1:125 sq. *SEE LITURGY*.

The reading of the lesson in the early ages of the Church was entrusted to the *lector* (q.v.). At present, in the Romish mass, when the number of officiating priests is complete, the epistle is read by the subdeacon and the Gospel by the deacon. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:268; Blunt, *Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theol.* p. 408 sq. *SEE LESSON*. (J. H. W.)

Lectisternium

(Lat. *lectus*, a couch, and *sternere*, to spread), a religious festival ceremony among the ancient Romans. It was celebrated during times of public calamity, when the gods were invited to the entertainment, and their statues taken from their pedestals and laid on couches. The lectisternium, according to Livy (5:13), was first celebrated in the year of Rome 354 (on the occasion of a contagious disease which committed frightful ravages among the cattle), and lasted for eight successive days. On the celebration of this festival enemies were said to forget their animosities, and all prisoners were liberated. — Brande and Cox, *Dictionary of Art and Sciences*, vol. 2, s.v.

Lector

(ἀναγνώστης) or READER was the name of an officer in the ancient Church whose place it was to read the holy Scriptures and other lessons (for instance, the *Acta martyrum*) in public worship. He was also entrusted with the keeping of the sacred volumes. This reading of the Word of God formed an important part in the service of the Jewish synagogues (see ~~4016~~Luke 4:16; ~~4135~~Acts 13:15, 27; ~~4014~~2 Corinthians 3:14), and was introduced into the Christian Church from thence. But we do not know at what period the performance of it became a special office. Yet Tertullian, *De praescr. hapr.* c. 41, expressly speaks of the lector as a special officer in the Church, and Cyprian (*Ep.* 33, and edit. Oberth. 34) mentions the ordination of two readers. The early Church councils (*Concil. Chalcedon.* a. 451, c. 13, 14; *Tolet.* 7, 2; *Vasense*, 2:2; *Valentin.* c. 1; *A rausial*, 1:18) give directions about the duties of readers. Still, although the most eminent fathers laid great stress on the reading of Scripture in the churches, and Cyprian declares their office one of great honor (*Epist.* 34), it was yet classed among the *ordines inferiores*. This is easily accounted for from the fact that the simple reading, without any exegetical or homiletical explanations (which are not in the province of the reader), was a mere mechanical performance, and in after times often entrusted to children. After the form of the liturgy of the mass was finally settled, the lectors were forbidden to read the pericopes occurring in the missa fidelium. They were also thereafter excluded from the altar, and suffered to read only at the *pulpitum*, and finally were obliged to leave to the deacon or presbyter the pronouncing of the formula solennis. probably because the reader was of lower degree in the hierarchy. Yet in some churches the ordination of

readers was a very solemn affair, especially among the Greeks, where it was accompanied by imposition of hands. In course of time the office of reader in the Romish Church came to be absorbed in the deacon's, and identified with it. See C. Schone, *Geschichtsforschungen ü.d. Kirchl. Gebr.* 3:108 (Berlin, 1822); Jo. Andr. Schmidt, *De primitivae eccles. lectoribus illustribus* (Helmstadt, 1696); Bingham, *De origin. eccles.* 2:29; Suicer and Du Fresne, *Lexica*; Augusti, *Denkwürd.* vol. 6; *Handb. d. chr. Arch.* 1:262; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:268.

Lectorium

SEE LECTERN.

Lecturers

an order of preachers in the Church of England, distinct from the incumbent or curate, usually chosen by the vestry or chief inhabitants of the parish, and supported either by voluntary contributions or legacies. They preach on the Sunday afternoon or evening, and in some instances on a stated day in the week. The lecturers are generally appointed without any interposition of the incumbent, though his consent, as possessor of the freehold of the Church, is necessary before any lecturer can officiate: when such consent has been obtained (but not before), the bishop, if he approve of the nominee, licenses him to the lecture. Where there are lectures founded by the donations of pious persons, the lecturers are appointed by the founders, without any interposition or consent of the rectors of the churches, though with the leave and approbation of the bishop, and after the candidate's subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Act of Uniformity, such as that of lady Moyer at St. Paul's, etc. When the office of lecturer first originated in the English Church it is difficult to determine. It is manifest from the statute (13 and 14 Car. II, c. 4, § 19), commonly known as the *Act of Uniformity* (1662), that the office was generally recognized in the second half of the 17th century. Even as early as 1589, however, an evening lecture on Fridays was endowed in the London parish of St. Michael Royal, and at about the same time three lecture-sermons were established in St. Michael's, Cornhill — two on Sundays after evening prayers, and a third at the same time on Christmas day. During the Great Rebellion lecturers used their influence and opportunities for the overthrow of the State Church and the monarchy. — Eden, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* p. 371.

Lectures, Bampton

SEE BAMPTON LECTURES.

Lectures, Boyle

SEE BOYLE LECTURES

Lectures, Congregational

SEE CONGREGATIONAL LECTURES.

Lectures, Hulsean

SEE HULSEAN LECTURES.

Lectures, Merchants'

a lecture set up in Pinner's Hall in the year 1672, by the Presbyterians and Independents, to show their agreement among themselves, as well as to support the doctrines of the Reformation against the prevailing errors of Popery, Socinianism, and infidelity. The principal ministers for learning and popularity were chosen as lecturers, such as Dr. Bates, D;. Manton, Dr. Owen, Mr. Baxter, Messrs. Collins, Jenlines, Mead, and afterwards Messrs. Alsop, Howe, Cole, and others. It was encouraged and supported by some of the principal merchants and tradesmen of the city. Some misunderstanding taking place, the Presbyterians removed to Salter's Hall and the Independents remained at Pinner's Hall, and each party filled up their numbers out of their respective denominations. This lecture is kept up to the present day, and is now held at Broad Street meeting every Tuesday morning.

Lectures, Monthly

A lecture preached monthly by the Congregational ministers of London in their different chapels, taken in rotation. These lectures have of late been systematically arranged, so as to form a connected course of one or more years. A valuable volume on the evidences of Revelation, published in 1827, is one of the fruits of these monthly exercises.

Lectures, Morning

certain casuistical lectures, which were preached by some of the most able divines in London. The occasion of these lectures seems to be this: During the troublesome times of Charles I., most of the citizens having some near relation or friend in the army of the earl of Essex, so many bills were sent up to the pulpit every Lord's day for their preservation that the minister had neither time to read them nor to recommend their cases to God in prayer; several London divines therefore agreed to set apart a morning hour for this purpose, one half to be spent in prayer, and the other in a suitable exhortation to the people. When the heat of the war was over, it became a casuistical lecture, and was carried on till the restoration of Charles II. These sermons were afterwards published in several volumes quarto, under the title of the *Morning Exercises*. The authors were the most eminent preachers of the day; among them was, e.g. archbishop Tillotson. It appears that these lectures were held every morning for one month only, and, from the preface to the volume, dated 1689, the time was afterwards contracted to a fortnight. Most of these were delivered at Cripplegate Church, some at St. Giles's, and a volume against popery in Southwark. Mr. Neale observes that this lecture was afterwards revived in a different form, and continued in his day. It was kept up long afterwards at several places in the summer, a week at each place, but latterly the time was exchanged for the evening.

Lectures, Moyer's

a course of eight sermons, preached annually, founded by the beneficence of lady Moyer about 1720, who left by will a rich legacy as a foundation for the same. A great number of English writers having endeavored in a variety of ways to invalidate the doctrine of the Trinity, this opulent and orthodox lady was influenced to think of an institution which should provide for posterity an ample collection of productions in defense of this branch of the Christian faith. The first course of these lectures was preached by Dr. Waterland, on the divinity of Christ. These lectures were discontinued about the middle of the last century.

Lectures, Religious

are discourses or sermons delivered by ministers on any subject in theology. Besides lectures on the Sabbath day, many think proper to preach on week-days; sometimes at five in the morning, before people go

to work, and at seven in the evening, after they have done. In London there is preaching almost every forenoon and evening in the week at some place or other.

Lectures, Warburtonian

a lecture founded by bishop Warburton to prove the truth of revealed religion in general, and the Christian in particular, from the completion of the prophecies in the Old and New Testament which relate to the Christian Church, especially to the apostasy of papal Rome. To this foundation we owe the admirable discourses of Hurd, Halifax, Bagot, Apthorp, and many others.

Lecturn

SEE LECTERN.

Ledge

(only in the plural μυβάβιν] *shelobbim'*, from bl iv; to *mortice* together; Sent. ἐξεχόμενα, Vulg. *juncturie*), *prop.joints*, e. . at the corners of a base or pedestal; hence perhaps an ornament overlaying these angles to hide the juncture (^{<1073>}1 Kings 7:28, 29). In verses 35, 36, the term thus rendered is different, namely *dy*; *yacd*, lit. a *hand*, i.e. a lateral projection, probably referring to *side-borders* to the same pedestals. The description is too brief and the terms too vague to allow a more definite idea of these appendages to the bases in question. *SEE LAVER.*

Ledieu, Francois

abbe, a French ecclesiastic, noted as a writer, was born at Peronne about the middle of the 17th century. In 1684 he became private secretary of the celebrated French pulpit orator Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, and was by this prelate made canon of the church at Meaux. He died at Paris Oct. 7, 1713. He wrote *Memoires et Journal de l'Abbe Ledieu sur la vie et les ouvrages de Bossuet* (Paris, 1856-57, 4 vols. 8vo), upon which the late Sainte-Beuve thus comments: "L'abbe Ledieu n'a pas le dessein de diminuer Bossuet, mais il souvient son illustre maitre h une epreuve it laquelle pas une grande figure ne resisterait; il note jour par jour a l'epoque de la maladie derniere et d dedeclin tous les actes et toutes les paroles de faiblesse qui lui echappent, jusqu'aux plaintes et doleances aux quelles on se laisse aller la

nuit quand on se croit seul, et dans cette observation il porte un esprit de petitesse qui se prononce de plus en plus en avançant, un esprit has, qui n'est pas moins dangereux que ne le serait une malignite subtile” (*Moniteur*, Mar. 31, 1856). Ledieu also left in MS. *Memoires sur l'Histoire et les Antiquites du diocese de Mleaux*. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:262.

Ledru, AndrÈ Pierre

a French priest and naturalist, was born at Chantenay, Main, January 22, 1761. When quite young he entered the priesthood, and during the Revolution adopted its principles, and was appointed curate at Pre-au-Mans. Later he was employed as botanist in Baudin's expedition to the Canaries and the Antilles (in 1796). He died July 11, 1825. Ledru wrote several works, for a list of which see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:267.

Ledwich, Edward, D.D.

an Irish antiquary, fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, subsequently vicar of Aghaboe, Queens County, Ireland, was born in 1739, and died in 1823. He published *The Antiquities of Ireland* (1794), a very valuable work. He offended many of his countrymen by denying the truth of the legend of St. Patrick.

Lee, Andrew

D.D., a Congregational minister, was born May 7, 1745 (O. S.), at Lyme, Conn.; graduated at Yale College in 1766; entered the ministry in 1768; was ordained pastor at Lisbon, Conn., Oct. 26, 1768; and died Aug. 25, 1832. He was made a member of Yale College corporation in 1807. Dr. Lee published *An Inquiry whether it be the Duty of Man to be willing to suffer Damnation for the Divine Glory* (1786): — *Sermons on varlious inportant Subjects* (8vo, 1803); and several occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:668.

Lee, Ann

the founder of the sect of *Shakers*, was born in Manchester, England, Feb. 29, 1736. She was the daughter of a poor mechanic, a blacksmith by trade, and a sister of general Charles Lee of Revolutionary fame. When yet a young girl she married Abraham Standley, of like trade as her father, and

she became the mother of four children, who all died in infancy. When about twenty-two years of age Jane came under the influence of James Wardley, at this time the great exponent of the Millenarian doctrines of the *Camisards* and *French Prophets*. These religious fanatics, after enduring much persecution and great suffering in their native country, had sought a refuge in England in 1705. Gradually they spread their views — communicating inspiration, as they thought — finding ready followers, particularly among the Quakers, and one of this number James Wardle — in 1747 actually formed a separate society, consisting mainly of Quakers, claiming to be led by the Spirit of God, and indulging in all manner of religious excesses, similar to those of the *Canmisards* (q.v.) and *French Prophets* (q.v.). Wardley claimed to have supernatural visions and revelations, and as both he and his adherents were noted for their bodily agitations. they came to be known as *Shaking Quakers*. Of this sect Ann Lee, now Mrs. Standley, became one of the leading spirits. From the time of her admission she seems to have been particularly inspired for leadership and action. Naturally of an excitable temper, her experience in the performance of the peculiar religious antics of this society — by them termed “religious exercises” — was most singular and painful. Of a pious nature, she hesitated not to subject herself to all the torments of the flesh. Often in her fits or paroxysms, as she clinched her hands, it is said, the blood would flow through the pores of her skin in a kind of sanguinary perspiration. This her followers believe was a miraculous phenomenon, and they liken it to the “bloody sweat” of our Savior in the garden. Her flesh wasted away under these exercises, and she became so weak that her friends were obliged to feed her like an infant. Then, again, according to the account given by her followers, she would have “intervals of releasement, in which her bodily strength and vigor were sometimes *miraculously* renewed, and her soul filled with heavenly visions and divine revelations.” All these mortifications of the flesh were by her sect accepted not only as evidences of great spiritual fervor, but as proofs of the indwelling of the divine spirit in Ann in an uncommon measure. She rose rapidly in the favor and confidence of her brethren, and we need not wonder that soon she came to have visions and revelations, and that they frequently and gladly “attested” them as manifestations of God to the believers. By the year 1770 she had grown so much in favor among her people that her revelations and visions were looked upon with more than ordinary interest; and when in this year she was subjected to persecution and imprisonment by the secular authorities, her followers claim that the

Lord Jesus manifested himself to her in an especial manner, and from this time dates the beginning of that “latter day of glory” in which they are now rejoicing. Immediately after her release from prison she professed supernatural powers in the midst of the little society gathered about her, and she was acknowledged as their spiritual *mother in Christ*. Ann was thereafter accepted as the only true leader of the Church of Christ — not in the common acceptance of that term, but as the incarnation of infinite wisdom and the “second appearing of Christ,” as really and fully as Jesus of Nazareth was the incarnation of infinite power, or Christ’s first appearing, and she now hesitated not to style herself “Ann, *the Word*,” signifying that in her dwelt the *Word*. Among other things revealed to her at this time was the displeasure of the Almighty against the matrimonial state, and she opened her testimony on the wickedness of marriage. If nothing else could have provoked the secular powers to put a stop to her fanatic excesses in the garb of religion, her attack on one of the most sacred institutions of the civilized state demanded immediate action, and she was again imprisoned, this time for misdemeanor. Set free once more, she began to spread her revelations more generally, and actually entered upon an open warfare against “the root of human depravity,” as she called the matrimonial act, and the people of Manchester were so enraged that she was shut up in a *madhouse*, and was kept there several weeks. Thus harassed and persecuted on English soil, she finally decided to seek quiet and peace on this side of the Atlantic, and in 1773 professed to have a “special revelation” to emigrate to America. Several of her congregation asserted that they also had had revelations of a like nature, and she accordingly set out for this country. She came to America in the ship *Maria*, Captain Smith, and arrived at New York in May, 1774, having as her companions her brother, William Lee, James Whitaker, John Hocknell, called elders, and others. In the spring of 1776 she went to Albany, and thence to Niskayuna, now Watervliet, eight miles from Albany. Here she successfully established a congregation, which she called “*the Church of Christ’s second appearing*,” formally dissolved her connection with the man to whom she had in her youth given her hand and heart, and became their recognized head. It was not, however, until 1780 that Ann Lee succeeded in gathering about her a very large flock. At the beginning of this year an unusually great religious revival occurred at New Lebanon, and, improving this opportunity, she went prominently before the people, taking an active part in the religious commotion. This proved to her cause a fine harvest indeed. and the number of her deluded followers greatly

increased, and resulted in the establishment of the now flourishing society of New Lebanon. *SEE SHAKERS*. One of these New Lebanon converts, Valentine Rathbun, previously a Baptist minister, who, however, after the short period of about three months, recovered his senses, and published a pamphlet against the imposture, says that “there attended this infatuation an inexplicable agency upon the body, to which he himself was subjected, that affected the nerves suddenly and forcibly like the electric fluid, and was followed by tremblings and the complete deprivation of strength. When the good mother had somewhat established her authority with her new disciples, she warned them of the great sin of following the vain customs of the world, and, having fleeced them of their ear-rings, necklaces, buckles, and everything which might nourish pride, and having cut off their hair close by their ears, she admitted them into her Church. Thus metamorphosed, they were ashamed to be seen by their old acquaintances, and would be induced to continue Shakers to save themselves from further humiliation.” But whether it was the success of their unworthy cause, or their religious excesses, or their unwillingness to take the oath of allegiance to the State of New York, they made themselves obnoxious here also to the secular authorities, and, as in her native country, Ann Lee was subjected to imprisonment, and escaped trial and punishment only by the kind offices of the governor, George Clinton. In 1781 she set out, in company with her elders, on a quite extended preaching tour through the New England States, in the course of which societies were founded at Harvard, Mass., and sundry other places. She had always asserted that she was not liable to the assaults of death, and that, when she left this world, she should ascend in the twinkling of an eye to heaven; but, unhappily for her claims, “the mighty power of God, the second heir of the covenant of promise” and “the Lamb’s bride,” or, as she styled herself, “the spiritual mother of the new creation, the queen of Mount Zion, the second appearing of Christ,” died a natural death at Watervliet, September 8, 1784.

Strange as must ever appear the fanatical excesses of Ann Lee, and her willingness to lead men to acts of depravity, to blasphemous religious pretensions, it must be conceded that she was certainly a wonderful woman. Deprived of all the advantages of education, she nevertheless, by the power of a will wholly unyielding and a mind of no common order, succeeded in establishing a religious sect, by which, at present consisting of more than four thousand people, some of them of marked intelligence and

superior talents, possessing, in the aggregate, wealth to the amount of more than *ten millions of dollars*, she is considered as the very Christ — standing in the Church as God himself, and at whose tribunal the world is to be judged. Over this society her influence is spoken of as complete. Her word was a law from which there was no appeal. Obedience then, as now, was the one lesson that a Shaker was required to learn perfectly — an obedience unquestioned and entire; and all this when the very foundation upon which they rested their faith, namely, *her divine mission*, was notoriously antagonized by a life accused, and not without some show of truthfulness, as openly and shamefully impure. See H. P. Andrews in the *Ladies' Repository*, 1858, p. 646 sq.; Marsden (Rev. J. B.), *Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects*, 2:320 sq.; *Galaxy*, 1872 (Jan. and April).
SEE SHAKERS.

Lee, Charles

a Presbyterian minister, was born near Flemingsburg, Ky., May 12, 1818; was converted when about twenty years of age, and, though hitherto a farmer by employment, he decided at once upon the ministry, entered the college at Hanover, Ind., and, after graduating in 1853, studied theology with the president of his alma mater. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Madison in 1855, and became pastor at Graham, Ind. He died May 27, 1863. “With fair talents, and yet amid many discouragements both in himself and from without, he was still not only a faithful, but a successful pastor of the churches committed to his care. God gave him the witness of approval in the conversion of many under his ministry.” — Wilson. *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, p. 169.

Lee, Chauncey

D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at Salisbury, Conn., 1763; graduated at Yale College in 1784; entered the ministry June 3, 1789; and was ordained pastor in Sunderland, Vt., March 18, 1790, where he remained a few years, and in Jan., 1800, became pastor in Colebrook, Conn. “This connection he dissolved in 1827, to become pastor at Marlborough, Conn. Nov. 18, 1828, which place he held until Jan. 11, 1837. He died in Hartwick, N. Y., Dec., 1842. Lee published the *American Accomptant: an Arithmetic* (1797): — *The Trial of Virtuen: a metrical Version of the Book of Job* (1807): — *Sermons especially designed for*

Revivals (12mo, 1824): — *Letters from Aristarchus to Philemon* (1833); and two or three occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:288.

Lee, Edward

an English prelate, was born in Kent in 1482; was educated at Oxford and Cambridge; became chaplain of Henry VIII, and was finally employed by him in several diplomatic missions. In 1529 he was sent to Rome to negotiate for the divorce of the king, and in 1531 was appointed archbishop of York. He opposed the Reform doctrines of Luther, but favored the innovations which Henry VIII made in the Church. Lee died in 1544. He wrote, *Apologia adversus quorundam calumnias* (Louvain, 1520): — *Epistola nuncupatoria ad Des. Erasmum* (Louvain, 1520): — *Annotationum Libri duo in annotationes Novi Testamenti Erasmi* (Bale, 1520): — *Elistola apologetica qua respondet D. Erasmi Epistolis*. — *Allibone, Dict. of Brit. And Am. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Lee, Jason

a Methodist Episcopal minister, pioneer missionary to Oregon, was born at Stanstead, Lower Canada, in 1803; labored with the Wesleyan missionaries there until 1833; joined the New England Conference in that year, and was ordained missionary to Oregon. Here he labored nobly, buried two wives, and in 1844 returned to New York to raise funds for the Oregon Institute, for which he was made agent by the New England Conference, but he died at his birthplace, March 12, 1845. His loss was a blow to the mission. but it is his glorious monument for two worlds. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 3:617. (G. L. T.)

Lee, Jesse

one of the most eminent preachers in the early history of the American Methodist Church, and recognized as the founder of Methodism in New England was born in Prince George's County, Virginia, March 12, 1758. He received a fair education, was diligently instructed in the Prayer-book and Catechism, and early acquired skill in vocal music, which served him in all his subsequent labors. His early life was moral. "I believe I never did anything in my youth that the people generally call wicked," is the record in his journal. His father was led to a more serious mode of life than prevailed generally in that community chiefly by the influence of Mr. Jarratt, an Episcopal clergyman. Jesse's parents, however, finally, in 1773, joined the

Methodist Society then formed under Robert Williams, one of Wesley's preachers, the promoter of Methodism in those parts. In this very year Jesse experienced in a marked manner the sense of pardoned sin, and continued to benefit by the powerful revival influences which for some years prevailed in the neighborhood. In 1776 he experienced a state of grace which he called "perfect love." "At length I could say, 'I have nothing but the love of Christ in my heart,' "is his record. In 1777 he removed from his home into the bounds of Roanoke Circuit, North Carolina. where the next year he was appointed a class-leader. He preached his first sermon November 17, 1779, and for a time supplied the preacher's place. In the summer of 1780 he was drafted into the militia to meet the approach of the British army in South Carolina. Excused from bearing arms on account of his religious scruples, he rendered various other services, especially by preaching. Soon obtaining a discharge, he was earnestly solicited to enter the itinerant ministry, but shrank from the responsibility, "fearing lest he should injure the work of God." At the tenth Conference, held at Ellis Meeting-house, Sussex County, Virginia, April 17, 1782, Lee was deeply impressed with "the union and brotherly love" prevalent among the preachers, notwithstanding the warm difference that had of late existed among the Methodist preachers on the subject of the administration of the sacraments, and at a quarterly meeting in November he was prevailed upon to take charge, together with Mr. Dromgoole, of a circuit near Eldenton, North Carolina — the Amelia Circuit. At the Ellis Meeting-house Conference, May 6, 1783, he was received on trial. "This year he preached with marked success. He writes, "I preached at Mr. Spain's with great liberty . . . the Spirit; of the Lord came upon us, and we were bathed in tears." "I preached at Howel's Chapel from ~~Ex~~ Ezekiel 33:11 . . . I saw so clearly that the Lord was willing to bless the people, even while I was speaking, that I began to feel distressed for them. . . . After stopping and weeping for some time, I began again, but had spoken but a little while before the cries of the people overcame me, and I wept with them so that I could not speak. I found that love had tears as well as grief." Under appointment of the Conference, which *began* at Ellis Preaching-house, Virginia, April 30, 1784, and *ended* at Baltimore May 28 following (see minute for that year), he labored in different circuits with like success, and was now regarded as an important man in the connection. December 12 he was invited to meet Coke, Whatcoat, and Vasey at the celebrated Christmas Conference of 1784 at Baltimore, where, with the aid of these persons, ordained (and sent out for the

purpose by in r. Wesley, the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. Lee could not attend the Conference from his distant circuit on so short a notice and at that season of the year, but was immediately after requested by bishop Asbury to travel with him in a Southern tour. This was an important event for Lee. He preached with the bishop at (Gorgetown and Charleston. At Cheraw he met with a merchant who gave him such information of New England as awakened in him an eager desire to transfer his field of labor to that region. At the Southern Conference, held in North Carolina April 20, 1785, Lee, in ardent controversy with Coke, who was still in the country. sought the abrogation of certansin strigent rules on slavery adopted in 17 84, which required of each member of the society the gradual emancipation of his slaves. His views soon prevailed. He preached, 1786, in Kent Circuit, Maryland; 1787, in Baltimore; 1788, in Flanders Circuit, embracing a portion of New Jersey and New York. Previously to the General Conference of 1796 there were no prescribed limits to the several conferences, but they were held at the discretion of the bishop as to time and place, the same preacher being sometimes appointed from different Conferences in the same year. At the Conference held in New York, May 28, 1789, Lee was appointed to Stamford Circuit, in Connecticut, and now began his career in New England, which continued for eleven years. New England, from the natural temperament of its inhabitants, and their previous theological education, was a hard field for the introduction of Methodism, into which though spread into all the other Atlantic States, far into the West, to Canada and Nova Scotia — it had not hitherto ventured with a set purpose of permanent occupancy. The dearth of earnest religious interest which succeeded the revivals under Edwards, Whitefield, and Tennant, as well as the prevalent reactionary tendency to rationalism, furnished sufficient demand for the zealous preaching of the Methodists. They felt themselves called also to a special mission in upholding their form of doctrine concerning entire sanctification in this life; but their views on the subject offree *will* were greatly misunderstood, the Methodist Arminianism being confounded with Pelagianism. “The argument,” says John Edwards, “most constantly used against Arminianism in those days was its tendency to prepare the way for Popery” (as being a doctrine of salvation by good works). The dominant theology, therefore, gave the Methodist preachers but a cold reception. Lee preached at Norwalk first in the street, but was subsequently allowed, both in this and other places, the use of the courthouse, and sometimes of the meeting-house. Thomas Ware, who heard Lee about this time, writes, “When he

stood up in the open air and began to sing, I knew not what it meant. I drew near, however, to listen, and thought the prayer was the best I had ever heard...When he entered upon the subject-matter of his text, it was with such an easy, natural flow of expression, and in such a tone of voice, that I could not refrain from weeping, and many others were affected in the same way. When he was done, and we had an opportunity of expressing our views to each other, it was agreed that such a man had not visited New England since the days of Whitefield." At Stratfield he formed the first *class*, consisting of three women, September 26, 1787. At Reading, December 28, he formed another *class* of two. 'Thus, at the end of seven months' labor, he had secured five members in society. But the spirit with which he labored appears in his journal as follows: "I love to break up new ground, and hunt the lost souls in New England, though it is hard work; but when Christ is with me, hard things are made easy, and rough ways made smooth." After preaching to a large congregation on one occasion, he was, as usual, left to find shelter where he could, and, as he records, rode through storm, "my soul transplanted with joy, the snow falling, the wind blowing, prayer ascending, faith increasing, grace descending, heaven smiling, and love abounding."

In February, 1790, he received three helpers, Brush, Roberts, and Smith, and formed the New Haven Circuit. He passed through Rhode Island, and appeared in Boston July 9. Boardman and Garrettsen had before preached there, but no permanent fruit remained of their labors. Lee, finding no house opened, preached on the Common to 3000 hearers. Though Lee often returned to the city, no society was formed there till July 13, 1792. He had better success elsewhere, and constantly labored throughout New England in supervision of the work, till the General Conference of 1796. Soon after this date he began to travel at large with bishop Asbury, as his authorized assistant in preaching and in holding Conferences. Thus employed, he revisited the scenes of his former labors in the South, and traveled also through New England. The period of his labors in that section closed in 1800. It had continued for eleven years, amid great difficulties, frequent theological controversies, and no small degree of persecution. The statistical result at this date was 50 preachers and 6000 members. At the General Conference held May 6, 1800, at Baltimore, Lee was nearly elected a bishop, Whatcoat being chosen over him by four votes. The subsequent portion of his life was spent mostly in the South, in earnest and successful labor as pastor and presiding elder. He preferred, says his

biographer, the former position. At the Virginia Conference of 1807 his influence defeated, from an opinion of its unconstitutionality, the proposition to call an extraordinary General Conference, in order to elect a bishop in place of bishop Whatcoat, deceased. He had, for like reason, opposed his own ordination as assistant bishop in 1796. In the Virginia Conference of 1808 he advocated a petition to the following General Conference of May 20, 1808, to establish a *delegated* General Conference. This proposition had been urged by Lee as early as 1792. Such action was taken by the Conference of 1808, and the powers of the General Conference, as the supreme authority of the Church, were defined in what are termed the Restrictive Rules. In the same year Lee made a last visit and journey throughout New England, which was “an humble but exultant religious ovation.” In the summer of 1807 he published at Baltimore his *History of Methodism* in America, which was the first work of the kind. During that year he served the House of Representatives at Washington as chaplain, as he did also in 1812 and 1813. In 1814 he was chaplain of the Senate. At the General Conference of 1812, in New York, Lee strongly advocated, as he had previously done, the proposition to make the office of presiding elder elective. He opposed with equal zeal the principle of advancing local preachers to elders’ orders. He continued his faithful career as circuit preacher and as chaplain to Congress till 1816. He was present at the funeral services of his veteran colaborer, bishop Asbury, held by the General Conference of 1816 at Baltimore, and did not long survive himself, but died at the age of fifty-eight, Sept. 12, 1816. Dr. Stevens closes his history of the Methodist Episcopal Church with the following characterization of Jesse Lee; “A man of vigorous, though unpolished mind, of rare popular eloquence and tireless energy, an itinerant evangelist from the British Provinces to Florida for thirty-five years, a chief counsellor of the Church in its annual and general conferences,”” founder of Methodism in New England . . . he lacked only the episcopal office to give him rank with Asbury and Coke. Asbury early chose him for the position of bishop. Some two or three times it seemed likely that he would be elected to it, but his manly independence and firmness of opinion in times of party strife were made the occasion of his defeat.” “In public services he may fairly be ranked next to Asbury, and as founder and apostle of Eastern Methodism he is above any other official rank. In this respect his historic honor is quite unique; for, though individual men have in several other sections initiated the denomination, no other founder has, so completely as he, introduced, conducted, and concluded his work, and

from no other one man's similar work have proceeded equal advantages to American Methodism" (4:510. 511). The same author, in another place, thus presents his qualities as a preacher: "Pathos was natural to him. Humor seems, in some temperaments, to be the natural counterpart, or, at least, reaction of pathos. Lee became noted for his wit; we shall see it serving him with a felicitous advantage in his encounters with opponents, especially in the Northeastern States. It flowed in a genial and permanent stream from his large heart, and played most vividly in his severest itinerant hardships; but he was full of tender humanity and affectionate piety. His rich sensibilities, rather than any remarkable intellectual powers, made him one of the most eloquent and popular preachers of his day. One of his fellow-laborers, a man of excellent judgment, says that he possessed uncommon colloquial powers and a fascinating address; that his readiness at repartee was scarcely equaled, and by the skillful use of this talent he often taught those who were disposed to be witty at his expense that the safest way to deal with him was to be civil. He was fired with missionary zeal, and, moreover, was a man of great moral courage" (1:413). "It was a kind of fixed principle with him," says his biographer Lee (p. 350), "never to let a congregation go from his preaching entirely unaffected. He would excite them in some way. He would make them weep if he could. If he failed in this, he would essay to alarm them with deep and solemn warning of words and manner; and, if all failed, he would shake their sides with some pertinent illustration or anecdote, and then, having moved them, seek, by all the appliances of truth, earnestness, and affection, to guide their stirred-up thoughts and sympathies to the fountains of living waters." — See *Life and Times of Jesse Lee*, by Leroy M. Lee (Richmond, Va., 1848); Stevens, *History of the M. A. Church; Memoirs of Rev. T. Ware*. (E. B. O.)

Lee, Robert

D.D., a noted Scotch Presbyterian divine, was born at Tweedmouth about 1796; was educated at St. Andrew's University, and became a minister of the Gospel. After occupying two other charges, he became, with Chalmers and others, minister of old Grayfriars, Edinburgh. He died in March, 1868, at Torquay, Devonshire. Dr. Robert Lee published a translation of the *Thesis of Erastus* (1844): — *Prayers for Public Worships*: — *Handbook of Devotion*: — *Prayers for Family Worship*: — *The Bible, with New Marginal References*; a work which brought upon him severe condemnation for Rationalistic tendency. It is, however, by no means to be

inferred from this that Dr. Lee was not of the evangelical school; he fought the Socinians with the utmost exertion, and, as a Scotchman expressed it, "Dr. Lee emptied the Unitarian chapel" at Edinburgh. Dr. Lee was the leader in innovations and changes in the Church Establishment of Scotland. His views were ultra-liberal; and from the year 1858, when the innovations were complained of before the Low-Church courts, till the commencement of his last illness, he fought a great battle, as the *Daily Review* expresses it, for what he deemed a more liberal construction of the laws of the Church in the matter of public worship—in other words, publishing, using? defending written prayers—and by his own force of character, his ingenuity and power as a controversialist, and his influence over the younger ministers of the Church, he probably did more to carry forward the movement with which his name is identified than all the rest of his brethren who took part with him. *SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF.* (J. H. W.)

Lee, Robert P.

D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in 1803, at Yorktown, N. Y.; graduated at Dickinson College in 1824, and at the theological seminary at New Brunswick in 1828. The first year of his ministry, 1828-9, was spent as a missionary in New York City. He was pastor of the Reformed (Dutch) Church of Montgomery, in Orange Co., N. Y., from 1829 to 1858, when he died, in the midst of his usefulness. Dr. Lee was a rare man, a close student, a diligent and accurate theologian, an impressive, but not showy preacher. His mind was remarkably clear, comprehensive, and acute. His judgment was ripe and instinctively right. Decided in his theology, he loved its truths, and expounded and defended them with tenacity and power. In the classis and synods of his Church he was a representative man; among his brethren and neighboring congregations he was a trusted counselor and a peacemaker. Without haste or prejudices, calm and wise, of positive character and noted piety, he was always influential, and yet singularly modest and retiring. His personal presence was commanding, his fine countenance beamed with intelligence and benevolence, and his whole demeanor was such as became the true minister of Christ. His death was a great loss to the whole denomination, of which he was a noble representative. — Corwin, *Manual of Personal Recollections*, p. 136. (W. J. R. T.)

Lee, Samuel

(1), D.D., a distinguished English Orientalist and Biblical scholar, was born at Longnor, in Shropshire, May 14, 1783; was educated but moderately, and apprenticed to a carpenter. His aptitude for learning, however, led him to continue his studies privately, and he thus acquired the Latin language. He next mastered the Greek, and from that he advanced to Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Samaritan, all of which he acquired by his own unaided efforts before he was twenty-five years of age. By this time he had married, and exchanged his former occupation for that of a schoolmaster. Attracting the notice of archdeacon Corbett and Dr. Jon. Scott, he was, by their aid, enabled to add to his other acquisitions a knowledge of Arabic, Persic, and Hindustanee, as well as some European and other tongues. In 1815 he accepted an engagement with the Church Missionary Society, and became a student of Queen's College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of B.A. in 1817. At this time he edited portions of the Scriptures, and of the Prayer-book, in several Oriental languages. In 1818 he took orders, and preached at Shrewsbury, still carrying on his Oriental studies; at this time he is said to have had the mastery over eighteen languages. In 1819 he was honored, as his talents certainly deserved, with the professorship of Arabic, and in 1834 was made regius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge University, besides receiving some pieces of Church preferment, and the title of D.D. first from the University of Halle, and then from that of Cambridge. Shortly before his death, Dec. 16, 1852, he was made rector of Barley, in Somersetshire, where he died. Besides the editions of the Scriptures which he carried through the press, he published several valuable linguistical works, of which the most important are, *Grammar of the Hebrew Language, compiled from the best authorities, chiefly Oriental*, which has passed through several editions: — *A Lexicon, Heb., Chald., and Engl.* (Lond. 1840): — *The Book of the Patriarch Job translated, with Introduction and Commentary* (Lond. 1837): — *An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy* (Camb. 1849): — *Prolegomena in Bib. Polygl. Londinens. Minora* (Lond. 1828). He also published an edition of the controversial tracts of Martyn and his opponents; edited Sir William Jones's *Grammar of the Persian Language*, with an addition of his own, containing a synopsis of Arabic grammar; and translated an annotated the travels of Ibn-Batuta from the Arabic. A minor work of his, *Dissent Unscriptural and Unreasonable*, led to a controversy with Dr. J. Pye Smith (in 1834; the pamphlets were published

in 1835). Dr. Lee has generally been recognized not, only as a great scholar, but also as the greatest British Orientalist of his day, and his writings bear evident traces of a vigorous, earnest, and independent mind loving truth, and boldly pursuing it. See *Lond. Gentl. Magazine*, 1853, pt. 1, 203 sq.; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 49:597 sq.; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* vol. 2, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors.* vol. 2, s.v.

Lee, Samuel

(2), a minister of the United Presbyterian Church, born at Jericho, Vt., July 20, 1805, was converted at the age of nineteen, and educated at Vermont University. He studied theology at Auburn Seminary, and was licensed and ordained by Oneida Congregational Council Sept. 23, 1834. He spent one year of his ministry at Cazenovia, N. Y., and then went to Northern Ohio, and took charge of the Church in Medina, Ohio. Afterwards his labors were divided between the churches of Mantua and Streetsborough, Ohio. He died Jan. 28, 1866. — Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1867, p. 310.

Lee, Wilson

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Sussex County, Del., in 1761; entered the itinerancy in 1784; labored extensively in the West, mostly in Kentucky, until 1794, when he was appointed to New London, Conn.; to New York in 1795; to Philadelphia in 1796-7-8; to Baltimore District in 1801-2-3; superannuated in 1804, and died in Arundel County, Md., Oct. 11 of the same year. Mr. Lee was "one of the most laborious and successful Methodist preachers of his time." He was eminently shrewd and circumspect, and deeply pious. He was "a witness of the perfect love of God for many years before he died. He was an excellent presiding elder, and an eloquent, argumentative, and often overpowering preacher. His labors in the West were very heroic, and contributed largely to the evangelization of Kentucky and Tennessee." — *Minutes of Conferences*, 1:127; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, ch. 18; Bangs, *Hist. Meth. Episc. Ch.* vol. 1. (G. L. T.)

Leech

SEE HORSE-LEECH.

Leek

(*ryxjæ* *chatsir'*, from *rxj* ; to *enclose*, also to *grow green*; occurs in several places in the Old Testament, where it is variously translated, as *grass* in ^{<1187>}1 Kings 18:5; ^{<1206>}2 Kings 19:26; Job 40, 15; ^{<1370>}Psalm 37:2, etc.; ^{<2316>}Isaiah 15:6, etc.; *herb* in ^{<882>}Job 8:12; *hay* in ^{<1725>}Proverbs 27:25, and ^{<2316>}Isaiah 15:6; and *court* in ^{<2343>}Isaiah 34:13; but in ^{<0410>}Numbers 11:5 it is translated “*leeks*.” Sept. *τὰ πράσα*, *Vulg. pori*). Hebrew scholars state that the word signifies “greens” or grass” in general; and it is Ino doubt clear, from the context of most of the above passages, that this must be its meaning. **SEE GRASS**. There is, therefore, no reason why it should not be so translated in all the passages where it occurs, except in the last. It is evidently incorrect to translate it *hay*, as in the above passages of Proverbs and Isaiah, because the people of Eastern countries, as it has been observed, do not make hay. The author of *Fragments*, in continuation of Calmet, has justly remarked on the incorrectness of our version, “The *hay* appeareth, and the tender *grass* showeth itself, and the *herbs* of the mountains are gathered” (^{<1725>}Proverbs 27:25): “Now certainly,” says he, “if the *tender grass* is but just beginning to show itself, the *hay*, which is grass cut and dried after it has arrived at maturity, ought by no means to be associated with it; still less ought it to be placed before it.” The author continues: “The word, I apprehend, means the first shoots, the rising, just budding spires of grass.” So in ^{<2316>}Isaiah 15:6. **SEE HAY**.

Picture for Leek 1

In the passage at ^{<0410>}Numbers 11:5, where the Israelites in the desert long for “the cucumbers, and the melons, and the *leeks*, and the onions, and the garlic” of Egypt, it is evident that it was not *grass* which they desired for food, but some green, perhaps grass-like vegetable, for which the word *chatsir* is used. In the same way that in this country the word *greens* is applied to many varieties of succulent plants as food, in India *subzi*, from *subz*, “*green*,” is used as a general term for herbs cooked as kitchen vegetables. It is more than probable, therefore, that *chatsir* is here similarly employed, though this does not prove that *leeks* are intended. Ludolphus, as quoted by Celsius (*Hierobot.* 2:264), supposes that it may mean lettuce, or salads in general, and others that the succory or endive may be the true plant. But Rosenmüller states, “The most ancient Greek and the Chaldee translators unanimously interpret the Hebrew by the *Greek* *πράσα*, or leeks.” The name, moreover, seems to have been specially applied to leeks

from the resemblance of their leaves to grass, and from their being conspicuous for their green color. This is evident from minerals even having been named from **πράσον** on account of their color, as prasius, prasites, and chrysoprasium. The Arabs use the word *kûras*, or *kûrath*, as the translation of the **πράσον** of the Greeks, and with them it signifies the leek, both at the present day and in their older works. It is curious that of the different kinds described, one is called *kurasal-bukl*, or leek used as a vegetable. That the leek is esteemed in Egypt we have the testimony of Hasselquist, who says (*Travels*, p. 291), "The kind called *karrat* by the Arabs must certainly have been one of those desired by the children of Israel, as it has been cultivated and esteemed from the earliest times to the present time in Egypt." The Romans employed it much as a seasoning to their dishes (Horace, *Ep.* 1:12, 21; Martial, 3:47, 8), and it is an ingredient in a number of recipes in Apicius referred to by Ceisius (*Hierobot.* 2:263; comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 19:6; Hiller, *Hierophyt.* pt. 2, p. 36; Diosc. 2:4; Athen. 4:137,170). The leek (*Allium porrum*) was introduced into England about the year 1562, and thence, in due time, into America; and, as is well known, it continues to be esteemed as a seasoning to soups and stews in most civilized countries.

Picture for Leek 2

There is, however, another and a very ingenious interpretation of *chatsir*, first proposed by Hengstenberg, and received by Dr. Kitto (*Pictorial Bible*, Numbers 11:5), which adopts a more literal translation of the original word, for, says Kitto, "among the wonders in the natural history of Egypt, it is mentioned by travelers that the common people there eat with special relish a kind of grass similar to clover." Mayer (*Reise nach Aegyptien*, p. 226) says of this plant (whose scientific name is *Trigonella Faenum-graecum*, belonging to the natural order *Leguminose*) that it is similar to clover, but its leaves more pointed, and that great quantities of it are eaten by the people. Forskal mentions the *Trigonella*, as being grown in the gardens at Cairo; its native name is *Halbeh* (*Flor. Aegyptiaca*, p. 81). Sonnini (*Voyage*, 1:379) says, "In this fertile country the Egyptians themselves eat the *fenu-grec* so largely that it may be properly called the food of man. In the month of November they cry 'Green halbeh for sale!' in the streets of the town; it is tied up in large bunches, which the inhabitants purchase at a low price, and which they eat with incredible greediness without any kind of seasoning." The seeds of this plant, which is also cultivated in Greece, are often used; they are eaten boiled or raw,

mixed with honey. Forskal includes it in the materia medica of Egypt (*Matthew Med. Kahir.* p. 155). There does not appear, however, sufficient reason for ignoring the old versions, which all seem agreed that the *leek* is the plant denoted by *chatsir*, a vegetable from the earliest times a great favorite with the Egyptians, as both a nourishing and savory food. Some have objected that, as the Egyptians held the *leek*, *onion*, etc., sacred, they would abstain from eating these vegetables themselves, and would not allow the Israelites to use them (compare Juvenal, *Sat.* 15:9). We have, however, the testimony of Herodotus (2:125) to show that *onions* were eaten by the Egyptian poor, for he says that on one of the pyramids is shown an inscription, which was explained to him by an interpreter, showing how much money was spent in providing *radishes*, *onions*, and *garlic* for the workmen. The priests were not allowed to eat these things, and Plutarch (*De Isaiah et Osir.* 2, p. 353) tells us the reasons. The Welshman reverences his leek, and wears one on St. David's day; he *eats the leek* nevertheless, and doubtless the Egyptians were not overscrupulous (*Script. Herbal.* p. 230).

Lees

(only in the plural μυραῖν] *shemarim'*, from רמיו; to *keep* [²⁴⁸¹-Jeremiah 48:11; ³⁰¹²-Zephaniah 1:12; rendered “wines on the lees” in ²³²⁶-Isaiah 25:6; “dregs” in ⁴⁹⁷⁸-Psalm 75:8]; Sept. τρογία; Vulgate *faeces*). The Hebrew term רמיו, *shemer* (the presumed singular form of the above), bears the radical sense of *preservation*, and was applied to “lees” from the custom of allowing the wine to stand on the lees in order that its color and body might be better preserved; hence the expression “wine on the lees,” as meaning a generous, full-bodied liquor (²³²⁶-Isaiah 25:6; see Henderson, ad loc.). The wine in this state remained, of course, undisturbed in its cask, and became thick and syrupy; hence the proverb “to settle upon one's lees,” to express the sloth, indifference, and gross stupidity of the ungodly (²⁴⁸¹-Jeremiah 48:11; ³⁰¹²-Zephaniah 1:12). Before the wine was consumed it was necessary to strain off the lees; such wine was then termed “well refined” (²³²⁶-Isaiah 25:6). To drink the lees or “dregs” was an expression for the endurance of extreme punishment (⁴⁹⁷⁸-Psalm 75:8). An ingenious writer in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia* (s.v. *Shemarim*) thinks that some kind of *preserves* from grapes are meant in ²³²⁶-Isaiah 25:6, as the etymology of the word suggests; but this supposition, although it clears the passage from

some difficulties, is opposed to the usage of the term in the other places.
SEE WINE.

Leeser, Isaac

a noted Jewish theologian and religious writer, was born at Neukirch, in Westphalia, in 1806. In 1825 he emigrated to America, and became in 1829 rabbi of the principal synagogue of Philadelphia. This position he resigned in 1850, and died in that city in 1868. Leeser was a superior scholar and preacher, and among his people his memory will ever be respected and honored. His works, which are completely cited in Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, vol. 2, s.v., are mainly contributions to Jewish literature — principally Jewish history and theology. In 1843 he assumed the editorship of *the Jewish Advocate* (or *Occident*). Very valuable is his edition of the O.-T. Scriptures in the original, based on the labors of *Van der Hooght*, and published by Lippincott and Co. (Philadel. 1868, 8vo).

Le Fevre

SEE FABER STAPULENSIS.

Left

(prop. **l wamc]** *semôl'*. a primitive word; Gr. **εὐώνυμος** ', lit. *well-named*, i.e. lucky, by euphemism for *ptar* **ἀριστερός**, as opposed to **ἡμπεδεξιός**, the right). The left hand, like the Latin *laevus*, was esteemed of ill omen, hence the term *sinister* as equivalent to unfortunate. This was especially the case among the superstitious Greeks and Romans (see Potter's *Gr. Ant.* 1:323. Adams, *Romans Ant.* p. 301). Among the Hebrews the left likewise indicated the *north* (^{<1820>}Job 23:9; ^{<0145>}Genesis 14:15), the person's face being supposed to be turned towards the east. In all these respects it was precisely the opposite of the *right* (q.v.).

Left-Handed

(**/nymɔdyirFææ** *shut as to his right hand* [^{<0185>}Judges 3:15; 20:16]; Sept. **ἀμφοτεροδέξιός** ', Vulgate *qui utraque manu pro dextera utebatur*, and *itca sinistra ut dextra proelians*), properly one that is unable skilfully to use his right hand, and hence employs the left; but also, as is usual, *ambidexter*, i.e. one who can use the left hand as well as the right, or, more

literally, one whose hands are both right hands. It was long supposed that both hands are naturally equal, and that the preference of the right hand, and comparative incapacity of the left, are the result of education and habit. But it is now known that the difference is really physical (see Bell's *Bridgewater Treatise on the Hand*), and that the ambidexterous condition of the hands is *not* a natural development. **SEE AMBIDEXTER.**

The capacity of equal action with both hands was highly prized in ancient times, especially in war. Among the Hebrews this quality seems to have been most common in the tribe of Benjamin, for all the persons noticed as being endowed with it were of that tribe. By comparing ^{<0785>}Judges 3:15; 20:16, with ^{<1312>}1 Chronicles 12:2, we may gather that the persons mentioned in the two former texts as "left-handed" were really ambidexters. In the latter text we learn that the Benjamites who joined David at Ziklag were "mighty men, helpers of the war. They were armed with bows, and could use both the right hand and the left in hurling [slinging] and shooting arrows out of a bow." There were thirty of them; and as they appear to have been all of one family, it might almost seem as if the greater commonness of this power among the Benjamites arose from its being a hereditary peculiarity of certain families in that tribe. It may also partly have been the result of cultivation; for, although the left hand is not naturally an equally strong and ready instrument as the right hand, it may doubtless be often rendered such by early and suitable training. **SEE HAND.**

Leg

is the rendering of several words in the A.V. Usually the Heb. term is [rK; *karla'* (only in the dual ^{<0809>}μῦτ̄ K), the lower limb or *shank* of an animal (^{<0210>}Exodus 12:9; 29:17; ^{<0809>}Leviticus 1:9, 13; 4:11; 8:21; 9:14; ^{<1182>}Amos 3:12) or a locust (^{<0812>}Leviticus 11:21); the σκέλος of a man (^{<0681>}John 19:31, 32, 33). ^{<0700>}q̄wōshôk (Chald. ^{<0700>}q̄v; *shâk*, of an image, ^{<0223>}Daniel 2:33), is properly the *shin* or lower part of the leg, but used of the whole limb, e.g. of a person (^{<0683>}Deuteronomy 28:13; ^{<0470>}Psalms 147:10; ^{<1180>}Proverbs 26:7; "thigh," ^{<0342>}Isaiah 47:2; in the phrase "*hip* [q.v.] and thigh," ^{<0757>}Judges 15:7; spoken also of the drawers or *leggings*, Song of Solomon v. 15); also the "heave *shoulder*" (q.v.) of the sacrifice (^{<0222>}Exodus 29:22, etc.; ^{<0124>}1 Samuel 9:24). Once by an extension of ^{<0700>}l gr, *re'gel* (^{<0706>}1 Samuel 17:6), properly a *foot* (as usually rendered). Elsewhere improperly for ^{<0700>}l b̄vo

, *sho'bel*, the *train* or trailing dress of a female (^{<2470>}Isaiah 47:2); and **hd[x]**, *tseada'*, a *step-chain* for the feet, or perh. *bracelet* for the wrist (“ornament of the leg,” ^{<2183>}Isaiah 3:20). **SEE THIGH.**

Goliath’s greaves for his legs doubtless extended from the knee to the foot (^{<4976>}1 Samuel 17:6). **SEE GREAVES.** The bones of the legs of persons crucified were broken to hasten their death (^{<4323>}John 19:31). **SEE CRUCIFIXION.**

Legalists

Properly speaking, a legalist is one who “acts according to the *law*,” but in general the term is made use of to denote one who *seeks salvation by works of law* (not of *the law*, but of “law” generally, whether moral or ceremonial, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, Romans v. 20) instead of by the merits of Christ. Many who are alive to the truth that it is impossible to do anything that can purchase salvation, and who desire that this doctrine should be earnestly and constantly inculcated by Christian ministers in their teaching, conceive that there is a danger also on the opposite side; and that while plain Antinomian teaching would disgust most hearers, there is a kind of doctrine scarcely less mischievous in its consequences, that which only incidentally touches on good works. They think that whatever leads or leaves men, without distinctly rejecting Christian virtue, to feel little anxiety and take little pains about it; anything which, though perhaps not so meant, is liable to be so understood by those who have the wish as to leave them without any feeling of real shame, or mortification, or alarm on account of their own faults and moral deficiencies, so as to make them anxiously watchful *only* against seeking salvation *by* good works, and not at all against seeking salvation *without* good works — all this (they consider) is likely to be much more acceptable to the corrupt disposition of the natural man than that which urges the necessity of being “*careful to maintain good works.*” Those who take such a view of the danger of the case think that Christian teachers should not shrink, through fear of incurring the wrongful imputation of “legalism,” from earnestly inculcating the points which the apostles found it necessary to dwell on with such continual watchfulness and frequent repetition. But in general the term is made use of to denote one who expects salvation by his own works. We may further consider a legalist as one who has no proper conviction of the evil of sin; who, although he pretends to abide by the law, yet has not a just idea of its spirituality and demands. He is ignorant of the grand scheme of

salvation by free grace: proud of his own fancied righteousness, he submits not to the righteousness of (God; he derogates from the honor of Christ by mixing his own works with his; and, in fact, denies the necessity of the work of the Spirit by supposing that he has ability in himself to perform all those duties which God has required. Such is the character of the legalist, a character diametrically opposite to that of the true Christian, whose sentiment corresponds with that of the apostle, who justly observes, “By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast” (~~408~~ Ephesians 2:8, 9). — Eden, *Theol. Dict. s.v.*; Buck, *Theol. Dict. s.v.*; Buchanan, *Doctrine of Justification*, Lect. 6, especially p. 153 sq.

Legates

and Nuncios of the Roman Catholic Church. With reference to the endeavors of that Church to unite all the congregations into one vast system, and to rule over them successfully, preventing all heresy and division, the Council of Sardica (343) expressly stated: “Quod si is, qui rogat causam suam iterum audiri, deprecatione sua moverit episcopum Romanum, ut *de latere suo presbyteros mittat*, erit in potestate ejus,” etc. (*Con. Sardic.* 100:7, in 100:36, can. 2, qu. 6). The Romish clergy was therefore sent abroad everywhere. In the African churches, however, they refused to admit into fellowship those “qui ad transmarina (concilia) putaverit appellandum” (*Codex eccles. Afric.* 100:125), and wrote to Celestine at Rome, “Ut aliqui tanquam a tuce sanctitatis latere mittantur, nulla invenimus patrum synodo constitutum” (*ibid.* 100:138). Thomassin (*Vetus ac nova ecclesiae disciplina*, p. 1, lib. 2, cap. 117) has collected instances of delegations having been sent in various cases during the 4th and 5th centuries. But, as vicars of the bishop of Rome, we find in Western Illyria the bishops of Thessalonica after Damasus (a. 367); in Gaul, the bishops of Aries after Zosimus (a. 417); in Spain, the bishops of Seville after Simplicius (a. 467) (Constant, *De antiquis canonum collectionibus*, No. 23-25; Gallande, *De vetustis canonum collectionibus dissert.* 1:23 sq.; Petrus de Marca, *De concordia sacerdotii ac imperii*, lib. 5, cap. 19 sq., 30 sq.). Among the delegates of the bishop of Rome we must also put the Apocrisarii *SEE APOCRISIARIUS*, sent to the imperial court at Constantinople. Leo I, and particularly Gregory I, carefully continued the relations established by their legates, and created more, in order to improve the condition of the churches, and to increase the influence of Rome. Gregory appointed bishop Maximus of Syracuse over all the churches of

Sicily (“super cunctas ecclesias Sicilie te . . . vices sedis apostolicae ministrare decernimus”), with the right of deciding on all except the *causae majores*. This office was, however, vested only in the individual, not in the see (“Quas vices non loco tribuimus, sed personae,” 100:6, X.

Depraesumptionibus, 2:23, a. 592; 100:3, can. 7, qu. 1:30 [a. 594], 100:39; can. 11, qu. 1, and Gonzalez Tellez to c. 1, X. *De officio legati*. 1:30, a. 9). To England Gregory sent Augustine (a. 601), with the mission of improving the Church organization of that country, and particularly of upholding the episcopacy (*Epist.* 64, a. 601, in 100:3, can. 25, qu. 2); and Agathon (678) also sent the Roman abbot John to that country to organize worship, convoke a council to inquire into the state of religion, and report thereon at his return (Beda, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 4, cap. 18). Augustine is said to have himself taken part in settling ecclesiastical affairs during a journey through Gaul, and conferred with the bishop of Aries as his legate. Gregory I sent also other special delegates to Gaul, in order to improve the state of the churches there, with the aid of the bishops and the king (Thomassin, 100:118). In the course of time the legates were empowered to act by themselves on the orders communicated to them at Rome. The vicariates became connected with some of the ancient bishoprics, by whose incumbents they had long been exercised, and it became difficult to erect new permanent ones on account of the opposition of the other dignitaries of the Church; so that special delegates were only sent when affairs of importance rendered such a step necessary. Even then it became customary to await the wish, or at least to secure the sanction, of the governments into whose states they were sent. There were, then, two kinds of legates, the *legati nati*, and the *legati dati* or *meissi*.

1. *Legati nati*, in cases where the legation was connected with a bishopric. The rights of such a legate were at first very large; his jurisdiction had the character of *jurisdictio ordinaria*; it also appears as *ordinarii ordinariorum*, and formed a court of last resort for those who voluntarily appealed to it. After the 16th century their prerogatives were gradually restricted, and finally, after the introduction of the *legati a latere*, the title became merely a nominal one, the metropolitan not being even entitled to having the cross borne before him where there was a *legatus a latere* (e. 23, X. *De privilegiis*, 5. 33; Innocent III, in 100:5, *Conc. Lateran.* a. 1215).

2. *Legati missi* or *dati*. These are divided into,

(1) Deleqati, appointed for one specific object. It was already forbidden in the Middle Ages to appoint members of the clergy in their place.

(2) *Nuncii apostolici*, who are empowered to enforce the commands contained in their mandates. In order to effect this object they were given a right of jurisdiction until the 16th century. To enable them to legislate in reserved cases, they were invested with a *mandatum speciale*, making the reservations *generaliter* for them. They could grant indulgences for any period not exceeding a year. All other legates were subject to them except such as had special privileges granted them by the pope. The insignia of the nuncio comprised a red dress, a white horse, and golden spurs.

(3) *Legati ab latere*. Special delegates who acted as actual representatives of the popes, and who possessed all the highest prerogatives. Their plenary power is thus expressed: “Nostra vice, quae corrigenda sunt corrigat, quae statuenda constituat” (Gregor. VII, *Ep.* lib. 4, cp. 26). They exercised *ajurisdictio ordinaria* in the provinces, had power to suspend the bishops, and to dispose of all reserved cases. The manifold complaints which arose in the course of time led the popes to alter some points of the system. Leo X, in the Lateran Council of 1515, caused it to be ruled that the cardinal legate should have a settled residence; and the *Congregatio pro interpretatione. Cone. Trid.* construed the resolutions of the councils so as to make them very favorable to the bishops.

The Reformation gave occasion for the sending of a large number of legates, and also for the nomination of permanent nuncios at Lucerne, 1579; Vienna, 1581; Cologne, 1582; Brussels, 1588: this, however, gave rise to fresh disturbances in the Church. The troubles caused by the nuncios were the cause of the adoption of a new article under the *gravamina nationis Germanicae*. In the mean time the French Revolution broke out, disturbing all preconceived plans. After the restoration of order in the hierarchy the system of legations was revived, but with many modifications altering its Middle-Age features. The second article of the French Concordat of 1801 states expressly: “Aucun individu se disant nonce, legat, vicaire ou commissaire apostolique, ou se prevalant de toute autre denomination, ne pourra, sans l’autorisation du gouvernement, exercer sur le sol Franqais ni ailleurs, aucune fonction relative aux affaires de l’eglise Gallicane.” This clearly removed the original foundation of the intercourse formerly existing between the papal see and these countries. Moreover, several Roman Catholic governments, such as Austria, France, Spain, etc.,

reserved to themselves the right to point out the parties who should be accredited to their courts as nuncios (Klüber, *Europäisches Völkerr.* § 186, Anm. a.). The formula of the oath of obedience to the pope, which, since Gregory VII, is taken by bishops at their ordination, says: “Legatum apostolicas sedis . . . honorifice tractabo et in illis necessitatibus adjuvabo” (100:4, X. *De jurejurando*, 2:24). This involves the duty of supporting the procurations. But the state is also enlisted on account of its power.

The usual envoys of the pope have now the titles of,

1. *Legati nati*, no longer invested with an inherent right to the management of ecclesiastical affairs.

2. *Legtuli dati, missi*, which are divided into

(1) *Legali a latere* or *de latere*, who, it is stated, are entitled to be canonically designated as cardinals a latere or legates de latere. This is incorrect, for cardinals are now seldom sent on such missions; if ever, but, on the contrary, other members of the clergy, *cum potestate legati a latere*.

(2) *Nuncii apostolici*, bearers of apostolic mandates. While the former are looked upon as ambassadors, it is a nice question whether the latter occupy the second position, that of envoys. They are either ordinary permanent nuncios, as in Germany, or extraordinary, sent for some special purpose.

(3) *Internuncii (residentes)*, considered by some as forming a third class, by others as belonging to the second. At the Congress of Vienna, 1815, it was decided by the first article of the *Reglement sur le rang entre les Agonns diplomatiques* that the first class would be formed of *Ambassadeurs, Legats ou Nonces*; and in article fourth that no change would be made in regard to papal representatives. See Klüber, *Völkerrecht*; Heffter, *Völkerrecht*; Miruss, *Das Europäische Gesandtschaftsrecht*; Schulte, *Katholisch. Kirchenrecht* (Giessen, 1856); Walter, *Kirchenrecht* (11th edit. Bonn, 1854); Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 8:269 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:409 sq.

Legend

(Lat. *legenda*, “things to be read,” lessons) was the name given in early times, in the Roman Catholic Church, to a book containing the daily lessons which were wont to be read as part of divine service. This name, however, in process of time, was used to designate the lives of saints and

martyrs, as well as the collection of such narratives, from the fact that these were read by the monks at matins, and after dinner in the refectories. Among numerous theories as to the origin of the legends, the following is the most probable. Before colleges were established in the monasteries where the schools were held, the professors in rhetoric frequently gave their pupils the life of some saint for a trial of their talent for *amplification*. The students, being constantly at a loss to furnish out their pages, invented most of these wonderful adventures. Jortin observes that the Christians used to collect, out of Ovid, Livy, and other pagan poets and historians, the miracles and portents to be found there, and accommodated them to their own monks and saints. The good fathers of that age, whose simplicity was not inferior to their devotion, were so delighted with these flowers of rhetoric that they were induced to make a collection of these miraculous compositions, not imagining that at some distant period they would become matters of faith. Yet, when Jacob de Voragine, Peter de Natalibus, and Peter Ribadeneira wrote the lives of the saints, they sought for their materials in the libraries of the monasteries; and, awakening from the dust these manuscripts of amplification, imagined they made an invaluable present to the world by laying before them these voluminous absurdities. The people received these pious fictions with all imaginable simplicity, and, as few were able to read, the books containing them were amply illustrated with cuts which rendered the story intelligible.

Many of these legends, the production of monastics, were invented, especially in the Middle Ages, with a view to serve the interests of monasticism, particularly to exalt the character of the monastic orders, and to represent their voluntary austerities as purchasing the peculiar favor of heaven. For this purpose they unscrupulously ascribe to their patrons and founders the power of working miracles on the most trifling occasions. Many of these miracles are blasphemous parodies on those of our blessed Lord; not a few are borrowed from the pagan mythology; but some are so exquisitely absurd that no one but a monk could have dreamed of imposing such nonsense on the most besotted of mankind. "It would be easy to accumulate proofs of the ready belief which the lower orders of Irish Romanists give to tales of miracles worked by their priests; but it is remarkable that in the earlier legends we very rarely find supernatural powers attributed to the secular ecclesiastics; the heroes of most of the tales are monks and hermits, whose voluntary poverty seemed to bring them down to a level of sympathy with the lower orders. Indiscriminate

alms, which have often been demonstrated to be the source of great evils, are always popular with the uninstructed, and hence we find that many of the heroes of the legends are celebrated for the prodigality of their benevolence. The miracles attributed to the Irish saints are even more extravagant than those in the Continental martyrologies. We find St. Patrick performing the miracle of raising the dead to life no less than seventeen times, and on one occasion he restores animation to thirty-four persons at once. Gerald, bishop of Mayo, however, surpassed St. Patrick, for he not only resuscitated the dead daughter of the king of Connaught, but miraculously changed her sex, that she might inherit the crown of the province, in which the Salic law was then established. We find, also, in the ecclesiastical writers, many miracles specially worked to support individual doctrines, particularly the mystery of transubstantiation. Indeed, a miracle appears to have been no unusual resource of a puzzled controversialist. On one occasion the sanctity of the wafer is stated to have been proved by a mule's kneeling to worship it; at another time a pet lamb kneels down at the elevation of the host; a spider, which St. Francis d'Ariano accidentally swallowed while receiving the sacrament, came out of his thigh; and when St. Elmo was pining at being too long excluded from a participation in the sacramental mysteries, the holy elements were brought to him by a pigeon. But the principal legends devised for the general exaltation of the Romish Church refer to the exercise of power over the devil. In the south of Ireland nothing is more common than to hear of Satan's appearance in proper person, his resistance to all the efforts of the Protestant minister, and his prompt obedience to the exorcisms of the parish priest. In general, the localities of the stories are laid at some neighboring village; yet, easy as this renders refutation, it is wonderful to find how generally such a tale is credited. From the archives of the Silesian Church, we find that some German Protestants seem to believe in the exorcising powers of the Romish priests. Next to the legends of miracles rank those of extraordinary austerities, such as that St. Polycronus always took up a huge tree on his shoulders when he went to pray; that St. Barnadatus shut himself up in a narrow iron cage; that St. Adhelm exposed himself to the most stimulating temptations, and then defied the devil to make him yield; and that St. Macarius undertook a penance for sin six months, because he had so far yielded to passion as to kill a flea. It is unnecessary to dwell upon these, because they are manifestly derived from the habits of the Oriental fanatics, and are evident exaggerations made without taste or judgment. See *History of Popery* (Lond. 1838, 8vo).

The most celebrated of these popular mediaeval fictions is the *Legenda Aurea*, or Golden Legend, originally written in Latin, in the 13th century, by Jacob de Voragine (q.v.), a Dominican friar, who afterwards became archbishop of Genoa, and died in 1298, This work was the great text-book of legendary lore of the Middle Ages. It was translated into French in the 14th century by Jean de Vigny, and in the 15th into English by William Caxton. It has lately been made more accessible by a new French translation: *La Legende Doree, traduite du Latin*, par M. G. B. (Par. 1850). There is a copy of the original, with the *Gesta Longobardorum* appended, in the Harvard College Library, Cambridge, printed at Strasburg in 1496. Longfellow, in a note to his beautiful poem, says, "I have called this poem the Golden Legend, because the story upon which it is founded seems to me to surpass all other legends in beauty and significance. It exhibits, amid the corruptions of the Middle Ages, the virtue of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice, and the power of Faith, Hope, and Charity sufficient for all the exigencies of life and death." The story is told, and perhaps invented, by Hartmann von der Aue, a Minnesinger of the 12th century. The original may be found in Marlath's *Alt-deutsche Gedichte*, with a modern German version. There is another in Marbach's *Volksbücher*, No. 32. We may mention also, among other productions, the *Kaiserchronik* (Imperial Chronicle), where the legendary element forms a very important part of the whole, and Werner's versified *Marienleben* (Life of Mary), written in 1173, etc. The authors of these works were ecclesiastics, but in the following age, when the mediaeval poetry of Germany was in its richest bloom, and the fosterers of the poetic art were emperors and princes, the legend was employed by laymen on a grand scale, and formed the subject-matter of epic narratives. Thus Hartmann von der Aue worked up into a poem the religious legends about Gregory; Konrad von Fussesbrunnen those concerning the childhood of Jesus; Rudolph von eElms those about Barlaam and Josaphat; and e Kimbat von Durne those about St. George. Between the 14th and 16th centuries legends in prose began also to appear, such as Hermann von Fritzlär's *Von dem Heiligen Leben* (written about 1343), and gradually supplanted the others.

Much of this legendary rubbish was cleared away by Tillemont, Fleury, Baillet, Lasunoi, and Bollandus, but the faith in many of them still remains strong in the more ignorant minds of the Romish Church. The repeated and

still continued editions of the *Acta Sanctorum* (q.v.) afford sufficient evidence of this.

The most comprehensive and valuable work on the subject of the legends is that commenced by the Bollandists in the 17th century, *Acta Sanctorum*, and still in process of publication. Legends are found not only in the Roman Catholic, but also in the Greek Church. They also found an entrance into the *national* literature of Christian nations. Among the Germans especially was this the case, particularly in the 12th century, although specimens of legendary poems are not altogether wanting at an earlier period. In Great Britain, also, the legends of King Arthur and his Round Table have sprung afresh into popular favor, after centuries of comparative obscurity, and have once more become the treasure-house from which poet and painter draw subjects for their pictures, and in which essayists, weary of the old heathen classics, seek for illustrations and allusions. The first of the recent poets, however, who clearly apprehended the poetic and spiritual elements of the old Christian legend was Herder, and his example has been followed by other poets, for example, the romantic school in Germany, and Bulwer and Tennyson in England. 'he tendency to mythic embellishment showed itself more particularly in regard to the Virgin Mary, the later saints, and holy men and women. Of all these, the most captivating, as an amiable weakness, was the devotion to the Virgin. The denial of the title "The Mother of God" by Nestorius was that which sounded most offensive to the general ear; it was the intelligible, odious point in his heresy, and contributed, no doubt, to the passionate violence with which that controversy was agitated; and the favorable issue to those who might seem most zealous for the Virgin's glory gave a strong impulse to the worship; for, from that time, the worship of the Virgin became in the East an integral part of Christianity. Among Justinian's splendid edifices arose many churches dedicated to the Mother of God. The feast of the Annunciation was celebrated both under Justin and Justinian. Heraclius had images of the Virgin on his masts when he sailed to Constantinople to overthrow Phocas; and before the end of the century the Virgin is become the tutelar deity of that city, which is saved by her intercession from the Saracens. "The history of Christianity," says dean Milman, "cannot be understood without pausing at stated periods to survey the progress and development of the Christian mythology, which, gradually growing up, and springing as it did from natural and universal instincts. took a more perfect and systematic form, and at length, at the height of the

Middle Ages, was as much a part of Latin Christianity as the primal truths of the Gospel. This religion gradually molded together all which arose out of the natural instincts of man, the undying reminiscences of all the older religions — the Jewish, the Pagan, and the Platonic — with the few and indistinct glimpses of the invisible world, and the future state of being in the New Testament, into a vast system, more sublime, perhaps, for its indefiniteness, which, being necessary in that condition of mankind, could not but grow up out of the kindled imagination and religious faith of Christendom. The historian who should presume to condemn such a religion as a vast plan of fraud, or a philosopher who should venture to disdain it as a fabric of folly only deserving to be forgotten, would be equally unjust, equally blind to its real uses, assuredly ignorant of its importance and its significance in the history of man; for on this, the popular Christianity — popular, as comprehending the highest as well as the lowest in rank, and even in intellectual estimation — turns the whole history of man for many centuries. It is at once the cause and the consequence of the sacerdotal dominion over mankind, the groundwork of authority at which the world trembled, which founded and overthrew kingdoms, bound together or set in antagonistic array nations, classes, ranks, orders of society. Of this, the parent, when the time arrived, of poetry, of art, the Christian historian must watch the growth and mark the gradations by which it gathered into itself the whole activity of the human mind, and quickened that activity till at length the mind outgrew that which had been so long almost its sole occupation. It endured till faith, with the schoolmen, led into the fathomless depths of metaphysics, began to aspire after higher truths; with the Reformers, attempting to refine religion to its primary spiritual simplicity, this even yet prolific legendary Christianity, which had been the accessory and supplementary Bible, the authoritative and accepted, though often unwritten Gospel of centuries, was gradually dropped, or left but to the humblest and most ignorant, at least to the more imaginative and less practical part of mankind.” “The influence that these works exerted on the mediaeval mind,” says Hardwick, “was deep and universal. While they fed almost every stream of superstition, and excited an unhealthy craving for the marvelous and the romantic, they were nearly always tending, in their *moral*, to enlist the affections of the reader on the side of gentleness and virtue, more especially by setting forth the necessity of patience, and extolling the heroic energy of faith. One class of those biographies deserve a high amount of credit; they are written by some friend or pupil of their subject; they are natural and life-like pictures of the

times, preserving an instructive portrait of the missionary, the recluse, the bishop, or the man of business; yet most commonly the acts and sufferings of the mediaeval saint have no claim to a place in the sphere of history, or at best they have been so wantonly embellished by the fancy of the author that we can distinguish very few of the particles of truth from an interminable mass of fiction. As these 'Lives' were circulated freely in the language of the people, they would constitute important items in the fireside reading of the age; and so warm was the response they found in men of every grade, that, notwithstanding feeble efforts to reform them, or at least to eliminate a few of the more monstrous and absurd, they kept their hold on Christendom at large, and are subsisting even now in the creations of the mediaeval artist" (*Ch. Hist. Middle Ages*).

On the origin of these legends there is a great diversity of opinion among the learned. Some trace it to the northern Skalds, who, accompanying the army of Rollo in his warlike migrations southward, carried with them the lays of their own mythology, but replaced their pagan heroes by Christian kings and warriors. Salmasius adopted the theory, which was endorsed by Warton, that the germs of romantic fiction originated with the Saracens and Arabians, and ascribes its introduction into Europe to the effects of the Crusades, or, according to Warton himself, to the Arab conquests in Spain; that from thence they passed into France, and took deepest root in Brittany. Others, again, have seen in the tales of chivalry only a new development of the classic legends of Greece and Italy. As Christianity unquestionably borrowed and modified to its own use many of the outward ceremonies of paganism, so they held that the Christian *trouveur* only adopted and transmuted the heroes of classical poetry. The researches of count Villemarque and lady Charlotte Schreiber, however, to which the attention of the learned world had been directed before by Leyden, Douce, and Sharon Turner, conclusively prove that the true theory as to their origin is that they are Cymric or Armorican, or both. The wealth of the old Cymric literature in this particular respect was never even suspected until lady Charlotte Schreiber, with the aid of an eminent Welsh scholar, the Rev. Thomas Price, brought to light in their original form, accompanied by an English version. the collection of early Cymric tales known as the *Mabinogion*. M. de la Villemarque, for his own side of the Channel, not only confirms the evidence of lady Schreiber, but brings forward additional items of proof, from fragments of Breton songs and poems, that the roots of their renowned fiction lie deep in their literature also. Their very form —

the eight-syllabled rhyme, in which the French metrical version is written — he claims, and apparently with justice, as Cymric. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; *Cyclop. Brit.* s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyk.* 8:274 sq.; Vogel, *Versuch. einer Gesch. u. Würdigung der Legenden* in Illgein's *Hist. theol. Abhandl.* (Lpz. 1824), p. 141 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, and her *Legends of the Madonna*. **SEE MYTH.**

Legend, Golden

A renowned collection of legends written in the 13th century by Jacob de Voragine (q.v.). **SEE LEGEND.**

Léger, Antoine

(1), a French Protestant divine, was born in Savoy in 1594. He was professor of theology and Oriental languages at Geneva from 1645 until his death in 1661. He edited the Greek text of the New Testament (1638).

Léger, Antoine

(2), son of the preceding, was born at Geneva in 1652. He also became a Protestant minister, and afterwards filled the chair of philosophy for twenty-four years at Geneva with eminent success. He died in 1719. He published several scientific treatises and many sermons.

Léger, Jean

a French Protestant minister, was born in Savoy in 1615. He was pastor of a Church of the Waldenses, but fortunately escaped from the massacre of 1655. He afterwards went to France, and solicited the intervention of the court for his countrymen. In 1663 he went to Holland, and became pastor of a Walloon Church in Leyden. He died in 1670. Léger wrote a *History of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont* (1669). **SEE WALDENSES.**

Legerdemain

SEE MAGIC.

Le'gion

Picture for Legion

(λεγεών, Graecized from the Latin *legio*), a main division of the Roman army, corresponding nearly to the modern *regiment*. It always comprised a large body of men, but the number varied so much at different times that there is considerable discrepancy in the statements with reference to it. The legion appears to have originally contained about 3000 men, and to have risen gradually to twice that number, or even more. In and about the time of Christ it seems to have consisted of 6000 men, and this was exclusive of horsemen, who usually formed an additional body amounting to one tenth of the infantry. As all the divisions of the Roman army are noticed in Scripture, we may add that each legion was divided into ten *cohorts* or battalions, each cohort into three *maniples* or bands, and each manipule into two *centuries* or companies of 100 each. This smaller division into centuries or hundreds, from the form in which it is exhibited as a constituent of the larger divisions, clearly shows that 6000 had become at least the formal number of a legion. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Ant* s.v. Army, Roman.

The word *legion* came to be used to express a great number or multitude (e.g. of angels, ⁴¹⁸⁵Matthew 26:53). Thus the unclean spirit (Mark v. 9; compare 15), when asked his name, answers, "My name is Legion, for *we* are many." Many illustrations of this use of the word might be cited from the Rabbinical writers, who even apply it (^{^/ygl}, ^{^/ygl}) to inanimate objects, as when they speak of "a legion of olives," etc. (see Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. et Talm.*; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* s.v.). — Kitto. **SEE ARMY.**

Legion, Theban

according to Eucherius, was a legion of 6600 men (the usual number) which had come from the East to render assistance to Maximian. The latter having issued orders to his whole army to persecute the Christians, this legion alone refused to obey. The emperor was in the neighborhood, at Octodurum (Martinach, at the foot of Mount St. Bernard); irritated when he heard of the refusal of the Theban legion, he had it decimated twice, and finally, as he failed to secure its members to join in persecuting their Christian brethren, he ordered their extermination by the remainder of his army. Another account, giving I substantially the same version of this

event, embellishes it by what seems to have taken place about the year 286, although it mentions a pope Marcellinus as having advised them rather to submit to death than to act against the dictates of their conscience, while this Marcellinus only became pope ten years after the above time. This second version appears to be but a rear regement of the legend of Eucherius, just as there have been others until the time of the Reformation (by Petrus Canisius and Gulielmus Baldesanus). This legend was first treated as untrue in Magdeburg; then Jean Armand Dubourdieu, a French Reformed minister at London, undertook to prove that the number of the legion did not by any means amount to 6666 (the figures given in the second version). This led to a protracted controversy. The silence of the leading early ecclesiastical historians — Eusebius, Lactantius, Sulpicius Severus, and Orosius — over the event some have advanced to prove that it is simply a fable, but their silence does not, in our mind, go far to disprove it. Eusebius says little of the Western martyrs, yet mentions that an officer picked out the Christians in the Roman army before the beginning of the great persecution, and gave them the choice of renouncing their religion or of leaving the army, adding that many Christians were killed by his orders. The others either do not mention the martyrs of that period, or were by other circumstances prevented from becoming acquainted with much of their history. On the other hand, Ambrose († 397) says, “Every city prides itself that has had one martyr; how much more, then, can Milan prilde herself, who had a whole army of divine soldiers?” Eucherius takes this as an allusion to the Theban legion. Another testimony to the same effect is contained in St. Victricius’s *work, De laudibus martyrum* (390). The third is the discovery of a shield in the bed of the Arve, near Geneva, representinhg the Thebas, with the inscription *Largitas D. M. Valentiniani Augusti*. A fourth is found ins the life of St. Romanus (520), who mentions, among others, his journey to Agaunumn (*Castra martyrum*), probably between the years 460 and 470. It also corroborates Eucherius’s figures (6600). The fifth is that of Avitus, archbishop of Vienna, a breastplate originally belonging to whom is yet kept in the convent: this dates from the year 517. A sixth is given in the *Vita* of Victor of Marseilles. It is most probable, however, that while the legend rests on a foundation of facts, these facts were generalized and amplified, so that a number of Christian soldiers in the Roman army became a legion first of 6600, then of 6666. Those who deny the truth of the legend take their stand on its similarity with that of a certain Simeson Metaphrastes, according to whom, also, one Mauritiuis, under the same emperor, is said

to have suffered martyrdom with Photinus, Theodorus, Philippus, and sixty-seven others, all of the military order. But, aside from the name of Mauritius, all the others have different names, while the details of the event also vary. Among the writers who have contested the truthfulness of the legend concerning the Theban legion, the most important are Dubourdieu, Hottinger, Moyle, Burnet, and Mosheim; it has been defended by George Hickes, M. Felix de Balthasar (*Defense de la Legion Thebeenne*, Lucerne. 1760, 8vo), Dom Joseph de Lisle (*Defense de la Verite du Martyre de la Legion Thebeenne*, 1737, 8vo), Rossignoli (*Historia di San Maurizio*), and P. de Rivaz (*Eclaircissements sur les Martyres de la Legion Thebeenne*, Paris, 1779, 8vo). See Herzog, *Real — Encyklopädie*, vol. 9, s.v. Mauritius. *SEE MAURITIUS*.

Legion, Thundering

(*Legio fulminatrix*), the title of a Roman legion in the time of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, which, after the expulsion of the Marcomnani and Quadi from Hungary, while the emperor Aurelius was pursuing these German tribes with a detachment of his forces (A.D. 174), was shut up in a valley surrounded on every side by high mountains, and both by the heat of the weather and the want of water was suffering more cruelly than from the attacks of the enemy, when suddenly, in this crisis, a shower of rain reanimated the Roman soldiers, while at the same time a storm of hail, attended with thunder, assailed the enemy, who were then easily repulsed and conquered. Both heathen and Christian authors agree in their relation of the principal circumstances of this event. The adherents of each religion saw in it the influence of the prayers of their brethren. According to Dio Cassius (*Excerpta Xiphilin.* I, 71, cap. 8), the miracle was wrought by an Elgyptian sorcerer in the train of the emperor; according to Capitolinus (*Vita Marc. Aurel.* cap. 24), it was the effect of the emperor's prayers; but according to Tertullian (*Apologet.* cap. 5; *Ad Scopul.* cap. 4) and Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* lib. 5, cap. 5), it was brought about by the prayers of the Christians in his army; hence the legion to which these Christians belonged was denominated *fulminatrix*. The letter of the emperor Marcus Aurelius, commonly printed in Greek in the first Apology of Justin Martyr, gives the same account with the Christian writers, but it is spurious. The marble pillar erected at Rome in honor of Marcus Aurelius, and still standing, represents this deliverance of the Roman arm — the Roman soldiers catching the falling rain, and a warrior praying for its descent. It is not, however, to be considered as a memorial of any influence exercised by the

Christians in that event. See Milman, *History of Christianity*, 2:145 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* I, bk. 1, cent. 2, part 1, chap. 1, § 9; Pressense, *History of Early Christianity*, p. 129. (J. H. W.)

Legists And Decretists

the interpreters and editors (*glossatores*) of the Roman law. *SEE GLOSSES* and *SEE DECRETALS*.

Legrand, Antoine

a French writer and monk, born at Douay, lived about 1650-80, He was professor of philosophy and theology in Douay, and was a disciple of the Cartesian philosophy, on which he wrote several treatises. He published a *Sacred History from the Creation to Constantine the Great* (1685), and other works. — Thomas, *Biog. Dictionary*, s.v.

Legrand, Joachim

a French historian and abbe, born at Saint-Lo in 1653, was a person of great erudition. He was secretary of legation in Spain about 1702, and was afterwards employed in the foreign office. He died in 1733. He published a *History of the Divorce of Henry VIII of England* (1688), and a few other historical works.

Legrand, Louis

a French theologian, was born in Burgundy in 1711, became professor in the seminary of Saint-Sulpice, Paris, and died in 1780. He published, besides other works, a *Treatise on the Incarnation of the Word* (1751). He composed the censures which the faculty of theology published against Rousseau's *Emile* (1762) and Buffon's *Epoques de la Nature* (Diedin, 1780). — Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Legris-Duval, René Michel,

a French priest, who was born at Bretagne in 1705, and died in 1816, is noted as a zealous and efficient promoter of benevolent institutions.

Legros, Antoine

a French scholar and writer, who was born in Paris about 1680, and died in 1751, published, besides other works, *The Works of the Fathers who lived in the Time of the Apostles, with Notes* (1717).

Legros, Nicolas

a French Jansenist theologian, was born at Rheims in 1675. He passed the last twenty-five years of his life in Holland, to which he retired for refuge from persecution. He died in 1751. Among his works are a French translation of the Bible (1739), which is esteemed for fidelity; and a *Manual for the Christian* (1740).

Le'habim

(Heb. *Lehabim'*, ‏מִיבִימ׃] preb. for ‏מִיבִימ׃, *Lubim*; Sept. Λαβειύμ, v. r. in Chron. Λαβεΐν; Vulg. *Laabim*), a people reckoned among the Midianitish stock (‏גֵּזֵרִים Genesis 10:13; ‏בְּנֵי מִצְרָיִם 1 Chronicles 1:11). See ETHNOLOGY. The word is in the plural, and evidently signifies a tribe, doubtless taking the name of *Lehab*, Mizraim's third son (‏גֵּזֵרִים Genesis 10:13). Bochart affirms that the Lehabim are not, as is generally supposed, identical with the Libyans. His reasons are, That Libya was much too large a country to have been peopled by one son of Mizraim; and that in other parts of Scripture Libya is either called Phut (‏פּוּט, Jer. 46:9; ‏עֵזֶקֶל Ezekiel 30:5), or Lubim ‏מִיבִימ׃, ‏בְּנֵי מִצְרָיִם 2 Chronicles 12:3; ‏נָחֻם Nahum 3:9), and Phut was a brother, and not a son of Mizraim (‏גֵּזֵרִים Genesis 10:6; Bochart, *Opera*, 1:279). These arguments do not stand the test of historical criticism. Phut and Lubim are not identical (‏נָחֻם Nahum 3:9); and the Lehabim may have been joined by other tribes in colonizing Libya. It is quite true there is no direct evidence to identify the Lehabim and Lubim; yet there seems a high probability that the words are only different forms of the same name — the former being the more ancient, the middle radical **h** was afterwards softened (as is not unusual in Hebrew, Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 743, 360) into **w** quiescent. The Lehabim are not again mentioned in Scripture, but we find the Lubim connected with Mizraim (‏בְּנֵי מִצְרָיִם 2 Chronicles 12:3), and the Kushites or Ethiopians (16:8). We may therefore safely infer that the Lehabim were the ancient Lubim or Libyans, who perhaps first settled on the borders of the Nile, among or beside the Mizraim; but, as they increased in number, migrated to the wide regions south-west, and occupied the vast territory

known to classical geographers as Libya (Kalisch On ^{<0103>}Genesis 10:13; see also Michaelis, *Spicileg. Geogr.*; Knobel *Völkertafel des Pent.*). Dr. Beke maintains that the Lehabim, as well as the Mizraim, were a people of north-western Arabia; but his views are opposed alike to the opinions of ancient and modern geographers, and his arguments (do not appear of sufficient weight to command acceptance (*Origines Biblicae*, p. 167, 198 sq.). There can be no doubt that the Lubim are the same as the ReBU or LeBU of the Egyptian inscriptions, and that from them Libya and the Libyans derived their name. These primitive Libyans appear, in the period at which they are mentioned in these two historical sources, that is, from the time of Menptah, B.C. cir. 1250, to that of Jeremiah's notice of them late in the 6th century B.C., and probably in the case of Daniel's, prophetically to the earlier part of the second century B.C., to have inhabited the northern part of Africa to the west of Egypt, though latterly driven from the coast by the Greek colonists of the Cyrenaica, as is more fully shown under LUBIM. Geographically, the position of the Lehabim in the enumeration of the Mizraitcs immediately before the Naphtuhim suggests that they at first settled to the westward of Egypt, and nearer to it, or not more distant from it than the tribes or peoples mentioned before them. *SEE MIZRAIM*. Historically and ethnologically, the connection of the ReBU and Libyans with Egypt and its people suggests their kindred origin with the Egyptians. *SEE LIBYA*.

Le'hi

(Heb. *Lechi'*, yj **לְחִי**, in pause *Le'chi*, yj **לְחִי**, a cheek or jaw-bone [usually with the art. yj **לְחִי**]; Sept. **Λεχι** v. r. **Λευί**), a place in the tribe of Judah where Samson achieved one of his single-handed victories over the Philistines (^{<0713>}Judges 15:9, 14, 19, in which last passages the Sept. translates **σινάγων**, *Vulg. maxilla*). It contained an eminence — Ramath-lehi, and a spring of great and lasting repute (see Ortlob, *De fonte Simeonis*, Lips. 1703) — En hak-kore (ver. 17). The name of the place before the conflict was evidently Lehi, as appears from verses 9 and 14; perhaps so called from the form of some hill or rock (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 752). After the slaughter of the Philistines, Samson, with a characteristic play upon the name, makes it descriptive of his signal and singular victory. Lehi is possibly mentioned in ^{<10231>}2 Samuel 23:11 — the relation of another encounter with the Philistines hardly less disastrous than that of Samson. The Heb. there has **hYj l i** as if **hYj i** from the root yj i (Gesenius, *Thesaur.*

p. 470). In this sense the word very rarely occurs (see A. V. of ^{<0980>}Psalm 68:10, 30; 74:19). It elsewhere has the sense of “living,” and thence of wild animals, which is adopted by the Sept. in this place, as remarked above. In ver. 13 it is again rendered “troop.” In the parallel narrative of 1 Chronicles (11:15), the word **hnj m**, a “camp,” is substituted. In the passage 2 Samuel, it is rendered in the A. V. “into a troop,” but by alteration of the vowel-points becomes “to Lehi,” which gives a new and certainly an appropriate sense. This reading first appears in Josephus (*Ant.* 7:12, 4), who gives it “a place called Siagona” — the jaw — the word which he employs in the story of Samson (*Ant.* 5:8, 9). It is also given in the Complutensian Sept., and among modern interpreters by Bochart (*Hieroz.* 1:2, ch. 13), Kennicott (*Dissert.* p. 140), J. D. Michaelis (*Bibelfür Ungfelehrt.*), Ewald (*Geschichte*, 3:180, note). The great similarity between the two names in the original (Gesenius, *Thsctur.* p. 175 *b*), has led to the supposition that Beer-Lahai-roi was the same as Lehi. But the situations do not suit. The well Lahai-roi was below Kadesh, very far from the locality to which Samson’s adventures seem to have been confined. Jerome states that Paula, when on her way from Bethlehem to Egypt, passed from Sochoth to the fountain of Samson (*Opera*, 1:705, ed. Migne). Later writers locate it beside Eleutheropolis (Anton. Mar. *liin.* 30; Reland, p. 872); but the tradition appears to have been vague and uncertain (Robinson, 2:64 sq.). There is only a deep old well, which would not answer to the Scripture narrative (Robinson, 2:26 sq.). — Smith; Kitto. Van de Velde (*Narrative*, 2:140, 141) proposes to identify Ramoth-Lehi with Ramoth Nekeb (^{<0917>}1 Samuel 30:27), as well as with Baalath (^{<1098>}1 Kings 9:18; ^{<1486>}2 Chronicles 8:6), Baalath-beer (^{<0698>}Joshua 19:8), or Bealoth (^{<0654>}Joshua 15:24); and all these with some ruins on tell *Lekiyeh*, three or four miles north of Bir es-Seba (comp. *Memoir*, p. 343), a view to which we yield an assent, reluctantly, however, owing to its great distance from the Philistine territory, and the want of exact agreement in the Arabic name (*Lechi and Legiyeh*). The *Beit-Likiyeh*, mentioned by Tobler (*Dritte Wanderung*, p. 189) as a village on the northern slopes of the great wady Suleiman, about two miles below the upper Beth-horon, is a position at once on the borders of both Judah and the Philistines, and within reasonable proximity to Zorah, Eshtaol, Timnath, and other places familiar to the history of the great Danite hero. But this, again, is too far north for any known position of the adjoining rock Etamn (q.v.).

Lehmann, Christian Abraham,

a German theologian, was born at Tütenbock Jan. 4, 1735, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg (1754-58). In 1760 he became deacon, in 1764 pastor at Lockwitz, and in 1806 senior of the district of the Dresden diocese. He died Dec. 30, 1813. He spent his life in practical activity. He was remarkably successful in an attempt to hold prayer-meetings, connected with Bible instruction, thus influencing and affecting the heart in a time when the great majority of the pulpits of Germany were occupied by rationalism. Of the few books he composed, we mention *Kunzer Entwurf der Glaubenslehre für erwachsene Kinder*, etc. (1772, 8vo; new and enlarged edit., 1797, 8vo). — Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* vol. 2, s.v.

Lehnberg, Magnus,

a Swedish prelate, noted as a pulpit orator, was born in 1758, and became bishop of Linköping. He died in 1809.

Lehnin, Hermann Von,

a monk of the convent of that name, said to have flourished about the close of the 13th century, as the author of a prophetic poem, in 100 Latin hexameter verses, concerning his convent and the house of Brandenburg, entitled *Vatfincinium Lehninense*. According to the legend, the MS. was discovered in an old wall, in the 17th century, by the elector, when the latter intended to build a palace on the ruins of the convent. The poem is written in the interest of the hierarchy; it deplores the heresy of the former house of Brandenburg in the ascendant house of Hohenzollern (the latter family adhering to Protestantism), and prophesies the downfall of the now ruling family, to be followed by the restoration of the unity of Germany and the reestablishment of the Roman Catholic Church. The existence of this poem is not, however, to be traced with any certainty further back than the year 1693. It was first published in Lilienthal (Konigsb. 1723, 1741), then at Berlin and Vienna, 1745; Bern, 1758; Leipsic, 1807; also in France, in 1827 and 1830, by W. Meinhold, with a metrical translation, Leips. 1849; C. Kosch, Stuttgart, 1849; Gieseler, *Die Lehkinsche Weisagyunnr* (Erf. 1849); Guhrauer, *Die Weissayungen v. Lehnin* (Bresl. 1850); M. Heffter, *Geschichte des Klosters Lehnin* (Brandenburg, 1851). Those who consider this poem a mere mystically-shaped narrative of past events, name as its author M. F. Seidel, assessor of the privy council († at Berlin in 1693); or

Andrew Fromm, counsellor of the Consistory († at Prague in 1688); or Nicolas von Zitzwitz, abbot of Huysburg, who, they say, composed it about 1692; or the Jesuit Frederick Wolf, chaplain to the Austrian embassy at Berlin in 1685-86 († 1708); or (Elven, captain of cavalry at Stettin († 1727). See L. de Bouverois, *Extracit d'un manuscrit relatif a la prophetie du frere St. de Lehninz* (German transl. by W. von Schütz (Würzb. 1847); J. A. Boost, *Die Weissagungene des Mönchs H. z. Lehnin* (Augsb. 1848). — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 8:273; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 5:757 sq.

Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm,

Baron von-philosopher, theologian, jurist, historian, poet, mathematician, mechanician, naturalist, and votary of all arts and all sciences — was the most brilliant, profound, and versatile scholar of the century following the death of Des Cartes — perhaps of modern times. He is among the few who have earned the honors of all-embracing erudition — *ultra progredi nefas est*. As the opponent of Spinoza, Bayle, and Locke; as the conciliator of Plato and Aristotle; as the reverential follower of the discredited schoolmen; as the precursor of Kant, and as the vindicator “of the ways of God to man,” Leibnitz occupies an equally eminent and important position in the history of philosophic opinion. His metaphysical speculations were, however, but a small portion of his labors. His greatest achievements in nearly all cases were only the liberal recreations of his idle hours. He rendered all learning and nearly all knowledge tributary to his genius, and deserved the happy eulogy of Fontenelle, that “he drove all the sciences abreast.” He reformed and enlarged old systems of doctrine, he added new provinces to them, he improved their methods, he supplied them with keener instruments, he discovered new continents of study, and delineated them for future occupation and culture. Whatever region he visited in the wide circuit of his explorations was quickened into bloom and fruitage beneath his feet —

“Suaveis Daedala tellus Summittit flores.”

Life. — Leibnitz was the son of Frederick Leibnitz, professor of ethics in the University of Leipsic, and was born there July 3, 1646. He was early placed at school. At six years of age he lost his father, from whom he inherited a small fortune and an extensive library. This library inspired, molded, and furnished forth his career. He buried himself in his young years amid its volumes, and delighted in the unaided perusal of the ancient

classics. His attention was not confined to the great masters of style, nor to linguistic pursuits. He read with like diligence poets, orators, jurists, travelers - works of science, medicine, philosophy, and general information. Nothing came amiss to his insatiable appetite and incredible industry. At fifteen he entered the University of Leipsic, and was directed by Jacobus Thomasius to mathematical and philosophical studies. He applied himself assiduously to the writings of Plato and Aristotle, and already, at the age of eighteen, was endeavoring to harmonize and combine their antagonistic systems. One year he spent at the University of Jena, but he returned to his own city to prosecute his professional studies. Applying for the degree of doctor of law when he had scarcely attained his twentieth year, he was refused the diploma on the pretext of his youth. It was cheerfully accorded by the University of Altdorf, which tendered him a professorship; but this was declined. To this period belong his *Ars Combinatoria* — a curious adaptation of Raymond Lully's Art of Meditation and Logical Invention — and his *Mathematical Demonstration of the Existence of God*. His estimate in declining life of the former treatise may be seen from his fourth letter to Remond de Montmort in 1714.

From Altdorf Leibnitz proceeded to Nuremberg, where, in consequence of an application filled with cabalistic terms, unmeaning to himself and to every one else, he was admitted into an association for the pursuit of the philosopher's stone, and was appointed its secretary. Half a century before, Des Cartes had been similarly seduced in the same regions. From these visionary occupations the young alchemist was soon withdrawn by the baron De Boineburg, chancellor of the elector of Mayence, who recommended him to prosecute history and jurisprudence, and invited him to Frankfort, with the promise of preferment. He illustrated his change of abode by publishing *Nova metholdus discendae docendeque Jurisprudenticae* (1667), to which was appended a *Catatalogus Desilderatolrum*. The unsystematic treatment of jurisprudence had long needed reform. Leibnitz continued his efforts in this direction by an essay, *De Corpore Juris reconcinnando*. He contemplated at this time a new and enlarged edition of Alsted's *Encyclopaedia*. and never abandoned, but never commenced his design. From these vast projects he was diverted by Boineburg, at whose instance he composed a diplomatic exposition of the claims of Philip William, duke palatine of Neuburg, to the vacant throne of Poland. He declined an invitation to the duke's court, remained at Frankfort, and brought out a new edition of the forgotten work of Marius

Nizolius, *De Veris Principiis et Vetra Ratione Philosophandi*. He added notes, and prefixed two dissertations; one on *The Philosophical Style of Composition*, the other *On Writing the History of Philosophy*. In the latter he treated of Des Cartes, Aristotle, and the schoolmen, and on the mode of harmonizing the Peripatetic with later philosophy. All his writings exhibit pronounced Cartesianism. His first approaches to physical science were made in his *Theoria Motus Abstracti*, containing the germs of his Calculus, and his *Theoria Motus Concreti* (1671). They were not favorably received; but Leibnitz was still only twenty-five years old. Next year appeared his *Sacrosancta Trinitas per novan argumenta defensa*, directed against Wissowatius, a Polish Unitarian. Thus, say the writers in the *Biographie Universelle*, "each year brought a new title of glory to Leibnitz, and gave him rank among the masters of the different sciences." He was already a counselor of the chancery of Mayence. At length his desire of seeing Paris was gratified. Boineburg sent him thither as tutor to his sons, and in charge of some public affairs. He was at once admitted into the most brilliant scientific circles, in the most brilliant period of the reign of Louis XIV. Here he made the acquaintance of Huyghens, and improved the calculating machine of Pascal. He was also induced to aid in preparing the Latin classics *in usum Delphini*. On the death of Boineburg (1673) he passed over into England, where he was received with distinction by Boyle, Oldenburg, and other members of the recent Royal Society. Intelligence of the demise of the elector of Mayence reached him in London. He was thus deprived of the means of support. Flattering proposals had been made to him by Louis XIV, but they had been refused, as they required adhesion to the Catholic communion. In his anxiety and distress, he was appointed by the duke of Brunswick a counsellor, with an adequate pension, and with the privilege of remaining abroad. He returned to Paris, and remained there fifteen months. In 1676 he revisited England, and thence proceeded to Hanover by way of Holland. Here he entered upon his duties as counselor, and strange duties for a minister of state employed himself in arranging and enlarging the library of his protector, and improving the drainage of his mines. His services were rewarded with a considerable salary, but the duke soon died (1679). He found other employment, for he was never idle, and composed a treatise on *The Rights of Ambassadors*, arguing the question of States' Rights, which has assumed such prominence in Germany in recent years. The new duke of Brunswick engaged Leibnitz to compose the *History of the House of Brunswick*. To prepare for the task, he visited southern Germany and Italy, consulting the learned, exploring monasteries,

ransacking libraries, examining old charters, deciphering moldy manuscripts, and transcribing worm-eaten documents. Whatever he undertook he projected on a scale proportionate to his own vast comprehension and various knowledge, with little regard to the legitimate magnitude of the subject, or to the brevity of human life. He brought back from his wanderings an abundant supply of diplomatic materials, which he arranged, and from which he extracted extensive works, sometimes having little direct connection with the Chronicles of Brunswick. The first-fruits of these collections were the *Codex Juris Gentium Diplomaticus*, of which the first volume was issued in 1693, in folio; the second in 1700, with the title *Mantissa Codicis*. Valuable as were the documents, the most valuable part of the work was the Introduction, reviewing the principles of natural and international law, and sketching the reform of civil jurisprudence ultimately achieved by Napoleon. Other works of wide comprehension were due to these archaeological researches: the demonstration of the descent of the Guelphic line from the Italian house of Este; the *Accessiones Historicae* (1698, 2 vols. 4to, containing a multitude of unpublished papers), and the *Scriptores Rerum Brunsvicensium*. The first volume of this historical collection appeared in 1707, folio; the second in 1710; the third in 1711. These extensive accumulations were only materials to be employed for *The History of the House of Brunswick*. In the Introduction to the *Corpus Scriptorum* Leibnitz discussed everything connected with the family, the realm, and the country of the Guelphs, investigating the traditions of the early tribes that dwelt on the Elbe and the Weser, tracing their changes and migrations, marshalling the passages of the ancient authors in which they were mentioned, and examining their language and the mixture of their dialects. It inaugurated ethnological science and comparative philology. His inquiries, however, stretched far beyond the *incunabula gentis*, and contemplated the primitive condition of the abode of the race. This preliminary outline is given in the *Protogaea* (1693), which founded the modern sciences of geology and physical geography. It is interesting to compare this fragmentary sketch with the *Vulgar Errors* of Sir Thomas Browne, and to note the immense stride which was made by Leibnitz. Of the main work, to which this essay was to be introductory — the *History of the House of Brunswick* — only a brief and imperfect outline was ever drawn by the accomplished author. It was published after his death by Eccard, in the *Acta Eruditorum*, in 1717.

These historical labors were the real task of the life of Leibnitz. But the long years of plodding industry were abundantly filled with other enterprises, and it is to them that his reputation is mainly due.

By his exertions chiefly, the *Acta Eruditorum* — a scientific and philosophical periodical — was established (vol. 1, Leipsic, 1682). To this he contributed largely, and in its pages appeared many of his most luminous discoveries and suggestions. In it was published his *Meditationes de Cognitione, Veritate et Ideis* (1684), propounding his modifications of the Cartesian doctrine of knowledge. In the same year, and in the same work, appeared his rules for the Differential Calculus, the germs of which had been indicated in his *Theoria Motus Abstracti* thirteen years before. He gave no demonstrations; these were divined with wonderful ingenuity, and promulgated by the Bernouilli brothers. In 1687 the world was enriched by Sir Isaac Newton's *Principia Mathematica Philosophica Naturalis*, which employed a mathematical device closely analogous to the Calculus of Leibnitz. A bitter controversy in regard to priority of discovery and originality of invention sprung up between the partisans of these great mathematicians. It is scarcely yet terminated. The rigorous and repeated examination of the question justifies the conclusion that both had independently discovered corresponding procedures. The history of inventions is full of such coincidences. There is sufficient difference between the Fluents and Fluxions of Newton and the Calculus of Leibnitz to indicate the originality of each. Neither was the first to enter upon this line of inquiry. To Leibnitz is specially due the acquisition of the powerful instrument by which so many of the triumphs of modern science have been won. In this connection a passing reference may be made to his *Arithmetica Binaria* (1697) — a method of notation and computation employing only the symbols 1 and 0; and also to the *Philosophy of Infinity*, long meditated, but never made public.

The conception of dynamical science continually occupied the mind of Leibnitz, and was the natural tendency of his philosophical method. The *Acta Eruditorum* for 1695 contained his *Specimen Dynamicum*; and in the same year he gave to the world, through the *Journal des Scavans*, his *Systema de Natura et Communicatione Substantiarum, itenzque Unione inter Corpus et Animam intercedente*. In the latter he propounded his celebrated dogma of *Pre-established Harmony*. The connection between mind and body, between force and matter, between the *natura naturans* and the *natura naturata*, is still an insoluble enigma, after all the

speculations of transcendental philosophy, and all the researches of modern philosophy and modern chemistry. We still grope for life in the dust and ashes of death. The veil of His has not been raised. Spencer, and Huxley, and Tyndall, *et id genus onse*, are compelled to acknowledge their inability to penetrate the mystery of the connection. However tutenable, however hazardous, however absurd the Pre-established Harmony of Leibnitz may be, it was a beautiful dream, generated in some sort by the atmosphere of the time, and certainly a bold and ingenious attempt to escape from the brute mechanism of Des Cartes, the pantheism of Spinoza, the puppetry of Malebranche. and the materialism of the Sensationalists. The doctrine was illustrated, explained, and expanded in the *Theodicee*, and in many short essays and letters. So much, indeed, of the philosophy of Leibnitz was communicated only by occasional papers and correspondence, so little by systematic works, that it is impossible to trace the course and development of his views in any brief notice. His two formal metaphysical works belong to the last period of his life. The *Nouveaux Essais*, in reply to Locke, answering the English philosopher chapter by chapter, and section by section, were completed in 1704, but were not published for more than half a century. They were withheld from the press in consequence of Locke's death in that year, and were first published by Raspe in 1763. The *Theodicee*, which was designed as a refutation of Bayle, and was undertaken at the request of the queen of Prussia, was completed two years after the death of that princess and of Bayle, but was not published till 1710, six years before Leibnitz's own decease. Like the *Nouveaux Essais*, it was composed in French, of which language Leibnitz was a perfect master. It is exquisitely written, and is the finest specimen of philosophical literature since the Dialogues of Plato. A very large portion of the metaphysical and other writings of Leibnitz have been transmitted to us only by posthumous publication.

Though Leibnitz composed only these two formal treatises, his philosophical and scientific labors were multitudinous and multifarious. He was indefatigable in labor, and his mind ranged with equal rapidity and splendor over the whole domain of knowledge. Nothing was too vast for his comprehension, too dark for his penetration, too humble for his notice. He corresponded with Pelisson on the conciliation and union of the Protestant and Catholic communions, and was thus brought into connection with Bossuet. With Burnet he discussed the project of uniting the Anglicans and the Continental Protestants. He expended much time

over the invention of a universal language. He wrote extensively on etymology, and the improvement of the German language, which he so rarely employed. Medicine, botany, and other branches of natural history attracted his earnest regards. He addressed a memoir to Louis XIV on *the Conquest and Colonization of Egypt, with the view to establishing a Suprenacy over Europe*. The age of chivalry and the Crusades was not over with him. He certainly pointed out the road to Napoleon. He was deeply interested in the accounts of the Chinese, and in the Jesuit missions for their conversion. He wrote much upon the *philosophis Sinzensis*, in accordance with the delusion of the age. He engaged in an active but courteous controversy with Samuel Clarke, in which the highest and most abstruse riddles of metaphysics were discussed. From his historical researches he drew the materials for an instructive essay, *De Origine Francorum* (1715); and so various was the range of topics that engaged his attention, that he commented on the political position and rights of English freeholders. His mind, like the sun, surveyed all things, and brightened all that it shone upon. This enumeration of his inquiries gives a very imperfect view of either the number or the variety of his productions. The catalogue of his writings fills thirty-three pages in the 4th edition of his works by Dutens.

The literary fecundity of Leibnitz was equaled by his activity in promoting the practical interests of intelligence. His correspondence linked together the scholars of all countries, furnished a bond of connection between all learning and science, and created for the first time a universal republic of letters. He thus communicated an impulse to the dissemination of knowledge not less potent than that given by Bacon's *New Atlantis*, and by the institution of the Royal Society of England. Of that society he was an adjunct member, as he was the chief of the foreign associates of the Academy of Sciences of France. He suggested to the first king of Prussia the foundation of the Royal Academy of Berlin, aided in its establishment, and became its first president (1700). He proposed a like institution for Dresden, but was frustrated by the wars in Poland, for his zeal for liberal studies was contemporaneous with the conquering campaigns of Charles XII of Sweden. When the Berlin Academy was endangered by the death of its royal founder, Leibnitz sought to open a new home for learning by establishing a similar society at Vienna (1713). The design was not carried into effect. The exhaustion of the finances by the War of the Spanish Succession, which was scarcely closed, was unfavorable to the scheme.

Leibnitz was warmly received, was encouraged by prince Eugene, was created a baron of the empire, and was appointed aulic counselor, with a salary of 2000 florins. Two years previously he had been consulted at Torgau, in regard to the civilization of Russia, by Peter the Great, who had made him a counselor of the Russian empire, and had conceded a handsome pension to him. All the while he remained historiographer of Brunswick. It is reported that the elector of Brunswick was much dissatisfied with the slow progress of the history of his house. When the elector became king of England (1714), Leibnitz hastened from Vienna to pay his court to the monarch, but his new majesty had departed for his new dominions. He met the sovereign, however, on his return to his paternal domain. The years of Leibnitz were now drawing to an end. He suffered from acute rheumatism and other painful disorders. Having much acquaintance with medicine, he tried novel remedies upon himself, with no good result. He prolonged his studies almost to his last days, and died tranquilly, with scarcely a word, on Nov. 14, 1716, having reached the age of "threescore and ten years" His monument at the gates of Hanover, erected by king George, bears the modest inscription *Ossa. Leibnitii*.

Leibnitz was of medium height, and slender. He had a large head, black hair, which soon left him bald, and small eyes. He was very short-sighted, but his vision was otherwise sound to the end of his days. His constitution was remarkably good, for he reached old age without serious malady, notwithstanding the strain to which it was subjected. He drank moderately, but ate much, especially at supper, and immediately after this heavy meal retired to rest. He was wholly irregular in eating. He took his food whenever he was hungry, usually in his library, without abandoning his books. Frequently he took his only repose in his chair, and occasionally pursued his reflections or researches, without change of place, for weeks — Fontenelle says for months. He read everything — good books and bad books, and books on all manner of subjects. He extracted largely from the authors perused, and made copious annotations upon them. His memory was so tenacious that he rarely recurred to these *Adversaria*. He sought intercourse with men of all occupations and of all grades of intelligence. Every work of God or man was an object of interest and regard to him. He stretched forth his hand to everything — the election of a king of Poland, the revival of the Crusades, the conversion of the heathen, the reunion of the churches, the codification of laws, the history of a dynasty and people, the constitution of the universe, the creation of new sciences, the

derivation of words, the invention of a calculating machine, the projection of a universal languages the construction of windmills, or the improvement of pleasure carriages. The extent of his correspondence was amazing, and may be conjectured from the list of distinguished correspondents culled by Brucker from the ampler catalogues of Feller and Ludovici. The courtesy of his epistles was as notable as their multitude. They were scattered over all civilized nations, and were on an endless diversity of topics, but they were uniformly marked by deference for the persons and opinions of others. This gentleness sprung from an amiable and cheerful nature. It was cultivated and refined by intercourse with princes, and statesmen, and philosophers, and scholars, and also with the humblest classes of society. It was confirmed by his belief that no honest conviction can be entirely wrong. His conversation was easy and abundant — as full of charm as of instruction. It may be conceded to Gibbon that completeness was sacrificed by Leibnitz to universality of acquirement; but, when all his gifts and accomplishments are embraced in one view, he may be justly deemed to merit the eulogy of his French editor, Jacques: “In point of speculative philosophy he is the greatest intellect of modern times; and had but two equals, but no superiors, in antiquity.”

Leibnitz was never married. He contemplated the experiment once, when he was fifty years of age (“de quo semel tantum in vita, atate jam provector, sed frustra cogitavit”). The lady asked time for reflection. The opportunity for reflection cooled the ardor of the philosopher — the match was not decreed by any pre-established harmony, and the suit was not pressed.

The religious fervor of Leibnitz was undoubted, but he was negligent of the offices of religion. In his efforts to promote Christian unity, and to recognize only “one Lord, one faith, one baptism,” he may have felt too keenly the defects of rival creeds, so as to accept from none the truth which seemed mutilated and imperfect in each.

Philosophy. — The mathematical and scientific, the historical and juridical, the linguistic and miscellaneous speculations of Leibnitz have been noticed very inadequately, but as fully as comports with the design of this Cyclopaedia. His philosophy awaits and merits niore precise consideration. It must be premised that all his labors, however remote in appearance from philosophical speculation, were inspired and animated by his own peculiar scheme of doctrine, and were really fragmentary applications of his

distinctive principles. Hence proceeded that pervading spirit of reform which is manifested in all the departments of knowledge handled by him, and which was rewarded by numerous great triumphs in so many and such dissimilar directions. When details are neglected, the whole body of his writings is found to be connected by many lines of interdependence, and to be harmonized into unity by a common relation to the central thought around which his own reflections incessantly revolved. God is one, and there must be consistency and concord in the creation of God. It is no easy a task to discern this unity, and to detect the general scheme of the Leibnizian philosophy. Leibnitz nowhere presents a symmetrical exposition of his whole doctrine. His *Monadologie*, or *Principia Philosophiae, seu Theses in Gratiam Principis Eugenii*, furnishes a clew to his system, but it is only a slender clew. Even if the *Principes de la Nature et de la Grace* be added as a supplement, the guiding thread is very frail. His views must be painfully gathered from elaborate treatises, from occasional essays, from scientific papers, from passing hints, from explanations of controverted points, from elucidations of obscure or misapprehended statements, and from the series of his multifarious epistles. Here a principle is thrown out, there its applications are illustrated; in one place an erroneous conclusion or a mistaken inference is corrected, in another, or in many others, fresh limitations or further expansions of a hypothesis are proposed. These different members of the imperfect whole are separated by months or years in the life of the author, or by hundreds of pages, or whole volumes in his collected works. It required the patient diligence of Christian Wolf to combine, complete, and organize in cumbrous quartos leaves scattered like the oracles of the Sibyl. Leibnitz had, indeed, no system to propound; he had no thought of promulgating a system or of establishing a sect. Yet his mind was thoroughly systematic. The system which resulted from perfect coherence of thought was latent in his own mind from the beginning, and was consistently evolved as the occasion furnished the opportunity of presenting its several parts. The highest intellect attaches itself instinctively to a principle, and allows accident to determine how far and when its consequences shall be unrolled. Leibnitz only desired to reconcile the opinions of his illustrious predecessors; to correct the errors and to supply the deficiencies which he recognized in the theory of his chief leader, Des Cartes, and to redress the evils which had flowed logically from those errors. The main design of his profound investigations was to give precision, harmony, and veracity to the immense stock of his own acquisitions and meditations. Had he reached the

years of Methuselah he might have proposed a system, but it would have been simply the rectification of Cartesianism, or the conciliation of Plato and Aristotle, of Buonaventura and Aquinas. It must be remembered that, of his two systematic treatises, one was published towards the close of his life, the other not till half a century after his death. His natural disposition apparently inclined him to accumulate knowledge for its own sake, and to reflect upon his acquisitions from his own satisfaction. He seemed to be impelled to publication only by some accidental stimulus. His whole life was a discipline and preparation for what he never found time to execute — never, perhaps, seriously thought of executing — a vast encyclopaedia embracing all that could be known by man. The hints thrown out in his long career, apt as they are for the construction of a consistent globe of speculation, only indicate an undeveloped system, which is revealed by glimpses as the need or provocation of the moment inspired. From such broken and dispersed lights his philosophy must be divined.

Leibnitz was essentially a Cartesian. He was Cartesian in his method, and Cartesian in his fundamental principles. He never revolted from his great teacher. He pursued the Cartesian mode of analysis and abstraction, he employed the Cartesian procedure by mathematical demonstration, he reasoned, like Des Cartes, from presumptive principles, he accepted the Cartesian *indicia* of truth; but he rendered them more irecise, and was not wholly negligent of experience. He also rehabilitated the Scholastic or Aristotelian logic. He endeavored to combine with the dominant doctrine all that seemed valuable in elder systems, and he found some truth in all the schemes that he rejected. His imagination was too bold and too active to permit him to be the servile follower of any master, and his perspicacity was too acute to overlook the fatal defects of the principles and conclusions of Des Cartes. The main errors to be corrected sprung from the distinction made by the French reformer between mind and matter. According to his theory, the one could not act upon the other. The intelligent and the material universe were thus hopelessly divorced. Mind was pure thought; matter was simple extension; the apparent concurrence of the two in the phenomena of existence was due to divine assistancy. See DES CARTES. Beasts were machines galvanized into the semblance of volhutory action by the intervention of divine power. Every movement was a *nodus vindice dignus*. If mind is pure thought, all mental action must be an effluencee, an effect, or a manifestation of the one sole Intelligence. The distinction of minds was an impossibility. To Leibnitz the want of any

principium individuationis — that old war-cry of the schoolmen — was apparent. He discussed this topic in a public thesis before he was seventeen (May 30, 1663, *Opera*, tom. 2, part 1, p. 400, ed. Dutens). He ascribed *entitative* activity to matter, and a distinct entity to each individual mind. He regarded the human mind as an assemblage of dormant capacities (ἐντελεχείαι), to be called into action by the stimulation of sensations from without, and of promptings from within. He departed so far from the teachings of Des Cartes that he ascribed soul and reason to brutes. and in some sort to all matter also (*Leibnitiana*, § c, *Opera*, t. 6, part 1, p. 315; comp. § 181, p. 331; see Bayle, *Dict. Hist. Crit. Lit.* Rorarius, Pereira). If matter is mere extension, it must be identical with space, and is “without form and void,” impalpable, inconceivable, unreal. To give shape to “that which shape had none,” motion must be recognised as an essential quality of matter, because form is produced by movement in space. Leibnitz at times goes so far as to suspect that all space is matter. For the production of motion, force — determinate power in action — is necessary. Of the real existence of force the human consciousness affords assurance. From these corrections of the Cartesian postulates proceeded the mathematical and philosophical speculations of Leibnitz in regard to *vis viva*, his *Theory of Motion, Abstract and Concrete*. His *Dynamics*, and even his *Calculus of Infinitesimals*. All internal and external change, all properties and accidents of matter, are only “modes of motion.” The latest science is returning to similar hypotheses, though the language of science is altered. Observed phenomena appeared to be contradicted by the definition of body, as the conjunction of extension and motion. Bodies were often at rest, undergoing no sensible change. Motion could not belong to them essentially as aggregates, but only to the constituents from whose conjoint operation the external or the internal movements of the mass proceeded. If a property was to inhere in such constituents, matter could not be infinitely divisible: the process of division must be ultimately arrested by reaching an irreducible atom:

*“Fateare necesse ‘st,
Esse ea, quae nullis jam praedita partibus exstant,
Et minima constuent natura.”*

The motion attributed to these primordial particles is due to an indwelling force. Thus, from his definition of matter as the union of motion with extension, Leibnitz was led to recognize as the primary units of the universe an infinity of simple elementary substances or forces, which he

designated MONADS. These monads have some resemblance to those of Pythagoras, Democritus, and Epicurus, and also to the Ideas of Plato; but, unlike the Epicurean atoms, they are not *solida*, though they are *aeterna*. They are not material, but they are the souls of matter. This vaporous dematerialization of matter may be illustrated by Plotinus's definition of matter by the successive segregation of all the properties of specific body. Is not the theory of Boscovich, that matter is only an assemblage of points of force, an adaptation of Leibnitz's conception? Has not the theory of Boscovich won admiration and hesitating approval from many distinguished men of science?

The consequences of the rectification of the Cartesian conception of matter do not end here. As the motions or manifestations of force constitute the difference between the several simple substances or monads, when there is no diversity of motion there is no difference of properties and no distinction of nature. Hence follows another dogma of Leibnitz, the *Identity of Indiscernibles*. The monads are infinite in number, but they are unlike, and present an infinite diversity of forces. There is also an infinite variety of gradations, from the lowest atoms of matter up through human souls to the supreme monad, or God. Each monad is in some sort the mirror of the universe of things; each possesses spontaneous energy or life within itself, and, in consequence of these characteristics, each has its own peculiar kind of reason, passive in matter unorganized, rudimentary in crystals and vegetable existence, unreflecting and instinctive in brutes, self-conscious and introspective in man, and ascending through numberless orders of angelic intelligences. As motion is the principle of *quiddity* ("the ghosts of defunct" terms must be evoked), force is an essential quality of all existence, and is as imperishable as the monad is indestructible, unless both are annihilated by the same Power by which they were created. Here is another anticipation of recent scientific deductions. As these forces are immutable, their separate spheres of action must be exempt from intrusion. There may be composition of motions, or equilibrium of antagonisms, but there can be no interaction or reciprocal influence.

Here presents itself the ancient insoluble enigma, How can bodies act upon each other? How can matter be molded or modified by vital action? How can it be subdued or directed by the intelligent volition of man? How can it be conjoined with spirit in any form of animate existence? Des Cartes so completely contradistinguished mind and matter that it was impossible for mind to act upon matter or matter upon mind *frustra ferro diverberat*

umbras. Leibnitz so completely assimilated material to spiritual existence, giving body to spirit, and spirit to body (*Theod.* § 124), that they were indistinguishable except by their properties the one possessing *perception* only, the other having *apperception* also. There could be no intercommunion, no reciprocal influence between them, or between any monads. To cut rather than to loose the intellectual knot, which was only rendered more intricate, Leibnitz proposed an explanation in his *Systema Naturae* (1695). It is his celebrated doctrine of *Pre-established Harmony*. The monads are forces, sometimes active, sometimes suspended, ἐνεργεῖαι and δυνάμεις, governed by their own inherent tendencies, and without power of acting upon each other; but their separate actions are so foreknown on one side, and predetermined on the other, in the moment of creation, that their concurrent evolutions reciprocally correspond, and effectuate all the phenomena of the universe. Mind, therefore, does not coerce matter, nor does one form of matter control another, but the inclination of the will and the disposition of the matter, or the diverse evolutions of different monads, conjoin independently and without connection in the production of one result, in consequence of the preadaptation of all the elementary forces to that particular change, at that particular moment, in that particular composition, and with that particular consequence. Dugald Stewart illustrates this harmony by the supposition of two clocks so regulated and adjusted as to strike the hours in unison. It may be an illustration; it is scarcely an elucidation of the doctrine. The agreement is only in time and performance: there is no concordance of dissimilar processes. The machinery of *Divine Assistance*, which Des Cartes had employed for the explanation of the phenomena of animal life, was generalized by Leibnitz, applied to the whole order of things, and transferred to the original of all creation. There is thus much more than a poetic symbolism — there is a distinctive philosophical tenet involved in his fine expression that “the universe is the knowledge of God.” This preordination of concurrences, apt for each occasion, between monadic developments, each of which is determined by its own inherent force, which is will in intelligences and nature in material things, makes the whole endless series of change the realization of foreseen and prearranged correspondences. It is the continual evolution of the immeasurable plan entertained by the Creator before the beginning of the ages, and brought into act at the appointed time and in the appointed order, with mathematical precision, though beyond the calculation of mathematical devices. Certain fabrics are curiously woven with colors so arranged in the

yarn that when the weaving is performed each color falls with exact propriety into its due place, and contributes accurately to form, to tint, to perfect the contemplated pattern. So, in the system of pre-established harmony, “the web of creation is woven in the loom of time,” with threads prepared from the beginning to fall into the requisite connections, and to produce a foreknown design. Each concurrent movement arrives at the appropriate time and place in consequence of the whole antecedent series of changes in each case, for nowhere is there any solution of continuity, and the present is always the progeny of the past and the parent of the future. The innumerable lines of evolution continually interoscultate with each other, but never are blended together. It will readily be perceived that the whole intricate phantasmagoria of these unconnected monads is only a grand and beautiful variation of the Cartesian hypothesis, and is neither more valid nor more satisfactory than the fantasy it was designed to supplant.

This doctrine of pre-established harmony is in perfect consonance with Leibnitz’s vindication of the ways of God to man, if it did not necessitate his theological expositions. The *Theodicee* is the most exquisite, the most brilliant, the most profound, the most learned, and, in some respects, the most satisfactory of all treatises of philosophical theology. Many of its conclusions are either true, or as near the truth as the human intellect can attain in such inquiries. Others are merely conjectural, and are sometimes fantastic, as they lie beyond the domain of possible knowledge. Several of its positions have furnished pretexts for sweeping censures; but in such speculations error is inevitable, and a slight error opens the way for a host of pernicious and undesigned heresies. The most notable and characteristic of Leibnitz’s theological dogmas, which provoked the malicious wit of Voltaire’s *Candide*, is intimately associated with the explanation of the combined action of monads. This is the theory known as *Optimism*. Without absolutely asserting that “Whatever is, is best,” it alleges that the actual world is the best of all possible worlds, despite of acknowledged evils and defects. This is supposed to be proved, among other evidences, by the Leibnitzian principle of the *sufficient reason*, since, if any better world had been possible, it is reasonable to suppose that it would have been selected by God in preference to that which He actually created. The acute conceptions, the ingenious arguments, the various illustrations, the abundant analogies by which this thesis is maintained and adorned, can receive here only their merited tribute of admiration. When God looked

upon the work of each of the six days of creation, “He saw that it was good.” More than this it is not given man to know: “that which is wanting cannot be numbered.” But, if all events, if all changes, if all composite actions occur by divine pre-adaptation, it must be presumed that this is the best of worlds. There is wonderful coherence in the views of Leibnitz, interrupted and fragmentary as is their exposition. This dialectical consistency is so perfect, and in its evolution so splendid and imposing, that his scheme presents, both in the process of its construction and in its structure, the charm of a dream of the imagination. Nothing approaches it in magnificence but the ideal universe of Plato.

Of course, if this is the best of possible worlds, and if its phenomena are determined by the divine preordination or preorganization, evil, too apparent everywhere, must be merely contingent—a negative characteristic, a nonentity in itself. Leibnitz accordingly regards evil simply as imperfection — the privation of good. God is perfect: anything less than God must be imperfect. All limitation is imperfection; all imperfection is defect of good — is evil. The evil increases in quality and in degree with each remove from the perfection of the Supreme Existence. Hence, in this best of worlds, the taint of evil is over the whole creation:

“The trail of the serpent is over it all.”

All this may be admitted, but it affords only an inadequate explanation. It does not justify the retribution which is merited by all evil: it does not recognize the positive character of evil as the violation of the divine law and order; it hardly permits the notion of such violation. Leibnitz denies the existence of physical evil except as a consequence of moral evil; and moral evil consists in voluntary increase of imperfection, in willful estrangement from the Supreme Monad. Even thus, no sufficient reason can be assigned for ascribing sin. and for attaching a material or moral penalty to what is the result of a natural and inevitable imperfection. This defect in the system is clearly pointed out by Kant.

The unfathomable immensity of the creation can be but dimly apprehended by the finite and fallible mind of man. The mighty plan and purpose of God cannot be compressed within the compass of human intelligence. “We see as through a glass darkly.” Schemes of the universe framed from broken and darling glimpses become more delusive as they become more systematic. Leibnitz’s intuitive principles, abstract analysis and scholastic deduction were peculiarly apt to produce hallucinations.

Analysis for the discovery of *ultimate abstracts*; intuition for the acceptance of clear, distinct, and adequate ideas; the principle of contradiction as the test of verity; the principle of the sufficient reason as the canon of actuality — these are the metaphysical principles or postulates of Leibnitz. The resulting philosophy, both in conception and in construction, is exposed to “such tricks as hath strong imagination,” and wants firm and assured foundation. It is a complex fantasy, a mathematical romance, a universe of shadows. Still, it is marked by wonderful acuteness, logical coherence, and purity of spirit. It preludes, if it does not anticipate, the main doctrines of Kant, and is the fruitful parent of all the subsequent philosophy of Germany.

This exposition presents the leading tenets, the *idees meres* of Leibnitz, but it affords no image of the splendid completeness of the entire theory, in which God is presented as the first beginning and the last end — the Alpha and Omega of the whole order of things in time and out of time. Nor does it do justice to the vigorous thought, the profound reflection, the comprehensive intelligence, the keen penetration, the exhaustless learning, the wealth of knowledge, the variety of illustration, the fervent and lofty morality, which give grace, and dignity, and grandeur to the whole and to all its parts. *Elicidi quce potui, non ut volui, sed ut me spatii angustiae coegerunt.* Fuller information must be sought from his own extensive works, and from the elucidations afforded by the numerous commentators on them.

Literature. — *Leibnitii Opera* (ed. Duntens, Genesis 1768, 6 vols. 4to). A complete edition of all his works is that by Pertz (Hamburg, 1845-47, 1st series; 1847, 2d series; 1853-62, 3d series). The latest is by Onno Klopp, 1st series, 1864-66 (5 vols. 8vo). Other editions are: (*OEuvres* (ed. Foucher de Careil. Paris, 1854 sq., 20 vols.); *Deutsche Schriften* (ed. Guhrauer, Berlin, 1838); *Opera Philosophica* (ed. Erdmann, Berl. 1839-40); *Olell ra Motheantica* (ed. Gerhardt, Berlin, 1849-50); *OEuvres* (ed. Jacques, Par. 1842, 2 vols. 12mo); (*Eu'it 'esph ilosophiques* (ed. Janet, Par. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo); Rapes, (*Eu'ves Philosophiques de ftu of. Leibniz* (Amsterd. et Leips. 1765. 4to); Feder, *Lettres Choiesies de le Correspondance de M. Leibniz* (Hanover, 1805); Leibnitz, *Memoir recommending the Conquest of Egypt to Louis XI V*, etc. (London, 1801); Eccard, *Leben des Leibnitz* (Berl. 1740); Jancourt, *V'ie del Leibniz* (Amsterdam, 17 56); Gulrauer, *Leben dses Leibnitz* (Bresl. 1842; enlarged 1846); Vogel, *Leben des Leibnitz* (Leipsic, 1846); Mackie, *Life of Leilnfitz*

(Boston, 1845). Leibnitz transmitted an *Autobiography* to his friend Pelisson, but it has never seen the light. See also Fontenelle, *Eloge de Leibniz* (Paris, 1716); Bailly, *Eloge de Leibniz* (Paris, 1769); Kiistner, *Lobschrift cauf Leibnitz* (Altenb. 1769); Hanscins, *G. G. Leiblitii Principia Philosophie more Geomaetrico denmonstrata* (1728, 4to); Ludovici, *Principia Leibnitiana* (Lips. 1737, 2 vols. 8vo); Bayle, *Hist. Crit. Dict.*, may be consulted, especially under the title Rorarius; Emery, *Esprit de Leibniz*, etc. (Lyons, 1772, 2 vols. 8vo; reprinted, Paris, 1803); Emery, *Exposition de la Doctrine de Leil. niz sur la Religion* (Paris, 1819, 8vo); Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Philosophiae* (Lips. 1767; still an indispensable authority for Leibnitz); Dugald Stewart, *Suppl. Encyklop. Britannica*; Sir James Mackintosh, *ibid.*; Morell, *Jist. Philippians XIXth Century* (New York, 1848, 8vo); Lews, *Hist. of Philosophy* (new edition, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. 2; and the othler historians of modern philosophy; *Biographie Universelle*, s.v. Leibniz, by Biot, Duvau, Maine de Biran, and Stapfer; Schelling, *Leibnitz als Denker*; Helferich, *Spinoza und Leibnitz*; Zimmermann, *Leibnitz unt Herbart* (Wien, 1849); Feuerbach, *Darstellung, Entukicelung unid Kritik der Leibnitzschen Philosophie* (Anspach, 1837); Leckey, *Hist. of Msorals*, 1:25; Baumgarten-Crusius, *Dogmengesch.*; Hunt, *Pantheism*, p. 247; Gass, *Dogmengesch.* vol. 2 and 3; Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, p. 6,103; Saintes, *Rationalism*, p. 56; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. of Free Thought*, p. 56 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. d. protest. Theol.* p. 684 sq.; *Journal of Spec. Philos.* vol. 1, No. 3, art. 1; vol. 3, No. 1, art. 5; *Revue Chret.* 1868, p. 9; Brewster, *Life of Sir Isaac Newton*; *Edinb. Rev.* 1846 (July); *Atlantic Monthly*, 1858 (June); *Christian Examiner*, 28:418 sq.; *Contemp. Review*, May, 1867, art. 3; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1851 (April), p. 189, 211; 1862 (April), p. 335; *Revue des d. Mondes*, 1861 (Jan.), p. 15; also (Sept.), p. 81. (G. F. H.)

Leidradt

a noted Poman Catholic prelate, probably a Bavarian flourished in the 8th century. He was librarian to Charlemagne until 798, when he was made archbishop of Lyons. He was sent soon after by Charlemagne, together with the bishop of Orleans and other prelates, into the southern provinces of France, to suppress by moral means the spreading heresy of Adoptianism, and they succeeded in bringing the chief teacher of this doctrine, Felix, to acknowledge his error before the council held at Aix in 799. In 800 Leidradt was successful with his co-laborers in restoring 20.000 Adoptianists. He zeal which he everywhere displayed appears in a

letter written to Charlemagne not long before the latter's death. He writes: "I have done my best to increase as far as necessary the number of priests. I have established the Psalm service after the model of that observed in your palace, and have erected singing-schools by which the instruction may be continued. I have reading-schools where not only the appointed services are repeated, but where the holy Scriptures in general are studied and explained, and in which are those who understand the spiritual meaning not only of the Gospels, but also of the prophets, the books of Samuel, the Psalms, and Job. I have had as many books as possible transcribed for the churches in Lyons, procured vestments and other necessary appointments for divine service, and have repaired the churches." After Charlemagne's death, in the subscription to whose will the name of Leidradt appears, he resigned the bishopric and retired to the convent of the Holy Medardus, where he died. Neither the year of his death nor of his birth are known. He wrote in a clear and concise style some works which have since been edited. Of special value is a treatise of his on baptism, which was published by Mabillon (*Annales*, vol. 2). See Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* art. Baluze; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* vol.6i, s.v.

Leifchild, John, D.D.,

an eminent English Independent minister, was born in 1780 of Methodist parentage, and was brought up, and began to preach among the Methodists; but afterwards embracing Calvinistic opinions, it was impossible for him to continue preaching among them, and he was advised by Mr. Bunting, then the junior preacher in the circuit, to seek other associations. Accordingly, in 1804, he entered Hoxton Academy, but he retained through life a friendly feeling for the friends of his youth, and profited largely by what he learned among them. He died in June, 1862. Without possessing any very extraordinary natural endowments, he attained by faithful, earnest, and diligent labor a most successful and honorable career, and his life is a noble example of what may be effected by the right cultivation of the powers a man possesses within himself. Irreproachable in character, faithful in pastoral attentions, powerful in the pulpit, he filled every chapel he occupied, built up every Church he was the pastor of, and, when enfeebled by age, retired from his work laden with honors, and not without very substantial tokens of the love and gratitude of those whom he had served in the Gospel. One of the deacons of Craven Chapel states that, during the twenty-three years of his ministry there, more than fifteen hundred persons had been brought to decision and added to the

Church through his faithful ministry. The catholic spirit of Dr. Leifchild was almost as prominent a feature in his character as his intense and pervading earnestness. He was well known and well liked by Christians of various denominations, with whom he mingled freely, and whom he loved for the truth's sake. See J. R. Leifchild, *John Leifchild, his public Labors, private Usefulness, and personal Characteristics* (Lond. 1860); Grant, *Metropolitan Pulpit* (1839), 2:152; *Penn Pictures of Popular English Preachers* (1852), p. 130: Allibone, *Dict. of British and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v. (J. H. W.)

Leigh, Edward

a learned English layman, was born in 1602, and was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford. He was a member of the Long Parliament, but was expelled on account of his intercession in behalf of the life of king Charles. He was also a member of the Assembly of Divines, and held the office of parliamentary general. He died in 1671. Edward Leigh wrote largely. Of his Greek works, one of the best is *Critica Sacra* (1639, 4to, and often; best ed. 1662, folio), which not only gives the literal sense of every word in the Old and New Testaments, but enriches the definitions with philological and theological notes. It was held in high esteem until supplanted by the more fundamental works of later Hebrew lexicographers. He also wrote *Annotations on the New Testamzent*, which are short and judicious, and other theological works of considerable value. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, 2:1079.

Leigh, Sir Egerton

an English nobleman, who flourished towards the close of the last century, is noted for his piety and charitable acts. He was a member of the "London Missionary Society" from its very infancy (1795), as he was, indeed, the friend of every cause connected with the glory of God and the good of souls. "He devoted," says Morison (*Fathers and Founders of the London Miss. Soc.* p. 554), "much of his time, property, and influence to the spread of evangelical religion both at home and abroad, and was so zealous in the cause of his divine Master as occasionally to merge the baronet in the humble preacher of the cross of Christ."

Leigh, Hezekiah G.

D.D., an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Perquimas County, N. C., Nov. 23, 1795, was converted in 1817, joined the Virginia Conference in 1818, was set off with the N. C. Conference in 1836, was a delegate to every General Conference from 1824 to his death, and died in Mecklenburg Co., Va., Sept. 18, 1853. He was also a member of the Louisville Convention at the organization of the M. E. Church South, and as one of the founders and first agents of Randolph Macon College, and one of the organizing committee of Greensboro' Female College, N. C., he rendered long and very important service to the cause of education in the Church. He received a good academical education while young, and throughout his life was a diligent general student. Most of his ministry was spent in the office of presiding elder in Virginia and N. Carolina. His character was noble and attractive, and his mind full of lofty ardor for the welfare of Christianity. His influence was wide and controlling for many years. He was an earnest and useful minister of the Gospel, and will long be remembered in the Carolinas. — Summers's *Biograph. Sketches*, p. 165. (G. L. T.)

Leighlin, Synod of

was held in Campo-Lene, Ireland, near Old Leighlin, A.D. 633, with the purpose of settling the time as to the observance of Easter. A few years before (630), Honorius I had addressed an expostulatory letter to the Irish clergy on the paschal question; and it is worthy of remark that this was the first notice taken by the bishops of Rome in regard to the Church founded by St. Patrick, and was about 200 years after its commencement. At this period the Irish were divided on the time of keeping Easter, some advocating the Roman practice, others the Irish way of observing the 14th day of the first vernal month (if a Sunday), instead of adopting its celebration on the Sunday *following* the 14th, and the matter even resulted in a controversy. Laurentius of Canterbury relates that Dengan, an Irish bishop, when in North Britain, declared that he would neither eat, drink, or sleep under the same roof with those who held to the Roman practice. Cummian, who for twelve years had been an abbot of Iona, was greatly troubled about it. and in its investigation he said, "I turned over the holy Scriptures, studied history and all the cycles I could find. I inquired diligently what were the sentiments of the Hebrews, Grecians, Latins, and the Egyptians concerning this solemnity." A deputation was sent from this

synod, of which most probably Cumman was one, to ascertain from personal inspection whether, as they had heard in Ireland, other nations kept Easter at the same time that the Romans did. The object of this deputation has been greatly perverted in the interest of Romanism. It was not to get a decision from the pope, for this they had had for years, and had not obeyed it; but it was, as before stated, simply to determine for themselves. They remained at Rome or in the East about two years. On their return they reported that all they had heard in Ireland they had seen in Rome — even more (*valde certiora*) than they had heard. But even this report was not decisive, for the Venerable Bede says, “Though the south of Ireland partially conformed, the northern provinces and all Iona adhered to their former practice.” This and other questions of nonconformity were for a long time pressed and resisted. In A.D. 664, when Theodore, the Italian archbishop of Canterbury, by order of the pope, came to establish the entire regime of Roman Catholicism in North Britain, the paschal and many other questions were again so fiercely urged that Colman and most of the former clergy left and returned to Ireland. Again, in 1070, when Malcolm Canmore brought Margaret, his Saxon wife, to Scotland, she was shocked to find the faith and public worship of her new subjects so different from the Catholic Church of England. After laboring long to induce her husband to adopt the rites and order of the Saxon Catholics, she had a three days’ discussion with the existing clergy and the Culdees of Iona, she speaking in Saxon and her husband interpreting in Irish. See Todd, *Irish Church*, chap. 6; Usher, *Brit. Eccles. Antiq.* cap. 17 (*Works*, 6:492-510).

Leighton, Alexander

a Scottish divine, was born at Edinburgh in 1568. He was professor of moral philosophy in that city for several years prior to 1613, when he removed to London, and obtained a lectureship. For libellous or offensive expressions against the king, queen, and three bishops, in his book called *Zion's Plea* (1629), he was punished by the Star Chamber with mutilation, the pillory, and long imprisonment. He was released in 1640, and died about 1646. Archbishop Laud was no doubt responsible for the cruel and inhuman treatment of Leighton. *SEE LAUD*.

Leighton, Robert

a Scottish prelate, one of the most distinguished preachers and theologians of the 17th century, was born in Edinburgh, or, as others think, in London, in the year 1611. He was educated at the university of the former city, and there took his degree of M.A. in 1631, when he went to the Continent to study, especially in France. Here he resided with some relatives at Douay, and formed the acquaintance of several Rom'an Catholic students, whose Christian virtues made him a charitable Christian towards all who bore the name of his Master. "Gentle, tender, and pious from his earliest years, he shrunk from all violence and intolerance; but his intercourse with men whose opinions were so different from his own convinced his reason of the folly and sinfulness of 'thinking too rigidly of doctrine.'" He returned to Scotland in 1641, and was immediately appointed to the parish of Newbattle, near Edinburgh; but as Leighton identified himself with the cause of Charles I when the latter was confined, by the commissioners of the Parliament, in Holmby House, he brought upon his head the displeasure of the Presbyterians, and, according to bishop Burnet, "He soon came to dislike their Covenant, particularly their imposing it, and their fury against all who differed from them. He found they were not capable of large thoughts; theirs were narrow as their tempers were sour; so he grew weary of mixing with them," and became an Episcopalian. For this change, however, there were serious obstacles in Leighton's case, and it has therefore been a matter of general disapprobation. Certainly the facility with which he fraternized with the party that had inflicted such horrid cruelties on his excellent father, Dr. Alexander Leighton, in 1630, for merely publishing a book in favor of Presbyterianism, cannot be altogether approved (comp. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 4:463 sq.). In 1652 he resigned his charge, and in the following year was elected principal of the University of Edinburgh, a dignity which he retained for ten years. Earnest, spiritual, and utterly free from all selfish ambition, he labored without ceasing for the welfare of the students. He delivered lectures especially to the students of theology, and occasionally supplied the place of divinity professor. His theological lectures are known to the learned world, and have been translated into English. For pure Latin, sublime thought, and warm diction, they have never been surpassed, and seldom equaled. In that office Dr. Leighton was truly the ornament and delight of the university, and a blessing to studious youth. After the restoration of Charles II and the re-establishment of the episcopacy in

Scotland, Leighton, after much reluctance, accepted the bishopric of Dunblane, a small and poor diocese, and was consecrated at Westminster Dec. 15, 1661. Unfortunately for his peace, the men with whom he was now allied were even more intolerant and unscrupulous than the Presbyterians. The despotic measures of Sharpe and Lauderdale sickened him. Twice he proceeded to London (in 1665 and 1669) to implore the king to adopt a milder course — on the former of these occasions declaring “that he could not concur in the planting of the Christian religion in such a manner, much less as a form of government.” Nothing was really done, though much was promised, and Leighton had to endure the misery of seeing an ecclesiastical system which he believed to be intrinsically the best, perverted to the worst of purposes, and himself the accomplice of the worst of men. In 1670, on the resignation of Dr. Alexander Burnet, he was made, quite against his personal wishes, archbishop of Glasgow, and he finally accepted this great distinction only on the condition that he should be assisted in his attempts to carry out a liberal measure for “the comprehension of the Presbyterians.” But finding, after a time, that his efforts to unite the different parties were all in vain, and that he could not stay the high-handed tyranny of his colleagues, he finally determined to resign the ecclesiastical dignity (in 1673). After a short residence in Edinburgh, he went to live with his sister at Broadhurst, in Sussex, where he spent the rest of his days in a retired manner, devoted chiefly to works of religion. He died at London June 25, 1684. Leighton published nothing during his lifetime. His great work is his *Practical Commentary upon the First General Epistle of St. Peter*; not a learned exposition by any means, for the writer hardly notices questions of philology at all, but perhaps no more remarkable instance is extant of the power which sympathy with the writer gives in enabling an expositor to bring out and elucidate his meaning. Another able work of his is *Praelectiones Theologiae*, of which an edition was published a few years ago by the late professor Scholefield of Cambridge; also some sermons and charges. There is an edition of his work in 4 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1819; but the best edition is that of Pearson (Lond. 1828; N. Y. 1859, 8vo). Another good edition was published in 1871, in 6 vols. 8vo. All of Leighton’s writings have received the highest commendations because of the lofty and evangelical spirit that pervades them. They present the truths of Christianity in the spirit of Plato, and it was this that recommended them so much to Coleridge, whose *Aids to Reflection* are simply commentaries on the teachings of archbishop Leighton. “Few uninspired writings,” says Dr. Dodderidge, “are better

adapted to mend the world: they continually overflow with love to God and man." See Hetherington, *Ch. of Scotland*, 2:22 sq., 70 sq.; Burnet's *History of his Own Times*; Burnet's *Pastoral Care*; Doddridge's *Preface to Leighton's Words*; *The Remains of Archbishop Leighton*, by Jerment (1808); his *Select Works*, by Cheever (Boston, 1832); Pearson, *Life of Robert Leighton* (1832); Kitto, *Cycl. Libl. Lifer.* vol. 2, s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* vol. 6, s.v.; Chambers, *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. And Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Leipsic, Colloquy of

in 1631. The disputes which occurred in the 16th century, when the two evangelical churches framed their confession of faith, had produced great bitterness between the Lutherans and Calvinists. Attempts at reconciliation had already been made by pious individuals in the 16th century, and still others in the 17th, as, for instance, by the indefatigable Scotchman Duroeus, and by Rupertus Meldenius, but with little success. It was the trial which the evangelical churches of Germany underwent during the Thirty Years' War that really first made the two sister communions forsake their former hostility. They saw that they were both standing on the brink of a precipice, and the ties which bound them to each other were strengthened. Both the authorities and the people now used their utmost efforts to secure, if not unity, yet at least peace and harmony between the two churches. In the early part of 1631, after Gustavus Adolphus, the champion of evangelical liberty, had already come to Germany, the landgrave William of Hesse and the elector Christian William of Brandenburg joined the elector George of Saxony at Leipsic, and they resolved to oppose, by main force if necessary, the carrying out of the Edict of Restitution. The landgrave William had brought with him the professor of theology Crocius and the court preacher Theophilus Neuberger; the elector Christian William was accompanied by the court preacher John Bergius. The theologians of Hesse and Brandenburg invited those of Leipsic to a conference in order to attempt a reconciliation between the evangelical churches, or, at least, to promote a better understanding between them. It was intended that this conference should be of a private character, yet with the hope that the other parts of Germany would follow the example. The Reformed party demanded only that the court preacher Matthias Hoe, of Hohenegg, should in the discussions abstain from the vehemence which distinguished his writings, and the theologians of Leipsic failed not to grant this request, with the assurance

that Hoe was very gentle *in conversatione*. The elector George having sanctioned the plan of a private conference, the meetings commenced, March 3, at the residence of the upper court preacher, and under his presidency. They were held daily, and continued until March 23. On motion of the Reformed party the Confession of Augsburg was taken as a basis, they announcing their willingness to sign it, such as it then was in the Saxon form (published by order of the elector George, in 1628). They also thought that the princes of their different provinces were ready to do the same, without, however, undertaking to vouch for it. They stated furthermore that they would neither reject the altered edition of the Colloquy of Worms (in 1540) nor that of Regensburg (in 1541); they referred to the position taken at the convention of Naumburger in 1561, and by the Saxons in the preface to the Book of Concord. The Confession of Augsburg being thus adopted as a whole, every article was taken up separately and examined. They thus found that both parties fully coincided in the articles 5-7 and 7-28, while their differences on the articles 1 and 2 were comparatively unimportant. With regard to the 3d article, they all agreed as to the interpretation of the words, but the Saxon theologians maintained that not only the divine, but also the human nature of Christ possessed omniscience, omnipotence, etc., by virtue of the union of the two natures in his personality, and that all the glory which Christ received was only received by his human nature. The Reformed theologians, on the contrary, denied that Christ, as man, was omnipresent, or that in him the human nature had become omniscient and omnipotent. They agreed also in the 4th article, and the Reformed theologians affirmed that they did not believe Christ had come to save all men. They also agreed in the 9th article, to which they made some addition on the necessity of baptism, and on infant baptism. The 10th article, concerning the Eucharist, came up on March 7. Here they could not agree, the Reformed theologians denying the physical participation in the body and blood of Christ, and asserting a spiritual participation through faith; of unworthy communicants, they asserted that these partook only of simple bread and wine. The Reformed theologians, however, maintained that if it was impossible to agree on this point, it was at least possible for the two parties to bear charitably with each other, and to unite in opposing Romanism. The Saxons, who did not wish to bind themselves by any promises in a private conference, said that this proposition would have to be further considered in the fear of the Lord. After all the remaining articles had been agreed to, they came to the question of election, although this doctrine is not expressly presented in the

Confession of Augsburg. Both Lutherans and Reformed agreed in the doctrine that only a part of mankind will be saved, the Reformed theologians basing election on the absolute will of God, and reprobation on the unbelief of man. The Lutherans, on the other hand, considered election as the result of God's prescience of the faith of the elect. The fact that the theologians of the contending churches had been brought to meet together peaceably, and to explain to each other their respective doctrines, was not without a great influence for good, although the greater hopes for the future to which it gave rise were not destined to be fulfilled. As the colloquy was a private conference, it was thought best not to give its proceedings an undue publicity, and only four copies of its protocols were published, and delivered one to each of the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, one to the landgrave of Hesse, and one to the theological faculty of Leipsic. A full account, however, was subsequently published in England, France, Switzerland, Holland, and Sweden. The suspicions of both parties made any decided advance impossible, and resulted finally in greater estrangement of both, and in renewed attacks by the able Lutheran polemic Hoe (q.v.), of which a new and lengthy controversy was the result. See C. W. Hering, *Gesch. d. Kirchlichen Unionsversuche*, etc. (Lpz. 1836), 1:327 sq.; Alex. Schweizer, *D. protestantischen Centraldogmen*, part 2, p. 525; *Kurtzer Discurs con d. z. Leipzic 1631 mense Martio angestellten Religionsvergleychung*, etc. (Berlin, 1635); Niemeyer, *Collectio confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicatarum* (Lpz. 1840), p. 653 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* book 4, cent. 17, sect. 2, pt. 2, ch. 1, § 4; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:286.

Leipsic Discussion Of.

SEE ECK; SEE CARLSTADT, etc.

Leipsic, Interim of

SEE INTERIM (III).

Leitch, William, D.D.

a Scotch divine, was born in 1814 in the town of Rothesay, a famous watering-place on the island of Bute, Scotland, and was educated at the University of Glasgow, which he entered at the age of eighteen, and graduated as master in 1836 with the highest honors in the departments of mathematical and physical science. While a student he also lectured in the

university on astronomy, and as a result of his studies in this department we have from him a work entitled *God's Glory in the Heavens; or, Contributions to Astro-theology*, which contains the most recent astronomical discoveries stated with special reference to theological questions. In 1838 he was licensed as a preacher of the Gospel in the Church of Scotland by the Presbytery of Dunoon. In 1843 he received a presentation to the parish of Monimail. He continued minister of this parish until 1859, when he was selected as principal of Queen's University. He is well known to have been the author of certain articles in which, in a masterly manner, the views of the late Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, on the subject of miracles, are controverted. For several years he conducted a series of investigations on the subject of partheno-genesis and alternate generations, as illustrated by the phenomena of sexual development in hymenoptera. The result of these researches, which conflicts with that of the German physiologist Siebald in the same field, is given in the *Transactions of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, and in the *Annals of the Botanical Society of Canada*. Several separate publications of his also appeared on the subject of education. In 1860 he became principal of Queen's University, and this connection afforded him a seat in the Presbytery of Kingston, and, in consequence, in the synod also. His position also gave him a seat in the senatus of the University of Toronto, and he was appointed an examiner of that university. He died in 1862. See Appleton's *Amer. Ann. Cyclop.* 1864, p. 625.

Leitomysl Or Leitomischel, John

a Bohemian prelate noted for his energetic character and his unrelenting hostility to the Hussites, flourished in the latter part of the 14th and the early years of the 15th century. He first comes under our notice as one of the two prelates — the archbishop of Prague being the other — before whom John Huss was to be cited for heresy. His position and influence in Bohemia were such that Stephen Paletz, writing against Huss, dedicated to him his *Dialogus Volatilis*. As the troubles at Prague increased, he was one of those to whom the archbishop of Prague applied for advice, and his response was in accordance with his notoriously stern and unbending character. When the Council of Constance met in 1414, he was present as a member, and took a leading part in its proceedings. He was the first to denounce the Calixtine practice, recently introduced by Jacobel at Prague, and he was commissioned by the council to take measures for its suppression. His enmity to Huss was signaled by the language used by

him in the council, and excited the deep indignation of the friends of the Reformer, who did not hesitate to reprehend his course publicly in severe terms. His persistent energy, however, merited the eulogiums of the council, and by them he was appointed to bear their threatening letter to Bohemia, in which they attempted to terrify the followers of Huss into submission. The mission, however, proved a failure. The person of the bishop was no longer safe in his own country, and he returned to the council. The first reward of his diligence was his promotion, about A.D. 1416. to the bishopric of Olmutz, in Moravia. On the secession of Conrad, archbishop of Prague, to the Calixtines a short time afterwards, he was promoted to the vacant dignity. This, however, he was not destined to enjoy. The ascendancy of the Calixtines must have excluded him from Prague, if not from Bohemia; and perhaps among all the enemies of the Hussites, during the period of their religious wars, there was no one who could have been sooner made the victim of their vengeance than the obnoxious bishop. But as no mention is made of him at a subsequent date, and as he does not appear to have fallen into the hands of the Hussite leaders, we may presume that his life must have closed soon after the dissolution of the Council of Constance. He was eminently a martial prelate, and was known by the sobriquet of "John the Iron." Notices of him will be found in many histories of his times. See Von der Hardt, *Authorities on the Council of Constance*; Lenfant, *Council of Constance*; Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, vols. 1 and 2; F. Polacky, *Mag. J. Hus Documenta*. — Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 5: 296 sq. (E. 11. G.)

Lejay, Gui-Michel,

a noted French scholar in exegetical theology, was born at Paris in 1588. While at the high school he paid particular attention to the Eastern languages, and in 1615 projected a polyglot of the Bible, known as the Palis Polyglot (Paris, 1629-45, 10 vols. folio), and entitled *Biblia Hebraica, Samaritana, Chaldaica, Graeca, Syriaca, Latina, Arabica, quibus textus originales totius Scripturae sacrae, quarum pars in editione Complutensi, deinde in Antwerpiensi regis sumptibus extat, nunc integri ex manuscriptis toto fere orbe quaesitis exemplaribus exhibentur*. The first four vols. contain the Heb., Chald., Sept., and Vulg. texts of the O.T.; vols. 5 and 6 the N.T. in Gr., Syr., Arab., and Lat.; vol. 7, the Heb. Samar. Pent. the Sam. version, with translation by Morinus, the Arab. and Syr. Pent.; vols. 8-10, the rest of the books of the O. Test. in Syr. and Arab. Lejay lost largely by this publication; but, as a reward for his labor

and cost, he was ennobled. The work was the best of its kind till the London Polyglot appeared, by which it was soon superseded. See Lelong, *Discours historique sur les principales editions des Bibles polyglottes* (Paris, 1713, 12mo), p. 104 sq., 379, 399 sq., 545, 546 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:512 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. 2, s.v.

Lejbowicz

SEE FRANK.

Lejuive

PAUL, a French Jesuit missionary, was born in 1592, entered the Jesuitical order, and labored in Canada for seventeen years. He returned to France in 1632, and died Aug. 7, 1664. He published a descriptive work on Canada and its native tribes (7 vols., 1640). Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 30:518.

Leland, Aaron

a Baptist minister, sixth in descent from Henry Leland, the Puritan ancestor of all the Lelands in America, but in a different line from his more noted contemporary, Rev. John Leland, was born in Holliston, Mass., May 28, 1761. Of a naturally vigorous and inquisitive mind, he grew up with a larger measure of intelligence than his limited means of early culture would have indicated as probable. He united in 1785 with the Baptist Church in Bellingham, by which Church he was licensed to preach, and subsequently ordained. He soon after removed to Chester, Vt., where he gathered a small Church, which in thirteen years had become five — in Chester, Andover, Grafton, Wethersfield, and Cavendish. From Chester he visited Jamaica, in the same county, guided through the wilderness by marked trees: these visits resulted in the formation of several churches in that vicinity. He was not only an active and successful minister, but had important civil trusts committed to him by the suffrages of his fellow-citizens. He sat in the state Legislature several years; three years he was speaker of the House; four years a member of the council; five years successively lieutenant governor; and nothing but his own conviction of its incompatibility with the duties of his higher calling prevented his election to the governorship of the state. He refused to permit any civil engagements to hinder his usefulness and success as a Christian minister, and he continued to fulfill his calling with great energy, zeal, and success, until worn out with toil. He died August 25, 1833. He was a popular and

effective preacher. His commanding form and countenance; his musical and sonorous voice; his ready and fervid, often impassioned utterance; his vigorous intellect and great tenderness of spirit, gave him unusual power over congregations. He was often sought as an orator on public occasions, and called to give counsel in ecclesiastical questions. His zeal was enlisted in the temperance cause, insisting on total abstinence from intoxicating beverages, and in promoting ministerial education and all liberal culture. He was in the board of fellows of Middlebury College from the year 1800 till his death. (L. E. S.)

Leland, John

(1), a celebrated English divine, was born at Wigan, Lancashire, Oct. 18 16, 91, and was educated at the University in Dublin. In 1716 he became pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Dublin. He afterwards distinguished himself in a series of works in which he defended with great eloquence the Christian religion against the attacks of Atheists and Deists. As an acknowledgment of his services, the University of Aberdeen gave him the title of D.D. He died Jan. 16, 1766. His important works are, *Defence of Christianity* (Dublin, 1733, 2 vols. 8vo, and often; intended as an answer to Tindal's *Christianity as old as the Creation*, Dublin, 1773, 2 vols. 8vo): — *The divine Authority of the Old and New Testament asserted, wctih a particular Indication of the Characters of loses and the Prophets, and Jesus Christ and his Apostles, against the unjust Aspersions and false Reasoning of a Book entitled "The Moral Philosopher"* (Lond. 1739, 8vo): — *View of the principal Deistical Writers in England in the last and present Century* (ibid. 1754, 2 vols. 8vo), and two supplements. A new edition, with Appendix, by W. L. Brown, D.D., was published in 1798 (2 vols. 8vo). The best edition is the fifth, which has a valuable Introduction, comprising a succinct view of the subsequent history of the controversy, by Cyrus R. Edmonds (London, 1837, 8vo). He who can read this work and yet remain an unbeliever in Christianity must be hopelessly obtuse or perversely prejudiced: — *Advantage and Necessity of Christian Revelation* (London, 1764, 2 vols. 4to). After his death, his *Sermons* were published in 4 volumes 8vo by Dr. Isaac Weld, with the *Life of Dr. Leland*. See the last work, and *British Biog.* vol. 10; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Leland, John

(2), a Baptist minister, distantly related to Aaron Leland (see above), was born in Grafton, Massachusetts, May 14, 1754. About the age of eighteen he had strong and painful religious impressions; he emerged into light and peace gradually, and, after the lapse of several months, was baptized in June, 1774, in Bellingham, and was regularly licensed by the Church. He removed in 1776 to Virginia, where for above fourteen years he exercised an itinerant ministry, preaching over all the eastern section of the state, sometimes extending his tours southward into North Carolina, and northward as far as Philadelphia. He was ordained in Virginia, somewhat irregularly, in 1777, and again ten years later, with more regard to form and customary usage. His evangelical labors were attended with large success. He baptized seven hundred persons, and gathered churches at Orange and Louisa, one of three hundred and the other of two hundred members. He made the acquaintance of Mr. Madison, with whom he maintained a pleasant correspondence for many years, effectively co-operating with him to secure the ratification by Virginia of the Constitution of the United States. In 1791 he returned to New England, and the year following settled in Cheshire, Mass., where he resided till his death. Though acting for a limited period as pastor of the Church in Cheshire, he was always an itinerant, making extensive tours over western Massachusetts, often into the adjacent parts of New York, and into more distant sections of New England; twice visiting Virginia, and, wherever he went, preaching and baptizing — these two items of “the great commission” (⁴¹⁸⁹Matthew 28:19, 20) being all to which he felt himself called. His last record of baptism was Aug. 17, 1834, when he was over eighty years of age, which brought up the number of baptisms in his ministry to 1524. He still continued to preach, and died in the work at North Adams, Mass., Jan. 14, 1841. He recorded, when at the age of sixty-six, that he had then preached eight thousand sermons, and in order to do it had traveled distances which would thrice girdle the globe. His *Life and Remains*, edited by his daughter, including an autobiography, additional memoirs, and eighty pieces — sermons, tracts, public addresses, and essays on religious, moral, and political topics — most of which had been printed in pamphlet form during his life, were published not long after his decease, forming a volume of 700 pages 8vo. “Elder” Leland, as he was commonly styled, was in theology a Calvinist of the old school. He was always popular as a preacher and writer, especially among the less-cultivated class.

The elements of his success were a strikingly-original, often eccentric cast of thought; a terse, telling expression, abounding in compact, apothegmatic, easily-remembered sentences; a vigorous Saxon-English diction; slightly provincial (“Yankee”), homely illustration, often a spice of humor, and his sermons were never wanting in earnest appeal. These qualities were aided by his tall figure, the compass of his voice, and a peculiar but effective action. His singular views as to the limit of his ministerial duty, leading him to baptize converts without gathering them into churches, caused his success as an evangelist to leave less durable traces than might otherwise have been looked for. The relations of Church and State in Virginia and in most of New England, during the earlier period of his ministry, led him into a habit of political activity which was sometimes censured by persons unable to appreciate a state of society which had passed away. Two hymns, published anonymously in most hymn-books — one the popular evening hymn, “The day is past and gone;” the other beginning, “Now the Savior standeth pleading” — are ascribed to his pen, and not improbably the simple melodies in which they are oftenest sung. His productions, consisting of several sermons, essays, and addresses, were published after his death, with a memoir of the author by Miss L. F. Greene (1845, 8vo). See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 6:174. (L. E. S.)

Leland, Thomas

D.D., an English divine, was born at Dublin in 1722, and was educated at Trinity College in that city. He became senior fellow of the college, and was made a professor of poetry there in 1763; afterwards vicar of Bray, and later chaplain to the lord lieutenant of Ireland. He died in 1785. Leland was a profound scholar and a most eloquent preacher. He published the *Orations of Demosthenes*, Latin version and notes (London, 1754, 2 vols. 12mo), in conjunction with Dr. John Stokes: — the *Orations [19] of Demosthenes*, in English (1756-61-70, 3 vols. 4to; last ed. 1831, 12mo): — *Hist. of the Life and Reign of Philip, King of Macedon* (1758, 2 vols. 4to; last ed. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Dissertation on the Principles of Human Eloquence*, etc. (1764, 4to), elicited by bishop Warburton’s Discourse on the Doctrine of Grace: answered (anonymously) by Hurd, on behalf of Warburton, in a very petulant letter. Answer to a letter to him, etc., 1764, 4to. This is a reply to Hurd. Leland answered for himself, and, in the opinion of all the world, completely demolished his antagonist. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Lelong, Jacques

an eminent French bibliographer, was born at Paris April 19, 1665. In 1677 he was sent by his father to Malta, to be educated as a member of the order of Knights, but not liking the severity with which he was treated, he obtained permission to return to Paris. Here he continued his studies, and, as he had not yet taken the vows of the Order of St. John of Malta, he entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1686. He became successively professor of mathematics in the College of Juilli, and afterwards in the seminary of Notre Dame des Vertus, near Paris. Later he was appointed librarian of that institution, and in 1699 was transferred in the same capacity to the library of the Oratoire St. Honore, at Paris, one of the richest in that city, especially in Oriental books and MSS. This position he occupied for twenty-two years, rendering the greatest services to the scientific world by his valuable bibliographical researches, and by a threefold catalogue. He died Aug. 17, 1721. His most important work, which is yet highly prized by students, is his *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Par. 1709, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1723, 2 vols. fol. — this latter ed. is by far the best). Another augmented edition was published after his death by Desmolets, a priest of the Oratory (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. fol.). A valuable supplement was afterwards added to it, and the whole work carefully revised, by Chr. Fr. Borner (Lips. 1709); another enlarged and extended edition was published by A. G. Mlasch (Halle, 1778-1790, 5 vols. 4to). As a historian, Lelong distinguished himself particularly by his *Bibliothèque historique de la France, contenant le catalogue des ouvrages imprimés et manuscrits, qui traitent de l'histoire de ce royaume* (Par. 1719; 2d ed. by Fevret de Fontette, Par. 1768, 5 vols. fol.). This was to have been followed by notices on the author of these works. Lelong wrote *Discours historiques sur les principales éditions des Bibles Polyglottes* (Paris, 1713): — *Supplement à l'histoire des dictionnaires Habreux de Wolfus* (Par. 1707): — *Nouvelle méthode des langues Hébraïque et Chaldaïque* (Par. 1708), etc. See Desmolets, *Vie du P. Lelong*, in the 2d and 3d edition of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:290; Hoefer, *Noeuv. Biog. Generale*, 30:540 sq., Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v.

Lemaistre De Saci (Or Sacy)

ISAAC Louis, a noted French Jansenist theologian, a nephew of Antoine Arnauld le Grand, was born in Paris March 29, 1613; was ordained a priest in 1650, and became confessor or principal director of the recluses of Port

Royal. Entangled in a controversy with the Jesuits, he was persecuted by the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, in 1661, and, after having vainly sought refuge among friends, was confined in the Bastile in 1666. During his imprisonment, which lasted two years, he made a French translation of the Old Testament. He had previously been one of the translators of the New Testament of Mons (1667). which was often reprinted. In consequence of renewed persecution, he left Port Royal in 1679, seeking peace and quiet at the country seat of a friend of his. There he died, Jan. 4, 1684. He published French versions of several classical works, and of valuable theological treatises; also of Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation*. See Hoefr, *Nouv. Biog. Genetrale*, 30:568; Ste. Beuve, *Port Royal*, 2:1,2; Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v. Sacy, de.

Le Mercier, Jacques,

a French architect, born at Pontoise about 1600, is noted as the builder of the Church of the Sorbonne at Paris, reared by order of cardinal Richelieu about 1635. Le Mercier obtained the title of chief architect to the king. Among other admired works of his are the Church of the Annonciade at Tours, and that of Saint Roch in Paris. He died in 1660. — Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* p. 1.401; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:583.

Lemoine, Francois

a celebrated French painter of the 18th century, was born at Paris in 1688. He was the pupil of Louis Galloche, early distinguished himself, and in 1718 was elected a member of the Royal Academy of Painting. His great reputation at this time is due mainly to his painting, in oil, of the Transfiguration of Christ on the ceiling of the choir of the Church des Jacobins, Rue du Bacq. In 1724 Lemoine visited Italy, and in the year following, on his return to France, was made professor of painting in the Academy. Louis XV appointed him in 1736 his principal painter, with a salary of 4100 francs, in the place of Louis de Boullogne, deceased. The first of Lemoine's great works was the cupola of the chapel of the Virgin in St. Sulpice, in fresco, which he commenced in 1729 — a work of three years' labor. His masterpiece, however, is the Apotheosis of Hercules, painted in oil on canvas pasted on the ceiling of the Salon d'Hercule at Versailles, commenced in 1732, and finished in 1736. He committed suicide June 4, 1737. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:617, *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

L'empereur, Constantine

a celebrated Dutch Orientalist, was born at Oppyck, in the Netherlands, about 1570. He was professor of Hebrew at Harderwyk until 1627, when he was called to the University of Leyden as professor of Hebrew, and some time after was made professor of theology in that high school. He died in 1648. L'Empereur edited the Commentary of Aben-Ezra and Mos. Alschech on ^{צפתי}Isaiah 52:13-53:12, with notes (Leyd. 1633); and the Paraphrase of Joseph ben-Jachja on Daniel, with translation and notes (Amsterd. 1633), also the Mishnic tracts *Baba Kama* and *Middoth* (Leyd. 1737, 4to). He wrote himself *De Dignitate et Utilitate Linguae Hebraicae* (1627, 8vo): — *Clavis Talinudica, complectens formulas, loca, dialectica et logica priscorum Judaeorum* (Leyden, 1634, 4to): — *De legg. hebr. forens.* (Leyd. 1637, 4to); and *Disputationes theologicae* (Leyd. 1648, 8vo). See Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 30:642; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:245 sq.

Lemprière, John

a distinguished English biographer, was born in Jersey about 1760. He was educated at Winchester and at Pembroke College, Oxford, and subsequently became first head master of Abingdon Grammar-school, and later of the school at Exeter. In 1810 he resigned the latter, and the following year was presented to the livings of Meeth and Newton Petrock, in Devonshire, which he retained until his death Feb. 1, 1824. Lempriere was a man of extensive learning, and thoroughly acquainted with antiquity. His *Bibliotheca Classica* (1788, 8vo; subsequently reprinted, with additions by himself) is still in general use in the universities. He wrote also a translation of *Herodotus.* with notes (1792), of which the first volume only was published, and a *Universal Biography* (1803, 4to and 8vo). This last work, compiled with great care, has run through several editions. The name of Lempriere was once well known to every English-speaking classical student. but the rising generation is forgetting it, and it will soon become *vox et praeterea nihil.* A *Classical Dictionary* (*Bibliotheca Classica*, 1788) of his was for many years the English standard work of reference on all matters of ancient mythology, biography, and geography. See Davenport, *Ann. Biog.* 1824; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 30:643; Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Lem'üel

(Hebrew *Lemuel'*, [אמלי] ^{<AB02>} Proverbs 31:1; Sept. ὑπὸ θεοῦ, Vulgate *Lamuel*; also *Lemoël*, [אמול] ^{<AB04>} Proverbs 31:4; Sept. πάντα ποιεῖ, Vulgate *Lamuel*), an unknown prince, to whom the admonitory apothegms of ^{<AB02>} Proverbs 31:2-9 were originally addressed by his mother. Most interpreters understand Solomon to be meant either symbolically (the name signifying *to God*, i.e. created by him) or by a pleasing epithet (see Rosenmüller, *Scholia ad Prov.* p. 718). The Rabbinical commentators identify Lemuel with Solomon, and tell a strange tale that when he married the daughter of Pharaoh, on the day of the dedication of the Temple, he assembled musicians of all kinds, and passed the night awake. On the morrow he slept till the fourth hour, with the keys of the Temple beneath his pillow, when his mother entered, and upbraided him in the words of ^{<AB02>} Proverbs 31:2-9. Others (e.g. Grotius) refer it to Hezekiah (by a precarious etymology), while still others (e.g. Gesenius) think that no Israelite is referred to, but some neighboring petty Arabian prince. On the other hand, according to Eichhorn (*Einleitulq.* v. 106), Lemuel is altogether an imaginary person (so Ewald; comp. Bertholdt, v. 2196 sq.). Prof. Stuart (*Comment. on Prov.* p. 403 sq.) renders the expression "Lemuel, the king of Massa," and regards him as the brother of Agur, whom he makes to have been likewise a son of the queen of Massa, in the neighborhood of Dumah. **SEE AGUR; SEE ITHIEL.** In the reign of Hezekiah, a roving band of Simeonites drove out the Amalekites from Mount Seir and settled in their stead (^{<AB08>} 1 Chronicles 4:3843), and from these exiles of Israelitish origin Hitzig conjectures that Lemuel and Agur were descended, the former having been born in the land of Israel; and that the name Lemuel is an older form of Nemuel, the firstborn of Simeon (*Die Sprüche Salomo's*, p. 310-314). But this interpretation is far-fetched; and none is more likely than that which fixes the epithet upon Solomon. **SEE PROVERBS.**

Lemurès

the general designation given by the Romans to all spirits of departed persons, of whom the good were honored as Lares (q.v.), and the bad (Larvae) were feared, as ghosts or spectres still are by the superstitious. The common idea was that the Lemures and Larve were the same, and were said to wander about during the night, seeking for an opportunity of inflicting injury on the living (Horat. *Epist.* 2:2, 209; Pers.v. 185). The

festival called *Lemurias* was held on the 9th, 11th, and 13th of May, and was accompanied with ceremonies of washing hands, throwing black beans over the head, etc., and the pronunciation nine times of these words: "Begone, you spectres of the house!" which deprived the Lemures of their power to harm. Ovid describes the Lemuria in the fifth book of his *Fasti*. See *De Deo Sacr.* p. 237, ed. Bip.; Servius, *ad AEn.* 3:63; Varro, *ap. Nov.* p. 135; comp. Hartung, *Die Religion der Römer.* 1:55, etc.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Myth.* vol. 2, s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.

Lend

(represented by several Heb. words which in other forms likewise signify to borrow, e.g. *hwj* ; *lavah'*; *hvg*; = *fb* ; *abat'*; Gr. . *δανείζω, χράω*).

Among the Israelites, in the time of Moses, it must have been very common to lend on pledge, in the strict sense, according to the meaning of the word in natural law, which allows the creditor, in case of non-payment, to appropriate the pledge to his own behoof, without any authoritative interference of a magistrate, and to keep it just as rightfully as if it had been bought with the sum which has been lent for it, and which remains unpaid. But while pledges are under no judicial regulation, much extortion and villainy may be practiced, when the poor man who wishes to borrow is in straits, and must of course submit to all the terms of the opulent lender. It will not be imputed to Moses as a fault that his statutes contain not those legal refinements, which probably were not then invented, and which even yet may be said rather to be on record in our statute-books than to be in our practice. They would have been dangerous to his people, and peculiarly oppressive to the poor. He let *pledge* remain in its proper sense, pledge, and thus facilitated the obtaining of loans, satisfying himself with making laws against some of the chief abuses of pledging (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.*). See PLEDGE. These laws may be found in ^{<1725>}Exodus 22:25; ^{<1546>}Deuteronomy 24:6, 10-13. By the analogy of these laws, other sorts of pledges equally, if not more indispensable, such as the utensils necessary for agriculture, or the ox and ass used for the plow, must certainly, and with equal, and even greater reason, have been restored. The law in ^{<1542>}Deuteronomy 24:12, 13, is expressed in such general terms, that we cannot but see that *the pledge* under which the debtor must sleep is merely given as an example, and conclude, of course, that, in general, from the needy no pledge was to be exacted, the want of which might expose him to an inconvenience or hardship, more especially when we find the lawgiver

here declaring that God would regard the restoration of such pledges as almsgiving, or righteousness. So it was in fact, and at the same time it was attended with no loss whatever to the creditor; for he had it in his power, at last, by the aid of summary justice, to lay hold of the whole property of the debtor, and if he had none, of his person; and in the event of non-payment, to take him for a hired servant. The law gave him sufficient security; but with this single difference, that he durst not make good payment at his own hand, but must prosecute (^{<1829>}Leviticus 25:39-55; ^{<1815>}Nehemiah 5:5). See DEBT. In the book of Job, the character of a lender upon pledge is thus depicted: “He extorts pledges without having lent, and makes his debtors go naked” (22:6; 24:7); “He takes the widow’s ox for a pledge” (24:3); “He takes the infant of the needy for a pledge” (24:9-11). On this subject our Savior exhorted his disciples to the most liberal and forbearing course towards all whom they could aid or who were indebted to them (^{<1816>}Luke 6:30-35). *SEE LOAN; SEE USURY.*

Lenfant, Alexandre-Charles-Anne

a French priest of note, was born at Lyons Sept. 6, 1726, and was educated by the Jesuits of his native place. In 1741 he entered the order, and became professor of rhetoric at Marseilles. Endowed with great talent as a speaker, he became one of the most popular pulpit orators of his order. After its suppression Lenfant combated the doctrines of the philosophical antagonists of Christianity, particularly Diderot. In 1792 he was arrested by the Revolutionists, and subjected to capital punishment at Paris Sept. 3, 1793. His works are an *Oraison funèbre* on Belzunce, archbishop of Marseilles (1756, 8vo), and another on the father of Louis XVI (Nancy, 1766) *Sermons pour l’Avent et pour le Careme* (Paris, 1818, 8 vols. 12mo). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* ^{<1816>}Genesis 30:658.

Lenfant, Jacques

a very noted French preacher and theologian, the son of Paul Lenfant, the Protestant minister of Chatillon-sur-Seine, was born at Bazoches, in Beauce, a district of the ancient province of Orleannois, in France, April 13, 1661. Intended for the same profession as his father, he was sent to prosecute his studies at Saumur; and during his residence at that university he lived with the learned Jacques Cassel, the professor of Hebrew, with whom he formed a friendship which continued during their lives. He completed his theological education at Geneva and Heidelberg, in which latter town he

was admitted to the ministry of the Protestant Church in 1684. Soon after his ordination he obtained the appointment of minister of the French Church at Heidelberg, and chaplain to the dowager electress Palatine. The invasion of the Palatinate by the French troops, under marshal Turenne, compelled Lenfant to leave Heidelberg in 1688, and he settled at Berlin. The fear of meeting his countrymen arose from his having rendered himself obnoxious to the Jesuits by two letters which he had written against that society, and which are appended to his work, entitled *A Preservative against a Reunion with the Church of Rome*. Though the Protestant French church of that city had already a sufficient number of pastors attached to it, the reigning elector of Brandenburg, Frederick, afterwards king of Prussia, who knew Lenfant by reputation, appointed him to that church, where for upwards of thirty-nine years he performed duty. In 1707, on a visit to England, he preached before queen Anne, and it is said that he so pleased the queen that she desired him to enter the Church of England, and offered him the appointment as her chaplain. In 1710 he obtained the situation of chaplain to the king of Prussia, and counselor of the High Consistory. Lenfant was suddenly attacked with paralysis, while in the apparent enjoyment of perfect health, July 29, 1728, and died on the 7th of August following. His disposition is represented as having been extremely amiable, *and* his manner simple and modest. Of a reflective turn of mind, he spoke but little, and that little well. Though a most voluminous writer, he was fond of society, and opened himself without reserve to the confidence of his friends. As a preacher, his manner was pleasing and persuasive; the matter of his discourse was chiefly of a practical nature, and his eloquence was rather chaste than energetic. The style of his writing is elegant, though never florid; it has less force than that of Jurieu, and less eloquence than that of Saurin, but the French is purer, and the diction more refined. It is not certain whether he was the first to form the design of the *Bibliothèque Germusnique*, which was commenced in 1720, but he took a prominent part in its execution, and is the acknowledged author of the preface. Lenfant's first work, which appeared in 1683, was a review of one of Brueys, who, though a celebrated French dramatist, has written several theological works in defense of the Roman Catholic faith. In 1688 he published a translation of a selection from the letters of St. Cyprian; in 1690, a defense of the Heidelberg Catechism, which is generally annexed to his *Preservative*, etc., a work we have before alluded to; and in 1691, a Latin translation of the celebrated work of the pere Malebranche, *La Recherche de la Verite*. His history of the female pope Joan appeared in

1694: the arguments in it are drawn from the Latin dissertation on that subject of Spanheim. It is said, however, that in after life Lenfant discovered and acknowledged the absurdity of this fiction. See JOAN, POPE. In 1708 appeared his remarks on the Greek edition of the New Testament by Mill, which are in the *Bibliothèque Choisie* of Le Clerc, vol. 16. The following works afterwards appeared in succession: 1. *Reflexions et Remarques sur la Dispute du Pere Martiany avec un Juif*: — 2. *Memoire Historique touchant la Coommuneion sur les deux especes*: — 3. *Critique des Remarques dit Pere Vavasseur; sur les Reflexions de Rapin touchant la Poetique*: — 4. *Reponse de Mons. Lenfant à Mozns. Dartis au sujet du Socinianisme*. The above short works are to be found in the *Nouvelle de la Republique des Lettres*, a review to which Lenfant was a frequent contributor. In 1714 was published his learned and interesting *Histoire du Concile de Constance* (Amsterd. 1714, 2 vols. 4to; 1727, and an Engl. transl. Lond. 1730, 2 vols. 4to). Two years after he wrote an apology for this work, which had been severely attacked in the *Journal de Trevoux*. In 1718, in conjunction with Beausobre, he published a translation of the New Testament, with explanatory notes, and a long and most learned introduction. It is by this work (*Le Nouv. Test. traduit en Francais sur l'original Grec*, Amsterdam. 1718, 2 vols. 4to), perhaps that he is best known to English-speaking students. Among the most important of his other productions are *Poggiana, or the Life, Character, and Maxims of the celebrated Florentine Writer Poggio* (Amsterdam, 1720): — *A Preventive against Reunion with the See of Rome, and Reasons for Separation from that See* (Amsterdam, 1723), a work which continues to enjoy great popularity among Protestants: — *Histoire du Concile de Pise, et de ce qui s'est passe de plus memorable deppuis ce Concile jusqu'a celui de Constance*, a learned and accurate work, written with sufficient impartiality (Amsterd. 1724, 2 vols. 4to): — a volume containing sixteen *Sermons on different Texts of Scripture* (1728): — a small volume of *Remarks on Gisberts's Treatise on Pulpit Eloquence*, a work which has greatly added to his already high reputation: — *Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites et du Concile de Bâle* (Amsterd. 1731, 2 vols. 4to), for which he had been many years collecting materials, and in the preparation of which, through the influence of the king of Prussia, he had access to the archives of the corporation of Basle. See *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Hoefér, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:657; *Biblioth. Germanique*, 16:115 sq.

Leng, John

an English prelate, was born in 1665, and, after having completed his studies at Cambridge, became chaplain to king George I. In 1723 his royal master made Leng bishop of Norwich. He died in 1727. He published editions of the *Plutus* and *Nubes* of Aristophanes (1695): — an excellent edition of Terence (Cambridge, 1701): — *Sermons at Boyle's Lectures* (1717-18), and twelve separate *Sermons* (1699-1727). See Nichols's *Lit. Anzec. Lyson's Environs*. — Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, 2:1084.

Lengerke, Casar

a noted German theologian, was born at Iamburg March 30, 1803. He was educated at the University of Konigsberg, and became a professor of theology and Oriental languages at that high school in 1829. He died Feb. 3, 1855. His most important works are, *De Ephraemi Syri arte hermeneutica liber* (1831.): — *Das Buch Daniel* (1835): — *Kanaan, Volks und Religionsgesch. Israels*, vol. 1 (1814).

Lenoir, John

a French Jansenist priest, was born at Alencon in 1622. He became theological canon of Seez in 1652, and acquired great reputation as a preacher both in Normandy and at Paris. He was accused of Jansenism, and by his quarrelsome disposition was made the subject of many annoyances. Rouxel de Medavy, bishop of Seez, who had issued a charge for the publication of the Formulary, accused him of various errors, namely, of having permitted the publication of a work entitled *Le Chretien Champetre* by a layman, who said expressly that "there are four divine persons who are to be worshipped by the faithful, namely, Jesus Christ, St. Joseph, St. Anna, and St. Joachim; and that our Lord is present in the sacrament of the altar like a chicken in an egg-shell." Lenoir presented then a petition to Louis XIV, together with an attack on some propositions which he considered as heretical. His writings on these subjects were exceedingly violent: he attacked Rouxel de Medavy, who was then archbishop of Roueni, and even De Harlay, the archbishop of Paris. A commission was appointed to judge him, and he was condemned, April 24, 1684, to make a public apology in front of the cathedral at Paris, and to work for life on the galleys. The sentence was not fully carried out; but he remained a prisoner successively in the prisons of St. Malo, Brest, and Nantes until his death,

April 22, 1692. He wrote, *Avantages incontestables de l'Eglise sur les Calvinistes* (Paris and Sens, 1673, 12mo): — *Nouvelles Lumieres politiques, ou l'Evangile nouveau* (1676 and 1687, 12mo: this work arrested the publication of a French translation of the History of the Council of Trent by Pallavicini, and went through a third edition under the title of *Politique et Intrigues de la cour de Rome* [1696, 12mo]): — *L'evêque de cour oppose a l'evêque epistologique* (Cologne, 1682, 2 vols, 12mo): — *Lettre a M^{me} la duchesse de Guise sur la domination piscopale*, etc. (1679, 12mo). See *Supplem. au Necrolog. de Port Royal*, 1735; *Dict. hist. des auteurs eccles.*; Feller, *Dict. hist.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.*
 (1830) *Genesis* 38:203. (J. N. P.)

Lent

the forty days' fast, is the preparation for Easter in the Western, Eastern, and Lutheran churches, and in the Church of England, and was instituted at a very early age of Christianity. In most languages the name given to this fast signifies the number of the days — *Forty*; but our word *Lent* signifies the *Sparing Fast*, for “Lenten-Tide” in the Anglo-Saxon language was the season of spring, in German *Lenz*. (For another etymology, *SEE LENTILE*.) It is observed in commemoration of our Lord's fast in the wilderness (Matthew 4); and although he did not impose it on the world by an express commandment, yet he showed plainly enough by his example that fasting, which God had so frequently ordered in the *old* covenant, 'Twas also to be practiced by the children of the *new*. The observance of Lent was doubtless strongly confirmed by those words of the Redeemer in answer to the disciples of John the Baptist: “Can the children of the Bridegroom mourn as long as the Bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the Bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast” (1830) Luke 5:34, 35). Hence we find, in the Acts of the Apostles, that the disciples, after the foundation of the Church, applied themselves to fasting. In their epistles, also, they recommended it to the faithful. The primitive Christians seem to have considered Christ, in the above-mentioned passage, as alluding to the institution of a particular season of fasting and prayer in his future Church, and it was therefore only natural that they should have made this period of penitence to consist *of forty days*, seeing that our divine Master had consecrated that number by his own fast, and before him Moses and Elijah had done the same, it was even deduced from the forty years' staying of the Israelites in the desert (Augustine, *Serms.* 264, § 5). *SEE FASTING*,

I. Practice of the Early Church. — In the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles, it does not appear that much value was attached to the practice of fasting. In the *Shepherd* of Hermas it is spoken of in disparaging terms. Very little notice was taken of fasting by the writers of the first centuries, which may be accounted for from the discouraging influence of the doctrines of Montanus, the tenets of the new Platonic school, and the progress of Gnosticism. Hence it seems that the observance of fasts was introduced into the Church slowly and by degrees. We learn from Justin Martyr that fasting was joined with prayer at Ephesus in the administration of baptism, which is worthy of being noted as an early addition to the original institution. In the 2d century, in the time of Victor and Irenaeus, it had become usual to fast before Easter, yet it consisted not in a single fast, but rather in a series of solemnities, which were deemed worthy of celebration. It was therefore the custom of several congregations to prepare themselves by mortification and fasting, inaugurated of the afternoon of the day on which they commemorated the crucifixion, and it was continued until the morning of the anniversary of the resurrection. The whole interval would thus be only about forty hours (Chrysostom, *Orat. adv. Judaeos*, 3, § 4, vol. 1, p. 611: οἱ πατέρες ἐτύπωσαν, κ. τ. λ.; *Hom. 2 in Genesis*, § 1, vol. 4, p. 8; Irenaeus, *Epist. ad Victorin. Papanmi*; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 24; Dionys. Alex. *Epist. Canon.*; Beveridge, *Synoduon*). Clement of Alexandria, however, speaks of weekly fasts. Tertullian, in his treatise *De Jejunio*, complains bitterly of the little attention paid by the Church to the practice of fasting: by which we may see that even orthodox Christians exercised in this matter that liberty of judgment which had been sanctioned by the apostles. Origen adverts to this subject only once, in his 10th *Homily on Leviticus*, where he speaks in accordance with the apostolical doctrine. It appears, however, from his observations, that at Alexandria Wednesdays and Fridays were then observed as fast-days, on the ground that our Lord was betrayed on a Wednesday, and crucified on a Friday. The custom of the Church at the end of the 4th century may be seen from a passage of Epiphanius: “In the whole Christian Church the following fast-days throughout the year are regularly observed: On Wednesdays and Fridays we fast until the ninth hour,” etc.

But even at this comparatively late date there was no universal agreement in the practice of the Church in this matter, neither had fasts been established by law. Only later was the number of days (namely, *forty*) fixed

according to the Greek and Latin names (τεσσαρακόστη = quadragesima). But for a long time the Oriental and Occidental churches differed. As the former did not permit its members to fast on the Sabbath, their fast continued one week longer (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 1, 5, 100:22; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 5:24; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 7:19). The custom, so far as it existed, had been silently introduced into the Church, and its observance was altogether voluntary at first. This fasting consisted in abstinence from food until three o'clock in the afternoon, but at a later period a custom was introduced, probably by the Montanists, affecting the kind of food to be taken, which was limited to bread, salt, and water.

Some, however, who had become subject to the rules of the Church, tried to compensate themselves for their privation during the fasts by banqueting on the days preceding them (Chrysostom. *De penitentia*, hom. 5, § 5, vol. 2, p. 315). Others adhered literally to the rules of fasting by avoiding strictly the prohibited food, but prepared from that which was permitted costly dainties (Augustine, *Serm.* 208, § 1). The fathers and teachers of the Church of this period, as Chrysostom, Augustine, Maximus of Turin, Caesarius of Aries, etc., spoke often against this hypocritical fasting, and showed that abstinence would then only be of service when avoidance of sinful habits, etc., as well as contrition of heart was connected with it. The general design, then, of the primitive Church in fasting forty days, we may give in the words of Chrysostom: "Many heretofore were used to come to the communion indevoutly and inconsiderately, especially at that time, when Christ first gave it to his disciples. Therefore our forefathers, considering the mischief arising from such careless approaches, meeting together, appointed forty days for fasting and prayer, and hearing sermons, and for holy assemblies; that all men in these days, being carefully purified by prayer, and alms-deeds, and fasting, and watching, and tears, and confession of sins, and other like exercises, might come, according to their capacity, with a pure conscience, to the holy table."

"The rule of fasting for Lent varied greatly. It was usual to abstain from food altogether until evening, change of diet not being accounted sufficient. St. Ambrose exhorts men: *Differ aliquantulum, non longe fines est diei*' (*Serm. 8 in Psalm 118*). The food, when taken, was to be of the simplest and least delicate kind, animal food and wine being prohibited. St. Chrysostom (*Hom. 4 on Stat.*) speaks of those who for two days abstained from food, and of others who refused not only wine and oil, but every other dish, and throughout Lent partook of bread and water only. The

Eastern Church, at the present day, observes a most strict rule of fasting. Wine and oil are allowed on Saturdays and Sundays, but even these days are only partially excepted from the restrictions of Lent. The discipline of Holy Week is exceedingly rigorous. During Lent corporeal punishment was forbidden by the laws of Theodosius the Great: ‘Nulla supplicia sint corporis quibus (diebus) absolutio expectatur animarum’ (*Cod. Theodos.* 9, tit. 35, leg. 5.). Public games, and the celebration of birthdays and marriages, were also interdicted (*Concil. Laodic.* 51, 53). It was the special time for preparing catechumens for baptism, and most of St. Cyril’s catechetical lectures were delivered during Lent. St. Chrysostom’s celebrated *Homilies on the Statutes* were preached during this season. Daily instruction formed a part of the service, and holy communion was celebrated at least every Lord’s day. The last week, the Holy or Great Week, was kept with still greater strictness and solemnity” (Blunt, *Dict. Of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, p. 408).

II. Practice of later Times. — Fasting, after a time, ceased to be a voluntary exercise. By the second canon of the Council of Orleans, A.D. 541, it was decreed that any one who should neglect to observe the stated times of abstinence should be treated as an offender against the laws of the Church. The eighth Council of Toledo, in the 7th century (canon 9), condemns anyone who should eat flesh during the fast before Easter, and says that such offenders should be forbidden the use of it throughout the year. In the 8th century fasting began to be regarded as a meritorious work, and the breach of the observance at the stated times subjected the offender to excommunication. In later times some persons who ate flesh during Lent were punished with the loss of their teeth (Baronius, *Annal.* ad an. 1018). Afterwards these severities were to a great extent relaxed. Instead of the former limitation of diet on fast-days to bread, salt, and water, permission was given for the use of all kinds of food except flesh, eggs, cheese, and wine. Then eggs, cheese, and wine were allowed, flesh only being prohibited, an indulgence which was censured by the Greek Church, and led to a quarrel between it and the Latin. In the 13th century a cold collation in the evening of fast-days was permitted.

The following are the fasts which generally obtained in the Church:

1. *The annual fast of forty days before Easter, or the Season of Lent.* The duration of this fast at first was only forty hours (Tertull. *De Jejun.* 100:2, 13; Irenaeus, ap. Euseb. *ist. Eccl. E . 5*, 100:24). By the time of Gregory

the Great (in the 8th century) it had extended to thirty-six days, and it had been so accepted by the Council of Nicaea; but by Gregory the Great, or by Gregory II, it was extended to forty days, the duration of the recorded fasts of Moses, Elias, and our blessed Savior (~~1938~~ Exodus 34:28; ~~1198~~ 1 Kings 19:8; ~~4142~~ Matthew 4:2). Hence the term *Quadragesima* (q.v.), — which had already been used to denote this period, became strictly applicable. Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* 1. 7, 100:19), Basil the Great, Ambrose, and Leo the Great speak of this quadragesimal fast as a divine institution but this can mean no more than that the fast was observed in imitation of the example of the divine Redeemer (*Concil. Genonsens.* 100:7 — *in canone apostolorum*, 68: “Si quis Episcop., aut Presbyt., etc., sac. Quadragesimam Paschae, aut quartam feriam, aut Parasecevem non jejunaverit,” etc.: *Concil. Coloniens.* ii, pt. 9, can. 6).

2. Quarterly-fasts, no traces of which occur before the 5th century, although Bellarmine (*De bonis operibus*, lib. 2, 100:19) says that the first three of these fasts were instituted in the times of the apostles, and the last by pope Calixtus, A.D. 224.

3. A fast of three days before the festival of the Ascension, introduced by Mamercus, bishop of Vienne, in the middle of the 5th century. In some places it was not celebrated until after Whitsuntide. It was called *Jejunium Royationum*, or *Jejunium Litaniarum*, “the fast of Rogations or Litanies,” on account of certain litanies sung on those days. The words **λιτανεία** and **λιέται**, “litanies,” in Latin *Supplicationes et Rogationes*, in their original signification, are but another name for prayers in general, of whatever kind, that either were made publicly in the church or by any private person. (See Euseb. *Vit. Const.* 1. 1, 100:14; 1. 4, 100:66; Chrysost. *Hom. antequam iret in exilium*; *Cods. Theod.* lib. 16, tit. 5, “De hereticus,” 1, 30, 1.)

4. Monthly fasts, a fast-day in every month except July and August (*Concil. Illiberit.* can. 23; *Turon.* 2, can. 18, 19).

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

6. Weekly fasts, on Wednesdays and Fridays, entitled *stationes*, from the practice of soldiers keeping guard, which was called *statio* by the Romans (“Stationum dies,” Tertullian, *De Orait.*; “Stationibus quartam et sextam Sabbati dicamus,” Idem, *De Jejunio*; **Τῆς νηστείας, τῆς τετράδος καὶ**

τῆς παρασκευῆς, Clem. Alex. *Stroma*. 1. 7). These fasts were not so strictly observed as some others, and were altogether omitted between Easter and Whitsuntide. The observance was enjoined especially upon the clergy and monks (*Constit. Apost.* v. 15; *Can. Apost.* 69). By the Council of Elvira, 100:26, at the beginning of the 4th century, Saturday was added to the weekly fasts, and this led to the gradual neglect of the Wednesday fast in the Western Church. The stations, or fasts on stationary days, terminated at three o'clock P.M. ("non ultra nonam detinendum," Tertullian, *De Jejuniō*; "Quando et orationes fere nona hora concludat de Petri exemplo quod Act. 10 refertur," *ib.* 100:2). Hence Tertullian calls them *half-fasts* ("semijejunio stationum," *De Jejun.* 100:13). When a fast was continued the whole day, it was entitled *Jejuium, or Jejunium perfectum*; and when it lasted until the morning of the following day, or for several days together, it was distinguished by the title *Superpositio* (ὑπέρθησις). The latter kind of fasts was commonly observed during the *great week*, or week before Easter; but it was not strictly peculiar to that season. It exceeded the others not only in point of time, but by the observance of additional austerities, such as the ζηροφαγία, or *living on dry food*, namely, bread, salt, and water, taken only in the evening.

7. There were also *occasional fasts*, appointed by ecclesiastical authority in times of great danger, emergency, or distress (Cyprian, *Epist.* 8, § 1; 57, § 3; Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 40; *De Jejun.* 100:13).

III. *Practice in Modern Times.* — The Christians of the *Greek Church* observe four regular fasts. The first commences on the 15th day of November, or forty days before Christmas. The second is the one which immediately precedes Easter. The third begins the week after Whitsunday, and continues till the festival of St. Peter and Paul. The number of days, therefore, comprised in these seasons of fasting is not settled and determined, but they are more or less long, according as Whitsunday falls sooner or later. The fourth fast commences the 1st of August, and lasts no longer than till the 15th. These fasts are observed with great strictness and austerity. The only days when they indulge themselves in drinking wine and using oil are Saturdays and Sundays.

In the *English Church* Lent was first commanded to be observed in England by Ercombert, seventh king of Kent, before the year 800. The Lenten fast does not embrace all the days included between Ash-Wednesday and Easter, for the Sundays are so many days above the

number of *forty*. They are excluded because the Lord's day is always held as a *festival*, and never as a *fast*. These six Sundays are therefore called Sundays in Lent, not Sundays of Lent. The principal days of Lent are the first day of Lent (*Caput Jejunii*, or *Dies Cinerum*), *Ash Wednesday*, and the *Passion-week*, particularly Thursday and Friday in that week. There is also a solemn service appointed for Ash-Wednesday, under the title of a "Commination or denouncing of God's anger and judgments against sinners." The last week of Lent, called *Passion-week*, has always been considered as its most solemn season. It is called the *great week*, for the important transactions which are then commemorated.

The same rules, observations, services, etc., are observed in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America as in the Church of England during the solemn season of Lent.

In nearly all the Protestant churches of Europe, particularly in the *Lutheran Church*, fasts and Lenten-season remain up to this day pretty much the same as in the Roman Catholic Church.

See Bellarmine, *Opera*; Bergier, *Dictionnaire de Theologie*, art. Careme; Pascal, *La Liturgie catholique*, s.v.; Gfroerer's *Church History*; Hook, *Ch. Dict.* s.v.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 660, 668; Hall, *Harmony* (see Index); *Bible and Missal*, p. 170; Walcott, *Sac. Archaeol.* p. 348; Procter, *On Book of Common Prayer*, p. 250, 276, 277; Wheatley, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 217 sq. **SEE FASTING.**

Lentile

Picture for Lentiles 1

(only in the plural μυγδαί) *adashim'*, prob. from an obsolete root signifying to *fodder*; Sept. φάκός, Vulg. *lens*) is probably a correct rendering of the plant thus designated (^{<0254>}Genesis 25:34; ^{<0178>}2 Samuel 17:28; 23:11; ^{<000>}Ezekiel 4:9). In Syria lentiles are still called in Arabic *addas* (Russel, N. H. *of Aleppo*, 1:74). They appear to have been chiefly used for making a kind of pottage. The *red* pottage, for which Esau bartered his birthright, was of lentiles (^{<0259>}Genesis 25:29-34). The term *red* was, as with us, extended to *yellowish-brown*, which must have been the true color of the pottage if derived from lentiles, being that of the seeds rather than that of the pods, which were sometimes cooked entire (Mishna, *Shabb.* 7:4). The Greeks and Romans also called lentiles red (see

authorities in Celsius, *Hieroboltalic.* 1:105). Lentiles were among the provisions brought to David when he fled from Absalom (~~1078~~2 Samuel 17:28), and a field of lentiles was the scene of an exploit of one of David's heroes (~~1021~~2 Samuel 23:11). From ~~200~~Ezekiel 4:9, it would appear that lentiles were sometimes used as bread (comp. Athen. 4:158). This was doubtless in times of scarcity, or by the poor (compare Aristoph. *Plut.* 1005). Sonnini (*Travels*, p. 603) assures us that in southernmost Egypt, where corn is comparatively scarce, lentiles mixed with a little barley form almost the only bread in use among the poorer classes. It is called *bettan*, is of a golden yellow color, and is not bad, although rather heavy. In that country, indeed, probably even more than in Palestine, lentiles anciently, as now, formed a chief article of food among the laboring classes. This is repeatedly noticed by ancient authors; and so much attention was paid to the culture of this useful pulse that certain varieties became remarkable for their excellence (comp. Dioscor. 2:129). The lentiles of Pelusium, in the part of Egypt nearest to Palestine, were esteemed both in Egypt and foreign countries (Virgil, *Georg.* 1:228), and this is probably the valued Egyptian variety which is mentioned in the uishna (*Kilnaim*, 18:8) as neither large nor small. Large quantities of lentiles were exported from Alexandria (Augustine, *Comm. in Psalm 46*). Pliny, in mentioning two Egyptian varieties, incidentally lets us know that one of them was red (compare Diog. Laertius, 7:3), by remarking that they like a red soil, and by speculating whether the pulse may not have thence derived the reddish color which it imparted to the pottage made with it (*Histor. Natur.* 18:12). This illustrates Jacob's red pottage. Dr. Shaw (1:257) also states that these lentiles easily dissolve in boiling, and form a red or chocolate-colored pottage much esteemed in North Africa and Western Asia (see Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:409). Dr. Kitto also says that he has often partaken of red pottage, prepared by seething the lentiles in water and then adding a little suet to give them a flavor, and that he found it better food than a stranger would imagine; "the mess," he adds, "had the redness which gained for it the name of adorn" (*Pict. Bible*, ~~0250~~Genesis 25:30, 34). Putting these facts together, it is likely that the reddish lentile, which is now so common in Egypt (*Descript. de l'Egypte*, 19:65), is the sort to which all these statements refer. The tomb-paintings actually exhibit the operation of preparing pottage of lentiles, or, as Wilkinson (*Anc. Egyptians*, 2:387) describes it, "a man engaged in cooking lentiles for a soup or porridge; his companion brings a bundle of fagots for the fire, and the lentiles themselves are seen standing near him in wicker baskets." The

lentiles of Palestine have been little noticed by travelers (e.g. Burckhardt, *Arab.* p. 51). Nau (*Voyage Nouveau*, p. 13) mentions lentiles along with corn and peas, as a principal article of traffic at Tortura; D'Arvieux (*Mem.* 2:237) speaks of a mosque, originally a Christian church, over the patriarchal tomb at Hebron, connected with which was a large kitchen where lentile pottage was prepared every day, and distributed freely to strangers and poor people, in memory of the transaction between Esau and Jacob, which they (erroneously) believe to have taken place at this spot. When Dr. Robinson was at Akabah, he says: "The commissary in the castle had also a few stores for sale at enormous prices, but we bought little except a supply of lentiles, or small beans, which are common in Egypt and Syria under the name of *addas* (the name in Hebrew and Arabic being alike) the same from which the pottage was made for which Esau sold his birthright. We found them very palatable, and could well conceive that, to a weary hunter faint with hunger, they might be quite a dainty" (*Bib. Res.* 1:146). Again, when at Hebron, on the 24th of May, he observes: "The wheat harvest here in the mountains had not yet arrived, but they were threshing barley, *addas* or lentiles, and also vetches, called by the Arabs *kersuma*, which are raised chiefly for camels" (*Bib. Res.* 2:242).

Picture for Lentiles 2

The lentile (*Ervum lens* of Linnaeus, class 17:3) is an annual plant, and the smallest of all the leguminosme which are cultivated. It rises with a weak stalk about eighteen inches high, having pinnate leaves at each joint composed of several pairs of narrow leaflets, and terminating in a tendril, which supports it by fastening about some other plant. The small flowers which come out of the sides of the branches on short peduncles, three or four together, are purple, and are succeeded by the short and flat legumes, which contain two or three flat round seeds, slightly curved in the middle (as indicated in the Latin *lens*, which optical science has appropriated as a name for circular glasses with spherical surfaces), and of a color varying from tawny red to almost black. The flower appears in May, and the seeds ripen in July. When ripe, the plants are rooted up if they have been sown along with other plants, as is sometimes done, but they are cut down when grown by themselves. They are threshed, winnowed, and cleaned like grain. There are three or four kinds of lentiles, all of which are still much esteemed in those countries where they are grown, viz., the south of Europe, Asia, and North Africa. The red lentile is a small kind, the seeds of which, after being decorticated, are commonly sold in the bazaars of India.

To the present day a favorite dish among the Portuguese and Spaniards is lentiles, mixed with their unfailing oil and garlic, and flavored with spices and aromatic herbs. In the absence of animal food, it is a great resource in Catholic countries during the season of Lent, and some say that from hence the season derives its name. It is occasionally cultivated in England, but only as fodder for cattle; it is also imported from Alexandria. From the quantity of gluten the ripe seeds contain, they must be highly nutritious, though they have the character of being heating if taken in large quantities. Under the high-sounding name "Rlevalenta Arabica," we pay a high price for lentile flour, and in various culinary preparations are unawares repeating Jacob's pottage (Playfair, *Analysis*; Hogg, *Veg. Kingdom*, p. 275). In Egypt the haulm is used for packing.

Lentulus, Epistle Of

(*Epistola Lentuli*), is the well-known title of an apocryphal letter on the physical appearance of Christ, which the Romish Church receives as authentic, and as having been written by Publius Lentulus, a Roman of Palestine, and perhaps of Jerusalem, to Rome. . Manuscript copies of it are to be found, according to Job. Albert Fabricius (*Cod. apocryph. Novi Testamenti*, 1:302), in several libraries of England, France, and Italy (viz., in those of the Vatican and of Padua), Germany (at Augsburg and Jena, where two copies formerly existed, one of which was embellished with a fine image of Christ, and had been presented to the elector Frederick the Wise by pope Leo X). A librarian of Jena, Christopher Mylius (*Memorab. biblioth. academ. Jesensis*, Jen. 1746, 8vo, p. 301 sq.), states that this copy was written in golden letters upon red paper, very richly bound, and beautifully illustrated. This copy, however, is lost. The work was first printed in the Magdeburg Centuries (q.v.) (Basil. 1559), 1:344; it was then reproduced in Mich. Neandri *Apocrypha* (Basil. 1567), p. 410 sq., afterwards in Job. Jac. Grynsei *Monumenta s. Patrum orthodoxographa* (Basil. 1569, fol.). Joh. Reiskius, in *Exercitatt. histor. de imaginibus Jes. Chr. rel.* (Jen. 1685, 4to), gave a twofold version of it, one after Grynaeus, the other a reproduction of that described by Mylius. This epistle was highly regarded in former times; the papal legate, Jerome Xavier, translated it into Portuguese (in his history of Christ, a work full of legends and fables), and from this language it was subsequently translated into Persian; Reiske and Fabricius translated it into German, and published it at Nurenberg and at Erfurt. It is also to be found in a condensed form in the introduction to the works of archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, which,

though without date or name of place, are, from internal evidence, supposed to have been published at Paris towards the close of the 15th or the beginning of the 16th century; in this work it is accompanied by a description of the personal appearance of the Virgin Mary. In the earliest ages of the Church the question of the personal appearance of Christ while on earth had begun to attract considerable attention. Had there been anything positively known on the subject then, it would certainly have been eagerly received. Yet, although the Church fathers Justin, Tertullian, Hegesippus. and Eusebius mention a letter of Pilate to Tiberius, one of Abgarus to Christ, and one of Jesus to Abgarus, they make no mention of any letter of Lentulus concerning Christ. On the contrary, during the first century, while the Christian Church was suffering persecution, the impression prevailed, derived from ^{<OLD>}Isaiah 53:2, 3, that the Lord's personal appearance was very unprepossessing. But as the Church grew in prosperity and power this idea underwent a complete change. Eusebius and Augustine are heard to complain that nothing is known as to the Lord's personal appearance. In the Middle Ages a directly opposite opinion from that of the ancients prevailed, and the Lord was considered as having been an eminently handsome man, which opinion was only based on the passage ^{<OLD>}Psalms 45:2. In the works of the Greek historian Nicephorus (surnamed Callistus Xanthopulus), who lived in the 14th century, and whom Weismann considers a credulous, uncritical writer, we find a description of Christ's personal appearance, for which, however, the writer gives no authority, saying only that it is derived from the ancients. As it greatly resembles that of Lentulus, and perhaps served as its basis, we give it here as a curiosity: Ἡμένοι διάπλασις τῆς μορφῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἐξ ἀρχαίων παρειλήφαμεν, τοῖα δέ τις ὡς ἐν τύπῳ παραλαβεῖν ἦν, ὠραῖος μὲν ἦν τὴν ὄψιν σφόδρα. Τὴν γε μὲν ἡλικίαν εἶτ' οὖν ἀναδρομὴν τοῦ σώματος, ἐπὶ σπιθαμῶν ἦν τελείων. Ἐπίξανθον ἔχων τὴν τρίχα καὶ οὐ πάνυ δασεῖαν, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ πρὸς τὸ οὐλον μετρίως πῶς ἀποκλίνουσιν, μελαίνιας δὲ γε τὰς ὄφρυς εἶχε καὶ τὸ πάνυ ἐπικαμπεῖς, τοὺς δὲ ὀφθαλμοὺς χαρόπουςτινας καὶ ἥρμα (sic !) ἐπιξανθίζοντας, εὐοφθαλμὸς δὲ καὶ ἐπίρριν τὴν μέντοι τρίχα τοῦ πηγῶνος ξανθὴν τινὰ εἶχε, καὶ οὐκ εἰς πολὺν καθειμένην. Μακροτέραν δὲ τὴν τρίχα κεφαλῆς περιέφερον οὐδέποτε γὰρ ξυρὸς ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ χεῖρ ἀνθρώπου, πλὴν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ νηπιάζοντιος. Ἡρεμα ἐπικλινῆς τὴν ἀχένα, ὡς μηδὲ πάνυ ὀρδίου, καὶ εὐτεταμένην ἔχειν τὴν ἡλικίαν τοῦ σώματος σιτόχρους δὲ καὶ οὐ στοργγύλην ἔχων τὴν ὄψιν ἐτύγχανεν, ἀλλ' σπερ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ

μικρὸν ὑποκαταβαίνουσαν, ὀλίγον δὲ ἐπιφοινισσομένην, ὅσον ὑποφαίνειν τὸ σεμνόν το καὶ τὸ σύνετον τοῦ ἤθους καὶ ἡμερον καὶ τὸ κατάπαξ ἀόργητον. Κατὰ πάντα δὲ ἦν ἐμφορῆς τῇ δειῶ καὶ πανασπίλω ἐκείνου μητρί. Ταῦτα μὲν ἐντούτοις. Compare the articles CHRIST, IMAGES AND PORTRAITS OF; JESUS CHRIST (II, 11, in vol. 4, p. 884). The same tendency prevailed also in the Western Church until the Reformation, when Luther took a more reasonable view of the question, saying, “It is very possible that some may have been as handsome, physically, as Christ. Perhaps some were even handsomer, for we do not see it mentioned that the Jews ever wondered at his beauty.” The same view was taken by a Roman Catholic writer (*Il libro de forma Christi*, Paris, 1649), who said that the Redeemer was not either ill favored nor more handsome than other men. In other cases, however, the Roman Catholic Church has retained the ideas presented in the epistle of Lentulus.

If we now look more closely into this epistle of Lentulus, we find in the edition of Grynaeus (*Monum. orthodoxographa*) that it reads, “Lentulus, Hierosolymitanorum Preses, S. P. Q. Romano S.: Apparuit temporibus nostris et adhuc est homo magne virtutis, nominatus Christus Jesus, qui dicitur a gentibus propheta veritatis, quem ejus discipuli vocant filium Dei, suscitans mortuos et sanans languores [MS. Vatic. “languentes”]. Homo quidem staturie procerme [Goldast. addit. “scilicet xv palmorum et medii”], spectabilis, vultum habens venerabilem, quem intuentes possunt et diligere et formidare: Capillos vero circinos, crispus aliquantum caeruleiores et fulgentiores [MS. 1 Jen. “Capillos habens coloris nucis avellanae praema.turme et planos usque ad aures, ab nuribus vero circinos, crispus aliquantulum ceruliores (t fulgentiores”], ab humeris volitantes [omnes alii: “ventilantes”], discrimen habens in medio capitis juxta-norem Nazarenorum [Centur. Magd. et Anselmi opp. ‘*Nazaraeorum*’]: frontem planam et serenissimam, cu i facie sine ruga (ac) macula aliqua, quam rubor moderatus venustat. Nasi et oris nulla prorsus est repretensio, nbarba habens copiosam et rubram [fere omn ss alii: “impuberem”], capillorum colore, non longam ssd bifurcatam [omnes addunt: “adspectum habet simplicem et maturum”], oculis variis et claris existentibus. In increpatione terribilis, in admonitione placidus [plurimi alii: “blandus”] et amabilis, hilaris servata gravitate, qui nunquam visus est ridere, flere autem saepe. Sic in statura corporis propagatus [plurimi alii addunt: “et rectus”] manus habens et membra [ceteri omnes: “brachia”] visu delectabilia in eloquio [rectius ceteri: colloquio”] gravis, rarus et modestus speciosus inter filios hominum. Valete [Hoc Valete deest in reliquis MSS. et edd.]”

The very contents of the letter are sufficient evidence of its spuriousness. Had it really been written by a Roman, it would not have been addressed to the senate, but to the emperor, who was the immediate master of the Syrian provinces. It appears that this objection was already noticed in former times, for in the Magdeburg Centuries it is said to have been addressed to the emperor Tiberius. A fact of still greater importance is that Lentulus designated as *Hierosolymitanorum praeses*. No such office existed. There was a *Praeses Syriae* and a *Procurator Judaeae* but no *Praeses* of the Roman inhabitants at Jerusalem. For this reason he is called in the Manuscr. Jen. 1, *Proconsul in partibus Judaeae*, and in the Manuscr. Vatic. and Jen. 2, in a thoroughly Roman Catholic manner, *Officialis in provincia Judaea*, while there was no such office known in one at that period. But he is nowhere represented as a friend of Pilate, as Zimmermann attempts to make him in his *Lebensgeschichte d. Kirche Christi*, 1:70. We know most of the proconsuls or presides of Syria, and all the procurators of Judaea. but none of them was named Lentulus. In the classics there are forty-three persons of that name mentioned, but four only belonged to the times of Tiberius. One of them only, Enaeus Lentulus Gaetulicus, was, according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 4:46), in the year 26, consul with Tiberius, and in 34 was the chief of the legions in upper Germany (Tacitus, *Annal.* 6:30); he may, indeed, according to Suetonius (*Calig.* c. 8) and Pliny (*Epist.* 5:3), have been in Judaea during the years 26 to 33, but there is no proof of it. On the other hand, the Lentulus who wrote the epistle is expressly called in the MS. Jen. 1, *Publius*. Moreover, there is no mention at all made of the epistle by any of the ancient writers, whilst other epistles, even some of an apocryphal nature, are mentioned by them, and this one, had it then been known, would certainly have attracted the attention of the apologists at a time when the general impression was so strong against the fine personal appearance of the Lord. Nicephorus Xanthopoulos, whose description of Christ's personal appearance we gave above, states only that it is based on old traditions, while, if such a description as that given in the Epistle of Lentulus had been known in the Greek Church in the 14th century, he would certainly not have failed to quote it as *an* authority. Regarding the literary merits of the work, it must be confessed that it is written in old Latin; but as it is full of expressions which would not naturally be used by a Roman citizen — as the whole tenor of the work, moreover, is thoroughly unclassical, it is to be supposed that its writer aimed to imitate the style of the ancients, and pass it off as a work of their age. A Roman would never have used the expression *propheta*

veritatis filii hominum, at the beginning and at the end of the epistle. So also the appellation *Christus Jesus* is evidently taken from the New Test., for the Redeemer was never thus designated during his lifetime. Jesus himself declined the name of Christ, forbade his disciples calling him thus, and he never was called so by his enemies. How, then, could a heathen have come to call him Christ, and even to put that appellation before that of Jesus — a change which only took place after his claim to be considered as the Messiah had been established beyond cavil. If it is claimed that Christ was called by the heathen the prophet of truth, yet, as Christ's activity during his life was not directed towards the heathen in general, it could only apply to the Romans residing in Palestine. Yet these we do not find to have been designated as heathen, but as Romans; and they did not interest themselves enough in the wandering Rabbi to render such an expression general among them. Nor was it otherwise with the heathen residing on the frontiers of Palestine. "His disciples called him the Son of God." Though they gave him occasionally that name, it was so far from being a general custom that the governor himself knew nothing of it. So this, like the following sentences on the raising of the dead and healing of the sick, is all taken from the Gospel. It also says that his hair was parted after the manner of the Nazarites: we find the substitution of Nazarene for Nazarite, which only took place afterwards. Now a Roman officer would know little or nothing about the Nazarites; moreover, Christ could not properly be called a Nazarite, for he drank wine, touched the dead, and did many other things contrary to the customs of the Nazarites. The remark that he was never seen to laugh, but often to weep, proves him to have led a solitary life, such as we have no example of at the supposed time of the writing of this epistle, and is only an idea derived from the Gospels, and from the state of things in the Middle Ages. The last words also, "beautiful among the sons of men," are quite unsuited to the mouth of a Roman, who would never have made use of such a Hebraism, and it is clearly taken from the 45th Psalm, which is the basis of the whole description. This consequently could not apply to our Lentulus, but only to a monk of the Middle Ages.

Having thus seen how this epistle carries within itself the proofs of its spuriousness, the question arises, When was it written? If it were included in the works of Anselm, we would have to consider it as having been composed in the 11th century. Yet it is simply appended to the works of this author, and was never made use of until the 15th century, to give favor

to an opinion which the monks had an interest to propagate. Laurentius Valla, who lived in the 15th century, was the first who made any mention of it in his argument against the pseudo donation of Constantine. A postscript of great interest is appended to the 2d Jena MS., and it, in our estimation, tends to reveal the true character of the work: "Explicit epistola Jacobi de Columna anno Domini 1421 reperit eam in annalibus Romge, in libro antiquissimo in Capitolio ex dono Patriarchye Constantinopolitani." If this postscript is to be relied on, this epistle was sent to Rome in the 14th century by a patriarch of Constantinople as a present, just as it was afterwards sent to the elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony by pope Leo. But as from Constantinople there were generally sent Greek MSS. only. and as there is no mention made of the name of the patriarch supposed to have sent it, and as, moreover, the work is claimed to be a very old one, it is most likely that this description is a Latin translation of that of Nicephorus, which we gave above, that the translator added the postscript with the intention of rendering his spurious work more credible, and that consequently both epistle and postscript are spurious. The imitator or translator of Nicephorus, who gives ample proofs in his work of the source whence he drew when he speaks of the stature of Christ (in a copy in Goldast we find, after *statura procerus*, "*scilicet xv palmorum et medii*"), gave the work the form of an epistle, and gave it the name of Lentulus, taken from some tradition, or which otherwise seemed suitable to him. It is now evident that the epistle could only have been written at some time after Nicephorus, and before the year 1500, consequently in the 14th century. Dr. Edward Robinson, after carefully examining all the evidences for and against the authenticity of this work, thus presents the results of his inquiry — "In favor of the authenticity of the letter we have only the purport of the inscription. There is no external evidence whatever. *Against* its authenticity we have the great discrepancies and contradictions of the inscription; the fact that no such official person as Lentulus existed at the time and place specified, nor for many years before and after; the utter silence of history in respect to the existence of such a letter; the foreign and later idioms of its style; the contradiction in which the contents of the epistle stand with established historical facts; and the probability of its having been produced at some time not earlier than the 11th century." See Joh. Bened. Carpzov, *Theologi Helmstadiensis programma: de oris et corporis Jesu Christi*, etc. (Helmstadt, 1774, 4to); Joh. Philippian Gabler, *Theologus Altoffensis an. 1819 and 1822 in Authentiam epistole ublii Lentuli cad Senatium Romanum de Jesu Christo scrippte*; Herzog, *Real-*

Encyklopädie, 8:292 sq.; Dr. Robinson in *Biblical Repository*, 2:367; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 3:569; Jamieson, *Ourlord*, 1:35; *Friends' Review*, March 3, 1867, p. 769 sq. **SEE JESUS CHRIST.**

Leo Of Achris Or Achridia

(now *Ohkrida*, in Albania), was so called because he held the archbishopric of Achris, in the Greek Church, among the Bulgarians. He joined about A.D. 1053, with Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, in writing a very bitter letter against the pope, which they sent to John, archbishop of Trani, in Apulia, to be distributed among the members of the Latin Church—prelates, monks, laity. A translation of this letter is given by Baronius (*Annal. Eccles.* ad ann. 1053, 22, etc.). Pope Leo IX replied in a long letter, which is given in the *Concilia*, (vol. 9, col. 949, etc., ed. Labbe; vol. 6, col. 927, ed. Hardotuiln; vol. 19, col. 635, ed. Mansi), and the following year both Cerularius and Leo of Achris were excommunicated by cardinal Humbert, the papal legate (Baronius, ad ann. 1054, 25). Leo wrote many other letters, which are extant in MS. in various European libraries, and are cited by Allatius, in his *De Consensu Eccles. Orient. et Occident.*; by Beveridge, in his *Codex Canons*; by Alexis Aristenus, in his *Synopsis Epistolarum Canoniarum*; and by Comnenus Popadopoli, in his *Praenotiones Mystagogicae*. See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, 2:715; *Caves Hist. Litt.* 2:138, ed. Oxon. 1740; Oudin, *De Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles.* 2:603. — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* 2:741.

Leo, Aegyptius

or THE EGYPTIAN. The early Christian writers, in their controversy with the heathen, refer not unfrequently to a Leo or Leon as having admitted that the deities of the ancient Gentile nation had originally been men, agreeing in this respect with Evemerus, with whom he was contemporary, if not perhaps rather earlier. Augustine (*De Consensu Evangel.* 1:33, and *De Civ. Dei*, 8:5), who is most explicit in his notice of him, says he was an Egyptian priest of high rank, “*magnus antistes*,” and that he expounded the popular mythology to Alexander the Great in a manner which, though differing from those rationalistic explanations received in Greece, accorded with them in making the gods (including even the *Dii majorum gentium*) to have originally been men. Augustine refers to an account of the statements of Leo contained in a letter of Alexander to his mother. It is to be observed, though Leo was high in his priestly rank at the time when

Alexander was in Egypt (B. C. 332-331), his name is Greek; and Arnobius (*adv. Gentes*, 4:29) calls him *Leo Pellceus*, or Leo of Pella, an epithet which Fabricius does not satisfactorily explain. Worth (*Not. ad Tatian.* p. 96, ed. Oxford, 1700) would identify our Leo with Leo of Lampsacus, the husband of Themista or Themisto, the female Epicurean (Diog. Laert. 10:5, 25); but the husband of Themista was more correctly called Leonteus, while the Egyptian is never called by any other name than Leo. Arnobius speaks in such a way as to lead us to think that in his day the writings of Leon on the human origin of the gods were extant and accessible, but it is possible he refers, like Augustine, to Alexander's letter. The reference to Leon in Clemens Alexandrinus is not more explicit (*Stromata*, 1:21, § 106, l. 139, Sylburg; p. 382, edit. Pott; 2:75, edit. Klotz, Lipsiae, 1831, 12mo). But Tatian's distinct mention of the Ὑπομνήματα, or *Commentaries* of Leo, shows that the system had been committed to writing by himself; and Tertullian (*De Corona*, 100:7) directs his readers "to unroll the writings of Leo the Egyptian." Hyginus (*Poeticon Astronomicum*, 100:20) refers to Leon as though he wrote a history of Egypt ("Quires Aegyptiacus scripsit"); and the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (4:262) gives a reference here to what Leon had said respecting the antiquity of the Egyptians, probably depending upon the statements of Alexander. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 7:713, 719; 11:664; Voss, *De Hist. Graec.* libri 3, p. 179, edit. Amsterdam, 1699. — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* 2:742.

Leo, Diaconus, Or The Deacon,

a Byzantine historian of the 10th century, of whose personal history but little is known, except the incidental notices in his principal works (collected by C. B. Hase in his *Praefatio* to his edition of Leo), was born at Caloe, a town of Asia, beautifully situated at the side or foot of Mount Tmolus, near the sources of the Casstrus, in Asia Minor, and was at Constantinople pursuing his studies A.D. 966, where he was an admiring spectator of the firmness of the emperor Nicephorus II, Phocas, in the midst of a popular tumult (4:7). Hase places his birth in or about A.D. 950. He was in Asia in or about the time of the deposition of Basilus I, patriarch of Constantinople, and the election of his successor, Antonius III. A.D. 973 or 974, and relates that at that time he frequently saw two Cappadocians, twins of thirty years' age, whose bodies were united from the armpits to the flanks (10, 3). Having been ordained deacon, he accompanied the emperor Basilus II in his unfortunate expedition against

the Bulgarians, A.D. 981, and when the emperor raised the siege of Tralitzza or Triaditzza (the ancient Sardica), Leo barely escaped death in the headlong flight of his countrymen (10:8). Of his history after this nothing is known; but Hase observes he must have written his history after A.D. 989, as he adverts to the rebellion and death of Phocas Bardas (10:9), which occurred in that year. He must have lived later than Hase has remarked, and at least till A.D. 993, as he notices (10:10) that the emperor Basilius II restored “in six years the cupola of the great church (St. Sophia’s) at Constantinople, which had been overthrown by the earthquake (comp. Cedren. *Compend.* 2:438, ed. Bonn) of A.D. 987.” His works are, *Ἱστορία Βιβλίοις ὕορ Historia libris decem: — Oratio ad Basiliaum Imperatorem: —* and, unless it be the work of another Leo Diaconus, *Hlomonilia in Michcelcem Achaselium*. The two last are extant only in MS. The history of Leo includes the period from the Cretan expedition of Nicephorus Phocas, in the reign of Romansus II, A.D. 959. to the death of John I, Tzimisces, A.D. 975. It relates the victories of the emperors Nicephorus and Tzimisces over the Mohammedans in Cilicia and Syria, and the recovery of those countries, or the greater part of them, to the Byzantine empire, and the wars of the same emperors with the Bulgarians and Russians. According to Hase, Leo employs unusual and unappropriate words (many of them borrowed from Homer, Agathias the historian, and the Septuagint) in the place of simple and common ones, and abounds in tautological phrases. His knowledge of geography and ancient history is slight, but with these defects his history is a valuable contemporary record of a stirring time, honestly and fearlessly written. Scylitzes and Cedrenus are much indebted to Leo, and Hase considers Zonaras also to have used his work. The *Historia* was first published at the cost of count Nicholas Romanof, chancellor of Russia, by Car. Bened. Hase (Paris, 1818). Combefis had intended to publish it in the Paris edition of *Coryus Historie Byzantinna*, with the *Historia* of Michael Psellus, but was prevented by death. A.D. 1679. The Latin version which he had prepared was communicated by Montfaucon to Pagi, who inserted some portions in his *Critice in Baronitnt* (ad ann. 960, No. 9). The papers of Combefis were, many years after, committed to Michael le Quien, that he might publish an edition of Psellus and Leo, and part of the latter’s work was actually printed. In the disorders of the French RevolutionI the papers of Combefis were finally lost or destroyed. Hase, in his edition, added a Latin version and notes to the text of Leo, and illustrated it by engravings from ancient gems: this edition is, however, scarce and dear, the greater part of the

copies having been lost by shipwreck, but his text, preface, version, and notes (not engravings) have been reprinted in the Bonn ed. of the *Corpus Hist. Byzantine* (1828, 8vo). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 7:684, note 1; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 2:106; Hase, *Praestio ald Leon Diacon. Historianm.* — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2:743 sq.

Leo The Great.

SEE LEO THE THRACIAN (emperor) and *SEE LEO I* (pope).

Leo The Isaurian

is the name which is commonly given in history to LEO III or FLAVIUS LEO ISAURUS, emperor of Constantinople from the year 718 to 741, a man remarkable on many accounts, but who, from his connection with the great contest about image-worship in the Christian Church, became one of the most prominent historical names among the emperors of the East.

1. Early History. — He was born in or on the borders of the rude province of Isauria, and his original name was *Conon*. He emigrated with his father, a wealthy farmer or grazier of that country, to Thrace. Young Conon obtained the place of spatharius, or broadswordman, in the army of Justinian II, and soon, by his military talents, excited the jealousy of the emperor, as he drew the eyes of the people, and especially of the soldiers, towards him as one fitted to command, and competent even for the empire. He was sent forward, therefore, with a few troops, against the Alani, and then abandoned by the emperor without succor, in the hope that he would be cut off and destroyed, but from this critical position Leo extricated himself with consummate dexterity and courage. Anastasius II (A.D. 713-716) gave him the supreme command of the troops in Asia, which was exposed to the terrible onslaughts of the Arab or Saracen hordes, by whom it had already been half overrun and conquered. This command was still in his hands when Theodosius III, at the beginning of 716, rose against Anastasius, deposed him, and seated himself upon the throne. Leo, being summoned to acknowledge Theodosius, at once denounced him as a usurper, and attacked him under pretext of restoring the rightful sovereign to the throne, but probably with the design of seizing for himself the imperial dignity. He secured the support of the principal leaders in the army, reached the imperial troops before they could be gathered in sufficient force to resist him, and slew them. At Nicomedia he met the son of Theodosius, whom he defeated and captured. He next marched direct

upon Constantinople, and Theodosius, seeing no hope of resistance, quietly resigned his scepter in Mkarch, 718, and retired into a convent, while the vacant throne was forthwith occupied by Leo himself, by the suffrages of the troops.

2. Imperial History. — No sooner was Leo arrayed in the purple than the caliph Soleiman, together with the noted Moslima, appeared before Constantinople with an immense and enthusiastic army, supported by a powerful fleet, determined to retrieve their sullied fame. The city was invested by sea and land, and its capture was considered certain; but the indefatigable energy, military skill, and fearless courage of Leo, aided by the new invention of the Greek fire, saved the capital from falling, five centuries before its time, into the hands of the Moslems. The superstitious people ascribed their deliverance to the constant interposition of the Virgin, in which they gave the greatest possible praise to the genius of Leo. This third (Gibbon calls it the second) siege of Constantinople by the Saracens lasted precisely two years (Gibbon calls it thirteen months) from the 15th of August, 718. On the 15th of August, 720, the caliph (now Omar, who had succeeded Soleiman shortly after the commencement of the siege) was compelled to raise the siege, losing in a storm the greater part of the remnants of his third fleet before reaching the harbors of Syria and Egypt. So close had been the investment of the city, so enormous the preparations, and so loud the boasts of the Saracens, that in the provinces Constantinople was given up as lost, notwithstanding all the splendid victories of Leo, for the very news of those victories had been intercepted by the vigilant blockade of the besiegers. The whole empire was in consternation, and in the West the rumor was credited that the caliph had actually ascended the throne of Byzantium. Accordingly, Sergius, governor of Sicily, took measures to make himself independent, and to secure the crown for himself in case of complete success; but Leo immediately dispatched a small force to Sicily, which soon crushed the rebellion. The deposed monarch Anastasius, also, was tempted to plot the recovery of the throne, and in the attempt lost his life. In spite of his defeats before Constantinople, Omar continued the war for twenty years; and though, in 726, he captured Caesarea in Cappadocia, and Neo-Caesarea in Pontus, yet Leo maintained an acknowledged superiority. The great work of ecclesiastical reform occupied the attention of the empire, without any considerable interruption from the infidels, until the year 734. What belongs to this chapter of domestic history, though it includes elements and

facts of political and military significance, is reserved for the next head. During the last seven years of Leo's reign (from 734) falls the protracted life-struggle with the Saracens. The caliph Hesham instigated the Syrians to support an adventurer who pretended to be the son of Justinian II, and who, under the protection of the caliph, entered Jerusalem arrayed in the imperial purple. This proved a mere farce. But something more serious happened when, in 739, the Arab general Soleiman invaded the empire with an army of 90,000 men, distributed into three bodies. The first entered Cappadocia, and ravaged it with fire and sword; the second, commanded by Malek and Batak, penetrated into Phrygia; the third, under Soleiman, covered the rear. Leo was actually taken by surprise; but he soon assembled an army and defeated the second body, in Phrygia, in a pitched battle, and obliged Soleiman to withdraw hastily into Syria. The Saracens had, in the mean time, been routed in their invasion of Europe by Charles Martel in 732, and the progress of their conquests seemed now for some time to be checked both in the East and in the West. The remaining great event of Leo's reign was the terrible earthquake of October, 740, which caused great calamities throughout the empire.

3. *The Iconoclastic Controversy.* — In this business Leo would seem to have begun of his own motion, and almost single-handed. No party of any account against image-worship existed in the Church, but he believed that by taking the side of iconoclasm he could hasten the conversion of the Jews and Mohammedans, and though at first very cautious, he finally, after some nine or ten years of his reign, issued his edict prohibiting the worship of all images, whether statues or pictures, of Christ, the Virgin, or the saints. Christendom was astounded by this sudden proscription of its then common religious usages. *SEE ICONOCLASM.* Leo, in fact, found arrayed against him not only the bigoted and exasperated monastics, but the superstitious masses of the people of the East and West, and almost all the clergy, with all the bishops, excepting Claudius, bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia, and Theodosius, metropolitan of Ephesus, and perhaps two or three more. Even Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, joined with Gregory II of Rome in the universal outcry against the emperor's attempt, and thus, almost for the first time, the bishops of the two Romes were (like Pilate and Herod) united in one common cause. Whether provoked by the violence, and unreasonableness, and rebellious spirit of the opposition, or prompted by a growing zeal for the purity of religion, or by the obstinacy of personal pride and arbitrary power, or guided by considerations of

presumed policy, or from whatever motives, the emperor soon after issued a second edict far more stringent and decisive. It commanded the total destruction of all images (or statues intended for worship) and the effacement of all pictures by whitewashing the walls of the churches. The image-worshippers were maddened. The officer who attempted, in Constantinople, to execute the edict upon a statue of Christ renowned for its miracles, was assaulted by the women and beaten to death with clubs. The emperor sent an armed guard to suppress the tumult, and a frightful massacre was the consequence. Leo was regarded as no better than a Saracen. Even his successes against the common foe were ingeniously turned against him. A certain Cosmas was proclaimed emperor in Leo's stead, a fleet was armed, and Constantinople itself was menaced; but the fleet was destroyed by the Greek fire. The insurrection was suppressed, the leaders either fell or were executed along with the usurper. A second revolt at Constantinople was not suppressed till after much bloodshed.

Everywhere in the empire the monks were busy instigating and fomenting rebellion. Germanus, bishop of Constantinople, already an octogenarian, as he could not conscientiously aid in the execution of the imperial decree, quietly retired, or suffered himself to be removed from his see. Not quite so peaceful was the position pope Gregory II of Rome assumed. Following the bent of his own superstitious character, he seized the opportunity when the emperor had his hands full with seditious tumults and disturbances at home, and, confidently relying upon the support of the ignorant, and monk-ridden, and half-Christianized population of the West, dispatched to the emperor two most arrogant and insolent letters, and condemned in unmeasured terms his war upon images as a war upon the Christian religion itself. The emperor ordered the exarch of Ravenna to march upon Rome; but the pope, by the aid of the Lombards, compelled him to retire, and he had enough to do to maintain himself even at home. In fact, he was reduced to live in one quarter of Ravenna as a sort of captive; and finally Gregory III, the successor of Gregory II, in 731 held a council at Rome in which the Iconoclasts were anathematized. The emperor hereupon sent a formidable expedition against Italy, with special orders to reduce Ravenna. The expedition, however, failed, and Ravenna, with the Exarchate, fell into the hands of the Lombards, and thus Italy and the pope became practically independent of the Eastern empire. Leo now only sought the accomplishment of one object, viz., the detachment of Greece, Illyria, and Macedonia from the spiritual authority of the popes, and he consequently annexed them to that of the patriarchs of Constantinople, and this created

the real effective cause of the final schism of the Latin and Greek churches (734). The pope henceforth never submitted to the emperor, nor did he ever recover the lost portions of his patriarchate. Meantime, from the East, another voice joined in the fray—John of Damascus. He issued his culminations against the emperor securely from under the protection of the caliphs, who were more pleased with the attacks upon Leo than scandalized by the defense of image worship. *SEE JOHN OF DAMASCUS.* It was in the midst of this wild and protracted controversy that Leo died of dropsy in 741, and left to his son the accomplishment of a task which he had hoped he would himself effect.

As to the controversy itself, one of the strongest points ever made against the position of Leo is that he attacked the fine arts, and sought to destroy and abolish all the beauty and ornamentation of the Christian edifices. On this ground an earnest appeal has been made against him, and against all opponents of image worship, in the interests of esthetics. Even Neander seems quite to take sides with Gregory against the barbarian emperor in this point of view. But, in the first place, it is by no means historically certain that Leo proceeded to any such lengths, or with any such motives, in his iconoclasm. He proposed simply to destroy objects of worship. He made no war upon beauty or art. If, in accomplishing his purpose, in the face of the furious opposition he met with, he was carried further, it was not strange, especially considering his education, the great difficulty of making nice distinctions in such cases and under such circumstances, and the known propensity of human nature to run to extremes in the heat of controversy and conflict. Many of the holiest and most orthodox of the early fathers would have proscribed all classical learning, lest with it the classical paganism should be imbibed. But, in fact, neither Gregory nor the monks defended the use of images on esthetic grounds, and if they had they would have compromised their whole cause. It was not at all the beauty of the statue, but the sacred object represented, which gave it its meaning and value. Churches might be made as beautiful and decorated as highly as possible without the people's adoring or bowing down to the church, or its altar, or its ornaments. Besides, it is not probable that the images or the pictures of Leo's time were any very admirable specimens of esthetic achievement; and, if they had been, it is not likely that they would have attracted the reverence of the vulgar so much as they did. Artistic perfection tends rather to distract and dissipate than to intensify the religious reverence for images. With the development of Grecian art

Grecian idolatry lost its hold. It is a remarkable fact that the ugliest, and most misshapen, and hideous idols among the heathen have secured the widest and intensest devotion; and among the Christians, it has been some winking or bleeding statue, rudely imitating the human form, and not some Sistine Madonna, that has bent the knees of adoring multitudes. The image whose toe is now devoutly kissed by the faithful at St. Peter's, in Rome, is not remarkable for its esthetic claims. If Leo was a barbarian, Gregory was hardly less so, as is evident from the letters of the latter to his emperor. The ignorance of the pope is almost as remarkable as his impudence. He expressly and repeatedly confounds the pious Hezekiah, who destroyed the brazen serpent, with his pious ancestor Uzziah, and under this last name pronounces him a self-willed violator of the priests of God. He apparently confounded them both with Ahaz, who was the grandson of the one and the father of the other. It is true, he professes to quote the passage from the emperor's edict, but it is plain from internal evidence that, in the terms in which he gives it, it could not have been in that edict; and if it had been, he did not know enough to correct the blunder. It is said that Leo was cruel in the execution of his decree. It may be so. He was a soldier, a Byzantine emperor, and lived in the 8th century. But if the monks, and the pope; and the priests, and the populace, which they controlled, had not violently resisted the imperial decree, there would have been no cruelty. It is said that Leo acted arbitrarily, as if he had been the master of the minds and consciences of men, to make and unmake their religion for them. This is too true, and this was his mistake; but all his predecessors, with Constantine the Great, had made the same mistake. It was a Byzantine tradition. It was the theory of the age. Protestantism, with the same creed in regard to images, has proceeded upon a different theory, and has succeeded. It is said that the Church, in her general councils, has decided against Leo. If so, it was not till after, in his son's reign, a council styling itself oecumenical, and regularly convoked as such, consisting of no less than 348 bishops, had unanimously decided in his favor. It is said that, at all events, the question has been historically settled against Leo in the subsequent history of the Church: that iconoclasm was crushed and brought to naught in the East and in the West, and images achieved a complete triumph. Iconoclasm was indeed crushed by the unnatural and murderous monster Irene, whose character will hardly be regarded as superior to that of Leo. In fact, far as images are distinguished from pictures, iconoclasm has thus far triumphed in the East; and in the West it was not until after the earnest and manly resistance of Charlemagne and the

Council of Frankfort that the image-worshipping pope and priests finally, or rather for a time, carried their point.

4. Character of Leo. — Almost all we know of Leo comes to us through his enemies — his prejudiced, bigoted, unprincipled, deadly enemies. Some of the most odious acts alleged against him, as the burning of the great library at Constantinople, are purely their malignant inventions. His motives are seen only through their jaundiced or infuriated eyes. His very words come to us, for the most part, only through their garbled versions; yet, with all their zeal, they have not been able so to distort, or blacken, or hide his true lineaments, but that he still stands out to an impartial observer one of the ablest, purest, manliest, and most respectable sovereigns that ever occupied the Constantinopolitan throne. His rapid rise from obscurity to the pinnacle of power, his firm and successful administration amid foreign assaults and domestic plots, and his resolute prosecution of the reformation of the Church, all indicate a wise and provident policy, great vigor, and decision of will. His early military life may have rendered him cruel and obstinate, but did not taint the purity of his manners. He was in many respects, and particularly in a certain rugged and straightforward honesty and strength of purpose, just the man needed for the times. How much better and wiser he was than he appears we cannot say, but there is every reason to believe that a full and fair view of his history, if it could now be unearthed from the monkish rubbish, and rottenness, and filth that have overwhelmed it, would present him in a vastly more favorable light than that in which he has been left to stand. (D. B. G.)

5. Literature. — See Henke in Ersch u. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, sect. 2, vol. 16 (1839), 119 sq.; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* vol. 2, s.v.; Marsden, *Hist. Christian Churches and Sects*, 2:153; Milman, *Hist. Latin Christianity*, 2:305 sq.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 5:10 sq.; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 46 sq.; Leckey, *Hist. of Morals*, 2:282; Foulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, vol. 1 and 2; Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* (Freib. 1855); English transl. *History of Councils* (Lond. 1872, 8vo), vol. 1; Baxmann, *Politik der Päpste* (Elbfeld, 1868), vol. 1; Hergenruther, *Photius* (Regensb. 1867), vol. 1; and the references in the article ICONOCLASM.

Leo The Magentian

(*Μαγεντήνος*, or *Μαγεντίνος*), a commentator on Aristotle, flourished during the first half of the 14th century. His first name, Leo, is frequently omitted in the MSS. of his works. He was a monk, and afterwards archbishop of Mytilene. He wrote *Ἐξηγησις εἰς τὸ Περὶ ἑρμηνείας Ἀριστοτέλους*, *Commentarius in Aristotelis De Interpretatione Librum* (published by Aldus, Venice, 1503, folio, with the commentary of Ammonius, from which Leo borrowed very largely, and the paraphrase of Psellus on the same book of Aristotle, and the commentary of Ammonius on Aristotle's *Categoriae s. Praedicamenta*. In the Latin title of this edition, by misprint, the author is called *Margentinus*. A Latin version of Leo's commentary, by J. B. Rasarius, has been repeatedly printed with the Latin version of Ammonius. Another Latin version by Jerome Leustrius has also been printed): — *Ἐξήγησις εἰς τὰ Πρότερα ἀναλυτικὰ τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους*, *Commentarius in Priora Analytica Aristotelis* (printed with the commentary of John Philoponus on the same work by Trincavellus [Venice, 1536, fol.]; and a Latin version of it by Rasarius has been repeatedly printed, either separately or with other commentaries on Aristotle). The following works in MS. are ascribed, but with doubtful correctness, to Leo Magentenus: *Commentarius in Categoria Aristotelis* (extant in the King's library, Paris): — *Ἀριστοτέλους σοφιστικῶν ἐλέγχων ἑρμηνεία*, *Expositio Aristotelis De Sophisticis lenchis*; and *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ εὐπορίας προτάσεων*. These two works are mentioned by Montfaucon (*Bibl. Coislin.* p. 225); the latter is perhaps not a distinct work, but a portion of the above. In the MS. the author is called *Leontius Magentenus*: — *Commentarius in Isagogen s. Quinque Voces Porphyrii*. Buhle doubts if this work, which is in the Medicean library at Florence (Bandini, *Catalog. Codd. Laur. Medic.* 3:239), is correctly ascribed to Magentenus. In the catalogue of the MSS. in the King's library at Paris (2:410, 421), two MSS., No. 1845 and 1928, contain scholia on the *Categorie*, the *Analytica Priora et Posteriora* and the *Topica* of Aristotle, and the *Isagoge* of Porphyry, by "Magentius." Buhle conjectures, and with probability, that Magentius is a corruption of Magentenus or Magentinus; if so, and the works are assigned to their real author, we must add the commentaries on *Topica* and *Analytica Posteriora* to the works already mentioned. Nicolaus Comnenus Popadopoli speaks of many other works of Leo, but his authority is of little value. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 3:210, 213, 215, 218, 498, 7:717;

8:143; 12:208; Montfaucon, 1. c., and p. 219; Buhle, *Opera Aristolelis*, 1:165, 305, 306, ed. Bipont; *Catalog. Mistor. Biblioth. Regim* (Paris, 1740, fol.), 1. c. — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog.* 2:744 sq.

Leo Of Modena.

SEE LEON DA MODENA.

Leo The Philosopher

(*Sapieas* or *Philosophets*), a surname of FLAVIUS LEO VI, emperor of Constantinople, noted as the publisher of the *Basilica*, was born A. D. 865, and succeeded his father, Basil I, the Macedonial, on March 1, 886. His reign presents an uninterrupted series of wars and conspiracies. In 887 and 888 the Arabs invaded Asia Minor, landed in Italy and Sicily, plundered Samos and other islands in the Archipelago, and until 892 did away with imperial authority in the Italian dominions. By Stylianus, his father-in-law and prime minister, Leo was subjected to a bloody war with the Bulgarians; but, by involving them, through intrigues, in a war with the Hungarians, he succeeded in bringing the war with himself to a speedy termination. The following years were rendered remarkable by several conspiracies against his life. That of 895 proved nearly fatal; it was fortunately discovered in time, and quelled by one Samonas, who, in reward, was created patrician, and enjoyed the emperor's favor until 910, when, suspected of treachery, and accused of abuse of his position, he was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. At the opening of the 10th century, the Arabs and northern neighbors of the empire made another attack on the imperial possessions. The former once more invaded Sicily, and took Tauromenium, and in 904 appeared in the harbor of Thessalonica with a numerous fleet, soon made themselves masters of this splendid city, destroyed a great portion of it, plundered the inhabitants generally, and left laden with booty and captives. Leo died in 911. He was married four times, in consequence of which he was excluded from the communion with the faithful by the patriarch Nicolaus, as the Greek Church only tolerated a second marriage; it censured a thirde and condemned a fourth as an atrocious sill.

How Leo came by the exalted name of Philosopher it is difficult to understand, except it be taken in an ironical sense. Gibbon, with a few striking words, gives the following character to this emperor: "His mind was tinged with the most puerile superstition; the influence of the clergy

and the errors of the people were consecrated by his laws; and the oracles of Leo, which reveal in prophetic style the fates of the empire, are founded in the arts of astrology and divination. If we still inquire the reason of his sage appellation, it can only be replied that the son of Basil was only less ignorant than the greater part of his contemporaries in Church and State; that his education had been directed by the learned Photius, and that several books of profane and ecclesiastical science were composed by the pen or in the name of the imperial philosopher.”

In speaking of Leo’s literary merits, it is necessary to say a few words of his legislation. In his time the Latin language had long ceased to be the official language of the Eastern empire, and had gradually fallen into such disuse as only to be known to a few scholars, merchants, or navigators. The original laws, being written in Latin, opposed a serious obstacle to a fair and quick administration of justice; and the emperor Basil I, the father of Leo, formed and partly executed the plan of issuing an authorized version of the code and digest. This plan was carried out by Leo, who was ably assisted by Sabathins, the commander of the imperial life-guards. The new Greek version is known under the title of *Βασιλικὰ Διατάξεις*, or, shortly, *Βασιλικαί*; in Latin, *Basilica*, which means “Imperial Constitutions” or “Laws.” It is divided into sixty books, subdivided into titles, and contains the whole of Justinian’s legislation, viz. the Institutes, the Digest, the Codex, and the Novelli; also such constitutions as were issued by the successors of Justinian down to Leo VI. There are, however, many laws of the Digest omitted in the Basilica, while they contain, on the other hand, a considerable number of laws, or extracts from ancient jurists, not in the Digest. The Basilica likewise give many early constitutions not in Justinian’s Codex. They were afterwards revised by the son of Leo, Constantine Porphyrogenitus. For the various editions published of the *Basilica*, see Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* 2:741.

The principal works written, or supposed to be written, by Leo VI of special interest to us are,

1. Oracula, written in Greek iambic verse, and accompanied by marginal drawings, on the fate of the future emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople, showing the superstition of Leo if he believed in his divination, and that of the people if they believed in the absurd predictions. The seventeenth oracle, on the restoration of Constantinople, was published in Greek and Latin by John Leunclavius (ad calcem Const.

Manassee, Basil. 1573, 8vo). Janus Rutgersius edited the other sixteen, with a Latin version by George Dousa (Leyden, 1618, 4tso). Other editions, *Epositione delli Oracoli di Leoni imperatore*, by T. Patricius (Brixen, 1596), by Petrus Lambecius, with a revised text from an Amsterdam codex, also notes and new translation (Par. 1655, fol., ad calcem Codini). A German and a Latin translation by John and Theodore de Bry appeared (Frankf. 1597, 4to). It is doubtful whether Leo is actually the author of the Oracles. Fabricius gives a learned disquisition on the subject:

2. *Orationes*, mostly on theological subjects: one of them appeared in a Latin version by F. Metius, in Baronius's *Annales*; nine others by Gretserus, in the 14th volume of his *Opera* (Ingolstadt, 1660, 4to); three others, together with seven of those published by Gretserus, by Combefis, in the 1st volume of his *Biblioth. Pat. Graeco-Lat. Auctor.* (Paris, 1648, folio); *Oratio de Sto. Nicolo*, Greek and Latin, by Petrus Possime (Toulouse, 1654, 4to); *Oratio de Sto. Chrysostomo*, restored from the life of that father by Georgius Alexandrinus in the 8th volume of the Savilian ed. of Chrysostom (Antwerp, 1614, folio); some others in Combetis, *Biblioth. nionaonatoria*, in the *Biblioth. Pastrum Lugdun.*, and dispersed in other works; *Leoni Imp. Ilomilia nune primeum vulgata Graece et Latine ejuscdemnque qua Photiana est Confutatio, a Scipione Majiei* (Padua, 1751, 8vo): —

3. *Epistola ad Onareum Smaraclenum de Fidei Christianse Veritate et Sanrcenoruin Errorib*, (in Latin [Lyons, 1509] by Champerius, who translated a Chaldaean version of the Greek original, which seems to be lost: the same in the different *Biblioth. Patrum*, and separately by Prol: Schwarz in the *Program.* of the University of Lcipsic, in the year 1786): —

4. Ἡ γεγονυῖα διατύπωσις παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Λεόντος τοῦ Σοφοῦ κ. τ. λ... *ispositio fucta per Imnperatoremn Leontens Sapientem*, etc. (Greek and Latin, by J. Leunclavius, in *Jus Graeco-Romeranum*; by Jac. Goar, ad calcem Codini, Par. 1648, folio): — **5.** Εἰς τὰ Μονομεριου , *In spectaculum Unius Dei*, an epigram of little value, with notes by Brodneus and Opsopaeus, in *Epigram. libri 7*, edit. Wechel (Frankfort, 1600). See Zonoras, 2:174, etc.; Cedrenus, p. 591, etc.; Joel, p. 179, etc.; Manass. p. 108, etc.; Glycas. p. 296, etc.; Genesisius, p. 61, etc.; Coclin. p. 63, etc.; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, 7:693 sq.; Hamberger, *Nachrichten von Gelehrten Mannern*; Cave, *list. Litt.*; Hankius, *Script.*

Ryzant.; Oudin, *Comment. de SS. Eccl.* 2:394 sq. — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* 2:739 sq.

Leo Of Saint-Jean,

a French theologian and controversialist, was born at Rennes July 9, 1600. He entered the Carmelite convent when quite young, and, being greatly esteemed by the order, he successively filled nearly all the positions in their gift. He died at the convent “des Billettes,” Dec. 30, 1671. He wrote *Carmelus restitutus* (Par. 1634, 4to): — *Encyclop. Praemisum, seu sapientie universalis delineatio*, etc. (1635, 4to): — *Hist. Carmnelit. provincie Turonensis* (1640, 4to). His sermons were published under the title *La Somme des Sermons parenétiques et panegyriques* (1671-75, 4 vols. fol.). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:738.

Leo StypiŪta,

or STYPPA, or STYPA (Στύπης), patriarch of Constantinople in the 12th century (A.D. 1134 to 1143), flourished until about the time of the accession of the Byzantine emperor Manuel Comnenus. A decree of Leo Stypiota on the lawfulness of certain marriages is given in the *Jus Orientale* of Bonifidus (θεσμοὶ Ἀρχιερατικοί, *Sanction. Pontific.* p. 59), and in the *Jus Graeco-Romanum* of Leunclavius (liber 3, vol. 1, p. 217). He is often cited by Nicolaus Comnenus Popadopoli. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 8:721; 11:666. — Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biog.* 2:745.

Leo Of Thessalonica,

an eminent Byzantine philosopher and ecclesiastic of the 9th century, characterized by his devotion to learning, studied grammar and poetry at Constantinople, and rhetoric, philosophy, and arithmetic under Michael Psellus on the island of Andros, and at the monasteries on the adjacent part of continental Greece. He afterwards settled at Constantinople and became an instructor. Introduced to the notice of emperor Theophilus, he was appointed public teacher or professor, and the Church of the Forty Martyrs was assigned him for a school. Soon after the patriarch John, who appears hitherto to have neglected his learned kinsman, promoted Leo to the archbishopric of Thessalonica. Upon the death of Theophilus (A.D. 842), when the government came into the hands of Theodora, the iconoclastic party was overthrown, and Leo and John were deposed from their sees; but Leo, whose worth seems to have secured respect, escaped

the sufferings which fell to his kinsman's lot; and when Caesar Bardas, anxious for the revival of learning, established the mathematical school at the palace of Magnaura, in Constantinople, Leo was placed at the head. Leo was still living in A.D. 869: how much later is not known. Symeon (*De Mich. et Theodora*, c. 46) has described a remarkable method of telegraphic communication invented by Leo, and practiced in the reigns of Theophilus and his son Michael. Fires kindled at certain hours of the day conveyed intelligence of hostile incursions, battles, conflagrations, and the other incidents of war, from the confines of Syria to Constantinople; the hour of kindling indicating the nature of the accident, according to an arranged plan, marked on the dial-plate of a clock kept in the castle of Lusus, near Tarsus, and of a corresponding one kept in the palace at Constantinople. The **Μέθοδος προγνωστική**, *Methodus Prognostica*, or instructions for divining by the Gospel or Psalter, by Leo Sapiens, in the Medicean Library at Florence (Bandini, *Catalog. Codd. Laur. Medic.* 3:339), is perhaps by another Leo. Combefis was disposed to claim for Leo of Thessalonica the authorship of the celebrated **Χρησμοί**, *Oracula*, which are commonly ascribed to the emperor Leo VI, Sapiens, or the Wise, and have been repeatedly published. But Leo of Thessalonica is generally designated in the Byzantine writers *the philosopher* (**φιλάσοφος**), not *the wise* (**σοφός**); and if the published *Oracula* are a part of the series mentioned by Zonaras (15:21), they must be older than either the emperor or Leo of Thessalonica. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 4:148, 158; 7:697; 11:665; Allatius, *De Psellis*, 100:3-6; Labbe, *De Byzant. Histor. Scriptoribus Προτρεπτικόν*, pt. 2, p. 45. — Smith, *Dict. of Grk. and Roman Biog.* 2:745 sq.

Leo The Thracian

(also *the Great*), or FLAVIUS LEO I, emperor of Constantinople, was born in Thrace of obscure parents, entered the military service, and rose to high rank. At the death of the emperor Marcian in A.D. 457, he commanded a body of troops near Selymbria, and was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers, at the instigation of Aspar, a Gothic chief, who commanded the auxiliaries. The senate of Constantinople confirmed the choice, and the patriarch Anatolius crowned him. This is said to have been the first instance of an emperor receiving the crown from the hands of a bishop, a ceremony which was afterwards adopted by all other Christian princes, and from which the clergy, as Gibbon justly observes, have deduced the most formidable consequences. **SEE INVESTITURE**. Leo followed the measures

of Marcian against the Eutychians, who had been condemned as heretics, and who had recently excited a tumult at Alexandria, had killed the bishop, and placed one AElurus in his stead. Aspar for a time screened AElurus; but Leo at last had him exiled, and an orthodox bishop put in his place. The Huns, having entered the province of Dacia, were defeated by the imperial troops, and a son of Attila was killed in the battle. Soon after, Leo, in concert with Anthemius, emperor of the West, prepared a numerous fleet, with a large body of troops on board, for the recovery of Africa, which was occupied by the Vandals. Part of the expedition attacked and took the island of Sardinia; the rest landed in Libya, and took Tripolis and other towns; but the delay and mismanagement of the commander, who was Leo's brother-in-law, gave time to Genseric to make his preparations. Coming out of the harbor of Carthage by night, with fire-ships impelled by a fair wind, he set fire to many of the imperial ships, dispersed the rest, and obliged the expedition to leave the coast of Africa. Leo died in January, 474. — *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, 2:734.

Leo I

saint and pope, surnamed *the Great*, noted as the real founder of the papacy, was born about the year 390, though the exact date is not ascertained. We have also no precise information as to his birthplace; for while the *liber pontificalis* describes him as a Tuscan, and names Quintianus as his father, Quesnel, on the authority of an expression in one of Leo's own letters. (31:4), and an account of his election by a certain Prosper, stated that he was born at Rome, and this opinion has been accepted without further inquiry by most subsequent ecclesiastical writers. While yet an acolyte, Leo was dispatched, in A.D. 418, to Carthage, for the purpose of conveying to Aurelius and the other African bishops the sentiments of Zosimus concerning the Pelagian doctrines of Coelestius (q.v.). Under Celestine (q.v.) he discharged the duties of a deacon; and the reputation even then (431) enjoyed by him is clearly indicated by the terms of the epistle prefixed to the seven books *De Incarnatione Christi* of Cassianus, who at his request had undertaken this work against the Nestorian heresy. About this time he was applied to by Cyril of Alexandria to settle a difficulty between Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, and the primate of the ecclesiastical province of Jerusalem. Having obtained a great reputation for his knowledge, energy, and untiring activity, he failed not to secure the full confidence of Sixtus III (432. 440), to whom he rendered

valuable service. in several. important offices entrusted to him. Attracting also the notice of Valentinian III, he undertook, by request of this emperor, a mission to Gaul, to soothe the formidable dissensions existing between the two generals Aetius and Albinus. While Leo was engaged in this delicate negotiation, which was conducted with singular prudence and perfect success, Sixtus III died, Aug. 3, 440, and by the unanimous voice of the clergy and laity the absent deacon Leo was chosen to fill the vacant seat. Envoys were at once sent to Gaul to apprise him of his election, and having returned to Rome he was duly installed, Sept. 29, 440. Both the State and the Church were then in a critical position; the former in consequence of the frequent invasions of barbarians; the Church through its inner dissensions and quarrels. From the earliest ages until this epoch no man who combined lofty ambition with commanding intellect and political dexterity had presided over the Roman see; and although its influence had gradually increased, and many of its bishops had sought to extend and confirm that influence, yet they had merely availed themselves of accidental circumstances to augment their own personal authority, without acting upon any distinct and well — devised scheme. But Leo, while he zealously watched over his own peculiar flock, concentrated all the powers of his energetic mind upon one great design, which he seems to have formed at a very early period, and which he kept steadfastly in view during a long and eventful life, following it out with consummate boldness, perseverance, and talent. This was nothing less than the establishment of the “apostolic chair” as a spiritual supremacy over every branch of the Catholic Church, and the exclusive appropriation for its occupant of the title of *Papa*, or father of the whole Christian world. Leo may therefore be regarded as the precursor of Gregory the Great, and in this respect certainly deserved the surname of Great, which was given him. The evil days amid which his lot was cast were not unfavorable, as might at first sight be supposed, to such a project. The contending parties among the orthodox clergy, terrified by the rapid progress of Arianism, were well disposed to refer their minor disputes to arbitration. Leo, who well knew, from the example of his predecessor Innocent I, that the transition is easy from instruction to command, in the numerous and elaborate replies which he addressed to inquiries proceeding from various quarters, studiously adopted a tone of absolute infallibility, and assumed the right of enforcing obedience to his decisions as an unquestionable prerogative of his office, deriving authority for such a position from the relation of Peter to Christ and to the other apostles. He represented Peter as most intimately connected with Christ: “*Petrum in*

consortium individine unitatis assumtum, id quod ipse erat, voluit nominari dicendo: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, ut oeterni templi aedificatio, mirabili munere gratia dei, in Petri soliditate consisteret; hac ecclesiam suam firmitate corroborans, ut illam nec humana temeritas posset appetere, nec portue contra illam inferi praverent” (*Letters*, 10:1). This community of person into which the Lord received Peter is then made to extend into a community of power: “Q Quia tu es Petrus, i.e. cum ego sim lapis angularis, qui facio utraque unum, ego fundamentum, prmeter quod nenmo potest aliud ponere; tamen tu quoque petra es, quia mea virtute solidaris, et qua mihi potestate sunt propria, sint tibi mecum participatione communia” (*Letters*, 4:2). Peter had been received into the community of person with the Lord as a reward for his recognition and worship of Christ: true, he had denied his Master, but this the Lord had intentionally permitted to happen. But, in comparison with the other apostles, he possessed not only all that every one of them did, but also much that the others did not (*Letters*, 4:2), and was their original chief: “Transivit quidem etiam in alios apostolos jus potestatis istius (ligandi et solvendi) et ad omnes ecclesie principes decreti hujus constitutio commeavit, sed non frustra uni commendatur, quod omnibus intimetur. Petro enim ideo hoc singulariter creditur, qui cunctis ecclesiae rectoribus Petri forma preponitur.” It is only *in him* that the apostles were entrusted with their mission — in him they are all saved; and it is for this reason that the Lord takes special care of him, and that his faith is prayed for specially, “tanquam aliorum status certior sit futurus, si meus principis victa non fuerit.” After identifying the Church with the incarnation of Christ, Leo identifies Peter with Christ. This primacy of Peter continues, therefore, for while the faith of Peter is retained, all the privileges attached to this faith in Peter remain also. This primacy continues among the followers of Peter, for they hold the same relation towards Peter that Peter held towards Christ; as Christ was in Peter, so is Peter in his successors; it is still Peter who, through them, fulfills the command of Christ, “*Feed my sheep!*” — “Christus tantam potentiam dedit ei, quem totius ecclesiae principem fecit, ut si quid etiam nostris temporibus recte per nos agitur recteque disponitur, illius operibus, illius sit gubernaculis deputandum, cui dictum est: Et tu conversus confirma fratres tuos” (*Sermon*. 4:4). While affecting the utmost humility when speaking of himself personally as unworthy of his high office, he speaks of that office itself as the most exalted station.

It was more difficult for Leo, however, to prove that the bishop of *Rome* is the successor of St. Peter. Rome, says Leo, has been glorified by the death of the two greatest apostles, Peter and Paul, who brought the Gospel to the Eternal City; and Leo claims to discover a special Providence in this coming of Peter to Rome, so that that city should through him and in him become the center of the Christian world. “Ut hujus enarrabilis gratise (incarnationis) per totum mundum diffunderetur effectus, Romanum regnum divina providentia praepravit; cujus ad eos limites incrementa perducta sunt, quibus cunctarum undique gentium vicina et contigua esset universitas. Disposito namque divinitus operi maxime congruebat, ut multa regna uno confederarentur imperio et cito pervios haberet populos praedicatio generalis, quos unius teneret regimen civitatis” (*Serm.* 82:2). Here, finding dogmatical arguments unavailable for his purpose, Leo turns to history, which he arranges to suit himself. With regard now to the relation existing between the bishop of Rome and the other bishops, Leo says expressly, “All the bishops have indeed the same office, but not the same power. For even among the apostles, although they were all called apostles, there existed a remarkable distinction, for one only, Peter, held the first rank. From this results the difference among the bishops. It is a fundamental law of the Church that all have not the equal right to express all things, but that in each province there is one (the bishop of the principal place in the province) who has the first voice among his brethren. Again, those who occupy more important sees (the metropolitans of dioceses) have still greater power. But the direction of the whole Church is the care of the chair of St. Peter, and no one can take anything away from him who is the head of all.” Potent but unconscious instruments in forwarding Leo’s ambitious schemes were found in the barbarian chiefs whose power was not yet consolidated, and who were eager to propitiate one who possessed such weight with the priesthood, and through them could either calm into submission or excite to rebellion an ignorant and fanatic multitude. But, though the minds of men were in some degree prepared and disposed to yield to such domination, it was scarcely to be expected that the effort should not provoke jealousy and resistance. A strong opposition was speedily organized both in the West and in the East, and soon assumed the attitude of open defiance. In the West the contest was brought to an issue by the controversy with Hilary of Aries, *SEE HILARIUS ARELATENSIS*, concerning the deposition of Chelidonius, bishop of Vesontio (Besançon), who had married a widow, which was forbidden by the canons. Chelidonius appealed to Leo, who reinstated him in his see. Hilary was

summoned to Rome upon several charges brought against him by other bishops of Gaul, to whom his severity was obnoxious; and Leo obtained a rescript from the emperor Valentinian III suspending Hilary from his episcopal office. This suspension, however, does not appear to have been lasting, although the fact has been taken hold of by controversial writers as a stretch of jurisdiction in the see of Rome. Quesnel published a dissertation upon this controversy in his edition of the works of Leo (Paris, 1675). The total defeat and severe punishment of the Gallican bishop filled his supporters with terror, and the edict of Valentinian served as a sort of charter, in virtue of which the Roman bishops exercised for centuries undisputed jurisdiction over France, Spain, Germany, and Britain. In the East the struggle was much more complicated and the result much less satisfactory. The archimandrite Eutyches (q.v.), in his vehement denunciation of Nestorius, having been betrayed into errors, very different, indeed, but considered equally dangerous, was anathematized, deposed, and excommunicated, in A.D. 448, by the synod of Constantinople. Against this sentence he sought redress by soliciting the interference of the bishops of Alexandria and Rome. His cause was eagerly espoused by the former. As for Leo, he wrote to the patriarch Flavianus (q.v.), telling him that "he had been informed of the disturbances which had taken place in the Church of Constantinople by the emperor, and was surprised that Flavianus had not at once written to him about it, and informed him thereof before the subject had been disclosed to any one else." Leo also informed Flavianus that he had received a letter from Eutyches complaining that his excommunication had been without just cause, and that his appeal to Rome had not been considered. Flavianus was to send to Rome a competent envoy, with full information of all the particulars of the case, to render final judgment in the matter. In a case like the present, says Leo, in his conclusion, the first thing of all to be attended to is "ut sine strepitu concertationum et custodiatur caritas et veritas defendatur." In a letter of the same date to the emperor, Leo rejoices that Theodosius has not only a royal, but also a priestly heart, and carefully guarded against schism, for "the state also is in the best condition when the holy Trinity is worshipped in unity." Meanwhile a general council was summoned to be held on the 1st of August, 449, at Ephesus, and thither the ambassadors of Leo repaired, for the purpose of reading publicly the above letter to Flavianus. But a great majority of the congregated fathers, acting under control of the president, Dioscurus of Alexandria, refused to listen to the document, passed tumultuously a series of resolutions favorable to Eutyches,

excommunicated the most zealous of his opponents, and not only treated the Roman envoys with indignity, but even offered violence to their persons. Hence this assembly, whose acts were all subsequently annulled, is known in ecclesiastical history as the *Synodus Latrocinialis*. The vehement complaints addressed to Theodosius by the orthodox leaders proved fruitless, and the triumph of their opponents was for a time complete, when the sudden death of the emperor, in 450, again awakened the hopes and called forth the exertions of Leo. In consequence of the pressing representations of his envoys, Anatolius, the successor of Flavianus, together with all the clergy of Constantinople, was induced to subscribe the Confession of Faith contained in the Epistle to Flavianus, and to transmit it for signature to all the dioceses of the East. Encouraged by this success, Leo solicited the new monarch, Marcian, to summon a grand council for the final adjustment of the question concerning the nature of Christ, which still proved a source of discord, and strained every nerve to have it held in Italy, where his own adherents would necessarily have preponderated. In this, however, he failed, as the council was held at Chalcedon in October, 451. Although the Roman legates, whose language was of the most imperious description, did not fail broadly to assert the pretensions put forth by the representative of St. Peter, at first all went smoothly. The Epistle to Flavianus was admitted as a rule of faith for the guidance of the universal Church, and no protest was entered against the spirit of arrogant assumption in which it was conceived. But when the whole of the special business was concluded, at the very last sitting, a formal resolution was proposed and passed, to the effect that while the Roman see was, in virtue of its antiquity, entitled to take formal precedence of every other, the see of Constantinople was to stand next in rank, was to be regarded as independent from every other, and to exercise full jurisdiction over the churches of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus. The resistance of Leo was all in vain. The obnoxious canons were fully confirmed, and thus one half of the sovereignty at which he aimed was lost forever, at the very moment when victory seemed no longer doubtful. Leo made another and last effort on the 22d of May, 452, when he wrote to Marcian and to Pulcheria, threatening, but in vain, to excommunicate Anatolius. In 457, after the death of Marcian, the party of Eutyches made a last effort, and besought the new emperor to assemble a council to condemn the decrees of that of Chalcedon, but the emperor refused to yield to this request.

In the mean time serious events were taking place at Rome. In 452 the dreaded king of the Huns, Attila, invaded Italy, and, after sacking and plundering Aquileia, Pavia, and Milan, he marched against Rome. Valentinian, proving himself unfit for his high position: remained at Ravenna, and Aëtius himself saw safety in flight only. The Roman senate assembled to deliberate on what should be done in this emergency, and resistance being considered impossible, Leo was chosen as a mediator and sent to Attila. What the arguments employed by the eloquent suppliant may have been history has failed to record; but the Huns spared Rome, and, in consideration of a sum paid by the inhabitants, withdrew from Italy and retired beyond the Danube. This action of Attila appeared so strange that it was considered impossible to account for it except by a miracle. According to the legend, Attila confessed to his officers that during the address of Leo a venerable old man appeared to him, holding a sword with which he threatened to slay him if he resisted the voice of God. When again in 455 Rome lay at the mercy of the Vandals, who, taking advantage of the disturbances which followed the death of Valentinian, had invaded Italy, the senate had a second time recourse to Leo, and sent him to Genseric. But this time his eloquence did not prove so successful. Genseric consented only to promise not to burn the city, and to spare the life of the inhabitants, and from plunder three of the most important churches. The other parts of the town were abandoned to the soldiers for a fortnight. The remainder of Leo's life passed without further disturbance. While engaged in his schemes of aggrandizement, he never neglected for a moment to pursue and repress heresy within the states where his authority was recognized. Having learned that there were still a large number of Manichaeans in Rome, he caused them to be hunted up and punished. He acted with as much severity against the Pelagians and the Priscillianists. Barbeyrac (*Traite de la morale des Peres*, 100:17, § 2) even accuses him of having approved, and perhaps instigated, the violent measures taken against the heretics during his pontificate, and adduces in proof the letter of this pope to Turibius, bishop primate of Spain, concerning the Priscillianists. Beausobre (in his *Histoire du Manich.*, 50:9, 100:9, t. 2, p. 756) goes further, and charges Leo with having falsely accused the Manichaeans and Priscillianists of the misdeeds for which they were condemned.

Leo is said to have been the originator of the fasts of Lent and Pentecost. An old legend, found in a number of ancient writers, relates that in the

latter part of his life Leo cut off one of his hands; some, Th. Raynaud among them, give as the reason that a woman of great beauty having once, on Easter-day, been permitted to kiss his hand, the pope felt unholy desires, and thus punished this rebellion of the flesh, and they add that it is from that time the custom of kissing the pope's foot was introduced. Sabellicus and others assert that the pope only punished himself for having conferred orders on a man who proved unworthy. All state that his hand was finally restored to him by a miracle. He died April 11, 461.

The works of Leo consist of discourses delivered on the great festivals of the Church, or on other solemn occasions, and of letters. I. SERMONES. — Of these, the first by the Roman pontiffs which have come down to posterity, we possess 96. There are 5 *De Natali ipsius*, preached on anniversaries of his ordination, 6 *De Collectis*, 9 *De Jejuniis Decimi Mensis*, 10 *De Nativitate Domini*. 8 *In Epiphania Domini*. 19 *De Passione Domini*. 2 *De Resurrectione Domini*. 2 *De Ascensione Domini*. 3 *De Pentecoste*, 4 *De Jejuniis Pentecostes*, 1 *In Natali Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*. 1 *In Natali S. Petri Apostoli*. 1 *In Octavis Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*. 1 *In Natali S. Laurentii Martyris*, 9 *De Jejuniis Septimi mensis*, 1 *De Gradibus Ascensionis ad Beatitudinem*, 1 *Tractatus contra Heresim Eutychis*. Milman (*Hist. Lat. Christianity*, 1:258) thus comments on these productions of Leo: "His sermons singularly contrast with the florid, desultory, and often imaginative and impassioned style of the Greek preachers. They are brief, simple, severe, without fancy, without metaphysic subtlety, without passion; it is the Roman censor animadverting with nervous majesty on the vices of the people; the Roman proctor dictating the law, and delivering with authority the doctrine of the faith. They are singularly Christian — Christian as dwelling almost exclusively on Christ, his birth, his passion, his resurrection; only polemic so far as called upon by the prevailing controversies to assert with special emphasis the perfect deity and the perfect manhood of Christ."

II. EPISTOLAE. — These, extending to the number of 173, are addressed to the reigning emperors and their consorts, to synods, to religious communities, to bishops and other dignitaries, and to sundry influential personages connected with the ecclesiastical history of the times. They afford an immense mass of most valuable information on the prevailing heresies, controversies, and doubts on matters of doctrine, discipline, and Church government. Besides the 96 *Sermones* and 173 *Epistolae* mentioned above, a considerable number of tracts have from time to time

been ascribed to this pope, but their authenticity is either so doubtful or their spuriousness so evident that they are now universally set aside. A list of these, and an investigation of their origin, will be found in the edition of the brothers Ballerini, more particularly described below. In consequence of the reputation deservedly gained by Leo, his writings have always been eagerly studied. But, although a vast number of MSS. are still in existence, none of these exhibit his works in a complete form, and no attempt seems to have been made to bring together any portion of them for many hundred years after his death. The *Sermones* were dispersed in the *Lecttionaria*, or select discourses of distinguished divines, employed in places of public worship until the 11th century, when they first began to be picked out of these cumbrous storehouses and transcribed separately, while the *Epistolae* were gradually gathered into imperfect groups, or remained embodied in the general collections of papal constitutions and canons.

Of the numerous printed editions of Leo I's works, the first was published by Sweynheym and Pannartz (Rome, 1470, fol.), under the inspection of Andrew, bishop of Aleria, comprising 92 *Sermones* and 5 *Epistole*. The best two editions were published at Paris (1675, 2 vols. 4to) by Pasquier Quesnel and by the Ballerini (Verona, 1755-57, 3 vols. fol.). Of Quesnel's edition it is due to say that, by the aid of a large number of MSS., preserved chiefly in the libraries of France, he was enabled to introduce such essential improvements into the text, and by his erudite industry illustrated so clearly the obscurities in which many of the documents were involved, that the works of Leo now for the first time assumed an un mutilated, intelligible, and satisfactory aspect. But the admiration excited by the skill with which the arduous task had been executed soon received a check. Upon attentive perusal the notes and dissertations were found to contain such free remarks upon many of the opinions and usages of the primitive Church, and, above all, to manifest such unequivocal hostility to the despotism of the Roman see, that the volumes fell under the ban of the Inquisition very shortly after their publication, and were included in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* of 1682. Notwithstanding these denunciations, the book enjoyed great popularity, and was reprinted, without any suppression or modification of the obnoxious passages, at Lyons, in 1700. Hence the heads of the Romish Church became anxious to supply an antidote to the poison so extensively circulated. This undertaking was first attempted by Peter Cacciari, a Carmelite monk of the Propaganda, whose labors (*S. Leonis Magni Opera omnia* [Rome, 1753-

1755, 2 vols. fol.]; *Exercitationes in Universa S. Leonis Magni Opera* [Rome, 1751, fol.] might have attracted attention and praise had they not been, at the very moment when they were brought to a close, entirely thrown into the shade by those of the brothers Peter and Jerome Ballerini, presbyters of Verona. Their edition, indeed, is entitled to take the first place, both on account of the purity of the text, corrected from a great number of MSS., chiefly Roman, not before collated, the arrangement of the different parts, and the notes and disquisitions. A full description of these volumes, as well as of those of Quesnel and Cacciari, is to be found in Schonemann (*Bibl. Patrum Lat.* vol. ii, § 42), who has bestowed more than usual care upon this section. See Maimbourg, *Histoire da Pontificat de Leon* (Paris, 1687,4to); Arendt, *Leo d. Grosse* (Mainz, 1835, 8vo); *Gesch. d. Romans Literat.* (Suppl. Band. 2d part, § 159-162); Alex. de Saint-Cheron, *Histoire du Pontificat de St. Leon le Grand et de son siecle* (2 vols. 8vo.); Ph. de Mornay, *Histoire Pontificals* (1612, 12mo, p. 71); Bruys, *Hist. des Papes* (La Haye, 1732, 5 vols. 4to), 1:218; Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Lucques, 1738, 19 vols. fol.), 7:535-638; 8:1-240; G. Bertazzolo, *Breve Descrittione della Vita di san Leone primo et di Attila Flagello di Dio* (Mantua, 1614, 4to); Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.* 2:1; E. Perthel, *Pabst Leo's I Leben u. Lehren* (1843); C. T. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. 2; Milman, *Hist. Latin Christianity*, vol. 1, ch. 4; Neander, *Church History*, 2:104, 169 sq., 508 sq., 708 sq.; Dumoulin, *Vie et Religion de deux bons Papes Leon I et Gregoire I* (1650); Baxmann, *Politik der Papste*, 1:13 sq. Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* (Philippians 1869, 8vo: see its Index); Riddle, *Hist. Papacy*, 1:171 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 17:90 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 8:296-311; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Myth.* 2:746 sq.; Migne, *Nouv. Encyc. Theol.* 2:1152; Bergier, *Dict. de Theol.* 4:34 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Bio. Generale*, 30:704 -708; *Engl. Cyclop. s.v.*; *Christian Remembrancer.* 1854, p. 291 sq.

Leo II

Pope, was born at Cedelle, in Sicily, in the early part of the 7th century. He became first canon regular, then cardinal priest, and finally pope, as successor of Agatho. Although his predecessor had died in January of the same year, he was installed as late as August, 682, by the emperor Constantine V, as “the most holy and blessed archbishop of old Rome, and universal pope.” The reasons of this delay are unknown. Soon after his election Constantine requested him to send to Constantinople an

ambassador, with full authority to decide at once on all questions of dogmas and canons, and other ecclesiastical interests. But Leo, perceiving the aim of the request, sent only a sub-deacon, who would not act in matters of any importance without first consulting with Rome. He also immediately assembled a synod to approve of the acts of the sixth oecumenical council held at Constantinople in 681, which had been brought to Rome by the legates of Agatho. In 683 he sent a legate to Constantine, with a letter anathematizing the heresy of the Monothelites, and also pope Honorius (625-638), “who, instead of purifying the Apostolic Church by the doctrines of the apostles, has come near overthrowing the faith by his treason” (Labbe, *Conc.* 6:1246). Leo sought to induce all the churches to accept the decisions of that council, and for that purpose translated them from Greek into Latin, sending a copy of them in the latter language to the Spanish bishops. He appears also to have given his ambassador four letters, somewhat similar as to their contents (see Mansi, 11:1050-1058), addressed to the bishops of Ostrogothia, count Simplicius, king Erwig, and the metropolitan bishop Quiricus of Toledo, expressing his wish that all the bishops of Spain would endorse the acts of the Council of Constantinople. In these letters he says: “Honorius has falsified the inviolable rule of apostolic succession which he had received from his predecessors.” Baronius, wishing to rehabilitate Leo, denies the authenticity of these letters, while Pagi attempts to uphold it; Gfrörer (*Kirchengesch.* vol. 3, pt. 1, p. 397 sq.) also maintains their genuineness, and adduces in proof of it their corresponding precisely with the decisions of the fourteenth Council of Toledo. Leo also obtained from Constantine a promise that after the death of the titular archbishop of Ravenna his successors should, according to an old custom fallen into disuse, come to Rome to be consecrated. In exchange for this concession, Leo relieved the see of Ravenna from the obligation of paying the taxes formerly levied on the occasion of such consecration. Leo was a great friend of Church music, and did much towards improving the Gregorian chant. He built a church to St. Paul, and is said to have originated the custom of sprinkling the people with holy water. He died in July, 683: the exact date is not ascertained, and the Roman Catholic Church commemorates him on the 28th of June. See Dupin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles.* 5:105; Platina, *Historia delle Vite dei Sommi Pontusci*; Ciaconius, *Vitae Res gestae Pontificum Romanorum* (Romans 1677, 4 vols. folio), 1:478; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:311; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:708; laxmann, *Politik der Papste*, 1:185;

Bower, *History of the Popes*, 3:134 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 1:300.

Leo III

Pope, who brought about the elevation of the Frankish king to the position of emperor of the West, and thus relieved the Roman pontificate of further subjection to the Greek emperors, was a native of the Eternal City, and was elected after the death of Adrian I, Dec. 25, 795, Immediately after his election he communicated the intelligence to Charlemagne, and, like his predecessors acknowledged allegiance. Charlemagne replied by a letter of congratulation, which he entrusted to the abbot Angilbertus, whom he commissioned to confer with the new pontiff respecting the relations between the see of Rome and the "Patrician of the Romans," for this was the title which Charlemagne had assumed. In 796 Leo sent to Charlemagne the keys of St. Peter and the standard of the city of Rome, requesting the king to send some of his nobles to administer the oath of allegiance to the people of Rome, and thus the dominion of Charlemagne was extended over the city and duchy of Rome. In the year 799, an atrocious assault, the motive of which is not clearly ascertained, was committed on the person of the pope. While Leo was riding on horseback, followed by the clergy, and chanting the liturgy, a canon by the name of Paschal and a sacristan called Campulus, accompanied by many armed ruffians, fell upon him, threw him from his horse, and dragged him into the convent of St. Sylvester, when they stabbed him in many places, endeavoring to put out his eyes and cut out his tongue. Leo, however, was delivered by his friends from the hands of the assassins, and taken to Spoleti under the protection of the duke of Spoleti, where he soon after recovered; thence he traveled as far as Paderborn in Germany, where Charlemagne then was, by whom the pope was received with the greatest honors. Charlemagne sent him back to Rome with a numerous escort of bishops and counts, and also of armed men. The pope was met outside of the city gates by the clergy, senate, and people, and accompanied in triumph to the Lateran palace. A court composed of the bishops and counts proceeded to the trial of the conspirators who had attempted the life of the pope, and the two chiefs, Paschal and Campulus, were exiled to France. From this very lenient sentence and other concomitant circumstances, it appears that Charlemagne had greatly at heart the conciliation of the Romans in general, in order to deter them from betaking themselves again to the protection of the Greek emperors. In 800 Charlemagne himself visited Italy, and was met

at Nomentum, outside of Rome, by the pope, and the next day he repaired to the Basilica of the Vatican, escorted by the soldiers and the people. After a few days Charlemagne convoked a numerous assembly of prelates, abbots, and other persons of distinction, Franks as well as Romans, to examine certain charges brought against the pope by the partisans of Paschal and Campulus, but no proofs were elicited, and Leo himself, taking the book of gospels in his hand, declared himself innocent. On Christmas-day of that year the pontiff officiated in the Basilica of the Vatican, in presence of Charlemagne and his numerous retinue. As Charlemagne was preparing to leave the church, the pontiff stopped him, and placed a rich crown upon his head, while the clergy and the people, at the same moment, cried out "Carolo piissimo," "Augusto magno imperatori," with other expressions and acclamations which were wont to be used in proclaiming Roman emperors. Three times the acclamations were repeated, after which the pope was the first to pay homage to the new emperor. From that time Charlemagne left off the titles of king and patrician, and styled himself Augustus and emperor of the Romans, and he addressed the emperor of Constantinople by the name of brother. Thus was the Western empire revived 325 years after Odoacer had deposed Romulus Augustulus, the last nominal successor of the Caesars on the throne of the West. From that time all claim of the Eastern emperors to the supreme dominion over the duchy of Rome was at an end, and the popes from the same date assumed the temporal authority over the city and duchy, in subordination, however, to Charlemagne and his successors; they began, also, to coin money, with the pontiff's name on one side and that of the emperor on the other. In 804 the pope, during Christmas, visited Charlemagne at his court at Aquisgrana (Aix-la-Chapelle). In the division which Charlemagne made by will of his dominions among his sons, the city of Rome was declared to belong to him who should bear the title of emperor. Louis le Debonnaire was afterwards invested with that title by Charlemagne himself, and we find him accordingly, after the death of his father, assuming the supreme jurisdiction over that city on the occasion of a fresh conspiracy which broke out against Leo, the heads of which were convicted by the ordinary courts of Rome, and put to death. Louis found fault with the rigor of the sentence and the haste of its execution, and he ordered his nephew, Bernard, king of Italy, to proceed to Rome and investigate the whole affair. Leo, who seems to have been alarmed at this proceeding, sent messengers to the court of Louis to justify himself. Meanwhile he fell seriously ill, and the people of Rome broke out into insurrection, and pulled down some buildings he had

begun to construct on the confiscated property of the conspirators. The duke of Spoleti was sent for with a body of troops to suppress the tumult, when Leo suddenly died in 816, and Stephen IV was elected in his place. Leo is praised by Anastasius, a biographer of the same century, for the many structures, especially churches, which he raised or repaired, and the valuable gifts with which he enriched them. In his temporal policy he appears to have been more moderate and prudent than his predecessor, Adrian I, who was perpetually soliciting Charlemagne in his letters for fresh grants of territory to his see. Thirteen letters of Leo are published in Labbe's *Concilia*, 7:1111-1127. He is also considered the author of the *Epistole ad Carolum Magnum imp.*, ex editlone et cum notis Hermanni Conringii (Helmst. 1647, 4to). The *Enchiridion Leonis papae*, containing seven penitential psalms and some prayers, has been erroneously attributed to him. See Ph. Jaffi, *Reg. Pontific.* (Berlin, 1851, 4to), p. 215; F. Pagi, *Breviarium historico-chronologico-criticum illustriora pontif.* (4to), 2:1; J. G. Faber, *Lissertatio de Leone III, papa Romanii* (Tubing. 1748, 4to); Milman, *Hist. Latin Christianity*, 2:454 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of Papacy*, 1:24 sq.; Baxmann, *Politik der Papste*, 1:304; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 2 (see Index); Riddle, *Hist. of Papacy*, 1:326; Bower, *Hist. Popes*, 4:142 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 19:600 sq.; 20:510; 22:37 sq.; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 72 sq.; Lea, *Studies in Church Hist.* p. 34 sq., 38, 58, 88 note, 179; *Encyl. Cyclop.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:710; Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.* 3:1, 2.

Leo IV

Pope, was a native of Rome, and succeeded Sergius II in 847. He was hastily elected, and consecrated without waiting for the consent of the emperor Lotharius, because Rome was then threatened by the Saracens, who occupied part of the duchy of Benevento, and who a short time before had landed on the banks of the Tiber, and plundered the basilica of St. Peter's on the Vatican, which was outside of the walls. Leo's consecration, however, was undertaken with the express reservation of the emperor's rights, and when, in order to prevent a recurrence of the violence of the Saracens, Leo undertook to surround the basilica and the suburb about it with walls, the emperor sent money to assist in the work. The building of this Roman suburb occupied four years, and it was named after its founder, *Civitas Leonina*. Leo also restored the town of Porta, on the Tiber, near its mouth, settling there some thousands of Corsicans, who had run away from their country on account of the Saracens. Towers were built on both

banks of the river, and iron chains drawn across to prevent the vessels of the Saracens from ascending to Rome. The port and town of Centum Cellae being forsaken on account of the Saracens, Leo built a new town on the coast, about twelve miles distant from the other, which was called Leopolis; but no traces of it remain now, as the modern Civita Vecchia is built on or near the site of old Centum Cellae. Leo IV held a council at Rome in 853, in which Anastasius, cardinal of St. Marcel, was deposed for having remained five years absent from Rome, notwithstanding the orders of the pope. Leo died in July, 855, and fifteen days after his death Benedict III was elected in his place, according to the most authentic text of Anastasius, who was a contemporary; but later writers introduce between Leo IV and Benedict III the fabulous pope Joan (q.v.). Leo has left us two entire epistles, as also fragments of several others, and a good homily, which are contained in Labbe's *Conc.* See Baronius, *Annal.* 14:340; Ciaconius, 1:614; Gfrörer, *Kirchengeschichte*, 3:1, 2; Baxmann, *Politik d. Papste*, 1:281, 352; Lea, *Studies in Ch. History*, p. 61, 91; Riddle, *Hist. of Papacy*, 1:336 sq.; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 96; Labbe, *Concil.* 9:995; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 2:220 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:312; Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* 2:77; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 30:711; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Leo V

Pope, was born at Priapi, near Ardea (according to some at Arezzo). He entered the order of Benedictines, became cardinal, and was finally elected to the papal chair Oct. 28. 903. A few days afterwards, Christopher, cardinal priest of St. Lorenzo, in Damaso, and chaplain of Leo, instigated an insurrection at Rome, and made the pope prisoner, under the plea that he was incapable of governing. Christopher now exacted from Leo a formal abdication, and the promise of returning into his convent. According to Sigonius, Leo died "of grief" in his prison one month and nine days after his election. He was buried in St. John of Lateran. But Christopher himself did not remain long in the papal chair, as a new revolt of the Romans drove him from the usurped see, and put in his place Sergius III, who was the favorite of the celebrated Marozia, a powerful but licentious woman, who disposed of everything in Rome. The 10th century may well be termed the darkest sera of the papacy. See Platina, *Historia de Vitis Pontificum*, etc.; Artaud de Montor, *Hist. des souverains Pontifes Romains*, 2:62; Du Chene, *Hist. des Papes*; Baxmann, *Politik der Papste*, 2:76 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 5:86; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*,

2:36; Genebrard, *Chron.*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:315; *English Cyclopaedia*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:711.

Leo VI

Pope, a native of Rome, succeeded John X July 6, 928, and died seven months afterwards; some say that he was put to death by Marozia, like his predecessor. He was succeeded by Stephen VII. — *English Cyclopaedia*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 30:712; Bower, *History of the Popes*, v. 95.

Leo VII

Pope, a Roman, sometimes called Leo VI, succeeded John XI, the son of Marozia, January 8, 936. He mediated peace between Alberic, duke of Rome, and Hugo, king of Italy, who had offered to marry Marozia, in order to obtain by her means the possession of Rome, but was driven away by Alberic, also Marozia's son. Leo is said to have been a man of irreproachable conduct, but little is known of him. He died in 939, and was succeeded by Stephen VIII. We have of him an *epistola* to Hugo, abbot of St. Martin of Tours, published in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*; two others to Gerard, archbishop of Lorch, and to the bishops of France and Germany. See Mabillon, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, vols. 2 and 4; Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. 3; Fleury, *Hist. Ecclesiast.*; Baronius, *Arnsnl.* cent. 10; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 5:97 sq.; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 121; Baxmann, *Politik der Pipste*, 2:93; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:316; *English Cyclopaedia*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:712.

Leo VIII

Pope, a Roman, succeeded John XII, who was deposed for his misconduct by a council assembled at Rome, in presence of the emperor Otho I, in 963. But soon after Otho had left Rome, John XII came in again at the head of his partisans, obliged Leo to run away, and resumed the papal office. John, however, shortly after died or was murdered while committing adultery, and the Romans elected Benedict V. Otho, returning with an army, took the city of Rome, exiled Benedict. and reinstated Leo, who died about 965, and was succeeded by John XIII. See Baronius, *Annal.* 16:129; Platina, *Historia*, p. 14; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 5:112 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:42; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 126 sq., 216;

Baxmann, *Politik der Papste*, 2:114; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.* ~~1317~~ *Genesis* 30:713.

Leo IX

(BRUNO), Pope, bishop of Toul, was born in Alsace in 1002, and was cousin-german of the emperor Conrad the Salic. He was noted for great scholarly attainments, and was elected in 1049 to succeed Damasus II, at the joint recommendation of the emperor Henry III and of the famous Hildebrand (afterwards Gregory VII), who became one of Leo IX's most trusted advisers and guides. Indeed, it has often been a matter of comment that the reign of Leo IX was rather Gregorian in tendency. Leo was continually in motion between Germany and Italy, holding councils and endeavoring to reform the discipline and morals of the clergy, and also to check the progress of the Normans in Southern Italy, against whom he led an army, but was defeated in Apulia and taken prisoner by the Normans, who treated him with great respect, but kept him for more than a year in Benevento. Having made peace with them by granting to them as a fief of the Roman see their conquests in Apulia and Calabria, he was allowed to return to Rome, where he died in 1054, and was succeeded by Victor II. Among the councils held by Leo IX, one was convened at Rome (1050) against Berengar (q.v.), and in favor of Lanfranc (q.v.). Another important council held during his pontificate was that of Rheims in 1049, where many laws were enacted against simony, clerical matrimony, and the conditions and relations of monks and priests. Labbe and Cossart's *Conc.* contain nineteen letters of this pope (9:949-1001). See Baronius, *Annl.* 17:19-107; Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, 3:277, 278; Gfrörer, *Kirchengeschichte*, 4:1; Höfler, *Die deutschen Pabste*, 2:3-214; Baxmann, *Politik dera Papste*, 1:359 sq.; 2:191 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, v. 164 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:105 sq.; Hunkler, *Leo IX u.s. Zeit* (Mayence, 1851); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 3:240 sq.; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, p. 189 sq., 191 sq., 217, 244, 292; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:317 sq.; *English Cyclop. s.v.*, Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:714.

Leo X

(*Giovanni de Medici*), pope from 1513 to 1521, was born at Florence Dec. 11, 1475. He was the second son of the celebrated Lorenzo de' Medici (born Jan. 31, 1448; died April 8, 1492), surnamed "the Magnificent," and

grandson of Cosmo de Medici (born in 1389, died in 1464). From infancy Giovanni had been destined by his father to an ecclesiastical career, for to the lot of Pietro, the elder child, fell the succession in the Florentine government, and, as Giovanni early showed signs of ability, the great aim of Lorenzo was to secure for his house, by his second child, the influence of the Church. At the tender age of seven Giovanni was subjected to the tonsure, and at once presented by Louis XII of France with the rich living of the abbey of Fontdouce, and by pope Sixtus IV himself with that of the wealthy convent of Passignano. Various other rich livings were added to these successively, and in 1488, finally, the youthful ecclesiastic, of but thirteen years of age, was by pope Innocent VIII (father-in-law of Giovanni's sister Maddalena) presented with the cardinal's rank, limited by the condition only that the insignia of this distinction should not be assumed until his studies had been completed at Pisa. Hitherto his education had been entrusted to tutors mainly, and among them were the famous Greek historian Chalcondylas, and the learned Angelo Poliziano; he now set out at once for Pisa, and having there completed his theological studies in 1492, was on March the 9th of this same year installed at Florence into the cardinal's position, and three days after set out for and took up his residence in the Eternal City. Scarce had a month passed his induction to the cardinal's dignity when intelligence reached Rome that Lorenzo the Magnificent was no more, and hastily Giovanni retraced his steps to Florence, to afford succor and support to his weak but elder brother Pietro, upon whom now depended the continuance of the power of the Medici over Florence. In July of this year (1492) Innocent VIII died, and as Giovanni had opposed the election of his successor, Alexander VI, the Medici could no longer hope for support from the papacy. Blindly and madly, amid all these disadvantages, Pietro, unsatisfied with absolute power unless he could display the pomp and exercise the cruelties of despotism, contrived, in the short space of two years, to secure, instead of the love and good will, the hatred of the Florentines. Their enthusiastic devotion to the house of the Medici hitherto alone prevented any attempt to subvert his authority. They remained quiet even in 1494, when Charles VIII of France came into Italy to enforce his claim to the throne of Naples, and when Pietro joined the house of Aragon, instead of becoming a confederate of the French, as his ancestors had always been. But when Pietro, equally presumptuous in security and timid in danger, terrified by the unexpected success of the French, fled to the camp of Charles, and, kneeling at his feet, abandoned himself and his country to his mercy, the

indignation of the Florentines could no longer be stayed, and, entering into a treaty with the French, they stipulated especially the exile of the Medici (Nov. 1494). After his capitulation to king Charles, Pietro had returned to Florence, but the enraged populace made his stay impossible, and he quickly fled the city. Giovanni, bolder and more courageous than his elder brother, assisted by a few faithful friends, well-armed, made a last attempt to assert the Medicean authority, and put down the insurrection by a bold exercise of force. It soon, however, became but too apparent to the young cardinal that his hope was all vanity. "The people multiplied themselves against Pietro," as Guicciardini (*Storia Fiorentina* [Opere inedite]. 3:110) phrases it, and Giovanni, in the disguise of a friar, was glad enough to find himself outside the city gates, and on the open Bologna road, taking the same road as Pietro, followed by their younger brother Giuliano, still a mere lad. They went first to John Bentivoglio in Bologna, but, as they were not received here, went to Castello, and found a refuge with Vitelli. In this and other places, the Medici, the cardinal included, lived for some time, having frequent endeavors made for their restoration. But when Giovanni was finally persuaded that all such efforts were fruitless, he decided to quit his native country, now ravaged by foreign armies, and betrayed by the wretched policy of pope Alexander VI, and he set out on a journey to France, Germany, and the Netherlands. For the assertion that the cardinal undertook this journey for political ends there is not the slightest foundation. While abroad he sought literary associations mainly. He courted the acquaintance of men of learning, and not unfrequently displays his own taste for literature and the liberal arts. In 1503, upon the death of Alexander VI, against whom he cherished a bitter hatred, and on whose account only he had avoided Rome after the expulsion of his family from Florence, he returned to the banks of the Tiber. Pius III, who succeeded Alexander VI, lived only a few weeks, and, upon a further election, the pontifical chair was occupied by Julius II, a friend and admirer of Giovanni de' Medici. Our cardinal's elder brother had died in the mean time (in the battle of Garigliano in 1503), and, no longer distracted by the imprudent conduct and the wild plans of an imbecile, he gave himself up wholly to the interests of his ecclesiastical position. By the friendship of a nephew of the pontiff, Galeotto della Rovere, he was brought into closer relations with Julius II, and, after the latter had entered Perugia in 1506 (Sept. 12), cardinal Giovanni was entrusted with the government of that town, and only a short time after was honored with the appointment of papal field marshal, under the title of "legate of Bologla," to the army against the

French. The campaign, however, proved rather unsuccessful, and at the battle of Ravenna the cardinal was taken prisoner and sent to Milan, whence he made his escape while the French soldiers were busy in preparations for their removal to France. ‘The cardinal’s great aim, now that the French had quitted Lombardy and the Florentine republic, was to re-establish his house in the government of Florence. During the first eight years of their exile the Medici had made four unsuccessful attempts to regain their power; on the failure of their last attempt, their successful opponent, Pietro Soderini, had been chosen gonfaloniere for life: to dethrone Soderini, then, was the great object to be accomplished by the cardinal. The gonfaloniere’s reign thus far had been noted for its moderation and benign influence on Florence, and had secured to the country great prosperity; but Soderini’s integrity was not unimpeachable to the mind of the Medici, and Giovanni appealed to the *Holy League*, consisting of the pope, the emperor, the Venetians, and Ferdinand of Aragon, to undertake the restoration of the Medici, on the ground that Soderini showed great partiality to foreigners, and that his government was extremely corrupt. To secure the services of the *Holy League* no charges against Soderini were really needed, but he brought them, and promptly they replied. A body of 5000 Spaniards, brave to ferocity, were marched under Raymond de Cardona against Florence in August, 1512. On their way they stormed the town of Prato, and massacred the citizens, which so intimidated the Florentines that they immediately capitulated, and consented to the return of the Medici as private citizens. Cardinal de’ Medici and his brother Giuliano soon after entered Florence, and, though they had asked only their restoration as private citizens, without any share in the government, they had hardly been readmitted when they forced the signoria, or executive to immediately call a “parlamento,” or general assembly of the people, in the great square (September). This general assembly of the sovereign people had repeatedly been used by ambitious men as a ready instrument of their views, and it proved such on this occasion. All the laws enacted since the expulsion of the Medici in 1494 were abrogated. A “balia,” or commission, was appointed, consisting of creatures of that family, with dictatorial powers, to reform the state. No bloodshed, however, accompanied the reaction; but Soderini, having been deposed by the establishment of this new form of government, he and other citizens opposed to the Medici were banished, and “thus once again, after an exile of eighteen years, the fatal Medici were restored to Florence; once again fixed their fangs in the prey they had been scared away from, and ‘the

most democratical democracy in Europe' was once again muzzled and chained. A conspiracy of priest and soldier — that detestable and ominous combination, more baneful to humanity than any other of the poisonous mischiels compounded out of its evil passions and blind stupidities — had as usual trampled out the hopes and possibilities of social civilization and progress" (Trollope, 4:348).

Scarcely had the Medici re-established themselves at Florence when news came from Rome that the supreme pontiff had died. It was on the 20th of February, 1513, that "the furious nature" of his holiness the pope Julius II was quieted forever. Leaving his brother Giuliano, and his nephew Lorenzo, son of Pietro, at the head of the affairs of Florence, "our cardinal posts up in all haste to Rome," says Trollope (4:351), "to see whether mayhap Providence, in the utter inscrutableness of its wisdom, may consider him, Giovanni de' Medici, as the best and fittest person to be intrusted with heaven's vicegerency," accompanied in this excursion to the conclave by Filippo Strozzi-son of the great banker, the founder of the still well-known Strozzi palace, possessor of one of the then largest fortunes in Florence, and "on whose young shoulders was one of the longest heads that day in Florence" — as his friend, companion, and banker. "Especially in this last capacity was Filippo necessary to the aspiring cardinal, so soon to become pope by the grace of God and the capital of Strozzi." The younger members of the conclave had previously decided to elect one of their own age as successor to Julius II, and upon cardinal de' Medici, only thirty-seven years old, fell their choice, influenced, as we have seen by the quotation from Trollope, in a great measure by the *exertions* of the banker Strozzi. One of the first acts of the new pontiff, who assumed the name of Leo X, was to appoint two men of learning, Bembo and Sadoletto, for his secretaries. He next sent a general amnesty to be published at Florence, where a conspiracy had been discovered against the Medici, for which two individuals had been executed, and others, with the celebrated Machiavelli among the rest, had been arrested and put to the torture. Leo ordered Giuliano even to release the prisoners and recall those that were banished, Soderini among the rest. This accomplished, Giuliano was invited to Rome, where he was made gonfalonere of the Holy Church. "All the rich and lucrative offices of the apostolic court were conferred on Florentines, not a little to the disgust of the Roman world" (Trollope, 4:359). Of course, that Leo should do anything and everything to enhance the dignity and greatness of the Medicean family no one could object to, and,

consequently, no one had ought to say when he appointed his nephew Lorenzo, the eldest son of Pietro, a profligate young scape-grace, but the only heir remaining to succeed in the government of Florence, governor of the republic and general in chief, with absolute and supreme authority over all the Tuscan forces contributed by the commonwealth to the armies of a new league formed in 1515 by the emperor, the king of Aragon, the duke of Milan, and the Florentines against France and Venice. To have made Lorenzo, as Leo would have liked to do, sovereign prince, under the title of duke or some other like distinction, would have been premature, but with the appointment as made no one found fault, and it passed generally approved. Nor was any objection raised to Leo's further action in behalf of Florence, constituting it a dependency of Rome, which it continued during the remainder of his life. His cousin Giulio de' Medici, archbishop of Florence, on the decease of Julius II, Leo X at once promoted to the cardinal's dignity, and, in addition, entrusted him with the legateship of Bologna. By these new positions the influence of the Medici had been greatly improved, but the ever-plotting Leo, farseeing as he was, comprehended clearly that still more was needed to secure to his house the throne of Florence. Upon his accession to the pontificate he found the war renewed in Northern Italy. Louis XII had sent a fresh army, under La Trimouille, to invade the duchy of Milan. The Swiss auxiliaries of duke Maximilian Sforza defeated La rimouille at Novara, and the French were driven out of Italy. The Venetians, however, had allied themselves with Louis XII, and Leo sent Bembo to Venice to endeavor to break the alliance. Differences occurred between Leo and Alfonso d'Este, duke of Ferrara, who demanded the restoration of Reggio, taken from him by Julius II, which Leo promised, but never performed; on the contrary, he purchased Modena of the emperor Maximilian, disregarding the rights of the house of Este to that town. The pope held likewise Parma and Piacenza, and it appears that he intended to form out of these a territory for his brother Giuliano, and he made attempts to surprise Ferrara also with the same view. His predecessor Julius had had in view the independence of all Italy, and he boldly led on the league for this purpose — Leo had a narrower object — his own aggrandizement and that of his family, and he pursued it with a more cautious and crooked policy. To secure the adhesion of Louis XII, Leo reopened the Council of the Lateran, which had begun under Julius II, for the extinction of the schism produced by the Council of Pisa, convoked by Louis XII in order to check the power of Julius, who was his enemy. For such proceedings there was now no longer

any reason, and Louis XII gladly made his peace with Leo in 1514, renounced the Council of Pisa, and acknowledged that of the Lateran. But in the following year Louis XII died, and his successor, Francis I, among other titles assumed that of duke of Milan. Under him a new Italian war opened. The Venetians joined Francis I, while the emperor Maximilian, Ferdinand of Spain, duke Sforza, and the Swiss made a league to oppose the French. The pope did not openly join the league, but he negotiated with the Swiss by means of the cardinal of Sion, and paid them considerable sums to induce them to defend the north of Italy. The Swiss were posted near Susa, but Francis, led by old Trivulzio, passed the Alps by the Col de l'Argentier, entered the plains of Saluzzo, and marched upon Pavia, while the Swiss hastened back to defend Milan. The battle of Marignano was fought on the 14th of September, 1515. The Swiss made desperate efforts, and would probably have succeeded had not Alviano, with part of the Venetian troops, appeared suddenly with cries of "Viva San Marco." which dispirited the Swiss, who believed that the whole Venetian army was coming to the assistance of the French. The result was the retreat of the Swiss, and the entrance of the French into Milan, who took possession of the duchy. Leo now saw clearly that the salvation of his house lay in a union with France, and at once made proposals to Francis, who, in turn, eagerly embraced the proffered aid of the Church. It was on the 21st of October, 1515, that news reached Florence of this new alliance concluded by the holy father and the French king Francis I for the mutual defense of their Italian states, the king obliging himself specially to protect the pontiff, Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici, and the Florentines, and that both Lorenzo and Giuliano should receive commissions in the French service, with pay and pensions. If there had been danger to the Medici government in Florence, it threatened from the side of France, but that danger they escaped by this new alliance, brought about, in a great measure, by the sympathy which the two parties felt for each other.

At a meeting which these new allies subsequently held at Bologna (December, 1515) a marriage was agreed upon between Lorenzo, the pope's nephew, and Madeleine de Boulogne, niece of Francis de Bourbon, duke of Vendcme, from which marriage Catharine de' Medici, afterwards queen of France, was born, and thus the union of the French and Florentine interests became more closely cemented. But in ecclesiastical affairs also new measures were taken by a concordat, only abrogated by the French Revolution, which regulated the appointment to the sees and livings in the

French kingdom. Instead of capitular election, the king was to nominate, the pope to collate to episcopal sees. Annates were restored to the pope, who also received a small stipulated patronage in place of his indefinite prerogative of reserving benefices. It is true the Parliament and University of Paris both opposed this concordat, but the king and the pope each secured what they desired. To the king thus fell the real power and the essential patronage of the Church; by the pope the recognition of his own authority was obtained. The two, as Reichel (*See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, p. 538) has aptly said, by this new measure, “shared between them the ancient liberties of the Gallican Church. The rising freedom of the laity was thereby crushed; the pope recovered most of his ancient power.” Nothing could seem brighter now than the Medicean prospects and the future of the papacy. There was only one more thing to be immediately accomplished — to make Lorenzo a sovereign prince “by grace of God, or, at all events, clearly by grace of God’s vicegerent on earth.” Upon the most flagrant of pretenses, the duke of Urbino, Francesco Maria della Revere, was deposed, and upon Lorenzo fell the mantle of the duchy’s sovereignty, and at last the measure of Leo’s ambition was nearly full. (In 1519, upon the death of Lorenzo, the duchy of Urbino was added to the territory of the Church.) This family ambition, however, by no means found pleasure in the eyes of the Roman people, while the Florentines were flattered by the advance of their “first citizens” to the position of prince and pope. Prominent among the enemies of the Medici was the house of Petrucci, headed by the cardinal of that name, who was led into a conspiracy to murder the pope by the latter’s expatriation of his brother from Sienna. Not satisfied with the acquisition of the duchy of Urbino, Leo longed also for the possession of the free state of Sienna, lying between the territories of the Church and those of the republic of Florence, and to this end sent Borghesi, its governor, into exile. At first Borghesi’s brother, cardinal Petrucci, formed the mad design of stabbing Leo on their first meeting, but he finally abandoned this enterprise as too daring, and a conspiracy was formed instead to cause the death of Leo X by poison. Fortunately for Leo, the plot to take his life was timely discovered, and the cardinal expiated the intended crime with his life by secret strangling, while many others of like social standing suffered abasement and other punishment. To secure himself against a second attempt of the kind, Leo now (in 1517) created a whole host of able and experienced Florentines cardinals — no less than thirty-one of them altogether.

It was about this time also that the Lateran Council approached its close, and that the measures were inaugurated which resulted so unfavorably to the cause of the papacy and the Church of Rome, and have made the year 1517 forever memorable in the ecclesiastical annals for the foundation and commencement it gave to the revolution in the Church, commonly known by the name of *the Reformation* (q.v.). One of the greatest desires of Leo X, as pope of Rome, was the continuation of the incomplete structure commenced under Julius II — the building of St. Peter's church. Leo, who had made for himself a name as the protector and patron of art, and had well-nigh revived the Periclean age of the Greeks, could not brook the thought that, while he was pontiff within the walls of the Eternal City, this great enterprise, likely to immortalize the name of its patron in the annals of art, should be passed over, and, finding the coffers of the papacy drained by his predecessor, saw only one way in which to secure the necessary funds for so stupendous an undertaking — the sale of *indulgences* (q.v.), securing to the contributor for this object forgiveness of sin in any form (comp. Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* 2:66, note 6; Bower, *Hist. of Papacy*, 7:409 sq.; Robertson, *Hist. of Reign of Charles V*, Harper's edit., p. 125 sq., especially the footnotes on p. 126). Such utter disregard of the essence of religion resulted in one of the boldest assaults on the Romish Church that it had ever sustained. The very thought that forgiveness of sin was to be offered on sale for money "must have been mortally offensive to men whose convictions on that head had been acquired from contemplating the eternal relation between God and man, and who, moreover, had learned what the doctrine of Scripture itself was on the subject" (Ranke, *Hist. Pap.* 1:66). In Saxony, especially, men of piety and thought generally commended the interpretation which Luther gave to this subject. They all regretted the delusion of the people, who, being taught to rely for the pardon of their sins on the indulgences which they could secure by purchase, did not think it incumbent on themselves either to study the doctrines of genuine Christianity, or to practice the duties which it enjoins. Even the most unthinking were shocked at the scandalous behavior of the Dominicans — John Tetzel (q.v.) and his associates, who had the sale of indulgences entrusted to them — and at the manner in which they spent the funds accumulated from this traffic. These sums, which had been piously bestowed in hope of obtaining eternal salvation and happiness, they saw squandered by the Dominican friars in drunkenness, gaming, and low debauchery, and all began to wish that some check were given to this commerce, no less detrimental to society than destructive to religion"

(Robertson, p. 126). Indeed, even the princes and nobles objected to this traffic; they were irritated at seeing their vassals drained of so much wealth in order to replenish the treasury of a profuse pontiff, and when Luther's warm and impetuous temper did not suffer him any longer to conceal his aversion to the unscriptural doctrine of the Thomists, or to continue a silent spectator of the delusion of his country, from the pulpit in the great church of Wittenberg he inveighed bitterly against the false opinions, as well as the wicked lives, of the preachers of indulgences (see Löscher's *Reformationsakten*, 1:729). "Indignation against Roman imposture increased; universal attention and sympathy were directed towards the bold champion of the truth" (Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* [Harper's edit.] 4:33). On Oct. 31, 1517, finally, to gain also the suffrage of men of learning, Luther published ninety-five theses against the traffic in indulgences, setting forth his objections to this abuse of ecclesiastical power. Not that he supposed these points fully established or of undoubted certainty, but he advanced them as the result of his own investigation, and as subjects of inquiry and disputation unto others, that he might be corrected if his position could be impugned. He sent them to the neighboring bishops with a petition for the abolition of the evil if his views were found to be well grounded, and appointed a day on which the learned churchmen might publicly dispute the point at issue, either in person or by writing; subjoining to them, however, solemn protestations of his high respect for the apostolic see, and of his implicit submission to its authority. Many zealous champions immediately arose to defend opinions on which the wealth and power of the Church were founded; in especial manner the opposition of the Dominicans (q.v.) was roused, for the spirit of this order had become peculiarly sensitive on account of some recent humiliations, particularly by the fate of Savonarola (q.v.), the events at Berne, and by the still surviving controversy with l'euchlin (q.v.), aside from the fact that the different mendicant orders cherished constant jealousy against each other. (The conjecture of some that the jealousy of the Augustine monk was apparent in Luther's attack on Tetzel because to the Dominicans had been entrusted the indulgence traffic is too ridiculous to need repetition here. Comp. however, Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 4:25, note 17; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* bk. 4, cent. 16, sec. 1, ch. 2, note 18.) In opposition to Luther's theses, Tetzel himself came forward with counter theses, which he published at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Prominent among others also were Eck (q.v.), the celebrated Augsburg divine, and Prierias (q.v.), the inquisitor general, who both replied to the Augustine monk with all the virulence of scholastic disputants. "But the

manner in which they conducted the controversy did little service to their cause. Luther attempted to combat indulgences by arguments founded in reason or derived from the Scriptures; they produced nothing in support of them but the sentiments of the schoolmen, and the conclusions of the canon law, and the decrees of popes. The decision of judges so partial and interested did not satisfy the people, who began to call into question even the authority of these venerable guides when they found them standing in direct opposition to the dictates of reason and the determination of the divine law” (Robertson, p. 128). *SEE LUTHER; SEE REFORMATION.*

At Rome these controversies, though they had become a matter of interest to all the German people, were looked upon with great indifference. Leo judged it simply a wrangling of two mendicant orders, and he was determined to let the Augustinians and Dominicans settle their own quarrels. The adversaries of Luther, however, feared for their cause, and they saw no other way by which to secure anew peace to themselves, and the respect of the people, than by a wholesale slaughter of the Reformer and his friends. The solicitations of the Dominicans at the Vatican became daily more frequent and urgent; and when at last it became necessary for Leo to take some decided action, he simply commissioned his cardinal legate Cajetan (q.v.) to bring the Augustinian friar to his senses, and Luther was summoned to and promptly appeared at the Diet of Augsburg, in October, 1518. If Leo ever committed a blunder, it was done in this instance by appointing to the task of converting Luther a monastic of the very order he had so seriously attacked for its complicity in the indulgence traffic. If Luther was ever so much inclined to yield, a Dominican was certainly not the proper agent to accomplish such a purpose. Cajetan, moreover, treated Luther rather imperiously, and peremptorily required him to confess his errors, before the least attempt had been made to reply to his arguments, and of course our Augustinian, high-spirited as he was, turned away in disgust, and appealed *a papa non bene informato ad melius informandum*; and afterwards, when the whole doctrine of indulgence, as it had been developed up to the present time, was confirmed by a papal bull, the new heretic appealed from the pope to a general council (at Wittenberg, Nov. 28, 1518). By this time, however, the strife had assumed more gigantic proportions; around Luther were now gathered the great, and the strong, and the learned of the Teutonic race. A special helpmeet he had found in his colleagues of the lately founded high school of learning at Wittenberg; and as in the 13th century from Oxford and Prague had

proceeded the action against the Latin system, so it now proceeded from Wittenberg, until it terminated in the Reformation. When too late, the Roman court realized the mistake it had committed in entrusting Cajetan with the settlement of this difficulty, and another legate, the pope's own chamberlain, Charles of Miltitz (q.v.), was dispatched in December (1518) to give assurances to the electoral prince Frederick, by the valuable present of the consecrated golden rose (q.v.), of the good intentions of pope Leo towards Saxony, and at the same time, if possible, to conciliate Luther, in whom was now seen the representative of Wittenberg University, and at whose back stood one to whom even his enemies confess but few men of any age can be compared, either for learning and knowledge of both human and divine things, or for richness, suavity, and facility of genius, or for industry as a scholar — Philip Melancthon (q.v.). Unfortunately for the cause of the Dominicans, this very elector of Saxony, who had identified himself with and become the champion of the cause of the Wittenberg reform movement, was now, upon the death of Maximilian I, made regent of the empire in northern Germany (Jan. 12, 1519), and Miltitz saw only one way in which to settle the controversy—by appeasing the wrath of Luther. He accordingly flattered “the friar of Wittenberg,” as he was contemptuously called at Rome, by all manner of kindness, assured him that his case had been misrepresented to Leo, and actually succeeded in inducing Luther to promise, not, indeed, recantation, as he desired, but a promise to be silent if his opponents were silent, and an open declaration of obedience to the see of Rome: thus the whole matter apparently had reached its end. The opponents, however, were not silent; the controversy was renewed with greater animosity than before. *SEE CARLSTADT; SEE ECK; SEE LEIPSIC DISPUTATION*. Luther was forced to reply; the primacy of the pope and other questions became involved, which obliged additional research and study on the part of the reformers, and “in this way Luther gained so thorough an insight into the errors and corruption of the Roman Church that he gradually began to see the necessity of separating himself from it. He felt himself called as a soldier of God to fight against the wiles and deceit of the devil, by which the Church was corrupted” (Gieseler, 4:42). This he did hereafter, fearless of consequences, by both his pen and tongue. Luther's was a nature that recoiled from no extremity. The result was “the bull of condemnation,” issued June 15, 1520, which brought about the formal abjuration of the papacy on the part of Luther by the public burning of the bull, together with the papal law-books, Dec. 10 of this very year. January 3, 1521, came the bull of excommunication, and

a demand for its execution by the Diet of Worms, the body to which Luther appealed. *SEE REFORMATION.*

While these religious disputes were carried on with great warmth in Germany, and threatened the very existence of Romanism, pope Leo was much more concerned with what occurred around him in Italy. A politician of the best sort in the affairs of his native country, ever solicitous for its welfare, he saw greater danger calling for prompter action on the political horizon than any that had yet appeared, in his estimation, on that of ecclesiasticism. Leo, indeed, trembled for Florence at the prospect of beholding the imperial crown placed on the head of the king of Spain and of Naples, and the master of the New World; nor was he less afraid of seeing the king of France, who was the duke of Milan and lord of Genoa, exalted to that dignity. He even foretold that the election of either of them would be fatal to the independence of the holy see, to the peace of Italy, and perhaps to the liberties of Europe. But June 28, 1519, the king of Spain was elected successor to Maximilian. This was, indeed, an event calculated to cause a series of infinite perplexities to God's vicegerent on earth. So the important decision was taken, a secret league, offensive and defensive, signed with the new Caesar on July 8, 1521, by which it was stipulated that the duchy of Milan was to be taken from the French and given to Francesco Maria Sforza, and Parma and Piacenza to be restored to the pope. Leo subsidized a body of Swiss, and Prospero Colonna, with the Spaniards from Naples, joined the papal forces at Bologna, crossed the Po at Casalmaggiore, joined the Swiss, and drove the French governor Lautrec out of Milan. In a short time the duchy of Milan was once more clear of the French, and restored to the dominion of Sforza. Parma and Piacenza were again occupied by the papal troops. At the same time Leo declared Alfonso d'Este, a rebel to the holy see for having sided with the French, while the duke, on his part, complained of the bad faith of the pope in keeping possession of Modena and Reggio. The news of the taking of Milan was celebrated at Rome with public rejoicings, but in the midst of all this Leo fell ill on Nov. 25, and died Dec. 1, 1521, not without reasonable suspicion of poison, though some have maintained that he died a natural death. (See Trollope, *Hist. of Florence*, 4:385 sq., who quotes strong proof in favor of the assertion that Leo X died of poison.)

Personally Leo was generous, or rather prodigal; he was fond of splendor, luxury, and magnificence, and therefore often in want of money, which he was obliged to raise by means not often creditable. He had a discerning

taste, was a ready patron of real merit, was fond of wit and humor, not always refined, and at times degenerating into buffoonery: this was, indeed, one of his principal faults. His state policy was like that of his contemporaries in general, and not so bad as that of some of them. He contrived, however, to keep Rome and the papal territory, as well as Florence, in profound peace during his reign — no trifling boon — while all the rest of Italy was ravaged by French, and Germans, and Spaniards, who committed all kinds of atrocities. He was by no means neglectful of his temporal duties, although he was fond of conviviality and ease, and many charges have been brought against his morals. He did not, and perhaps could not, enforce a strict discipline among the clergy or the people of Rome, where profligacy and licentiousness had reigned almost uncontrolled ever since the pontificate of Alexander VI. It is to be regretted, however, that any one should have been able to say of a pope so distinguished as a patron of learning as Leo X that in his splendid and luxuriant palace Christianity had given place, both in its religious and moral influence, to the revived philosophy and the unregulated manners of Greece; that the Vatican was visited less for the purpose of worshipping the footsteps of the apostles than to admire the great works of ancient art stored in the papal palace (comp. *London Quart. Rev.* 1836, p. 294 sq.; Taine, *Italy* [Rome and Naples], p. 185). As a pontificate, that of Leo X, though it lasted only nine years, “forms one of the most memorable epochs in the history of modern Europe, whether we consider it in a political light as a period of transition for Italy, when the power of Charles V of Spain began to establish itself in that country, or whether we look upon it as that period in the history of the Western Church which was marked by the momentous event of Luther’s Reformation. But there is a third and a more favorable aspect under which the reign of Leo ought to be viewed, as a flourishing epoch for learning and the arts, which were encouraged by that pontiff, as they had been by his father, and, indeed, as they have been by his family in general, and for which the glorious appellation of the age of Leo X has been given to the first part of the 16th century” (*Engl. Cyclop.*). The services which Leo rendered to literature are many. He encouraged the study of Greek, founded a Greek college at Rome, established a Greek press, and gave the direction of it to John Lascaris; he restored the Roman University, and filled its numerous chairs with professors; he directed the collecting of MSS. of the classics, and also of Oriental writers, as well as the searching after antiquities; and by his example encouraged others, and among them the wealthy merchant Chigi, to the same, he patronized men

of talent, of whom a galaxy gathered round him at Rome. He corresponded with Erasmus, Machiavelli, Ariosto, and other great men of his time. He restored the celebrated library of his family, which, on the expulsion of the Medici, had been plundered and dispersed, and which is known by the name of the Biblioteca Laurenziana at Florence. In short, Leo X, if not the most exemplary among popes, was certainly one of the most illustrious and meritorious of Italian princes. See Guicciardini, *Storia d'Italia*; Roscoe, *Life and Pontificate of Leo X* (Lond. 1805, 4 vols. 4to); Farroni, *Vita Leonis X* (1797) Audin, *Leon X* (1844); Giovio, *Vita Leonis X* (1651); Artaud de Montor, *Histoire des Souverains papes*, vol. 4. For the bulls and speeches of pope Leo X, see Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina Medaica et Infirme E Statis*; Sismondi, *Hist. des Republiques Italiennes*; Ranke, *Hist. of the Papacy*, vol. 1, ch. 2; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 32:491 sq.; 34:83, 91; and his *Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref.* 1:76 sq., 314 sq.; 3:207 sq., 211 sq.; Raumer, *Gesch. der Padoalogik*, 1:54 sq.; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 7:400 sq.; Trollope, *History of Flaorence* (Lond. 1865, 4 vols. 8vo), especially vol. 4, book 10; Leo, *Gesch. Italiens*, vol. 5, ch. 3. (J. H. W.)

Leo XI

Pope (*Alessandro de Medici*), a descendant of the house of the Medici, was born at Florence in 1535. After representing Tuscany for some years at the court of pope Pius V, he was made bishop of Pistoia in 1573, and archbishop of Florence in 1574. Made cardinal in 1583, he was sent by his predecessor, Ckment VIII, legate a *latere* to France to receive Henry IV into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. He was very old when elected, on the 1st of April, 1605, by the utmost exertions of the French, against the wishes of the Spanish. He died on the 27th of the same month, it is said. from the fatigue attending the ceremony of taking possession of the patriarchal church of St. John the Lateran. See Artaud de Montor, *Histoire des Sourerains Pontifs*; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 7:476; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:725; *Engl. Cyclop. s.v.*

Leo XII

Pope (cardinal *Annibale della Genga*), was born in the district of Spolcto in 1760, of a noble family of the Romagna; was made archbishop of Tyre in 1793, and was later employed as nuncio to Germany and France by Pius VII, who made him a cardinal in 1816. On the death of this pontiff he was elected pope, in September, 1823. He was well acquainted with diplomacy

and foreign politics, and in the exercise of his authority, and in asserting the claims of his see, he assumed a more imperious tone than his meek and benevolent predecessor. He re-established the right of asylum for criminals in the churches, and enforced the strict observance of fast days. He was a declared enemy of the Carbonari and other secret societies. He proclaimed a jubilee for the year 1825; and in his circular letter accompanying the bull, addressed to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops, he made a violent attack on the Bible Societies, as acting in opposition to the decree of the Council of Trent (session 4) concerning the publication and use of the sacred books. Leo also entered into negotiations with the newstates of South America for the sake of filling up thevacant sees. He gave a new organization to the university of the Sapienza at Rome, which consists of fivecolleges or faculties, viz., theology, law, medicine, philosophy, and philology; and he increased the number of the professors, and raised their emoluments. He published in October, 1824, a *Moto Proprio*, or decree, reforming the administration of the papal state, and also the administration of justice, or *Procedura Civile*, and: he fixed the fees to be paid by the litigant parties. He corrected several abuses, and studied to maintain order. and a good police in his territories. He died February 10, 1829, and was succeeded by Pius VIII. See *Engl. Cyclop. s. 5.*; Rudoni, *Leone XII e Pio VIII* (1829);. Schmid, *Trauerre de of Leo XII* (1829); Artaud de Montor, *Histoire clu pape Leon XII* (1843, 2 vols. 8vo); Wiseman, *Recollections of the last four Popes* (see Index).

Leodegar

a saint (in French *St. Leger*), was born about 616. He was educated by his uncle (some say his grandfather), the bishop of Poitiers, who made him archdeacon. Leodegar was afterwards called to the court as adviser of Bathilde, and tutor of her young son Chotaire. In 659 he was appointed bishop of Autun. That diocese was then in a rather dilapidated condition, and Leodegar applied himself at once to its restoration. He supported the poor, instructed the clergy and the people, decorated and enriched the churches, and reformed the morals of convents by introducing the rule of St. Benedict, for which purpose he held a synod at the end of 670. He was also instrumental in securing to Childeric II, of Austrasia, the western part of France in 670; but the fickle monarch did not long consent to be ruled by his advice, and Leodegar was finally disposed of by public execution after Chikleric's death, being accused of complicity in his murder, in 678. His death is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church Oct. 2.

Leon Da Modena (Ben-Isaac Ben-Mordecai),

also called *Jehudah Arje Modanese*, one of the most celebrated Italian rabbis, the Jewish John Knox of the 16th century in Italy, was born in Venice April 23, 1571, of an ancient and literary family, originally from France. Leon displayed his talents and extraordinary intellectual endowments at a most tender age. The Sabbatic lesson, *SEE HAPHTARAH*, it is said, he read before the whole congregation in the synagogue when he was only two and a half years old, and he began to preach (ִּצְרָד) when he had scarce reached the age of ten. At thirteen Leon came before the public with a treatise against gambling with dice and cards (entitled [רִימ רִוּס, first published in 1596, and reprinted in French, Latin, and German), and thus active, and retaining all the vigor and elasticity of youth, he remained through life, though- subjected to great suffering by the great misfortune of passing his days by the side of an insane wife, and by following his promising sons to an early grave. With a genius so fertile, and a mind so swell endowed, coupled with a thirst for learning and devotedness to Biblical literature and exegesis, master of the Latin, Italian, and Hebrew, he surveyed the whole theological and philosophical field with ease, and became the author of numerous poetical, liturgical, ethical, doctrinal, polemical, and exegetical works. Unfortunately, however, for Leon Modena, he was fickle in mind, and both to adhere long to one opinion, in consequence of which we find him today the decided exponent of Mosaism, tomorrow the staunch defender of Rabbinism, the next day in favor of a total abrogation of the whole ceremonial law, and perhaps on the day following an apologist for Christianity, because, as he expressed it, Judaism formed its base. Both the orthodox and liberal Jews claim Leon as the exponent of their doctrines; but we think that justly he can be claimed only by the Reformed Jewish Church, for his masterpiece is, after all, the *Kol Sakol* (לִּכְסֵל וְקוֹל), the existence of which was long known, but it was only in the present century that the MS. was discovered in the library of the duke of Parma. It was then drawn from its hiding-place, and was published under the supervision of the late rabbi Reggio in *hl bqh tnyj b* (Gorz, 1852); an English translation appeared in *The Jewish Times* (New York), in the last numbers of 1871. This work contains a concise and terse exposition of the religious philosophy of Judaism, and of the ideas embodied in the various ceremonial practices, and is written from a most liberal stand-point. He also wrote

dbd ḥb, a treatise on Metempsychosis, in which he takes ground against the Cabalists (published in **μynq μ[r**, p. 61 sq.): — *Hebrew and Italian Dictionary*, called **hdwhy twl g** (“The Captivity of Judah”), or **rbd rçp** (“Explanation of Words”), in which he explains in Italian all the difficult expressions in the Hebrew Bible, and which is preceded by grammatical rules (Venice, 1612; Padua, 1640; also printed in the margin of the Hebrew Bibles published for the use of the Italian Jews, following the order of the canonical books): — *Rabbiical and Italian Vocabulary*, called **hyra yp** (“The Lion’s Mouth”), of which the Italian title is *Raccolta delle voci Rabin. non Hebr. ne Chald.*, etc. (Padua, 1640; appended to the preceding work; afterwards printed separately in Venice, 1648): — A polemical treatise against the Cabalists, whom he despised and derided, on the genuineness of their interpretation of the Pentateuch (*Sochr*), entitled **yra rps μhwn** (edited by Dr. Fürst, Leipzig, 1840): — *Historia dei Riti Hebraici ed osservanza degli Hebrei di questi tempi*, or the history of the rites, customs, and manner of life of the Jews, consisting of thirteen chapters, and written in Italian (Paris, 1637; in a revised form, Venice, 1638). This celebrated and most useful manual was translated into English by Edmund Chilmead (Lond. 1650); and also edited by Simon Ocklev, under the title *History of the present Jews throughout the World* (London, 1707), in Picard’s *Ceremonies and Religious Customs of the various Nations of the known World*, vol. 1 (London, 1733); into French by father Simon, who prefaced it with an elaborate account of the Karaites and Samaritans (Par. 1674); into Dutch (Amsterd. 1683), and into Latin by Grosgebauer, *Historia rituum Judaeorum* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1693): — *Commentary on the Books of Samuel*: — *Commentary on the five Megilloth*, i.e. the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther: — *Commentary on the Psalms*: — *Commentary on Proverbs*: — *Commentary on the Sabbatic Lessons*: — and a polemical work against Christianity, entitled **brj w ḡm**; but several of these works have not as yet been published. Leo died in Venice, where he was chief rabbi, in 1648. See his autobiography, entitled **hdyhy yyh**, extant only in MS., from which extracts were made by Carmoly. *Rev. Orientale* (1842), p. 49 sq., and Reggio, **hl bqh tnyj b.** (1852); Fürst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 2:383 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Fibl. Bodleiana*, col. 1345-56; *Der Israelitische Volkslehrer* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1854), 4:91 sq., 186 sq., 247 sq.; 1855, v. 396 sq.; Geiger, in Liebermann’s *Volkskalender-*

Jahrbuch, 1856; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:141 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. 2, s.v.

Leon Or Leone, Jacob Jehudah

a Jewish writer of note, who was born, of Moorish descent, in 1614, in Holland, and flourished first at Middelburg and later at Amsterdam, is noted as a writer on the Temple model (compare *Retrato del Templo*, Middelb. 1642, or Hebrew *l kyh tynbt*, Amst. 1650), and as an illustrator of the Talmudical writings. He also figured prominently as a polemical writer, contending for the inspiration of the O.T. writings, while he ruthlessly attacked the Gospel doctrines. He is now generally supposed to have been the author of *Colloquium Middelburgense* (attributed by Fabricius to Manasse ben-Israel), and of *Con dijierentes theologos de lac Christianid. ad*. Leon died after 1671. See Gratz. *Gesch. d. Juden*, 10:24 sq., 200 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2:232 sq.

Leon, Luis Ponce de

a Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Belmonte, in the south of Spain, in 1527 (according to the *Tesoro de los Prosadores Espanoles por Ochod* [Paris, 1841], at Granada; and according to St. Antonio and Ticknor at Belmnonte in 1528). He studied at Salamanca, entered in 1543 the order of the Augustines, and was thereafter known under the name of Luis de Leon. Having been received D.D., he was in 1561 appointed to a professorship at St. Thomas. His knowledge and success created him many enemies, at the head of whom were the Dominicans of Granada. Accused of heresy and of having translated parts of the Bible into the vernacular, contrary to the orders of the Sanctum Officium, he was in 1572 imprisoned in the dungeon of the Inquisition at Valladolid, and appeared over fifty times before the high court. His defense, which is extant, contains 200 closely-written pages in the purest Castilian. Although unable to prove anything against him, his judges condemned him to the rack; but this sentence was reversed by the Inquisitorial high court of Madrid, and he was liberated with the advice of being more careful in future. In 1578 he returned to his convent and resumed his office. He thereafter devoted himself exclusively to theology and to the duties of his order; but his health never recovered entirely from the shock it had undergone while in the prisons of the Inquisition. He became general and provincial vicar of his order in Salamanca, and died in 1591. His principal writings are poems in Latin and in Spanish; the latter

are distinguished for beauty of language and purity of style. His original pieces have been published, with a German translation, by C. B. Schliiter and W. Storck (Münster, 1853). His whole works, consisting of the above, together with translations from the classics, the Psalms, and parts of the book of Job, were collected and published (Madrid, 1804-16, 6 vols.). See Quevedo, *Vita de L. de L.* (Madrid, 1631); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s.v.

Leonard, St.,

a French nobleman who flourished in the first half of the 6th century, was a convert and pupil of Remigius. He retired at first into a convent near Orleans, and afterwards into a hermitage in the neighborhood of Limoges. Here he applied himself to the conversion of the people. A few followers soon gathered around him. and he founded the convent of Noblac. He took special interest in prisoners, and the legend relates that centuries after his death prisoners were released and captives brought back from distant countries through his intercession. His prayers are said to have saved the life of the queen of France in a dangerous confinement, and he became also the protector of travelers. He died in 559, and is commemorated on the 6th of November. He is especially recognized in France and in England. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:332; Migne, *Nouv. Encyc. Theolog.* 2:1168. (J. N. P.)

Leonard, Abiel

S.T.D., an army chaplain and Congregational minister, was born at Plymouth, Mass., Nov. 5, 1740; graduated at Harvard College in 1759; and was ordained pastor of the original Church in Woodstock, Conn., in 1763. In 1775 he was appointed chaplain in the Revolutionary army, and was in the service of his country until 1778. when he went home on a furlough to see his sick child. Having remained longer than the appointed time, he found, upon his return, that he was superseded, which news so affected him that he put an end to his life in the western part of Connecticut, Aug. 14, 1778. Dr. Leonard was an elegant speaker, and published two sermons. See *Cong. Quar.* 1861. p. 350.

Leonard, George

(1), a Congregational, and subsequently an Episcopal, minister, was born in Middleborough, Mass., April 6, 1783; graduated at Dartmouth College in

1805; studied with Dr. Perkins, of West Hartford; and was ordained over the Church in Canterbury, Conn., in 1808. After two years he was dismissed, and preached in various places in Massachusetts. In 1817 he was ordained a deacon in the Episcopal Church by bishop Griswold; admitted to priest's orders the following year at Marblehead; and was rector of Trinity Church, Cornish, N. H., and of St. Paul's, Windsor, Vt., until his death, which took place at the house of his sister in Salisbury, N. H., June 28, 1834. "Disinterested and judicious counsellor, open-hearted and honest man, and a sincere Christian." Several of his sermons were published. See *Cong. Quar.* 1859, p. 354.

Leonard, George

(2), a Baptist minister, was born in Ratynham, Bristol Co., Mass., Aug. 17, 1802; entered Brown University in September, 1820; graduated in 1824; and after being for some time a subordinate instructor in the Columbia College at Washington, went to the Newton Theological Institution to study theology. In August, 1826, he was ordained pastor of the Second Baptist Church of Salem, Mass., and while there filled also the office of secretary of the Salem Bible Translation and Foreign Mission Society; but his health compelled him to resign that position in 1829. Having somewhat recovered, he became pastor of the Church in Portland, Me., in October, 1830. Here he labored faithfully and successfully until his death, Aug. 11, 1831. He wrote a *Dissertuation on the Duty of Churches in reverence to Temperance* (published in the *Christian Watchman*, 1829). The year after his death (1832), a small volume containing twelve of his *Sermones*, together with the sermon delivered on the occasion of his death by the Rev. Dr. Babcock, was published under the direction of his widow. — Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6:729.

Leonard, Josiah

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Kingsborough, N. Y., April 15, 1816. He graduated from Union College in 1837, and finished his theological course in Union Seminary. He was ordained to the ministry in 1840, and was pastor of the following churches successively: Mexicoville, N. Y., 1840-4; Oswego, 1842-45; Dellii. 1845-48; Fulton, Ill., 1856-71. In 1872 he became stated supply at Clinton, Ia., where he died, Feb. 22, 1880. (W. P. S.)

Leonard, Levi Washburn

D.D., a Congregational minister, was born at S. Bridgewater, Mass., June 1, 1790, and was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1805. He then studied theology at Cambridge, and Sept. 6, 1820, became pastor at Dublin, N. H., where he continued until 1854. He died at Exeter Dec. 12, 1864. He published several school-books and other works of general interest only. — Drake, *Dict. of American Biography*, s.v.; Appleton, *Amer. Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1864, p. 623.

Leonard, Zenas Lockwood

a Baptist preacher, was born at Bridgewater, Mass., January 16, 1773. In June, 1790, he was converted, and shortly after joined the church in Middleborough. In May, 1792, he entered the sophomore class of Brown University, and graduated with honor in 1794. On leaving college he commenced a course of theological study with Rev. W. Williams, of Wrentham, Mass. In 1796 he was ordained pastor of the Baptist church in Sturbridge, Mass. The next year he opened a grammar-school, which he continued for several years. Mr. Leonard was active in procuring a division of the Warren, R. I., Baptist Association, Nov. 3, 1801, and the formation of the Sturbridge Association, Sept. 30, 1802. He was particularly active in promoting prominent benevolent objects, especially the Sabbath-school, the temperance cause, African colonization, and missions. On Oct. 13, 1832, he was, by his own request, dismissed from the charge of his congregation. For six terms he represented his district in the councils of the state. Mr. Leonard manifested supreme deference to the authority, truth, and spirit of the Gospel; stability of purpose; uncompromising advocacy of the cause of freedom, righteousness, and public virtue; and unwearied activity in performing the various duties of his profession. His piety was of steady progress, ripening continually until his death. He died June 24, 1841. The only printed productions of his pen, with the exception of contributions to various periodicals, are the *Circular Letters to the Association* for the years 1802, 1810, 1822, and 1825. Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6:347 sq.

LEONARDO, DA PORTO MAURIZIO,

a noted missionary priest and the founder of the Brotherhood of the Heart of Jesus, was born in Liguria in 1676. While yet a youth he became a pupil of the Jesuits, and a member of the Order of the Reformed Franciscans. He

was especially active in promoting the doctrine of the immaculate conception. He died about the middle of the 18th century, and was sainted by Pius VI in 1796.

Leonardo Da Vinci.

SEE VINOI.

Leonardoni, Francesco,

an Italian painter, was born at Venice in 1654; visited Spain and settled at Madrid; gained great eminence as a portrait-painter; executed several historical works for the churches, characterized by a grand style of design; and died at Madrid in 1711. Among his principal works are a large altarpiece of the *Incarnation*, in the Church of San Gerónimo el Real, at Madrid: — and two subjects from the *Life of St. Joseph*, in the Church of the Colegio de Atocha. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts*, s.v.

Leonbruno, Lorenzo,

an Italian painter, was born at Mantua in 1489; studied under count Castiglione, the friend of Raphael; appointed painter to the duke of Mantua; gave offense to Giulio Romano, in consequence of which he was obliged to quit Mantua; settled at Milan, and died there about 1537. Three of his pictures at Mantua are very highly praised, viz., *St. Jerome*: — *The Metamorphosis of Midas*: — and *The Body of Christ in the Arms of the Virgin*. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of Fine Arts*, s.v.

Leonidas

father of the celebrated Origen, was a Christian martyr of the 3d century. Previous to his execution, his son, in order to encourage him, wrote to him as follows: "Beware that your care for us does not make you change your resolution!" The father accepted the heroic exhortation of the son, and yielded his neck joyfully to the stroke of the executioner. — Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, p. 23.

Leonista

is the name by which the *Waldenses* are sometimes referred to, and is derived from Leona (Lyons).

Leontes

an important river of northern Palestine, doubtless the present *Litany*, which bursts in a deep chasm through the Lebanon range (Robinson, *Res.* 3:409 sq.; Ritter, *Erdk.* 17:48 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.). For a description, *SEE LEBANON*.

Leontius

a Christian martyr and saint, probably of Arabian origin, was born at Vicentia, in Venetia, in the 3d century after Christ. He afterwards moved to Aquileia, in Venetia, where, in company with St. Carpophorus, who was either his brother or intimate friend, he distinguished himself by zeal in favor of Christianity. For this offense they were both brought before the governor Lysias, and after being tortured in various modes, and, according to the legend, miraculously delivered, they were at last beheaded, probably A.D. 300. Their memory is celebrated by the Romish Church on Aug. 28. See the *Acta Sanctorum* (in Aug. 20), where several difficulties are critically discussed at length. — Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Leontius Of Antioch,

a learned Syrian theologian of the early Church, was born in Phrygia about the close of the 3d or the opening of the 4th century. He was a disciple of the martyr Lucianus, and, having entered the Church, was ordained a presbyter. In order to enjoy without scandal the society of a young female, Eustolia or Eustolia, to whom he was much attached, he mutilated himself, but, notwithstanding, did not escape suspicion, and was finally deposed from his office. On the deposition, however, of Stephanus, or Stephen, bishop of Antioch, he was, by the favor of the emperor Constantius and the predominant Arian party, appointed to that see about 348 or 349. Leontius died about A.D. 358. Of his writings, which were numerous, nothing remains except a fragment of what Cave describes, we know not on what authority, as *Oratio in Passionem S. Babylae* (cited in the *Paschal Chronicle*, in the notice of the Decian persecution). In this fragment it is distinctly asserted that both the emperor Philip and his wife were avowed Christians (Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:26; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:20; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:10, 24; Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:15, 17, 18; Athanasius, *Apolog. de Fuga suat*, 100:26; *Hist. Ariatnor. ad Monachos*, 100:28; *Chron. Pasch.* 1:270, 289, ed. Paris; p.

216, 231. ed. Venice; p. 503, 535, ed. Bonn; Cave, *Hist. Literaria*, 1:211, ed. Oxon. 1740-43; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, 8:324). — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Romans Biog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Leontius Of Arabissus,

in Cappadocia, of which town he was bishop, flourished as an ecclesiastical writer. The period in which he lived, however, is quite uncertain. Photius has noticed two of his works: 1. *Εἰς τὴν κτίσιν λόγος* (*Sermo de Creatione*), and, 2. *Εἰς τὸν Λάζαρον* (*De Lazaro*), and gives extracts from both these works (Photius, *Cod.* 272). See also Cave, *Hist. Liter.* 1:551; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 8:324; 10:268, 771. Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Leontius Of Arelate,

or ARLES, was bishop of that city about the middle of the 5th century. Several letters were written to him by pope Hilarius, A.D. 461-467, which are given in the *Concilia*, and a letter of Leontius to the pope, dated A.D. 462, is also given in the *Concilia* and in D'Achery's *Spicilegium* (v. 578 of the original edition, or 3:302 in the edition of De la Barre, Paris, 1723, folio). Leontius presided in a council at Aries, held A.D. 475, to condemn an error into which some had fallen respecting the doctrine of predestination. He appears to have died in A.D. 484. He is mentioned by Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* 7:6). See *Concil.* 4, col. 1039, 1041, 1044 (1828, ed. Labbe); Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1:449; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 8:324; 12:653; *Bibl. Med. et Infim. Latinitatis*, v. 268 (ed. Mansi); Tillemont, *Memoires*, 16:38. — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* vol. 2, s.v.

Leontius Of Byzantium

(1), an ecclesiastical writer of the latter part of the 6th and commencement of the 7th century, is sometimes designated, from his original profession, *Scholasticus*, i.e. pleader. As there are several works of that period which bear the name of Leontius, distinguished by various surnames, it is sometimes doubtful to whom they should be assigned. According to Oudin, Leontius flourished as an inmate of the monastery which had been founded by St. Saba near Jerusalem, and was for a time its abbot (*De Scriptor. Eccles.* 1, col. 1462, etc.). Cave, confounding two different persons bearing this name, places our Leontius in the reign of Justinian, but from one of the works with which he is credited it is evident that he flourished

half a century later. The works which appear to be by our Leontius are as follows:

1. **Σχόλια** (*Scholias*), taken down from the lips of Theodorus (first published with Latin version by Leunclavius, and commonly cited by the title *De Sectis* in a volume containing several other pieces [Basle, 1578, 8vo], and reprinted in the *Auctarium Bibliothecae Patrum* of Ducaeus, vol. 1 [Paris, 1624, folio], in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. 9 [Paris, 1644, fol.], and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, 12:625, etc. [Venice, 1728, folio]. The Latin version alone is given in several other editions of the *Biblioth. Patrum*).
2. *Contra Eutychianos et Nestorianos Libri tres, s. confutatio utriusque Fictionis inter se contrarice*. Some inaccurately speak of the three books into which this work is divided as distinct works.
3. *Liber adversuzs eos qui proferunt nobis qucedamn Apollinariii, falso inscriptal nomine Sanctonrum Patrum, s. adversus Fraudes Apollinaristarum*.
4. *Solutiones Argumentationzum Severi*.
5. *Dubitationes hypotheticae et definientes contra eos qui negant in Christo post Unionem duas veras Naturas*. These pieces have not been printed in the original, but in a Latin version from the papers of Franciscus Turrianus (published by Canisius in his *Lectiones Antiquae*, vol. 4, or 2:525, etc., ed. Basnage, and reprinted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. 9 [Lyons, 1677, folio], and in the above-mentioned volume of Galland).
6. *Apologia Concilii Chalcedonensis* (printed, with a Latin version and notes, by Antonio Bougivianni, in the *Concilia*, 7:799, ed. Mansi [Florence, 1762, folio], and reprinted by Galland, 1. c.). In the title of this work Leontius is called *Monachus Hierosolymitanus*, but the word Hierosolymitanus is possibly an error of the transcriber. At any rate, Galland identifies the writer with our Leontius, and the subject of the work makes it probable that he is right.
7. *Adversus Eutychianus (s. Severianos) et Nestorianos in octo libros distincturn* (described by Canisius as being extant in MS. at Munich, and by Fabricius as occurring in the catalogue of the Palatine library).

8. *Liber de Duplici Naturat in Christo contra Haeresin Monophysitarum* (Labbe and Cave speak of this as extant in MS. at Vienna, and they add to it *Disputatio contra Philosolhum Arianum*: this, however, seems to be an extract from Gelasius of Cyzicus), which probably is one of the discussions between the “holy bishops” of the orthodox party and the “philosophers” who embraced the opposite side, and the Leontius who took a part in it was a bishop of the Cappadocian Caesarea, and contemporary of Athanasilus.

9. According to Nicephorus Callistus (*II. E. 18:43*), our Leontius wrote also “an admirable work,” in thirty books, unfortunately lost, in which he overthrew the tritheistic heresy of John the Laborious, and firmly established the orthodox doctrine. Cave also ascribes to our Leontius *Oratio in medium Pentecostem et in Csecumz a Nacstivitate, necnon in illud: Nolite judicare secundum fietceiem* (published by Combefis, with a Latin version, in his *Auctarium Novurn*, vol. 1 [Paris, 1648, fol.]). It is so given by the editors of the *Biblioth. Latrum*, vol. 9 (Lyons, 1671, folio), but Fabricius (*Bibl. Graeca*, 8:321) ascribes the homily to Leontius of Neapolis, while Galland omits it altogether. A homily on the parable of the good Samaritan, printed among the supposititious works of Chrysostom (*Opera*, 7:506, ed. Savill), seems also to be a production of our Leontius. There are various homilies extant in MS. by “Leontius presbyter Constantinopolitanus.” See Canisius, *Vita Leontii in Biblioth. Patrum*, vol. 9 (Lyons, 1677, fol.), and *Lectons Antiquae*, 1:527, etc., ed. Basnage; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1:543; Vossius, *De Historicis Graecis Liber*, 4, 100:18; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca, Graeca*, 8:309, etc., 318; 12:648; Oudin, *De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles.* 1, col. 1462; Mansi, *Concil.* 7, col. 797, etc.; Galland, *Bibl. Patrum*, 12, *Prolegom.* 100:20. — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog.* 2:756 sq.

Leontius Of Byzantium

(2), the author of a part of the **Χρονογραφία**, lived in the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. A second portion, bringing the work down to the second year of Romanus, son and successor of Porphyrogenitus, and probably only reaching or designed to reach a later period, is an addition by another hand. In fact, the work which is entitled **Χρονογραφία**, *Chronographia*, is composed of three parts, by three distinct writers:

- (1.) The history of the emperor Leo V, the Armeniar, Michael It of Aurorium, Theophilus, the son of Michael, and Michael III and Theodora, the son and widow of Theophilus; by the so-called Leontius, from the materials supplied by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.
- (2.) The life of Basil the Macedonian, by Constantine himself (though Labbe and Cave would assign this also to Leontius); and
- (3.) The lives of Leo VI and Alexander, the sons of Basil, and of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and the commencement of the reign of Romanus II; by an unknown later hand. This third part is more succinct than the former parts, and is in a great degree borrowed, with little variation, from known and existing sources. The first edition of the *Chronographia* prepared for publication with a Latin version was by Combefis, and was published in the Paris edition of the Byzantine historians, forming a part of the volume entitled *Οἱ μετὰ Θεοφάνη, Scriptorum post Theophanem* (1685, folio); again published in the Venetian reprint (1729, folio), and again, edited by Bekker (Bonn, 1838, tvo). The life of Basil by Constantine Porphyrogenitus was printed separately as early as 1653, in the *Συμμικτά* of Allatius (Cologne, 8vo). See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 7:681; 8:318; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 2:90. — Smith. *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, 2:757 sq.

Leontius Of Neapolis

(or of *Hagiopolis*, according to his own authority), in Cyprus, who was bishop of that city, which Le Quien (*Oriens Christianus*, 2:1061) identifies with the Nova Lemissus, or Nemissus, or Nemosa, that rose out of the ruins of Amathus, flourished in the latter part of the 6th and the early part of the 7th century. Baronius, Possevinlo, and others call Leontius bishop of Salamis or Constantia, but in the records of the second Nicene or seventh General Council, held A.D. 787, Actio 4 (*Concilia*, 7, col. 236, ed. Labbe; 4, col. 193, ed. Hardouin; 8, col. 884, ed. Coleti; and 13, col. 44, ed. Mansi), he is expressly described as bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus. His death is said to have occurred between 620 and 630. His principal works are *Λόγοι ὑπὲρ τῆς Χριστιανῶν ἀπολογίας κατὰ Ἰουδαίων καὶ περὶ εἰκόνων τῶν ἁγίων*, *Sermones pro Defensione Christianorum contra Judaeos ac de incainsibus sanctis*. A long extract from the fifth of these sermons was read at the second Nicene Council (*Concilia*, 1. c.) to support the use of images in worship; and several passages, most of them

identical with those cited in the council, are given by John of Damascus in his third oration, and in *De Imaginibus* (*Opera*, 1:373, etc., ed. Le Quien). A Latin version of another portion of one of these discourses of Leontius is given in the *Lectiones Antiquae* of Canisius, 1:793, edit. Basnage: **Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας τοῦ Ἐλεήμονος**, *Vita Sancti Joannis Arcaiepiscopi Alexandria c Coynomento En leemonis, s. Eleemosynarii*. **SEE JOHN THE ALMSGIVER**. This life by Leontius was mentioned in the second Nicene Council (*Concilia*, vol. cit., col. 246 Labbe. 202 Hardouin, 896 Coleti. 53 Mansi), and is extant in No. 8 in the Imperial Library at Vienna. An ancient Latin version by Anastasius Bibliothecarius is given by Rosweid (*De his Patrum*, pars 1), Surius (*De Probatiss Sanctorum his*), and Bollandus (*Acta Sanctorum*, January, 2:498, etc.). The account of St. Vitalis or Vitalius, given in the *Acta Sanctorum* of Bollandus (January), 1:702, is a Latin version of a part of this life of John the Almsgiver: **Βίος τοῦ ὁσίου Συμεῶν τοῦ σαλοῦ**, *Vita Sancta Symneonis Simplicis*, or **Βίος καὶ πολιτεία τοῦ ἀββᾶ Συμεῶν τοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐπονομασθέντος Σαλοῦ**, *Vita et Conversatio Abbatis Symeonis qui cognominsatus est Stultus propter Christum*, was also mentioned in the Nicene Council (1:(.), and published in the *Acta Sauctl.* of the Bollandists (July), 1:136, etc. The other published works of Leontius are homilies: *Sermo in Simeonem quando Dominum in Ulnas suscepit: — In Diem festum mediae Pentecostes*; both with a Latin version in the *Novum Auctariumsn* of Combis, vol. 1 (Par. 1648, fol.). As Leontius is recorded to have written many homilies in honor of saints (**ἐγκώμια**) and for the festivals of the Church (**πανηγυρικοὶ λόγοι**), especially on the transfiguration of our Savior, it is not unlikely that some of those extant under the name of Leontius of Constantinople may be by him. He wrote also **Παραλλήλων λόγοι β΄**, *Parallelorum, s. Locorum communium Theologicorum Libri ii*; the first book consisted of **τῶν θειῶν**, and the other **τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων**. Turrianus possessed the second book; but whether that or the first is extant, we know not; neither has been published. It has been thought that John of Damascus, in his *Parallela*, made use of those of Leontius. Fabricius also inserts among the works of our Leontius the homily **Εἰς τὰ βαΐα**, *In Festum (s. Ratwos) Pulnarum*, generally ascribed to Chrysostom, and printed among his doubtful or spurious works (7:334, ed. Savill; 10:767, ed. Montfaucon, or 10:915, and 13:354, in the recent Parisian reprint of Montfaucon's edition). Maldonatus (*ad Joan. 7*) mentions some MS. *Commentarii in Joannem* by Leontius, and an *Oratio*

in laudem S. Epiphanii is mentioned by Theodore Studita in his *Antirrheticus Secundus*, pud Sismondi, Opp. 5. 130. (See Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 8:320, etc.; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* 1:550; Oudin, *De Scriptor. Ecclesiasticus*, 1, col. 1575, etc.; Vossius, *De Histor. Graec.* lib. 2. 100:23; Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 2, col. 1062; *Acta Sanctor.* July, 5:131.) Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography*, 2:758.

Leopard

Picture for Leopard

(Heb. **רמא**; *namer'*, so called as being *spotted*, ^{<2418>}Song of Solomon 4:8; ^{<2416>}Isaiah 11:6; ^{<2416>}Jeremiah 5:6; 13:23; ^{<2417>}Hosea 13:7; ^{<2418>}Habakkuk 1:8; Chald. **רמא**, *nemar'*, ^{<2416>}Daniel 7:6; Gr. **πάρδαλις**, ^{<2416>}Daniel 7:6; ^{<2417>}Revelation 13:2; Ecclesiasticus 28:23). Though zoologists differ in opinion respecting the identity of the leopard and the panther, and dispute, supposing them to be distinct, how these names should be respectively applied, and by what marks the animals should be distinguished, nevertheless there can be no doubt that the *nbamer* of the Bible is that great spotted feline which anciently infested the Syrian mountains, and even now occurs in the wooded ranges of Lebanon, for the Arabs still use *nimer*, the same word slightly modified, to denote that animal. The Abyssinian name differs scarcely from either; and in all these tongues it means spotted. *Pigikris*, according to Kirscher, is the Coptic name; and in English "*leopard*" has been adopted as the most appropriate to represent both the Hebrew word and the Greek **πάρδαλις** (which is imitated in the Tallmudic **sl drb**, Mishna, *Baba Mez.* 8:2), although the Latin *leopardus* is not found in any author anterior to the fourth century, and is derived from a gross mistake in natural history. Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 443) contends that the scriptural animal was rather striped than spotted (**†/rBābj** ; ^{<2417>}Jeremiah 13:23), and thinks that not improbably the *tiger* was also comprised under this name, as the Hebrews had no specific name for that animal (*Thesaur.* p. 889). The panther (*Felis pardus* of Linn.) lives in Africa (Strabo, 17:828; Pliny, 10:94), Arabia (Strabo, 16:774, 777), as well as on Lebanon (Seetzen, 18:343; Burckhardt, *Trav.* 1:99), and the Hills of middle Palestine (Schubert, 3:119), not to mention more distant countries, as India, America, etc. The most graphic description of the (African and Arabian) panther is by Ehrenberg (*Symbol. phys. Mammal*, lec. 2, pl. 17). The variety of leopard, or rather panther, of Syria is

considerably below the stature of a lioness, but very heavy in proportion to its bulk. Its general form is so well known as to require no description beyond stating that the spots are rather more irregular, and the color more mixed with whitish, than in the other pantherine felins, excepting the *Felis Uncia* or *Felis Irbis* of High Asia, which is shaggy and almost white (Sonnini, *Trav.* 1:395). It is a nocturnal, cat-like animal in habits, dangerous to all domestic cattle, and sometimes even to man (comp. Plin. 10:94; Hom. *Hymn in Ven.* 71; Oppian, *Cyneg.* 3:76 sq.; Cvrill. Alex. in *Hos.* 1. c.; Tsetz. *Chiliad.* 2:45; Poiret, *Voyage*, 1:224). In the Scriptures it is constantly placed in juxtaposition with the lion (²¹⁰⁶Isaiah 11:6; ²⁴⁷⁶Jeremiah 5:6; ²⁸¹⁷Hosea 13:7; Ecclesiasticus 28:23 [27]; comps. Aelian, V. H. 14:4) or the wolf. The swiftness of this animal, to which Habakkuk (³⁰⁰⁸Habakkuk 1:8) compares the Chaldean horses, and to which Daniel (²⁷⁰⁶Daniel 7:6) alludes in the winged leopard, is well known. So great is the flexibility of its body that it is able to take surprising leaps, to climb trees, or to crawl snake-like upon the ground. Jeremiah and Hosea (as above) allude to the insidious habit of this animal, which is abundantly confirmed by the observations of travelers: the leopard will take up its position in some spot near a village, and watch for some favorable opportunity for plunder. From the Canticles (as above) we learn that the hilly ranges of Lebanon were in ancient times frequented by these animals, and it is now not uncommonly seen in and about Lebanon, and the southern maritime mountains of Syria (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on ²⁰⁰⁸Song of Solomon 4:8). There is in Asia Minor a species or variety of panther, much larger than the Syrian, not unfrequent on the borders of the snowy tracts even of Mount Ida, above ancient Troy; and the group of these spotted animals is spread over the whole of Southern Asia to Africa. From several names of places (e.g. Beth-Nimrah, etc.), it appears that, in the earlier ages of Israelitish dominion, it was sufficiently numerous in Palestine, and recent travelers have encountered it there (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1848, p. 669; Lynch's *Expedition*, p. 212). Leopard skins were worn as a part of ceremonial costume by the superiors of the Egyptian priesthood, and by other personages in Nubia; and the animal itself is represented in the processions of tributary nations (Wilkinson, 1:285, 291, 319). In ²⁷⁰⁷Daniel 7:7, the third stage of the prophetic vision is symbolized under the form of a leopard with wings, representing the rapidly formed Macedonian empire; its four heads corresponding to the division of Alexander's dominions among his four generals. In ⁶⁶³²Revelation 13:2, the same animal is made a type of the spiritual power

of the Roman hierarchy, supported by the secular power in maintaining Paganism in opposition to Christianity. See generally Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:100 sq.; Schoder, *Specin. hieroz.* 1:46 sq.; Wemyss, *Clavis Symbolica*, s.v.; Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 29 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:156 sq.

Leopold II

of Germany (1790-1792) and I of Tuscany (1765-1790), the second son of Maria Theresa of Austria and her husband Francis of Lorraine, is noted in Church History for the part he took in the ecclesiastical affairs of Tuscany, which, after Maria Theresa had succeeded to the Austrian dominions, according to treaties, establishing the independence of Tuscany as a state separate from the hereditary states of Austria, devolved upon Leopold, his elder brother Joseph being the presumptive heir of the Austrian dominions. His principal reforms in Tuscany concerned the administration of justice and the discipline of the clergy in his dominions. By his "Motu proprio" in 1786, he promulgated a new criminal code, abolished torture and the pain of death, and established penitentiaries to reclaim offenders. In the ecclesiastical department, after having instituted various reforms, he actually, in July, 1782, abolished the Inquisition in Tuscany, and placed the monks and nuns of his dominions under the jurisdiction of the respective bishops. The discovery of licentious practices carried on in certain nunneries in the towns of Pistoja and Prato with the connivance of their monkish directors induced Leopold to investigate and reform the whole system of monastic discipline, and he entrusted Ricci, bishop of Pistoja, with full power for that purpose. This occasioned a long and angry controversy with the court of Rome, which pretended to have the sole cognizance of matters affecting individuals of the clergy and monastic orders. Leopoldi, however, carried his point, and the pope consented that the bishops of Tuscany should have the jurisdiction over the convents of their respective dioceses. Ricci, who had high notions of religious purity, and was by his enemies accused of Jansenism, attempted other reforms: he endeavored to enlighten the people as to the proper limits of image-worship and the invocation of saints; he suppressed certain relics which gave occasion to superstitious practices; he encouraged the spreading of religious works, and especially of the Gospel, among his flock; and, lastly, he assembled a diocesan council at Pistoja in September, 1786, in which he maintained the spiritual independence of the bishops. He advocated the use of the liturgy in the oral language of the country, he exposed the abuse of indulgences, approved of the four articles of the Gallican Council of 1682,

and, lastly, appealed to a national council as a legitimate and canonical means for terminating controversies. Several of Ricci's propositions were condemned by the pope in a bull as scandalous, rash, and injurious to the Holy See. Leopold supported Ricci, but he could not prevent his being annoyed in many ways, and at last he saw him forced to resign his charge. (For further details of this curious controversy, see Potter, *Vie de Scipion de Ricci* [Brussels, 1825, 3 vols. 8vo].) Leopold himself convoked a council at Florence of the bishops of Tuscany in 1787, and proposed to them fifty-seven articles concerning the reform of ecclesiastical discipline. He enforced residence of incumbents, and forbade pluralities; suppressed many convents, and distributed their revenues among the poor benefices, thus favoring the parochial clergy, and extending their jurisdiction, as he had supported and extended the jurisdiction of the bishops. He forbade the publication of the bulls and censures of Rome without the approbation of the government; he enjoined the ecclesiastical courts not to interfere with laymen in temporal matters, and restrained their jurisdiction to spiritual affairs only; and he subjected clergymen to the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts in all criminal cases. All these were considered in that age as very bold innovations for a Roman Catholic prince to undertake. *SEE RICCI.*

Leopold IV

margrave of Austria, son of Leopold III, was born Sept. 29, 1073. He was educated by the priest Udalrich, under the direction of Altmann, bishop of Passau, and succeeded his father in 1096. His chief object during his whole reign was to promote the happiness of his subjects. He avoided war, and husbanded the resources of his country with great care. He was about to accompany the emperor, Henry IV, in a crusade to Jerusalem, when the insurrection of the emperor's son, Henry V, obliged him to change his plans. At first he went to assist the emperor (in 1105), but somewhat later he was influenced by his brother-in-law, Borzywoy II, duke of Bohemia, and the promises of Henry V, to join the latter, to whose sister Agnes, widow of Frederick of Suabia, he was married in 1106. The remainder of his reign passed in peace and prosperity, although occasionally (especially in 1118) he was subjected to annoyances by the inroads of the Hungarians. In 1125, after the death of Henry V, he was spoken of for emperor, but declined in favor of Lothaire, duke of Saxony. Leopold died Nov. 15, 1136, and was canonized by pope Innocent VIII in 1485. He founded a large number of convents, among which are those of Neuburg, of Mariazell, and of the Holy Cross, and built a number of churches. See A.

Klein, *Gesca. des Christenthums in Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1840), vol. 1 and 2; *Leopold d. Heiliqe* (Vien. 1835); L. Lang, *D. hl. Leopold* (Reutlingen, 1836); Pez, *Vita sancti Leopoldi*; same, *Scriptores Rerum Austriacarum*, 1:575; Poltzmann, *Compendium vitae S. Leopoldi*; Jaffe, *Gesch. des deutschen Reiches unter Lothasr dem Sachsen* (Berlin, 1843); and his *Geschichsfe d. deutsch. Reiches u. Konrad III* (Han. 1845); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:332; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 30:797.

Leper

(some form of [ῥῆκ; to smite with a providential infliction; λεπρός). *SEE LEPROSY.*

Leporius

a monastic who flourished in the second half of the 4th and the early part of the 5th century, a native of Gaul, embraced asceticism under the auspices of Cassianus about the opening of the 5th century, at Marseilles, where he enjoyed a high reputation for purity and holiness. Advancing the view that man did not stand in need of divine grace, and that Christ was born with a human nature only, he was excommunicated in consequence of these heretical doctrines. He betook himself to Africa, and there became familiar with Aurelius and St. Augustine, by whose instructions he profited so much that he not only became convinced of his errors, but drew up a solemn recantation addressed to Proculus, bishop of Marseilles, and Cyllinnius, the bishop of Aix (see below as to the title and value of this treatise), while four African prelates bore witness to the sincerity of his conversion, and made intercession on his behalf. Although now reinstated in his ecclesiastical privileges, Leporius does not seem to have returned to his native country, but, laying aside the profession of a monk, was ordained a presbyter by St. Augustine, A.D. 425, and appears to be the same Leporius so warmly praised in the discourse *De Vita et Moribus Clericorum*. We know nothing further regarding his career except that he was still alive in 430 (Cassianus, *De Incarn.* 1:4). The treatise above alluded to is still extant, under the title *Libellus emendationis sie satisfactionis ad Apiscopos Galliae*, sometimes with the addition *Confessionem Fideii Catholicae continens de Mysterio Incarnationis Christi, cum Erroris pristini Detestatione*. It was held in very high estimation among ancient divines, and its author was regarded as one of the firmest bulwarks of orthodoxy against the attacks of the Nestorians.

Some scholars in modern times, especially Quesnel, who has written an elaborate dissertation on the subject, have imagined that we ought to regard this as a tract composed and dictated by St. Augustine, founding their opinion partly on the style, and partly on those terms in which it is quoted in the acts of the second Council of Chalcedon and early documents, and partly on certain expressions in an epistle of Leo the Great (165, edit. Quesnel); but their arguments are far from being conclusive, and the hypothesis is generally rejected. Fragments of the *Libellus* were first collected by Sismondi from Cassianus, and inserted in his collection of Gaulish councils (1:52). The entire work was soon discovered and published by the same editor in his *Opuscula Dogmatica Veterum quinque Sacristorum* (Par. 1630, 8vo), together with the letter of the African bishops in favor of Leporius. It will be found also in the collection of councils by Labbe (Paris, 1671, folio); in Garnier's edition of *Marisus Mercator* (Paris, 1673, fol.), 1:224; in the *Bibliotheca Patrum Max.* (Lugd. 1677), 7:14; and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland (Ven. 1773), 9:396. Consult the dissertation of Quesnel in his edition of the works of Leo, 2:906 (ed. Paris); *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, 2:167 the second dissertation of Garnier, his edition of *M. Mercator*, 1:230; the *Prolegomena* of Galland; Schonemann, *Bibliotheca Patr. Lat.* 2, § 20. — Smith, *Dict. Greek and Roman Biography*, vol. 2, s.v.

Leprosy

(**ἰ** **ῥ** **ῥ** **ῥ**; *tsara'äth*, a smiting, because supposed to be a direct visitation of heaven; Gr. λέπρα, so called from its *scaliness*, hence English "leper," etc.), a name that was given by the Greek physicians to a scaly disease of the skin. During the Dark Ages it was indiscriminately applied to all chronic diseases of the skin, and more particularly to elephantiasis, to which latter, however, it does not bear a complete resemblance. Hence prevailed the greatest discrepancy and confusion in the descriptions that authors gave of the disease, until Dr. Willan restored to the term *lepra* its original significations. In the Scriptures it is applied to a foul cutaneous disease, the description of which, as well as the regulations consecrated therewith, are given in Leviticus 13, 14 (comp. also ^{<1006>}Exodus 4:6,7; Numb. 12:10-15; ^{<1009>}2 Samuel 3:29; ^{<1017>}2 Kings 5:27; 7:3; 15:5; ^{<1018>}Matthew 8:2; 10:8, etc.). In the discussion of this subject we base our article upon the most recent scientific and archeological distinctions, compared with the present Oriental usages.

I. Scriptural and Talmudical Statements. —

(I.) Leprosy in Human Beings. —

1. Cases and Symptomns of Biblical Leprosy. — ^{<BIBL>}Leviticus 13:2-44, which describes this distemper as laying hold of man, gives six different circumstances under which it may develop itself. They are as follows:

(1.) The first circumstance mentioned in ^{<BIBL>}Leviticus 13:2-6 is that it may develop itself without any apparent cause. Hence it is enjoined that if any one should notice a rising or swelling (**taç**), an eruption or scab (**tj ps**), or a glossy pimple (**trhb**) in the skin of his flesh, which may terminate in leprosy (**t[rx]**), he is at once to be taken to the priest, who is to examine it and pronounce it leprosy, and the man unclean, if it exhibits these two symptoms, viz. *a*, the hair of the affected spot changed from its natural black color to white; and, *b*, the spot deeper than the general level of the skin of the body (ver. 2, 3). But if these two symptoms do not appear in the bright pimple, the priest is to shut him up for seven days, examine him again on the seventh day, and if the disease appears to have made no progress during this time, he is to remand the patient for another seven days (ver. 4, 5), and then, if on inspecting it again he finds that the bright spot has grown darker (**hhk**), and that it has not spread on the skin, he is to pronounce it a simple scab (**tj psm tj ps**), and the person clean after washing his garments (ver. 6). If, however, the pustule spreads over the skin after it has been pronounced a simple scab and the individual clean, the priest is to declare it leprosy, and the patient unclean (ver. 7, 8). It is thus evident that the symptoms which indicated scriptural leprosy, as the Mishna rightly remarks (*Negaim*, 3:3), are bright pimples, a little depressed, turning the hair white, and spreading over the skin.

As the description of these symptoms is very concise, and requires to be specified more minutely for practical purposes, the spiritual guides of Israel defined them as follows: Both the bright pimple (**trhb**) and the swelling spot (**taç**), when indicative of leprosy, assume respectively one of two colors, a principal or a subordinate one. The principal color of the bright pimple is as white as snow (**gl çk tz[**), and the subordinate resembles plaster on the wall (**l kyhh dysk**); whilst the principal color of the rising spot is like that of an eggshell (**hxb µwrqk**), and the secondary one

resembles white wool (^ʿbl rmxk, *Negaim*, 1:1); so that if the affected spot in the skin is inferior in whiteness to the film of an egg it is not leprosy, but simply a gathering (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 1:1). Any one may examine the disease, except the patient himself or his relatives, but the priest alone can decide whether it is leprosy or not, and accordingly pronounce the patient unclean or clean, because ^{<RE15>}Deuteronomy 21:5 declares that the priest must decide cases of litigation and disease. But though the priest only can pronounce the decision, even if he be a child or a fool, yet he must act upon the advice of a learned layman in those matters (*Negaim*, 3:1; Maimonides, *l. c.*, 9:1, 2). If the priest is blind of one eye, or is weak-sighted, he is disqualified for examining the distemper (Mishna, *l. c.*, 2:3). The inspection must not take place on the Sabbath, nor early in the morning, nor in the middle of the day, nor in the evening, nor on cloudy days, because the color of the skin cannot properly be ascertained in these hours of the day; but in the third, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, or ninth hour (*Negaim*, 2:2); and the same priest who inspected it at first must examine it again at the end of the second seven days, as another one could not tell whether it has spread. If he should die in the interim, or be taken ill, another one may examine him, but not pronounce him unclean (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 9:4). There must be at least two hairs white at the root and in the body of the bright spot before the patient can be declared unclean (Maimonides, *l. c.*, 2:1). If a bridegroom is seized with this distemper he must be left alone during the nuptial week (*Negaim*, 3:2).

(2.) The second case is of leprosy reappearing after it has been cured (^{<RE13>}Leviticus 13:9-17), where a somewhat different treatment is enjoined. If a person who has once been healed of this disease is brought again to the priest, and if the latter finds a white rising in the skin (taç hnbl), which has changed the hair into white and contains live flesh (yj rçb), he is forthwith to recognize therein the reappearance of the old malady, and declare the patient unclean without any quarantine whatever, since the case is so evident that it requires no trial (ver. 9-11). There were, however, two phases of this returned distemper which exempted the patient from uncleanness. If the leprosy suddenly covered the whole body so that the patient became perfectly white, in which case there could be no appearance of live flesh (ver. 12, 13), or if the whiteness, after having once diminished and allowed live flesh to appear, covers again the whole body, then the patient was clean (ver. 14-17). This, most probably, was regarded as

indicative of the crisis, as the whole evil matter thus brought to the surface formed itself into a scale which dried and peeled off. The only other feature which this case represents besides the symptoms already described is that leprosy at times also spread over the whole skin and rendered it perfectly white. As to the live flesh (**yj rçb**), the Sept., the Chaldee, the Mishna, and the Jewish rabbins, in accordance with ancient tradition, take it to denote *soundflesh*, or a spot in the flesh assuming the appearance of life after it had been paled by the whiteness overspreading the whole surface. The size of this spot of live flesh which renders the patient unclean must, according to tradition, be at least that of a lentil (Maimonides, 1. c., 3:1-3).

(3.) The third case is of leprosy developing itself from an inflammation (**ˆyj ç**) or a burn (**çā twkm**), which is to be recognized by the same symptoms (^(כִּבְשֵׁת)Leviticus 13:18-28). Hence, when these suspicious signs were discernible in that part of the skin which was healed of an inflammation, the patient was to go to the priest, who was at once to pronounce it leprosy developed from an inflammation, if the symptoms were unmistakable (ver. 19, 20). If the priest found these marks, he remanded the patient for seven days (ver. 21), and if the disorder spread over the skin during the time the patient was declared leprous and unclean (ver. 22); but if it remained in the same condition, he pronounced it the cicatrix of the inflammation (**ˆyj çh thrx**) and the patient clean (ver. 23). The same rules applied to the suspicious appearance of a burn (ver. 24-28). According to the Hebrew canons, **ˆyhç** is defined inflammation arising from “an injury received from the stroke of wood or a stone, or from hot olive husks, or the hot Tiberian water, or from anything, the heat of which does not come from fire, whilst **twkm** denotes a burn from live coals, hot ashes, or from any heat which proceeds from fire” (*Negaim*, 9:1; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, v. 1). It will be seen that there is a difference in the treatment of the suspicious symptoms in (1.) and (3.). In the former instance, where there is no apparent cause for the symptoms, the suspected invalid has to undergo two remands of seven days before his case can be decided; whilst in the latter, where the inflammation or the burn visibly supplies the reason for this suspicion, he is only remanded for one week, at the end of which his case is finally determined.

(4.) The fourth case is leprosy on *the head* or *chin* (^(כִּבְשֵׁת)Leviticus 13:29-37), which is to be recognized by the affected spot being deeper than the general level of the skin, and by the hair thereon having become thin and

yellowish. When these symptoms exist, the priest is to pronounce it *a scall* (**qtn**), which is head or chin leprosy, and declare the patient unclean (ver. 30). But if this disorder on the head or chin does not exhibit these symptoms, the patient is to be remanded for seven days, when the priest is again to examine it, and if he finds that it has neither spread nor exhibits the required criteria, he is to order the patient to cut off all the hair of his head or chin, except that which grows on the afflicted spot itself, and remand him for another week, and then pronounce him clean if it continues in the same state at the expiration of this period (ver. 31-34); and if it spreads after he has been pronounced clean, the priest is forthwith to declare him unclean without looking for any yellow hair (ver. 35,36). The Jewish canons define **qtn** by “an affection on the head or chin which causes the hair on these affected parts to fall off by the roots, so that the place of the hair is quite bare” (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 8:1). The condition of the hair, constituting one of the leprosy symptoms, is described as follows: “**qd** is *small* or *short*, but if it be long, though it is yellow as gold, it is no sign of uncleanness. Two yellow and short hairs, whether close to one another or far from each other, whether in the center of *the nethek* or on the edge thereof, no matter whether *the nethek* precedes the yellow hair or the yellow hair *the nethek*, are symptoms of uncleanness” (Maimonides. *l. c.*, 8:5). The manner of shaving is thus described: “The hair round the scall is all shaved off except two hairs which are close to it, so that it might be known thereby whether it spread” (*Negaim*, 10:5).

(5.) The fifth case is leprosy which shows itself in white polished spots, and is not regarded as unclean (^(**RI38**)Leviticus 13:38, 39). It is called *bohak* (**qhBd**, from **qhB**; *to be white*), or, as the Sept. has it, **ἀλφός**, *vitiligo alba*, white scurf.

(6.) The sixth case is of leprosy either at the back or in the front of the head (^(**RI30**)Leviticus 13:40-44). When a man loses his hair either at the back or in the front of his head, it is a simple case of baldness, and he is clean (ver. 40,41). But if a whitish red spot forms itself on the bald place at the back or in the front of the head, then it is leprosy, which is to be recognized by the fact that the swelling or scab on the spot has the appearance of leprosy in the skin of the body; and the priest is to declare the man’s head leprosy and unclean (ver. 42-44). Though there is only one symptom mentioned whereby head leprosy is to be recognized, and nothing is said about remanding the patient if the distemper should appear doubtful,

as in the other cases of leprosy, yet the ancient rabbins inferred from the remark, "It is like leprosy in the skin of the flesh," that *all* the criteria specified in the latter are implied in the former. Hence the Hebrew canons submit that "there are two symptoms which render baldness in the front or at the back of the head unclean, viz. live or sound flesh, and spreading; the patient is also shut up for them two weeks, because it is said of them that 'they are land therefore must be treated like leprosy in the skin of the flesh' "^(~~BRIS~~)Leviticus 13:43). Of course, the fact that the distemper in this instance develops itself on baldness, precludes white hair being among the criteria indicating uncleanness. The manner in which the patient in question is declared unclean by two symptoms and in two weeks is as follows: "If live or sound flesh is found in the bright spot on the baldness at the back or in the front of the head, he is pronounced unclean; if there is no live flesh he is shut up and examined at the end of the week, and if live flesh has developed itself, and it has spread, he is declared unclean, and if not he is shut up for another week. If it has spread during this time, or engendered live flesh, he is declared unclean, and if not he is pronounced clean. He is also pronounced unclean if it spreads or engenders sound flesh after he has been declared clean" (*Negaim*, 10:10; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 5:9,10).

2. Regulations about the Conduct and Purification of leprous Men. — Lepers were to rend their garments, let the hair of their head hang down disheveled, cover themselves up to the upper lip, like mourners, and warn off every one whom they happened to meet by calling out "Unclean! unclean!" since they defiled every one and everything they touched. For this reason they were also obliged to live in exclusion outside the camp or city (^(~~BRIS~~)Leviticus 13:45, 46; ^(~~GRIL~~)Numbers 5:1-4; 12:10-15; ^(~~ITWB~~)2 Kings 7:3, etc.). "The very entrance of a leper into a house," according to the Jewish canons, "renders everything in it unclean" (*Negaim.*, 12:11; *Kelim*, 1:4). "If he stands under a tree and a clean man passes by, he renders him unclean. In the synagogue which he wishes to attend they are obliged to make him a separate compartment, ten handbreadths high and four cubits long and broad; he has to be the first to go in, and the last to leave the synagogue" (*Negaim*, 12:12; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 10:12); and if he transgressed the prescribed boundaries he was to receive forty stripes (*Pesachim*, 67, at). All this only applies to those who had been pronounced lepers by the priest, but not to those who were on quarantine (*Negaim*, 1:7). The rabbinic law also exempts women from the obligation to rend their garments and let the hair of their head fall down (*Sota*, 3:8). It is therefore

no wonder that the Jews regarded leprosy as a living death (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 3:11, 8, and the well-known rabbinic saying **tmk bwqj** [**rwxm**]), and as an awful punishment from the Lord (^{<1187>}2 Kings 5:7; ^{<1481>}2 Chronicles 26:20), which they wished all their mortal enemies (^{<1089>}2 Samuel 3:29; ^{<1187>}2 Kings 5:27).

The healed leper had to pass through two stages of purification before he could be received back into the community. As soon as the distemper disappeared he sent for the priest, who had to go outside the camp or town to convince himself of the fact. Thereupon the priest ordered two clean and live birds, a piece of cedar wood, crimson wool, and hyssop; killed one bird over a vessel containing spring water, so that the blood might run into it, tied together the hyssop and the cedar wood with the crimson wool, put about them the tops of the wings and the tip of the tail of the living bird, dipped all the four in the blood and water which were in the vessel, then sprinkled the hand of the healed leper seven times, let the bird loose, and pronounced the restored man clean (^{<841>}Leviticus 14:1 7; *Negtaime*, 12:1). The healed leper was then to wash his garments, cut off all his hair, be immersed, and return to the camp or city, but remain outside his house seven days, which the Mishina (*Negailm*, 14:2), the Chaldee Paraphrase, Maimonides (*On Leprosy*, 11:1), etc., rightly regard as a euphemism for exclusion from connubial intercourse during that time (ver. 8), in order that he might not contract impurity (comp. ^{<858>}Leviticus 15:18). With this ended the first stage of purification. According to the Jewish canons, the birds are to be “free, and not caged,” or sparrows; the piece of cedar wood is to be “a cubit long, and a quarter of the foot of the bed thick;” the crimson wool is to be a shekel’s weight, i.e. 320 grains of barley; the hyssop must at least be a handbreadth in size, and is neither to be the so-called Greek, nor ornamental, nor Roman, nor wild hyssop, nor have any name whatever; the vessel must be an earthen one, and new; and the dead bird must be buried in a hole dug before their eyes (*Negaim*, 14:1-6; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 11:1).

The second stage of purification began on the seventh day, when the leper had again to cut off the hair of his head, his beard, eyebrows, etc., wash his garments, and be immersed (^{<841>}Leviticus 14:9). On the eighth day he had to bring two he-lambs without blemish, one ewe-lamb a year old, three tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil, and one log of oil; the one he-lamb is to be a trespass-offering, and the other, with the ewe-lamb, a

burnt and a sin-offering; but if the man was poor he was to bring two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, for a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, instead of a he-lamb and a ewe-lamb (ver. 10, 11, 21). With these offerings the priest conducted the healed leper before the presence of the Lord. What the offerer had to do, and how the priest acted when going through these ceremonies, cannot be better described than in the following graphic language of the Jewish tradition. "The priest approaches the trespass-offering, lays both his hands on it, and kills it, when two priests catch its blood, one into a vessel, and the other in his hand; the one who caught it into the vessel sprinkles it against the wall of the altar, the other goes to the leper, who, having been immersed in the leper's chamber [which is in the women's court], is waiting [outside the court of Israel, or the men's court, opposite the eastern door] in the porch of Nicanor [with his face to the west]. He then puts his head into [the court of Israel], and the priest puts some of the blood upon the tip of his right ear; he next puts in his right hand, and the priest puts some blood upon the thumb thereof; and, lastly, puts in his right ear, and the priest puts some blood on the toe thereof. The: priest then takes some of the log of oil and puts it into, the left hand of his fellow-priest, or into his own left hand, dips the finger of his right hand in it, and sprinkles it seven times towards the holy of holies, dipping his finger every time he sprinkles it; whereupon he goes to the leper, puts oil on those parts of his body on which he had previously put blood [i.e. the tip of the ear, the thumb, and the toe], as it is written, 'on the place of the blood of the trespass-offering' [^{<BIB>}Leviticus 14:28], and what remains of the oil in the hand of the priest he puts on the head of him who is to be cleansed, for an atonement" (*Negaim*, 14:8-10; Maimonides, *Michoth Mechosrei Kepora*, 4). It is in accordance with this prerogative of the priest, who alone could pronounce the leper clean and readmit him into the congregation, that Christ commanded the leper whom he had healed to show himself to this functionary (^{<ARB>}Matthew 8:2, etc.).

(II.) Leprous Garments and Vessels. — Leprosy in garments and vessels is indicated by two symptoms, *green* or *reddish spots*, and *spreading*. If a green or reddish spot shows itself in a woolen or linen garment, or in a leather vessel, it is indicative of leprosy, and must be shown to the priest, who is to shut it up for a week. If, on inspecting it at the end of this time, he finds that the spot has spread, he is to pronounce it inveterate leprosy (**t**ramm t[rx]), and unclean, and burn it (^{<BIB>}Leviticus 13:47-52); if it has not spread he is to have it washed, and shut it up for another week, and

if its appearance has then not changed, he is to pronounce it unclean and burn it, though it has not spread, since the distemper rankles in the front or at the back of the material (ver. 53-55). But if, after washing it, the priest sees that the spot has become weaker, he is to cut it out of the material; if it reappears in any part thereof, then it is a developed distemper, and the whole of it must be burned; and if it vanishes after washing, it must be washed a second time, and is clean (ver. 56-59). The Jewish canons define the color green to be like that of *herbs*, and red like that of *fair crimson*, and take this enactment literally as referring strictly to wool of sheep and flax, but not to hemp and other materials. A material made of camel's hair and sheep's wool is not rendered unclean by leprosy if the camel's hair preponderate, but is unclean when the sheep's wool preponderates, or when both are equal, and this also applies to mixtures of flax and hemp. Dyed skins and garments are not rendered unclean by leprosy; nor are vessels so if made of skins of aquatic animals exposed to leprous uncleanness (*Negaim*, 11:2,3; Maimonides, *ut sup.* 11:1; 12:10; 13:1-3).

(III.) Leprous Houses. — Leprosy in houses is indicated by the same three symptoms, viz. spots of a deep green or reddish hue, depressed beyond the general level, and spreading (⁴¹⁴³Leviticus 14:33-48). On its appearance the priest was at once to be sent for, and the house cleared of everything before his arrival. If, on inspecting it, he found the first two symptoms in the walls, viz. a green or red spot in the wall, and depressed, he shut the house up for seven days (ver. 34-38), inspected it again on the seventh day, and if the distemper spread in the wall he had the affected stones taken out, the inside of the house scraped all round, the stones, dust, etc., cast into an unclean place without the city, and other stones and plaster put on the wall (ver. 39-42). If, after all this, the spot reappeared and spread, he pronounced it inveterate leprosy, and unclean, had the house pulled down, and the stones, timber, plaster, etc., cast into an unclean place without the city, declared every one unclean, till evening, who had entered it, and ordered every one who had either slept or eaten in it to wash his garments (ver. 43-47).

As to the purification of the houses which have been cured of leprosy, the process is the same as that of healed men, except that in the case of man the priest sprinkles seven times upon his hand, while in that of the house he sprinkles seven times on the upper door-post without. Of course the sacrifices which the leprous man had to bring in his second stage of

purification are precluded in the case of the house (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 15:8).

3. Prevalence, Contagion, and Curableness of Leprosy. — Though the malicious story of Manetho that the Egyptians expelled the Jews because they were afflicted with leprosy (Josephus, *Ap.* 1:26), which is repeated by Tacitus (lib. v, c. 3), is rejected by modern historians and critics as a fabrication, yet Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, art. 209), Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, p. 652), and others still maintain that this disease was “extremely prevalent among the Israelites.” Against this, however, is to be urged that, 1. The very fact that such strict examination was enjoined, and that every one who had a pimple, spot, or boil was shut up, shows that leprosy could not have been so widespread, inasmuch as it would require the imprisonment of the great mass of the people. 2. In cautioning the people against the evil of leprosy, and urging on them to keep strictly to the directions of the priest, Moses adds, “Remember what the Lord thy God did to Miriam on the way when you came out of Egypt” (^{<1249>}Deuteronomy 24:9). Now allusion to a single instance which occurred on the way from Egypt, and which, therefore, was an *old case*, naturally implies that leprosy was of rare occurrence among the Jews, else there would have been no necessity to adduce a by-gone case; and, 3. Wherever leprosy is spoken of in later books of the Bible, which does not often take place, it is only of isolated cases (^{<1208>}2 Kings 7:3; 15:5), and the regulations are strictly carried out, and the men are shut up so that even the king himself formed no exception (^{<1245>}2 Kings 15:5).

That the disease was *not contagious* is evident from the regulations themselves. The priests had to be in constant and close contact with lepers, had to examine and handle them; the leper who was *entirely* covered was pronounced clean (^{<1232>}Leviticus 13:12, 13); and the priest himself commanded that all things in a leprous house should be taken out before he entered it, in order that they might not be pronounced unclean, and that they might be used again (^{<1245>}Leviticus 14:36), which most unquestionably implies that there was no fear of contagion. This is, moreover, corroborated by the ancient Jewish canons, which were made by those very men who had personally to deal with this distemper, and according to which a leprous minor, a heathen, and a proselyte, as well as leprous garments, and houses of non-Israelites, do not render any one unclean; nor does a bridegroom, who is seized with this malady during the nuptial week, defile any one during the first seven days of his marriage (comp. *Negaim*,

3:1, 2; 7:1; 11:1; 12:1; Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 6:1; 7:1, etc.). These canons would be utterly inexplicable on the hypothesis that the distemper in question was contagious. The enactments, therefore, about the exclusion of the leper from society, and about defilement, were not dictated by sanitary caution, but had their root in the moral and ceremonial law, like the enactments about the separation and uncleanness of menstruous women, of those who had an issue or touched the dead, which are joined with leprosy. Being regarded as a punishment for sin, which God himself inflicted upon the disobedient (^{<0153>}Exodus 15:26; ^{<0145>}Leviticus 14:35), this loathsome disease, with the peculiar rites connected therewith, was especially selected as a typical representation of the pollution of sin, in which light the Jews always viewed it. Thus we are told that “leprosy comes upon man for seven, ten, or eleven things: for idolatry, profaning the name of God, unchastity, theft, slander, false witness, false judgment, perjury, infringing the borders of a neighbor, devising malicious plans, or creating discord between brothers” (*Erachin*, 16, 17; *Baba Bathra*, 164; *Aboth de R. Nathan*, 9; *Midrash Rabba on Leviticus* 14). “Cedar wood and hyssop, the highest and the lowest, give the leper purity. Why these? Because pride was the cause of the distemper, which cannot be cured till man becomes humble, and keeps himself as low as hyssop” (*Midrash Rabba, Koheleth*, p. 104).

As to the curableness of the disease, this is unquestionably implied in the minute regulations about the sacrifices and conduct of those who were restored to health. Besides, in the case of Miriam, we find that shutting her up for seven days cured her of leprosy (^{<0421>}Numbers 12:11-13).

II. Identify of the Biblical Leprosy with the modern Distemper bearing this Name. — It would be useless to discuss the different disorders which have been palmed upon the Mosaic description of leprosy. A careful classification and discrimination is necessary.

1. The Greeks distinguished three species of *lepra*, the specific names of which were *ἄλφος*, *λευκή*, and *μέλας* which may be rendered the *vitiligo*, the *white* and the *black*. Now, on turning to the Mosaic account, we also find three species mentioned, which were all included under the generic term of *trḥḇi* *bahereth*, or “bright spot” (^{<0832>}Leviticus 13:2-4,18-28). The first is called *qhBṛbhak*, which signifies “brightness,” but in a subordinate degree (^{<0833>}Leviticus 13:39). This species did not render a

person unclean. The second was called **trḥBihnbj]** *bahereth lebandh*. or a bright white *baherleth*. The characteristic marks of the *bahe'eth lebandh* mentioned by Moses are a glossy white and spreading scale upon an elevated base, the elevation depressed in the middle, the hair on the patches participating in the whiteness, and the patches themselves perpetually increasing. This was evidently the true leprosy, probably corresponding to the *white* of the Greeks and the *vulgaris* of modern science. The third was **hhK]trḥBi** *bahereth khadh*, or dusky *bahereth*, spreading in the skin. It has been thought to correspond with the *black* leprosy of the Greeks and the *nigricans* of Dr. Willan. These last two were also called **t [r̄k;** *tsardath* (i.e. proper leprosy), and rendered a person unclean. There are some other slight affections mentioned by name in Leviticus (chap. 13), which the priest was required to distinguish from leprosy, such as **tæ]** *seeth*; **l pv;** *shaphdl*; **qpT,** *nethek*; **ˆyj æ-** *shechen*, i.e. “elevation,” “depressed,” etc.; and to each of these Dr. Good (*Study of Med.* 5:590) has assigned a modern systematic name. But, as it is useless to attempt to recognize a disease otherwise than by a description of its symptoms, we can have no object in discussing his interpretation of these terms. We therefore recognize but two species of real leprosy.

(I.) Proper Leprosy. — This is the kind specifically denominated **trḥBi** *bahereth*, whether white or black, but usually called *white leprosy*, by the Arabs *barras*; a disease not unfrequent among the Hebrews (^{<1187>}2 Kings 5:27; ^{<1046>}Exodus 4:6; ^{<1020>}Numbers 12:10), and often called *lepra Mosaica*. It was regarded by them as a divine infliction (hence its Heb. name **t [r̄k;** *tsardath*, a stroke i.e. of God), and in several instances we find it such, as in the case of Miriam (^{<1020>}Numbers 12:10), Gehazi (^{<1187>}2 Kings 5:27), and Uzziah (^{<1236>}2 Chronicles 26:16-23), from which and other indications it appears to have been considered hereditary, and incurable by human means (comp. ^{<1082>}2 Samuel 3:29; ^{<1187>}2 Kings 5:7). From ^{<1248>}Deuteronomy 24:8, it appears to have been well-known in Egypt as a dreadful disease (comp. *Description de l'Egypte*, 13:159 sq.). The distinctive marks given by Moses to indicate this disease (Leviticus 13) are, *a depression of the surface and whiteness or yellowness of the hair* in the spot (ver. 3, 20, 25, 30), or *a spreading of the scaliness* (ver. 8, 22, 27, 36), or *raw flesh* in it (ver. 10, 14), or a *white-reddish sore* (ver. 43).

The disease, as it is known at the present day, commences by an eruption of small reddish spots slightly raised above the level of the skin. and

grouped in a circle. These spots are soon covered by a very thin, semitransparent scale or epidermis, of a whitish color, and very smooth, which in a little time falls off, and leaves the skin beneath red and uneven. As the circles increase in diameter, the skin recovers its healthy appearance towards the center; fresh scales are formed, which are now thicker, and superimposed one above the other, especially at the edges, so that the center of the scale appears to be depressed. The scales are of a grayish-white color, and have something of a micaceous or pearly lustre. The circles are generally of the size of a shilling or half crown, but they have been known to attain half a foot in diameter. The disease generally affects the knees and elbows, but sometimes it extends over the whole body, in which case the circles become confluent. It does not at all affect the general health, and the only inconvenience it causes the patient is a slight itching when the skin is heated; or, in inveterate cases, when the skin about the joints is much thickened, it may in some degree impede the free motion of the limbs. It is common to both sexes, to almost all ages, and all ranks of society. It is not in the least infectious, but, it is always difficult to be cured, and in old persons, when it is of long standing, may be pronounced incurable. It is commonly met with in all parts of Europe, and occasionally in America. Its systematic name is *Lepra vulgaris*.

Moses prescribes no natural remedy for the cure of leprosy (Leviticus 13). He requires only that the diseased person should show himself to the priest, and that the priest should judge of his leprosy; if it appeared to be a real leprosy, he separated the leper from the company of mankind (^{<B35>}Leviticus 13:45, 46; comp. ^{<B2>}Numbers 5:2; 12:10, 14; ^{<B2>}2 Kings 7:3; 15:5; Josephus, *Apion*, 1:31; *Ant.* 3:11,3; *Wars*, 5:5,6; see Wetstein, *N. t.* 1:175; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 861; Withob, *Opusc.* p. 169 sq.). Although the laws in the Mosaic code respecting this disease are exceedingly rigid (see Michaelis, *Orient. Bibl.* 17:19 sq.; *Medic. hermeneuet. Untersuch.* p. 240 sq.), it is by no means clear that the leprosy was contagious. The fear or disgust which was felt towards such a peculiar disease might be a sufficient cause for such severe enactments. All intercourse with society, however, was not cut off (^{<B2>}Matthew 8:2; ^{<B2>}Luke 5:12; 17:12), and even contact with a leper did not necessarily impart uncleanness (^{<B2>}Luke 17:12). They were even admitted to the synagogue (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 862). Similar liberties are still allowed them among the Arabians (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 136); so that we are probably to regard the statements of travelers respecting the utter exclusion of modern lepers in the East as

relating to those affected with entirely a different disease, the elephantiasis. In Leviticus 14 are detailed particular ceremonies and offerings (compare ~~100~~ Matthew 8:4) to be officially observed by the priest on behalf of a leper restored to health and purity. See D. C. Lutz, *De duab. avtib. purgationi leprosi destinatis earundenzque mysterio*, Hal. 1737; Bihr, *Symbol.* 2:512 sq.; Baumgarten, *Commnent.* I, 2:170 sq.; Talmud, tract *Negaim*, 6:3; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 365 sq.; Rhenferd, in Meuschen, *N.T. Talmud.* p. 1057.

(II.) *Elephantiasis.* — This more severe form of cutaneous, or, rather, scrofulous disease has been confounded with leprosy, from which it is essentially different. It is usually called *tubercular leprosy* (*Lepra nodosa*, Celsus, *Med.* 3:25), and has generally been thought to be the disease with which Job was afflicted ([*ri`yj v*] ~~100~~ Job 2:7; comp. ~~100~~ Deuteronomy 28:35). **SEE JOBS DISEASE.** It has been thought to be alluded to by the term “botch of Egypt” (*μυακῆ ἀἰγῆ*) ~~100~~ Deuteronomy 28:27), where it is said to have been endemic (Pliny, 26:5; Lucret. 6:1112 sq.; comp. Aretaeus, *Cappad. morb. diut.* 2:13, see Ainslie, in the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society*, 1:282 sq.). The Greeks gave the name of elephantiasis to this disease because the skin of the person affected with it was thought to resemble that of an elephant, in dark color, ruggedness, and insensibility, or, as some have thought, because the foot, after the loss of the toes, when the hollow of the sole is filled up and the ankle enlarged, resembles the foot of an elephant. The Arabs called it *Judhâm*, which means “mutilation,” “amputation,” in reference to the loss of the smaller members. They have, however, also described another disease, and a very different one from elephantiasis, to which they gave the name of *Da'l fil*, which means literally *morbus elephas*. The disease to which they applied this name is called by modern writers the *tumid Barbadoes leg*, and consists in a thickening of the skin and subcutaneous tissues of the leg, but presents nothing resembling the tubercles of elephantiasis. Now the Latin translators from the Arabic, finding that the same name existed both in the Greek and Arabic, translated *Da'l fil* by elephantiasis, and thus confounded the Barbadoes leg with the Arabic *Judham*, while this latter, which was in reality elephantiasis, they rendered by the Greek term *lepra*. See Kleyer, in *Miscell. nat. curios.* 1683, p. 8; Bartholin. *Morb. Bibl.* 100:7; Michaelis, *Finleit. ins A. T.* 1:58 sq.; Reinhard, *Bibelkrank.* 3:52.

Elephantiasis first of all makes its appearance by spots of a reddish, yellowish, or livid hue, irregularly disseminated over the skin and slightly raised above its surface. These spots are glossy, and appear oily, or as if they were covered with varnish. After they have remained in this way for a longer or shorter time, they are succeeded by an eruption of tubercles. These are soft, roundish tumors, varying in size from that of a pea to that of an olive, and are of a reddish or livid color. They are principally developed on the face and ears, but in the course of years extend over the whole body. The face becomes frightfully deformed; the forehead is traversed by deep lines and covered with numerous tubercles; the eyebrows become bald, swelled, furrowed by oblique lines, and covered with nipple-like elevations; the eyelashes fall out, and the eyes assume a fixed and staring look; the lips are enormously thickened and shining; the beard falls out; the chin and ears are enlarged and beset with tubercles: the lobe and alae of the nose are frightfully enlarged and deformed; the nostrils irregularly dilated, internally constricted, and excoriated; the voice is hoarse and nasal, and the breath intolerably fetid. After some time, generally after some years, many of the tubercles ulcerate, and the matter which exudes from them dries to crusts of a brownish or blackish color; but this process seldom terminates in cicatrization. The extremities are affected in the same way as the face. The hollow of the foot is swelled out, so that the sole becomes flat; the sensibility of the skin is greatly impaired, and in the hands and feet, often entirely lost; the joints of the toes ulcerate and fall off one after the other; insupportable fetor exhales from the whole body. The patient's general health is not affected for a considerable time, and his sufferings are not always of the same intensity as his external deformity. Often, however, his nights are sleepless or disturbed by frightful dreams; he becomes morose and melancholy; he shuns the sight of the healthy because he feels what an object of disgust he is to them, and life becomes a loathsome burden to him; or he falls into a state of apathy, and, after many years of such an existence, he sinks either from exhaustion or from the supervention of internal disease.

About the period of the Crusades elephantiasis spread itself like an epidemic over all Europe, even as far north as the Faroe Islands; and henceforth, owing to the above-named mistakes, every one became familiar with leprosy under the form of the terrible disease that has just been described. Leper or lazarus-houses abounded everywhere: as many as 2000 are said to have existed in France alone. In the leper hospital in Edinburgh

the inmates begged for the general community-sitting for the purpose at the door of the hospital. They were obliged to warn those approaching them of the presence of an infected fellow-mortal by using a wood rattle or clapper. The infected in European countries were obliged to enter leper hospitals, and were considered legally and politically dead. The Church, taking the same view of it, performed over them the solemn ceremonies for the burial of the dead — the priest closing the ceremony by throwing upon them a shovelful of earth. The disease was considered to be contagious possibly only on account of the belief that was entertained respecting its identity with Jewish leprosy, and the strictest regulations were enacted for secluding the diseased from society. Towards the commencement of the 17th century the disease gradually disappeared from Europe, and is now mostly confined to intertropical countries. It existed in Faroe as late as 1676, and in the Shetland Islands in 1736, long after it had ceased in the southern parts of Great Britain. This fearful disease made its appearance in the island of Guadaloupe in the year 1730, introduced by negroes from Africa, producing great consternation among the inhabitants. In Europe it is now principally confined to Norway, where the last census gave 2000 cases. It visits occasionally some of the sea-port localities of Spain. It has made its appearance in the most different climates, from Iceland through the temperate regions to the and plains of Arabia — in moist and dry localities. It still exists in Palestine and Egypt — the latter its most familiar home, although Dr. Kitto thinks not in such numerous instances as in former ages. The physical causes of the malady are uncertain. The best authors of the present day who have had an opportunity of observing the disease do not consider it to be contagious. There seems, however, to be little doubt as to its being hereditary. See Good's *Study of Medicine*, 3:421; Rayer, *Malachi de la Peau*, 2:296; Simpson, *On the Lepers and Leperhouses of Scotland and England*, in *Edinb. Medical and Surgical Journal*, Jan. 1, 1842; J. Gieslesen, *De elephantiasi Norvegica* (Havn. 1785); Michael. *U. orient Bibl.* 4:168 sq.; B. Haubold, *Vitiliginis leproscer rarioris historia c. epicrisi* (Lips. 1821); C. J. Hille, *Rarmioris norbi clephantiasi partiali sienilis histor.* (Lips. 1828); Rosenbaum, in the *Hall. Encyklop.* 33:254 sq.

Elephantiasis, or the leprosy of the Middle Ages, is the disease from which most of the prevalent notions concerning leprosy have been derived, and to which the notices of lepers contained in modern books of travels exclusively refer. It is doubtful whether any of the lepers cured by Christ

(~~408B~~ Matthew 8:3; ~~404C~~ Mark 1:42; Luke v. 12, 13) were of this class. In nearly all Oriental towns persons of this description are met with, excluded from intercourse with the rest of the community, and usually confined to a separate quarter of the town. Dr. Robinson says, with reference to Jerusalem, "Within the Zion Gate, a little towards the right, are some miserable hovels, inhabited by persons called lepers. Whether their disease is or is not the leprosy of Scripture I am unable to affirm; the symptoms described to us were similar to those of elephantiasis. At any rate, they are pitiable objects, and miserable outcasts from society. They all live here together, and inter-marry only with each other. The children are said to be healthy until the age of puberty or later, when the disease makes its appearance in a finger, on the nose, or in some like part of the body, and gradually increases as long as the victim survives. They were said often to live to the age of forty or fifty years" (*Bib. Res.* 1:359). With reference to their presence elsewhere, he remarks, "There are said to be leprosy persons at Nablûs (Shechem) as well as at Jerusalem, but we did not here meet with them" (*ib.* 3:113 note). On the reputed site of the house of Naaman, at Damascus, stands at the present day a hospital filled with unfortunate patients, the victims affected like him with leprosy. *SEE PLAGUE.*

2. That the Mosaic cases of true leprosy were confined to the former of these two dreadful forms of disease is evident. The reason why this kind of cutaneous distemper alone was taken cognizance of by the law doubtless was because the other was too well marked and obvious to require any diagnostic particularization. With the scriptural symptoms before us, let us compare the most recent description of modern leprosy of the malignant type given by an eye-witness who examined this subject: "The scab comes on by degrees, in different parts of the body; the hair falls from the head and eyebrows; the nails loosen, decay, and drop off; joint after joint of the fingers and toes shrink up, and slowly fall away; the gums are absorbed, and the teeth disappear; the nose, the eyes, the tongue, and the palate are slowly consumed; and, finally, the wretched victim shrinks into the earth and disappears, while medicine has no power to stay the ravages of this fell disease, or even to mitigate sensibly its tortures" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, p. 653, etc.); and again, "Sauntering down the Jaffa road, on my approach to the Holy City, in a kind of dreamy maze, I was startled out of my reverie by the sudden apparition of a crowd of beggars, sans eyes, sans nose, sans hair, sans everything. They held up towards me their handleless arms, unearthly sounds gurgled through throats without palates" (*ibid.* p.

651). We merely ask by what rules of interpretation can we deduce from the Biblical leprosy, which is described as consisting in a rising scab, or bright spot deeper than the general level of the skin, and spreading, sometimes exhibiting live flesh, and which is non-contagious and curable, that loathsome and appalling malady described by Dr. Thomson and others?

3. As to the leprosy of garments, vessels, and houses, the ancient Jewish tradition is that “leprosy of garments and houses was not to be found in the world generally, but was a sign and a miracle in Israel to guard them against an evil tongue” (Maimonides, *On Leprosy*, 16:10). Some have thought garments worn by leprosy patients intended. The discharges of the diseased skin absorbed into the apparel would, if infection were possible, probably convey disease, and it is known to be highly dangerous in some cases to allow clothes which have so imbibed the discharges of an ulcer to be worn again. The words of Jude, ver. 23, may seem to countenance this, “Hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.” But, 1st, no mention of infection occurs; 2d, no connection of the leprosy garment with a leprosy human wearer is hinted at; 3d, this would not help us to account for a leprosy of stone walls and plaster. Thus Dr. Mead (*ut sq.*) speaks at any rate plausibly of the leprosy of garments, but becomes unreasonable when he extends his explanation to that of walls. There is more probability in the idea of Sommer (*Bibl. Abhandlugen*, 1:224) that what is meant are the fusing-stains occasioned by damp and want of air, and which, when confirmed, cause the cloth to moulder and fall to pieces. Michaelis thought that wool from sheep which had died of a particular disease might fret into holes, and exhibit an appearance like that described in ^(B137)Leviticus 13:47, 59 (Michaelis, art. 211, 3:290, 291). But woolen cloth is far from being the only material mentioned; nay, there is even some reason to think that the words rendered in the A.V. “warp” and “woof” are not those distinct parts of the texture, but distinct materials. Linen, however, and leather are distinctly particularized, and the latter not only as regards garments, but “anything (lit. vessel) made of skin” — for instance, bottles. This classing of garments and house-walls with the human epidermis as leprosy has moved the mirth of some and the wonder of others. Yet modern science has established what goes far to vindicate the Mosaic classification as more philosophical than such cavils. It is now known that there are some skin-diseases which originate in an acarus, and others which proceed from a fungus. In these we may probably find the solution of the paradox. The

analogy between the insect which frets the human skin and that which frets the garment that covers it, between the fungous growth that lines the crevices of the epidermis and that which creeps in the interstices of masonry, is close enough for the purposes of a ceremonial law, to which it is essential that there should be an arbitrary element intermingled with provisions manifestly reasonable. Michaelis (*ibid.* art. 211:3:293-9) has suggested a nitrous efflorescence on the surface of the stone, produced by saltpetre, or rather an acid containing it, and issuing in red spots, and cites the example of a house in Lubeck; he mentions, also, exfoliation of the stone from other causes; but probably these appearances would not be developed without a greater degree of damp than is common in Palestine and Arabia. It is manifest, also, that a disease in the human subject caused by an acarus or a fungus would be certainly contagious, since the propagative cause could be transferred from person to person. Some physicians, indeed, assert that *only* such skin-diseases *are* contagious. Hence, perhaps, arose a further reason for marking, even in their analogues among lifeless substances, the strictness with which forms of disease so arising were to be shunned.

Whatever the nature of the disorder might be, there can be no doubt, as Baumgarten has remarked (*Comm.* 2:175), that in the house respect was had to its possessor, since when *it* came to be in a good condition a cleansing or purification quite analogous to the man's was prescribed. He was thus taught to see in his external environments a sign of what was or might be internal. The later Jews appear to have had some idea of this, though others viewed it differently. Some rabbins say that God sent this plague for the good of the Israelites into certain houses, that, they being pulled down, the treasure which the Amorites had hidden there might be discovered (Patrick on ~~ORAB~~ Leviticus 14:34). But "there is good reason," adds the learned prelate, "from these words ['I put the plague of leprosy upon a house], to think that this plague was a supernatural stroke. Thus Aberbanel understands it: 'When he saith "I put the plague," it shows that this thing was not natural, but proceeded from the special providence and pleasure of the blessed God.' So the author of *Sepher Cosri* (pt. 2, § 58): God inflicted the plague of leprosy upon houses and garments as a punishment for lesser sins, and when men continued still to multiply transgressions, then it invaded their bodies. Maimonides will have this to be the punishment of an evil tongue, i.e. detractions and calumny, which began in the walls of the offender's house, and went no farther, but

vanished if he repented of his sin; but if he persisted in his rebellious courses, it proceeded to his household stuff; and if he still went on, invaded his garments, and at last his body” (*More Nebochim*, pt. 3, cap. 47).

Finally, as to the moral design of all these enactments. Every leper was a living sermon, a loud admonition to keep unspotted from the world. The exclusion of lepers from the camp, from the holy city, conveyed figuratively the same lesson as is done in the New Testament passages (~~627~~ Revelation 21:27; ~~485~~ Ephesians 5:5)...It is only when we take this view of the leprosy that we account for the fact that just this disease so frequently occurs as the theocratic punishment of sin. The image of sin is best suited for reflecting it: he who is a sinner before God is represented’ as a sinner in the eyes of man also, by the circumstance that he must exhibit before men the image of sin. God took care that ordinarily the image and the thing itself were perfectly coincident, although, no doubt, there were exceptions” (Hengstenberg, *Christol.* on ~~2413~~ Jeremiah 31:39). **SEE UNCLEANNESS.**

Literature. — Besides the above notices and canons on leprosy given in the Mishna, tract *Negaim*; also by Maimonides, *Yod Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Mechosse Kapara*, cap. 4, and *Hilchoth Tamath Tsoraoth*; and by Rashi and Rashbarn, *Commentar.* on Leviticus 13, 14; see, among modern writers, Mead, *Medica Sacra*, in his *Medical Works* (Edinb. 1765), 3:160, etc.; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses* (Lond. 1814), 3:257-305; Mason Good, *The Study of Medicine* (Lond. 1825), v. 585 sq.; Schilling, *De lepra Commentationes* (Lugd. Bat. 1778); Hensler, *Vorn abendlandischen Aussatze im Mittelalter* (Hamb. 1790); Jahn, *Biblische A rchaologie* (Vienna, 1818), I, 2:355 sq.; Bahr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus* (Heidelb. 1830), 2:459 sq., 512 sq.; Sommer, *Biblische Abhandlungen*, vol. 1 (Bonn, 1846); Pruner, *Die Krankheiten des Orients* (Erlang. 1847), p. 163 sq.; Trusen, *Die Sitten, Gebrauche und Kranklheiten der A lten Hebr.* (Bresl. 1833); Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht* (Berlin, 1853), 1:217 sq.; Keil, *Handbuch der Biblischen A rchaologie* (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858), 1:270 sq., 288 sq.; Bonorden, *Lepra squamosa* (Hal. 1795); Lutz, *De avibus purgat. leprosi* (Hal. 1757); Withof, *De leprosariis vet. Hebrueorum* (Duisb. 1756); Murray, *Historia leprce* (Gott. 1749); J. Thomas, *De lepra Grcecor. et Judaeor.* (Basil. 1708); Norberg, *De lepra A rabums* (Lond. 1796); Hilary, *Observ. on the Diseases of Barbadoes* (Lond. 1759), p. 326 sq.; Sprengel, *Pathol.* 3:794-835; Frank, *De curandis honzin. morbis*, I, 2:476; Schnurrer, in the *Halle Encyklop.*

6:451 sq.; Rust, *Handb. d. Chirurg.* 2:581 sq.; Roussille-Chamseru. *Recherches sur ie véritable. Caractere de la Lepre des Hebreux, and Relation Chirurg. de l'Armee de l'Orient* (Paris, 1804); Cazenave and Schedel, *A breg Pratique des Maladies de la Peau*; Aretaeus, *Maorb. Chron.* 2:13; Fracastorius, *De Morbis Contagiosis*; Johannes Manardus, *Epist. Medic.* 7:2, and to 4:3, 3, § 1 Avicenna, *De Medic.* v. 28, § 19; also Dr. Sim in the *North American Chirurgical Review*, Sept. 1859, p. 876; Hecker, *Die Elephantiasis oder Lepra Arabica* (Lehr, 1858); also the monographs cited by Volbeding, *Index*, p. 42; and by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 137. The ancient authorities are Hippocrates, *Prophetica*, lib. 12, ap. fin.; Galen, *Explicati Linguaruum Hippocratis*, and *De Art. Curat.* lib. 2; Celsus, *De Medic.* 5:28, § 19. **SEE DISEASE.**

Le Quien, Michael

a Dominican, who was born at Boulogne, Oct. 6, 1661, was remarkable for his learning in Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, and in Oriental Church History. His *Joanis Dacmsceni opera* (Paris, 1712, in two folio volumes) is a superior edition of that father. His most important work is *Oriens Christianus, insuper et Africa*, an account of the churches, patriarchs, etc., of the East (3 vols. 8vo), the first part of which appeared before, the second part after the author's death, which took place at the convent in St. Honore March 13, 1733.

Lerins, Convent Of,

one of the oldest, and once one of the most important monastic establishments in France, is situated in the island of St. Honore, on the coast of Provence, opposite Antibes. The legend concerning its origin is as follows: Honoratus, a man of noble descent, and who had even been once consul, embraced the Christian faith, together with his brother, in spite of the remonstrances of his family. They first retired to an island near Marseilles, but Honoratus afterwards went back to Provence, where he settled at Lerins, under the protection of the bishop of Frjus. His reputation for sanctity induced many to join him, and they lived, some in communities (*coenobites*), others as hermits in separate cells. It was the time when monachism was lately introduced into Europe from the East, and convents were arising along the shores of the Mediterranean, and on the coasts of Italy (Gallinara, Gorgona, Capraja), of Dalmatia, and of France. Martinus had just established a convent at Turonum, whose rules

were adopted in those that were established by Cassian. The statement that the Cassian rules were first introduced at Lerins is therefore erroneous. Under Honoratus, who was afterwards appointed bishop of Aries, the last-named convent made rapid progress. Lerins became one of the most important schools for the clergy of Southern Gaul, and furnished a large number of bishops, among whom we will mention Hilarius of Arles and Eucherius of Lyons: at that time monks were often made bishops. In the 5th century the convent became imbued with semi-Pelagian ideas, which thence spread into Southern France. In the 7th century the monks of Lerins seem to have relaxed in their obedience to their rule, for Gregory wrote to the abbot *Conon* inviting him to reform their morals. This reform was accomplished by a Benedictine abbot, Aigulf, but only after a struggle which for a while threatened to destroy the convent, the opposition party going so far as to call in the assistance of neighboring lords, and murdering the abbot and some of his followers. Still, as the reform had been inaugurated, the convent resumed its former prosperity, and in the beginning of the 8th century its abbot counted 3700 monks under his command. Soon after, however, it was overrun by the Saracens from Spain; the abbot Porcarius, in prevision of this event, sent thirty-six of the younger monks and forty children to Italy, while he and those who remained were murdered, with the exception of four, who were retained prisoners. They escaped after a while, and, having returned to Lerins, formed the nucleus of a new convent. In 997, under the renowned Odilo, the convent once more rose to eminence, and attained its greatest fame under Adalbert (1030-1066). Raymund, count of Barcelona, gave the monks a whole convent in Catalonia, and they had possessions in France, Italy, Corsica, and the islands belonging to Italy. A nunnery at Tarascon, established by the seneschal of Provence, was also subject to their rule, together with a large number of *canonici regulares*, to whom the abbot Giraud gave two churches in 1226, under the condition that they should always remain subject to the rule of Lerins. Their prosperity decreasing, the abbot, Augustin Grimald, afterwards bishop of Grasse, connected them with the Benedictines in 1505, and this fusion received in 1515 the sanction of pope Leo X and of Francis I. In 1635 the island was taken by the Spaniards, who retained it until 1657; and, although the convent continued to exist, it lost henceforth all its importance. See Vincentius Barralis, *Chronologium Sanctolrumi et aliorum clarorum vmirorum insulce Lerinensis* (1613); *Abregy de l'Histoire de l'Ordre (de S. Benoist, par la*

Congregation de St. Maur, 1:215 sq., 468 sq.; 2:245; *Hist. des Ordres Monastiques*, 1:116 sq. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:333 sq.

Lesbônax

(Λεσβώναξ), a son of Potamon of Mytilene, a philosopher and sophist, lived in the time of Augustus. He was a pupil of Timocrates, and the father of Polemon, who is known as the teacher and friend of Tiberius. Suidas says that Lesbonax wrote several philosophical works, but does not mention that he was an orator or rhetorician, although there can be no doubt that he is the same person as the Lesbonax who wrote *μελετὰ ῥητορικὰ* and *ἔρωτικὰ ἐπιστολαί* (see Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 74, p. 52). — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biograpahy*, 2:772.

Le'sheln

(Heb. *id.* מלשן), a *gemr*, as in ^{<12389>}Exodus 28:19, etc.; Sept. Λέσεμ v. r. Λαχίς), a city in the northern part of Palestine (^{<16947>}Joshua 19:47); elsewhere called LAVISH (^{<07817>}Judges 18:7). *SEE DAN*.

Leshem

SEE LIGURE.

Lesley, John

a very celebrated Scotch prelate, was born in 1527, and was educated in the University of Aberdeen. In 1547 he was made canon of the cathedral church of Aberdeen and Murray, and after this he traveled into France, and, pursuing his studies in the universities of Toulouse, Poitiers, and Paris, finally took the degree of doctor of laws. He continued abroad till 1554, when he was commanded home by the queen regent, and made official and vicar general of the diocese of Aberdeen; and, entering into the priesthood, he became parson of Une. About this time, the Reformed doctrine, beginning to spread in Scotland, was zealously opposed by Lesley; and at a solemn dispute between the Protestants and Papists, held in 1560 at Edinburgh, Lesley was a principal champion on the side of the latter. However, this was so far from putting an end to the divisions that they daily increased, and, occasioning many disturbances and commotions, both parties agreed to invite home the queen, who was then absent in France. On this errand Lesley was employed by the Roman Catholics, and made such dispatch that he came to Vitri, where queen Mary was then lamenting

the death of her husband, the king of France, several days before lord James Stuart, sent by the Protestants. Having delivered to her his credentials, he told her majesty of lord James Stuart's mission, and actually succeeded in persuading her to embark with him for Scotland. Immediately upon his arrival home he was appointed senator to the College of Justice and a privy councilor, and a short time after was presented with the living of Lundores, and, upon the death of Sinclair, was made bishop of Koss. While in this position he took a prominent part in the civil as well as ecclesiastical affairs of his country, and secured to the Scots what are commonly called "the black acts of Parliament" (1566). During the flight of queen Mary to England he defended her cause against the Covenanters. In 1579 he was made suffragan bishop and vicar general of Rouen, in Normandy, and, after persecution and imprisonment, died in 1596. His writings are not of particular interest to theological students. See Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, vol. 2. s.v.; Collier, *Eccl. Hist. of England* (see Index, vol. 8).

Leslie, Charles

a prominent writer in the political and theological controversies of the 17th century, was the son of bishop John Leslie, of the Irish sees of Raphoe and Clogher, and was born in Ireland about 1650, and educated at Trinity College, Dublin. His course in life was very eccentric. In 1671 he went to England to study law, but in a few years turned himself to divinity, was admitted into orders, and settling in Ireland, became chancellor of Connor. He was living in Ireland at the time of the Revolution, and distinguished himself in some disputations with the Roman Catholics on the side of the Protestant Church. Though a zealous Protestant, he scrupled to renounce his allegiance to king James, and to acknowledge king William as his rightful sovereign. There was thus an end to his prospects in the Church, and, leaving Ireland, he went to England, and there employed himself in writing many of his controversial works, especially those on the political state of the country. When James II was dead, Leslie transferred his allegiance to his son, the Pretender; and, as he made frequent visits to the courts of the exiled princes, he so far fell under suspicion at home that he thought proper to leave England, and join himself openly to the court of the Pretender, then at Bar-le-Duc. He was still a zealous Protestant. and had in that court a private chapel, in which he was accustomed to officiate as a minister of the Protestant Church of England. When the Pretender removed to Italy, Leslie accompanied him; but, becoming at length sensible

of the strangeness of his position, a Protestant clergyman in the court of a zealous Roman Catholic, and age coming on, and with it the natural desire of dying in the land which had given him birth, he sought and obtained from the government of king George I, in 1721, permission to return. He died at Glaslough, in the county of Monaghan, in 1722. Leslie's writings in the political controversies of the time were all in support of high monarchical principles. His theological writings were controversial; they have been distributed into the six following classes: those against, 1, the Quakers; 2, the Presbyterians; 3, the Deists; 4, the Jews; 5, the Socinians; and, 6, the Papists. Some of them, especially the book entitled *A short and easy Method with the Deists*, are still read and held in esteem. Towards the close of his life he collected his theological writings, and published them in two folio volumes (1721). They were reprinted at Oxford (1832, 7 vols. 8vo). His other numerous works have not been published uniformly. Among them we notice *A View of the Times, their Principles and Practices*, etc. (2d ed. Lond. 1750, 6 vols. 12mo): — *The Massacre of Glencoe* (Anon., Lond. 1703, 4to) — *The Axe laid to the Root of Christianity*, etc. (Lond. 1706, 4to): — *Querela, temporum, or the Danger of the Church of England* (Lond. 1695, 4to): — *A Letter, etc., against the sacramental Test* (Lond. 1708, 4to): — *Answer to the Remarks on his first Dialogue against the Socinians*. Bayle styles him a man of great merit and learning, and adds that he was the first who wrote in Great Britain against the fanaticism of Madame Bourignon: his books, he further says, are much esteemed, and especially his treatise *The Snake in the Grass*. Salmon observes that his works must transmit him to posterity as a man thoroughly learned and truly pious. Dr. Hickee says that he made more converts to a sound faith and holy life than any man of the age in which he lived; that his consummate learning, attended by the lowest humility, the strictest piety without the least tincture of narrowness, a conversation to the last degree lively and spirited, yet to the last degree innocent, made him the delight of mankind. See *Biog. Brit.*; *Encyc. Brit.*; Jones, *Christ. Biog.*; *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:1825; Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors*, vol. 2. s.v.

Leslie, John

D.D., a noted prelate of the Irish Church, father of the celebrated Charles Leslie, was descended from an ancient family, and born in the north of Scotland about the beginning of the 17th century, and was educated at Aberdeen and at Oxford. Afterwards he traveled in Spain, Italy, Germany,

and France. He spoke French, Spanish, and Italian with the same propriety and fluency as the natives; and was; so great a master of the Latin that it was said of him when in Spain, “Solus Lesleius Latine loquitur.” He continued twenty-two years abroad, and during that time was at the siege of Rochelle, and in the expedition to the isle of Rhe with the duke of Buckingham. He was all along conversant in courts, and at home was happy in that of Charles I, who admitted him into his privy council both in Scotland and Ireland, in which stations he was continued by Charles II after the Restoration. His chief preferment in the Church of Scotland was the bishopric of the Orkneys, whence he was translated to Raphoe, in Ireland, in 1633, and the same year sworn a privy councilor in that kingdom. During the Rebellion he openly and valiantly espoused the cause of his royal master, and after the Restoration was translated to the see of Clogher. He died in 1671. See Chambers, *Biog. of Eminent Scotsmen*, s.v.

Less, Gottfried

a noted German theologian of the Pietistic school, was born in 1736 at Conitz, in West Prussia. He was a pupil of Baumgarten, professor of theology at Gottingen. He studied at the universities of Halle and Jena, and in 1762 became court preacher at Hanover. He was rather a practical than scholastic theologian, and was inclined both to Mysticism and Pietism. Less was author of a work on the authenticity, uncorrupted preservation, and credibility of the New Testament, which has been translated from German into English, and highly commended by Michaelis and Marsh. It is not so prolix as Lardner. The German title is *Beweis der Wahrheit der christlichen Religion* (1768). He also wrote *Ueber die Religion* (1786): — *Versuch einer praktischen Dogmatik* (1779): — *Christliche Moral* (1777).

Less(Ius), Leonhard

a Jesuit moralist, was born at Brecht, in Brabant, Oct. 1, 1554, and was educated at the University of Leyden, to which, after a two years' stay at Rome, he was called as professor of philosophy and theology in 1585. The pope had just condemned seventy-six propositions of Bajus, whom the Jesuits, disciples of Scotus, had attacked; but soon Less and Hamel falling into the opposite extreme of Pelagianism, the faculty, after due remonstrance, solemnly condemned also fifty-four propositions contained in their lectures. Still, as several universities of note were inclined to judge moderately of Less's heretical tendency, he retained his position, and

remained in high standing, especially with his order. He died Jan. 5, 1623. His numerous and well-written essays on morals partake (of the sophistry so often employed in his order. Among the most important, we notice his *Libri iv de justitia et jure, ceterisque virtutibus cardinalibus*, often reprinted since 1605 (last edit. Lugd. 1653, folio), with an appendix by Theophile Raynaud *pro Leon. Less. de licito usu sequivocationum et mentalium reservationum*. Also the first volume of his *Opp. theol.* (Paris, 1651, fol.; Antw. 1720); and his essays *De libero arbitrio, De providentia, De perfectionibus divinis*, etc. He followed the system of the scholastic moralists, of whom Schrockh (*Kirchen gesch. seit d. Reform.* 4:104) says: "They, in fact, continued the old method of their predecessors since the 13th century, in so far as that branch of theology was then advanced, i.e. treating it as a dependence of the dogmatic system; yet they differed from them inasmuch as they set forth their views in large works of their own, evinced more learning, a better style, and a certain regard for the times in which they lived." Less attacked also the Protestant Church in his *Consultatio, quae fides et religio sit capessenda* (Amstelod. 1609; last edit. 1701). His chief argument was that that Church did not exist before the Reformation; he was triumphantly answered on this point by Balthasar Meisner, of Wittenberg († 1626), in his *Consultatio catholica defide Lutherana capessenda et Romano-papistica deserenda* (1623). Still Less always retained the highest consideration in his Church, was even reputed to work miracles, and was finally canonized. See Herzog, *Real-Encyclopadie*, 8:340; Gieseler, *Kirchen Gesch.* vol. 3; Linsenmann, *Michael Baius* (Tüb. 1867).

Lesser, Friedrich Christian

a German theologian, was born May 29, 1692, at Nordhausen. In early life he manifested a desire for the knowledge of natural history, and in this department he afterwards distinguished himself greatly. In 1712 he entered the University of Halle, to study medicine, but soon altered his plan, and entered on the study of theology, by the advice of the learned theological professor Francke. He finished his theological studies at the University of Leipsic, and became pastor of a Church in his native city in 1716; in addition to it, he assumed in 1724 the supervision of the Orphan House. In 1739 he became pastor at the collegiate church of St. Martin, and in 1743 of St. Jacob's Church. He died Sept. 17, 1754. Besides his works on natural history, in some of which he endeavored to combine natural history with theology, e.g. *Theology of Stones (Lithotheologia, Hamb. 1735, 8vo)*;

Theology of Insects (De sapientia, omnipotentia et providentia ex partibus insectorum cognoscenda, etc., Nordh. 1735, 8vo), etc., he left productions of a theological character, of which a complete list is given by Doring in his *Gelehrt. Theol. Deutschlands*, 2:287 sq.

Lessey, Theophilus

a distinguished English Wesleyan minister, was born in Cornwall April 7, 1787; entered the regular ministry about 1808; and after laboring with great ability and success in most parts of the United Kingdom, was in 1839 made president of the Conference, and died June 10, 1841. Mr. Lessey was one of the most eminent preachers and eloquent platform speakers of his time, and was the familiar friend of James Montgomery, the poet, Richard Watson, and Robert Hall. Many instances of his remarkable eloquence are recorded, and many souls were saved by his preaching. — Wakeley, *Heroes of Methodism*, p. 396; Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism* (see Index). (G. L. T.)

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim

the generator of modern German literature of the 18th century. both secular and ecclesiastic, declared by Macaulay to have been “beyond dispute the first critic in Europe,” who “in the same breath convulsed powerfully both the dramatic and theological world, and by his critical acuteness has laid hands on both, and has produced polemics and called forth controversy in art as well as in religion, without having left behind him a finished system in either department, indeed without having been a professional poet in the strict sense of the word, or a professional theologian.”

Life. — Lessing was born at Kamentz (Camenz), in Upper Lusatia, Jan. 22, 1729. His father was the Protestant (Lutheran) “pastor primarius” of the place, and was widely noted for his learning, especially in the historical department. Designed for the ministry, young Lessing was trained by his pious parents “in the way he should go;” and he was not simply taught what he should believe, but how and why he should believe. Long before he was old enough to be sent to school the youth displayed an uncommon desire for books. After thorough preparation at an elementary school, he entered at the age of twelve the high-school at Meissen, and of his extraordinary diligence in study a sufficient idea may be formed when it is stated that while there he perused a number of classic authors besides those

which entered into the regular course, translated the third and fourth books of Euclid, drew up a history of mathematics, and, on taking leave of it, delivered a discourse “De Mathematica Barbarorum.” In 1746 he was ready to proceed to the university, and, as his parents had fondly hoped, to enter upon the studies which should fit him for the ministry of the word of God. His mother, in particular, designed that her Gotthold Ephraim “should be a real man of God.”

Like an earnest and ardent student, which he always proved himself, Lessing now devoted his time to all the studies which that university encouraged, except the one upon which the family hopes were set — theology; and this need not be wondered at, if we will but glance for a moment at a programme of the lectures in the four faculties of that high-school upon Lessing’s entry. In theology, jurisprudence, medicine, and philosophy twenty-two lectures were delivered weekly, yet the names of the lecturers were prominent only in the last-named department; they were notably obscure in that of theology. In philosophy Gottsched was lecturing upon the early Greek philosophers, Christ upon Horace and Ovid, Jocher upon the Reformation, Winckler upon Epictetus, Miller upon logic, May upon ethics, and Heinsius upon rectilinear and spherical trigonometry. Ernesti, the future noted theologian, was yet lecturing in the department of ancient literature, and it was by his direct and permanent influence, as well as by the exertions of professor Christ, that Lessing was led to enter upon the profound philological studies, which finally resulted in such great service to classical literature and art. Thrown into company with Mylius, an old schoolmate of his, and an ardent advocate of the stage as a means of moral reform, and other auditors of professor Kastner, who was then lecturing on dramatic art, Lessing acquired a decided taste for the theater, and was finally led to abandon his classical studies altogether, not only devoting himself more fully to this one study, but actually coming to entertain the thought of going on the stage himself. His conduct greatly displeased his parents and his sister, who warned him against it as being not merely trifling, but sinful. But Lessing continued in his course. Driven further, also, by the announcement that the family could contribute no allowance for his support except with extreme difficulty, he determined to shift for himself, and decided for his subsistence hereafter to devote his talents to poetry, criticism, and belles-lettres, as that field of literature which had been least of all cultivated by his countrymen, and where, besides having few rivals, he might employ his pen with greater advantage

to others as well as to himself. His first productions were one or two minor dramatic pieces, which were printed in a journal entitled *Ermunterungen zum Vergniigen*. In the meanwhile the gossip about his relation to the ungodly Mylius, who had by this time become his most intimate associate, spread, and reached the ears of his aged parents. Desperate measures only could secure his return to the parental hearthstone. Madame Lessing was overwhelmed with grief; her Gotthold Ephraim must be restored to her immediate influence, or he would forever be lost to the Church and the blessings of religion, and for once the end should justify the means. Accordingly, the youthful sinner was written to: "On receipt of this, start at once; your mother is dying, and wishes to speak to you before her death." Of course, no sooner had the letter reached Lessing than we find him starting for the little country town. His personal appearance and assurances of his good intentions, both as a Christian and an obedient son, soon quieted the disconsolate parents, and he was suffered once more to return to Leipsic. From this place he removed in 1750 to Berlin—the home of freethinkers, whither the arch-atheist Mylius had preceded him some time—certainly not a very comforting turn in his personal history for his well-nigh despairing parents.

Lessing was now twenty years of age. He had no money, no recommendations, no friends, scarcely any acquaintances — nothing but his cheerful courage, his confidence in his own powers, and the discipline acquired through past privations. He was so poor that he was unable to obtain even the decent clothing necessary to make a respectable appearance. He applied for aid to his parents, but they neither felt able nor willing to grant his request, and he had no other course open to him but to throw himself upon the influence and resources of his old schoolmate, Mylius, who was now editing a paper in Berlin. By this friend's exertions, oftentimes not stopping short of real sacrifices, Lessing managed to exist. Master of English, French, Italian, and Spanish, he found work in translating from these languages, while he also contributed largely to different literary journals of the Prussian metropolis. Gradually he was introduced to the notice of the scholars of the city, among them Mendelssohn, the Jewish philosopher, and Nicolai, the noted publisher and author of works of value in the department of secular German literature. Indeed, the association of Mendelssohn the Jew, and Lessing the Christian, has perhaps had greater influence on the position which Lessing assumed in after life than any he had with other persons. Both were yet young men.

The former had come to Berlin from Dessau in indigent circumstances, ignorant of the German language, but determined, nevertheless, to rise above his condition, and to master not only the German, Latin, and English, but also the intricate subject of philosophy; and in this attempt he had so well succeeded that at the first meeting of Lessing and Mendelssohn, in 1754, the latter was already acknowledged a man of superior ability and a scholar. They recognized in each other qualities that could well be used unitedly for the good of humanity, and they soon were content only when in each other's society. For two hours every day regularly they met and discussed together literary and philosophical subjects. Lessing came to comprehend the truth that virtue, honor, and nobility of character could be found in the Jew also, which the people of his day, led by a narrow-minded clergy, were prone to disbelieve: and this gave rise first to his important play entitled *Die Juden*, and later to his chef-d'oeuvre, *Nathan der Weise* (transl. by Ellen Frothingham, Nu. Y. 1871, 12mo, with which compare the essays by Kluno Fischer [Mannheim, 1865] and David Strauss [Berlin, 1866, 8vo, 2d ed.], and (Grütz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 11:35 sq.; also the works on German literature at the end of this article). Near the close of 1751 Lessing decided to return once more to the university, and this time chose Wittenberg, to penetrate into "the innermost sanctuary of book-worm erudition." For nearly a year he here gave himself up to the study of philology and history, especially that of the Reformation and the Reformers. His reputation as a critic grew daily, and in live years after his first entry at Berlin he was counted among the most eminent literati of the Prussian capital. Even at this early age Lessing had ventured into the whole circle of esthetic and literary interests of the day, never failing to bring their essential points into notice, and subjecting them to an exhaustive treatment, notwithstanding the fragmentary form of the composition, while in point of style he had already attained an aptness and elegance of language, a facile grace and sportive humor of treatment, such as few writers of that day had even dreamed of. "His manner lent enchantment to the dryest subjects, and even the dullest books gained interest from his criticisms." It was during his sojourn at Berlin that, with his and Mendelssohn's assistance, Nicolai (q.v.) started the *Library of Polite Literat*. (1757) and the *Universal German Library* (1765). (See Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* 1:278, 307.)

In 1760 the Academy of Sciences of Berlin honored itself by conferring membership on Lessing, and shortly after a somewhat lucrative position fell

to his lot in Breslau, whither he at once removed, and where he remained five years. It is in this, the chief city of Silesia, that most of Lessing's valuable contributions to the department of general literature were prepared. After a short visit to his parents, Lessing returned in 1765 to Berlin, then removed to Hamburg, and in 1770 finally started for Wolfenbüttel, to assume the duties of librarian to the duke Frederick William Ferdinand of Brunswick, a position congenial to his taste, and here he remained until his death, Feb. 15, 1781.

Theological Position. — We here consider Lessing as a writer and thinker of the 18th century, but in so far only as the works which he published, both his own productions and those that were sent forth with his approval, affected the theological world in his day and since, more especially in Germany. Originally intended for the pulpit, Lessing suddenly came to entertain the belief that morality, which to him was only a synonym of religion, should be taught not only from the pulpit, but also on the stage. Germany, in his day, was altogether Frenchified. "We are ever," said he himself, "the sworn imitators of everything foreign, and especially are we humble admirers of the never sufficiently admired French. Everything that comes to us from over the Rhine is fair, and charming, and beautiful, and divine. We rather doubt our senses than doubt this. Rather would we persuade ourselves that roughness was freedom; license, elegance; grimace, expression; a jingle of rhymes, poetry; and shrieking, music, than entertain the slightest misgiving as to the superiority which that amiable people, that first people in the world (as they modestly term themselves), have the good fortune to possess in everything which is becoming, and beautiful, and noble." Such had been the doctrines taught by the great ruler Frederick II himself, and no wonder the people soon fell into the frivolous ways of the French; and, as the literature is said to be the index of a people, we need feel no surprise at Lessing's great onslaught on Gottsched and his followers while yet a student of the university in which this leader of the school of French taste held a professorship. Nor must it be forgotten that the history of literature stands in unmistakable connection with the history of the thinking and struggling intellect generally, and consequently, also, with the history of religion and philosophy. One is reflected in the other. The influence of the vapid spirit of French literature of the age of Voltaire was transferred to (German ground, and soon the fruits became apparent in the general spread of French *illuminism* (q.v.) and a sort of *humanism*. **SEE ROUSSEAU.** The great German philosopher Wolf, following closely

in the footsteps of Leibnitz, had sought to check this rapid flow of the Germans towards infidelity by a system of philosophy that should lay securely the foundations for religion and morality, “fully persuaded that the so-called natural religion, which he . . . expected to be attained by the efforts of reason, and which related more to the belief in God and in immortality than to anything else, would become the very best steppingstone to the temple of revealed religion” (Hagenbach. *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* 1:78). Indeed, the theologians themselves sought to prove, by the mathematical, demonstrative method, the truth of the doctrines of revelation, and the falsity of infidelity, forgetting altogether the great fact that “that sharp form of thought which bends itself to mathematical formulas is not for every man, least of all for the great mass;” and had it not been for the influence which pietism was exerting in the 18th century upon orthodox Christianity, the latter must have suffered beyond even the most ardent expectations of the most devoted German Voltaireans. As it was, even, there gradually arose a shallow theology, destitute of ideas, and limited to a few moral commonplaces, known under the name of *neology* (q.v.), which, at the time of Lessing’s appearance, controlled the German mind. See SEMLER. An active thinker like Lessing, who, when yet a youth, could write to his father that the Christian religion is not a thing which one can accept upon the word and honor of a parent,” but that the way to the possession of the truth is for him only “who has once wisely doubted, and by the path of inquiry attained conviction, or at least striven to attain it,” such a one was not likely to remain passive in this critical period of the history of thought. Unfortunately, however, the mature Lessing had shifted from the position of the youthful inquirer, and, instead of accepting the truth when attained by conviction, he had come to believe that truth is never to be accepted. “It is not the truth of which a man is, or thinks he is, in possession that measures the worth of the man, but the honest effort he has made to arrive at the truth, for it is not the possession of truth, but the search for it, that enlarges those powers in which an ever-growing capacity consists. Possession satisfies, enervates, corrupts.” “If God,” he says, “held all truth in his right hand, and in his left hand nothing but the ever-restless instinct for truth, though with the condition of forever and ever erring, and should say to me, Choose, I would bow reverently to his left hand and say, Father, give; pure truth is for thee alone !” “Thus, forgetting altogether that Christianity is not a striving after truth, but possession of the truth, Lessing became unconsciously one of the greatest promoters of Rationalism in its worst

form (comp. Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, p. 147, 149). We say Lessing *unconsciously* became the promoter of Rationalism; for, with Dorner (*Gesch. d. Protest. Theol.* p. 731), we believe that his object was not to write against religion, but against theology; not against Christianity, but only against the poor proofs that were advanced in its behalf. Indeed, his own words on Diderot's labors condemn the charge so often brought against Lessing, that he was an outright opponent of Christianity, a pure deist, and nothing more. In reviewing one of Diderot's works, he says: "A shortsighted dogmatist, who avoids nothing so carefully as a doubt of the memorial maxims that make his system, will gather a host of errors from this work. Our author is one of those philosophers who give themselves more trouble to raise clouds than to scatter them. Wherever the fatal glance of their eyes fall, the pillars of the firmest truth totter. and that which we have seemed to see quite clearly loses itself in the dim, uncertain distance; instead of leading us by twilight colonnades to the luminous throne of truth, they lead us by the ways of fancied splendor to the dusky throne of falsehood. Suppose, then, such philosophers dare to attack opinions that are sacred. The danger is small. The injury which their dreams, or realities-the thing is one with them-inflit upon society is as small as that is great which they inflit who would bring the consciences of all under the yoke of their own."

While librarian of Wolfenbüttel, Lessing discovered there a MS. copy of the long-forgotten work of Berengar (q.v.) of Tours against Lanfranc (q.v.), which proved that some of the views of the Lutheran Church concerning the doctrine of the Eucharist had already been advanced by one of the most eminent teachers of the 11th century. Here was an evident service to theology, and for it he was commended by the theological world. Not so, however, when, with the same intent to serve, he sent forth a work which for years had been waiting for a printer and an editor. It is true the work was of decided infidel tendency, but Lessing never could hesitate on that account to give to the world what had been intended for its perusal and judgment, and he therefore sent forth "the Wolfenbüttel Fragments," as they are termed, in his *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Literatur* (1774-1778), which treat,

- 1, of the tolerance of the Dists;
- 2, of the accusations brought against human reason in the pulpit;
- 3, of the impossibility of a revelation which all men could believe in in the same manner;

- 4, of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea;
- 5, of the O. Test. not having been written with the intention of revealing a religion;
- 6, of the history of the resurrection.

The last essay, especially, called forth a storm of opposition, but this did not prevent Lessing's publishing in 1778 a final essay on the object of Jesus and of the apostles. With the views of these fragments, however, Lessing by no means himself coincided. *SEE WOLFENBÜTTEL FRAGMENTS.* They were intended simply to induce deeper researches on the part of theologians, and to establish a more stringent system of criticism. He desired to raise from a deep lethargy, and to purify from all uncritical elements, the orthodox whom he had so valiantly defended against neology, and proved that this was his intention by the manner in which he opposed the attempt of the Rationalists to substitute to intuitions of reason for the dictates of the heart and for the promptings of faith. "What else," he asks, "is this modern theology when compared with orthodoxy than filthy water with clear water? With orthodoxy we had, thanks to God, pretty much settled; between it and philosophy a barrier had been erected, behind which each of these could walk in its own way without molesting the other. But what is it that they are now doing? They pull down this barrier, and, under the pretext of making us *rational Christians*, they make us most *irrational philosophers*. In this we agree that our old religious system is false, but I should not like to say with you [he is writing to his brother] that it is a patchwork got up by jugglers and semiphilosophers. I do not know of anything in the world in which human ingenuity has more shown and exercised itself than in it. A patchwork by jugglers and semiphilosophers is that religious system which they would put in the place of the old one, and, in doing so, would pretend to more rational philosophy than the old one claims." When assailed by Gotze (q.v.) as attacking the faith of the Church by his publication of the *Fragments*, he replied that, even if the Fragmentists were right, Christianity was not thereby endangered. Lessing rejected the letter, but reserved the spirit of the Scriptures. With him the letter is not the spirit, and the Bible is not religion. "Consequently, objections against the letter, as well as against the Bible, are not precisely objections against the spirit and religion. For the Bible evidently contains more than belongs to religion, and it is a mere supposition that, in this additional matter which it contains, it must be equally infallible. Moreover, religion existed before there was a Bible. Christianity existed before

evangelists and apostles had written. However much, therefore, may depend upon those Scriptures, it is not possible that the whole truth of the Christian religion should depend upon them. Since there existed a period in which it was so far spread, in which it had already taken hold of so many souls, and in which, nevertheless, not one letter was written of that which has come down to us, it must be possible also that everything which evangelists and prophets have written might be lost again, and yet the religion taught by them stand. The Christian religion is not true because the evangelists and apostles taught it, but they taught it because it is true. It is from their internal truth that all written documents cannot give it internal truth when it has none" (Lessing's *Werke*, ed. by Lachmann, 10:10, as cited by Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, p. 152, 153). Lessing also distinguished between the Christian religion and the religion of Christ; "the latter, being a life immediately implanted and maintained in our heart, manifests itself in love, and can neither stand nor fall with the [facts of the] Gospel. The truths of religion have nothing to do with the facts of history" (Hurst, *Rationalism*, p. 154). "Although I may not have the least objection to the facts of the Gospel, this is not of the slightest consequence for my religious convictions. Although, historically, I may have nothing to object to Christ's having even risen from the dead, must I for that reason accept it as true that this very risen Christ was the Son of God?" Scripture stands in the same relation to the Church as the plan of a large building to the building itself. It would be ridiculous if, at a conflagration, people were first of all to save the *plan*; but just as ridiculous is it to fear any danger to Christianity from an attack upon Scripture. In his *Duplex* Lessing maintained, in reference to the history of the resurrection, that it contains irreconcilable contradictions; but he held also that it does not follow from this circumstance that the resurrection is unhistorical. "Who has ever ventured to draw the same inference in profane history? If Livy, Polybius, Dionysius, and acitus relate the very same event, it may be the very same battle, the very same siege, each one differing so much in the details that those of the one completely give the lie to those of the other, has any one, for that reason, ever denied the event itself in which they agree?"

Such are the thoughts which Lessing advanced in his theological polemical writings, particularly in the controversy with pastor Gotze after the publication of the so-called "Wolfenbüttel Fragments," but to present from them a connected theological system strictly defining Lessing's stand-point has not yet been made possible. Indeed, we would say with Hagenbach

(*Church Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent.* 1:288) that “he had none.” But just as much difficulty we would find in assigning Lessing a place anywhere in any theological system of thought already in vogue. Really, we think all that can be done for Lessing is to consider in how far his writings justify the disposition that has been made of him as a theological writer. There are at present three different classes of theologians who claim him as their ally and support. By some he has been judged to have held the position of a rather positive, though not exactly orthodox character. This judgment is based upon his views on the doctrine of the Trinity in his *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes*. (He there says: “What if this doctrine [of the Trinity] should lead human reason to acknowledge that God cannot possibly be understood to be *one*, in that sense in which all finite things are *one*? that his unity must be a transcendental unity, which does not exclude a kind of plurality,” evidently explaining the Trinity as referring to the essence of the Deity.) By others, either in praise or condemnation, he has been adjudged a “freethinker;” while still others have pronounced him guilty not only of a change of opinion — of a change from the camp of orthodoxy to heterodoxy but have also given him up in despair, as incapable of having cherished any positive opinion, because he was so many-sided in his polemics; indeed, he had himself explicitly declared that he preferred the search for the possession of the truth. The first to break away from one and all of these classifications has been Dr. J. A. Darnier (*Gesch. der protest. Theol.* [Munich, 1867, 8vo], p. 722 sq.), who assigns Lessing a position similar to that generally credited to Jacobi, the so-called “philosopher of faith”, *SEE JACOBI*, and for this there is certainly much in favor in Lessing’s own declarations; for, like Jacobi, he held that reason and faith have nothing in conflict with each other, but are one. He held fast, likewise, to a self-conscious personal God of providence, to a living relation of the divine spirit to the world, to whom a place belongs in the inner revelation, notwithstanding that he assails the outer revelation in its historical credibility, and assigns it simply a place in the faith of authority (Autoritätsglauben). “It is true,” says Dorner (p. 737), “Lessing has particularly aimed to secure for the purely human and moral a place right by the side of that generally assigned only to Christianity. But he is far from asserting that the understanding (Vernunft) of humanity was from the beginning perfect, or even in a normal development, but rather holds it to be developing in character, and in need of education by the divine Spirit, whom also he refuses to regard as a passive beholder of the acting universe.” (We have here a number of premises, which later writers,

particularly Schleiermacher, have taken to secure for historical religion a more worthy position.) Indeed, right here, in the attempt to make humanity progressive, and this progress dependent upon revelation, centred the whole of Lessing's theological views. "To the reason," he said, "it must be much rather a proof of the truth of revelation than an objection to it when it meets with things that surpass its own conceptions, for what is a revelation which reveals nothing?" (Comp. Hegel on this point as viewed by Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent.* 2:364 sq.) Thus he acknowledged the truth of revelation, though he would not regard the idea of a revelation as settled for all time, but rather as God's gradual act of training; and to elucidate this thought he wrote, in 1780, *Die Erziehung des mensch engygeschlechtes* (the authorship of which has sometimes been denied him: comp. *Zeitschr.: d. hist. theol.* 1839, No. 3; Guhrauer, *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes kritisch und philosophisch erirtert* [Berlin, 1841]), a work in which, concentrated in a hundred short paragraphs, is a system of religion and philosophy — the germ of Herder's and all later works on the education of the human race. "Something there is of it," says a writer in the *Westminster Rev.* (Oct. 1871, p. 222, 223), "that reminds the reader of Plato. It has his tender melancholy and his undertone of inspired conviction, and a grandeur which recalls that moving of great figures and shifting of vast scenes which we behold in the myth of Er. There speaks in it a voice of one crying words not his own to times that are not yet come."

The English Deists, as Bolingbroke and Hobbes, had regarded religion only from the standpoint of politics. "Man," they held, "can know nothing except what his senses teach him, and to this the intelligent confine themselves; a revelation, or, rather, what pretends to be one, might be a good thing for the populace." *SEE DEISM*. Lessing came forward, and, while seeking to make morality synonymous with religion, aye, with Christianity, taught that in revelation only lies man's strength for development. "Revelation," says Lessing, "is to the whole human race what education is to the individual man. Education is revelation which is imparted to the individual man, and revelation is education which has been and still is imparted to the human race. Education no more presents everything to man at once than revelation does, but makes its communications in gradual development." First Judaism, then Christianity; first unity, then trinity; first happiness for this life, then immortality and never-ending bliss. (See the detailed review on these points in Hurst's

Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent.* 1:291 sq.) The elementary work of education was the O.T. The progress to a more advanced book is marked by the timely coming of Christ, “the reliable and practical teacher of immortality;...reliable through the prophecies which appeared to be fulfilled in him, through the miracles which he performed, and through his own return to life after the death by which he had sealed his doctrine;” whose disciples collected and transmitted in writing his doctrines, “the second and better elementary book for the human race,” expecting (according to Ritter [*Lessing's philosophische u. religiose Grundsätze*, p. 56 sq.]) the complete treatise itself in the fulfillment of the promises of Christianity. Some have interpreted Lessing, because Christianity is spoken of as the second *elementary* work, as anticipating another religion, to be universally enjoyed, to supersede Christianity, but for this we can see no reason, and side with Ritter.

The position of Lessing has sometimes become equivocal by the peculiar interpretation of his *Nathan the Wise*. In his *Education of Humanity*, Christianity unquestionably is the highest religion in the scale; in his “Nathan” it is not so. Hence it has been asserted by many, Christian writers especially, that in his later years Lessing had become a most decided Rationalist, and Jacobi even asserted that he had died a Spinozist. (Compare the article JACOBI, and the literature at the end of this article.) The former interpretation is due, however, to wrong premises. Lessing wrote *Nathan the Wise* simply for one object: not to aggrandize and ennoble his associate and friend Meendelssohn the Jew, not to deprive Christianity of the best of her beauty, but only to teach humanity, to the followers of the Christ of the Gospel in the 18th century, the great lesson of *toleration*. The great French infidel-philosopher Voltaire had sought to do this, but he had failed — had failed utterly — and only because his idea of tolerance was really *intolerance*. He meant entirely too much by tolerance, for he demanded of the party tolerating not only to esteem all religions alike, to be content with any and every belief, to have no rights in conflict with another in religious matters, but to be obliged to conform to the notions and inclinations of others out of mere politeness; and we do not wonder when Hagenbach (1:29) says that “this is the toleration of shallowness, of cowardice, of religious indecision, of religious indifference — a toleration that finally and easily degenerates into intolerance, which is the hatred of every one who wishes to hold and to profess a firm and positive religion. Such persons must come at last to regard the tolerating

party as unyielding and stiff-necked. Such was the toleration of the Romans, which was so much praised by Voltaire. It soon came to an end with the Christians, because they neither could nor would submit to a strange worship. Nothing, however, is more foolish or more opposed to true toleration than precisely this effort to force such toleration upon those who do not agree with us in opinion, for toleration no more admits of force than religion does." Lessing believed that this grand lesson was yet to be taught. He would teach it especially to the Christian, who stood higher in the scale, and could easily influence those below him; nay, he believed that he should teach it. and that most effectually, by practicing it upon his inferiors in belief. He therefore would shame the Christian by examples most noble from religions generally regarded as inferior, and its followers as more fanatical. Yet it must not be forgotten that Lessing never went so far as to ignore his own religion, for these grand specimens of Judaism and Mohammedanism reveal their Christian painter after all, when once the lay brother is made to say, "Nathan, you are a Christian. Never was a better" (act iv, scene vii, line 2). He would teach us that Christianity is the most perfect of all religions, but that the others also have in them many parts which go to make it up; that as they shall modify in course of time, so shall also Christianity grow on to perfection (see above, Ritter's view). His principal fault was this, that his peculiar view of revelation led him to believe that no religion is as yet absolutely perfect, and that therefore none of the positive religions could justly claim the character of universality, and of exclusive privileges and rights; and hence he regarded all religions as an individualization of reason, according to time and place, and a product, on the one hand, of the culture of a people, and, on the other, of divine education and communication, thus making Christianity capable also of an objective perfectibility. (This is a view which has been advanced of late by many Christian writers of Mohammedanism; comp. Freeman, *The Saracens* [Oxford and London, 1870, 12mo], lect. 1.) Regarding the charge of his Spinozism, we would say with Mendelssohn, who defended Lessing from this charge after his death: "If Lessing was able absolutely and without all further limitation to declare for the system of any man, he was at that time no more with himself, or he was in a strange humor to make a paradoxical assertion which, in a serious hour, he himself again rejected" (Jacobi, *Werke*, vol. 4, pt. 1, p. 44; comp. Kahnis, *Germ. Prot.* p. 164 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. protest. Theol.* p. 723). **SEE MENDELSSOHN**. All that Jacobi had for his assertion that Lessing died a Pantheist was a conversation with him a few years before Lessing's death. Upon this fact Prof. Nichol justly

observes: “The reporting of such conversation must ever be protested against as breach of confidence, and it is almost as certainly a source of misrepresentation. What thinker does not, in the frankness and confidence of intercourse, give utterance at times to momentary impressions, as if they were his abiding ones? This much is unquestionable: Lessing has not written one solitary word inconsistent with a firmest persuasion in the personality of man. This great writer, indeed, belongs to a class of minds very easily misapprehended — minds which none but others in so far akin to them can rightly understand. Oftenest in antagonism, or in a critical attitude, thinkers like Lessing do not generally express their *whole* thought; they dwell only on the part of the common thought from which they dissent. So far, however, from being ruled by mere negations, it is certainly more probable that their dissent arises from a completer view and possession of truth; and that their effort is confined to the desire to separate truth from error, or, at all events, from non-essentials.” Not even the modest charge that Lessing in his latest years, by reason of his affiliation with Nicolai and Mendelssohn, *inclined* towards Rationalism, can, upon examination, be substantiated. His own words from Vienna, whither he had gone on a call from Joseph II, who in 1769 invited all the great and learned men of the times to his capital for a general assemblage, addressed to Nicolai, who had taken this occasion to ridicule Vienna, and praise his own Berlin by contrast, go far to disprove any such assertion: “Say nothing, I pray you, about your Berlin freedom of thinking and writing. It is reduced simply and solely to the freedom of bringing to market as many gibes and jeers against religion as you choose, and a decent man must speedily be ashamed to avail himself of this freedom.” If Lessing is to be classed at all with Rationalists, we should first distinguish between the higher Rationalism of humanity and its double-sighted compeer, trivial and vulgar Rationalism, and then assign Lessing a place in that of the former, for to it alone can he be claimed to have rendered intentional aid.

Of his service to German literature generally, it may be truly said “he found Germany without a national literature; when he died it had one. He pointed out the ways in poetry, philosophy, and religion by which the national mind should go, and it has gone in them” (*Westmn. Rev.* Oct. 1871, p. 223). “Honor,” says Menzel (*German Lit.* [transl. by C. C. Felton, Bost. 1840, 3 vols. 12mo], 2:405), “was the principle of Lessing’s whole life. He composed in the same spirit that he lived. He had to contend with obstacles

his whole life long, but he never bowed down his head. He struggled not for posts of honor, but for his own independence. He might, with his extraordinary ability, have rioted in the favor of the great, like Goethe, but he scorned and hated this favor as unworthy a free man. His long continuance in private life, his services as secretary of the brave general Tauenzien during the Seven Years' War, and afterwards as librarian at Wolfenbüttel, proved that he did not aspire to high places....He ridiculed Gellert, Klopstock, and all who bowed their laurel-crowned to heads to heads encircled with golden crowns; and he himself shunned all contact with the great, animated by that stainless spirit of pride which acts instinctively upon the motto *Noli me tangere.*"

Literature. — The complete works of Lessing were first published at Berlin (1771, 32 vols. 12mo), then with annotations by Lachmann (1839, 12 vols.), and by Von Maltzahn (1855, 12 vols). See Karl Gotthelf Lessing, *Lessing's Biographie* (Berl. 1793, 2 vols.); Danzel, *Lessing, sein Leben und seine Werke* (1850), continued by Guhrauer (1853-54); Stahr, *G. E. Lessing, sein Leben u. s. Werke* (6th ed. Berl. 1859, 2 vols. 12mo, transl. by E. P. Evans, late professor at Mich. Univ., Boston, 1867, 2 vols. 12mo); H. Ritter, in the *Göttingen Studien* (1847); Ritter, *Gesch. d. christi. Philos.* 2:480 sq.; Bohtz, *Lessing's Protestantism und Nath. der Weise*; Lang, *Religiose Charaktere*, 1:215 sq.; Röpe, *Lessing und Gotze*; Rohr, *Kleine theoloqische Schriften* (Schleusingen, 1841, vol. 1); Schwarz, *Lessing als Theologe* (1854); Gervinus, *National-Liter. d. Deutschen*, 4:318 sq.; Mohnike, *Lessingiana* (Lpz. 1843, 8vo); Schlosser, *Gesch. d. 18^{ten} Jahrhundert.* 3:2; Schmidt, *Gesch. d. geist. Lebens in Deutschld. von Leibnitz bis auf Lessing's Tod*; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. History 18th and 19th Cent.* vol. 1, lect. 13; *For. Quart. Review*, 25:233 sq.; *Westmnist. Rev.* 1871, Oct., art. 8; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:336 sq.; Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, p. 145 sq. (J. H.W.)

Lessons

SEE LECTONARIUM.

Lestines

SEE LIPTINES.

Letaah

SEE LIZARD.

Lethe

(λήθη, *oblivion*), in the Grecian mythology, the stream of forgetfulness in the lower world, to which the departed spirits go, before passing into the Elysian fields, to be cleansed from all recollection of earthly sorrows. *SEE HADES.*

Le'thech

(Ēt) , *le'thek*, Septuag. *véβελ*), a Hebrew word which occurs in the margin of ^{<XIII>}Hosea 3:2; it signifies *a measure* for grain, so called from *emptying* or *pouring out*. It is rendered "*a half homer*" in the A.V. (after the Vulg.), which is probably correct. *SEE HOMER.*

Leti, Gregory

a historian, born at Milan in 1630, who traveled in various countries, became Protestant at Lausanne, was for a time well received at the court of Charles II in England, and died at Amsterdam in 1701. He wrote, among other things, *Life of Sixtus V.* — *Life of Philip II.* — *Monarchy of Louis XIV.*: *Life of Cromwell.* — *Life of Queen Elizabeth.* — *Life of Charles V.*

Letter

stands in only two passages of the Bible in its narrow sense of an alphabetical character (*γράμμα*, in the plural, ^{<XIII>}Luke 23:38; and prob. ^{<XIII>}Galatians 6:11, *πηλίκους γράμμασι*; A. V. "how large a letter," rather *in what a bold hand*); elsewhere it is used (for *rpsea* book; *γραμμα*, either sing. or plur.; but more definitely for the later Heb. *trṣaæ* [Chald. *arṣā*, *ʾwṭy*]) (Chald. id. also *μῦτPæπιστολή*) in the sense of an *epistle* (q.v.). *SEE ALPHABET*; *SEE WRITING.*

Letter The,

a term used especially by the apostle Paul in opposition to the spirit; a way of speaking very common in the ecclesiastical style (^{<XIII>}Romans 2:27, 29; 7:6; ^{<XIII>}2 Corinthians 3:6, 7). In general, the word *letter* (*γράμμα*) is used to denote the Mosaic law. The law, considered as a simple collection of precepts, is but a dead form, which can indeed command obedience, but cannot awaken love. This distinction is shown with great skill in Schleiermacher's *Sermon: Christus, d. Befreier a. d. Sunde u. d. Gesetz* (in

his *Sämmt. Werke*, 2:25 sq.). The law cannot but be something outward, which, as the expression of another's will, appeals more to our comprehension than to our will or to our feelings. This is the reason why the law is the source of the knowledge of sin, and does not impart the life-giving power. But that the Mosaic law was called the letter (*γράμμα*) results from the fact of its being the *written* law. So ^{<4127>}Romans 2:27, 29: "And shall not uncircumcision, which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God." The meaning of this passage is, When the heathen does by nature that which the law requires, he puts to shame the Jew who in Scripture and by circumcision transgresses the law. For he is not a true Israelite who is so outwardly only, and merely through physical circumcision (as the sign of the covenant); but he only who is inwardly a Jew, his heart also being circumcised, and consequently after the spirit, and not merely after the letter (or outward form). Such a one is not merely praised by men, but loved by God. Again, ^{<4106>}Romans 7:6: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." Being now Christians, we ought to carry the law in our heart, and not merely fulfill it outwardly as a mere letter. ^{<4086>}2 Corinthians 3:6, for the letter (i.e. the Mosaic law) killeth (brings about death inasmuch as it discovers sin, ^{<4109>}Romans 7:9; 6:23; ^{<4156>}1 Corinthians 15:56), but the Spirit (the holy Spirit imparted through faith) giveth life (i.e. eternal life, ^{<4180>}Romans 8:10). Once more, ^{<4087>}2 Corinthians 3:7: "But if the ministration of death (of the letter), written and engraven in stones, was glorious . . . how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" The law of Moses is incapable of giving life to the soul, and justifying before God those who are most servilely addicted to the literal observance of it. These things can be effected only by means of the Gospel of Christ, and of that Spirit of truth and holiness which attends it, and makes it effectual to the salvation of the soul. — Krehl, *Neu-Test. Handwörterbuch*. *SEE LAW OF MOSES*.

Letters, Encyclical

SEE LITERAE ENCYCLICA.

Letters of Orders

a *document* usually of parchment, and signed by the bishop, with his seal appended, in which he certifies that at the specified time and place he *ordained* to the office of deacon or priest the clergyman whose name is therein mentioned.

Lettice, John, D.D.,

an English clergyman and poet, was born in Northamptonshire in 1737, and was educated at Cambridge, where he took his first degree in 1761. He soon obtained eminence as a pulpit orator. In 1785 he was presented to the living of Peasemarsch, and later with a prebend in the cathedral of Chichester. He died in 1832. Among his works are *The Conversion of St. Paul*, a poetical essay, which secured him a prize from his alma mater in 1764: — *The Antiquities of Herculaneum*, a translation from the Italian (1773) — *The Immortality of the Soul*, translated from the French (1795). See *Biog. Dict. Of Living Authors* (Lond. 1816); Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.; Thomas, *Biogr. Dict.* s.v.

Let'tus

(**Λαττούς** v. r. **Ἀττούς** ; Vulg. *Acchus*), a “son of Sechenias,” one of the Levites who returned from Babylon (1 Esdras 8:29), evidently the HATTUSI *SEE HATTUSI* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (^{<HEB>}Ezra 8:2).

Letu'shim

(Heb. *Letushim'*, **לְטוּשִׁים**], *hammered*, plur.; Sept. **Λατουσιείμ**), the second named of the three sons of Dedan (grandson of Abraham by Keturah), and head of an Arabian tribe descended from him (^{<HEB>}Genesis 30:3; and Vulg. at ^{<HEB>}1 Chronicles 1:32). B.C. considerably post 2024. *SEE ARABIA*. “Fresnel (*Journ. Asiat.* 3e serie, 6:217) identifies it with *Tasm*, one of the ancient and extinct tribes of Arabia, just as he compares Leummim with Umeiyim. The names may perhaps be regarded as commencing with the article. Nevertheless, the identification in each case seems to be quite untenable. It is noteworthy that the three sons of the Keturahite Dedan are named in the plural form, evidently as tribes descended from him” (Smith). “Forster supposes (*Geor. of Arabia*, 1:334) that the Letushim were absorbed in the generic appellation of Dedanim

(Jer. 25:23; ^{<2513>}Ezekiel 25:13; ^{<2913>}Isaiah 21:13), and that they dwelt in the desert eastward of Edom.” *SEE LEUMMIM.*

Leucippus

the founder of the atomistic school of Grecian philosophy, and forerunner of Democritus (q.v.). Nothing is known concerning him, neither the time nor the place of his birth, nor the circumstances of his life.

Leucopetrians

the name of a fanatical sect which sprung up in the Greek and Eastern churches towards the close of the 12th century; they professed to believe in a double trinity, rejected wedlock, abstained from flesh, treated with the utmost contempt the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and all the various branches of external worship; placed the essence of religion in internal prayer alone; and maintained, as it is said, that an evil being or genius dwelt in the breast of every mortal, and could be expelled from thence by no other method than by perpetual supplication to the Supreme Being. The founder of this sect is said to have been a person called *Leucopetrus*, and his chief disciple Tychicus, who corrupted by fanatical interpretations several books of Scripture, and particularly the Gospel of Matthew. This account is not undoubted.

Leüm’ mim

(Heb. *Leimmimn'*, **לממ**] peoples, as often; Sept. **Λαομείμ**), the last named of the three sons of Dedan (grandson of Abraham by Keturah), and head of an Arabian tribe descended from him (^{<027B>}Genesis 25:3; and Vulgate at ^{<1012>}1 Chronicles 1:32). B.C. considerably post 2024. *SEE ARABIA.* They are supposed to be the same with the *Allumoeotoe* (**Ἄλλουμαιῶται**), named by Ptolemy (6:7, 24) as near the Gerrhaei, which appears to be a corruption of the Hebrew word with the art. prefixed. He also enumerates *Luma* among the towns of Arabia Deserta (5:19), and Forster (*Geogr. of Arabia*, 1:335) suggests that this may have been an ancient settlement of the same tribe” (Kitto). “They are identified by Fresnel (in the *Journ. Asiat.* iii° serie, 6:217) with an Arab tribe called *Umeiyim*, one of the very ancient tribes of Arabia of which no genealogy is given by the Arabs, and who appear to have been ante-Abrahamic, and possibly aboriginal inhabitants of the country.” *SEE LETUSHIM.*

Leun, Johann Georg Friedrich

a German theologian, was born Aug. 9, 1757, at Giessen. In 1774 he entered the university of his native place; in 1797 he became deacon at Butzbach, near Giessen, and there he remained until his death, March 15, 1823. He possessed an extensive knowledge of the Oriental languages, and was a profound theologian. Among his works deserve special notice, *Voln der besten Methode. die hebraische Sprache zu erlernen* (Giessen, 1787-8): — *Handbuch zur cursorischen Lecture der Bibel fur Anfanger*, etc. (Legmo, 1788-91, 4th. 8): — *Handbuch zur cursorischen Lecture der Bibel des N.T.* etc. (ibid. 1795-96, 3 th. 8). Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, 2:292.

Leusden, Johann

a very celebrated Dutch Orientalist and theologian, was born at Utrecht in 1624, and was educated at the then recently founded university of his native place and at Amsterdam, paying particular regard to the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. In 1649 he was appointed professor of Hebrew at Utrecht, and for nearly fifty years he most creditably discharged the duties of this office, for which he had fitted himself, not simply at the universities already mentioned, but also by private study with several learned Jewish rabbis. He died in 1699, regarded by all as one of the best Hebrew scholars of his day, the Buxtorfs only taking precedence in rank. Of his works we may say that the writings of but few Biblical scholars of that day have descended to us which can be said to be of more solid utility than Leusden's. "If they are defective in originality of genius (the amount of which quality, however, it is impossible rightly to determine in works like our author's), they undoubtedly afford evidence of their author's varied resources of learning, adorned by clearness of method and an easy style, characteristics which made Leusden one of the most renowned and successful teachers of his age." His numerous works, which were all *Biblical*, may be classed as follows: (1) Critical, (2) Introductory, and (3) Exegetical. Under the first head we have his valuable *Biblia Hebraea accuratissima notis lHebraicis et lemmatibus illustrata: typis Josephi Athias* (Amstel. 1617 [2d ed. 1667], the first critical edition by a Christian editor ["Estimatissima primum numeratis versibus, primaque a Christiano adhibitis MSS. facta." Steinschneider, *Catal. Bodl.*]) In 1694 he joined Eisenmenger in publishing a Hebrew Bible without points. The Greek Scriptures also received his careful attention, as is proved by his editions of

the Greek Test. in 1675, 1688, 1693, 1698, 1701, and by his edition of the Septuagint (Amsterdam, 1683). After his death, Schaaf completed a valuable edition of the Syriac New Test. (with Tremnellius's version) which Leusden had begun. Under this first head we may also place his Hebrew Lexicon (1688); *Elementary Heb. Gram.*, which was translated into English, French, and German (1668); his *Compendia* of the O. T. and the N. Test. (comprising selections of the originals, with translations and grammatical notes in Latin), frequently reprinted; his *Onomasticon Sacr.* 1665, 1684), and his still useful *Clavis Hebr. Vet. Test.* (containing the Masoretic notes, etc., besides much grammatical and philological information), first published in 1683, and his *Clavis Graec. NV. T.* (1672). His contributions to the second head of Introduction (*Einleitung*) and sacred archaeology were not less valuable than the works we have already commended. Of these we mention three (sometimes to be met with in one volume) as very useful to the Biblical student: *Philologus Hebr. continens Quaestiones Hebr. quae circa V. Test. Hebr. fere moveri solent* (Utrecht, 1656, 1672, 1695, Amst. 1686, are the best editions, and contain his edition and translation of Maimonides's *Precepts of Moses*, p. 56); *Philologus Hebraeomixtus, una cume. Spicileg. Philol.* (Utr. 1663, etc., contains treatises on several interesting points of Hebrew antiquities and Talmudical science); *Philologus Hebraeo Graecus generalis* (Utr. 1670, etc.) treats questions relating to the sacred Greek of the Christian Scriptures, its Hebraisms, the Syriac and other translations, its inspired authors, etc., well and succinctly handled (with this work occurs Leusden's translation *into Hebrew* of all the Chaldee portions of the O.T.). Under the last, or Exegetical head, we have less to record. In 1656 (reprinted in 1.692) Leusden published in a Latin translation David Kimchi's Commentary on the prophet Jonah (*Jonas illustratus*), and in the following year a similar work (again after David Kimchi) on Joel and Obadiah (*Joel explicatus, adjunctus Obadja illustratus*). Well worthy of mention are also his editions (prepared with the help of Vиллеманды and Morinus) of Bochart's works, and the works of Lightfoot (which he published in Latin, in 3 vols. folio, in the last year of his life) and Poole (whose *Synopsis* occurs in its very best form in Leusden's edition, 1684, 5 vols. folio). See Burmann, *Trajectums eruditorum?*; De Vries, *Oratio in Obitum J. Leusdenii* (1699); Fabricius, *Ilist. ibliot. Graec.* 1 244; Walch, *Biblioth. Theol. Selecta*, vols. 3, 4; *Biographe universelle anc. et mod.* (1819) 24:357; *Elogia Philogorum quorundam Hebraeorum* (Lub. 1708, 8vo); Meyer, *Gesch. d. Schriffterklarung.* p. 111, 174 sq.; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog.*

Generale, 31:11 sq.; Kalisch, *Heb. Gram.* pt. 2 (Historical Introd.), p. 37; and in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:345, 346; Kitto, *Cyclop. Biblical Literature*, vol. 2, s.v.

Leutard Or Leuthard

a French fanatic, flourished among the peasants of Chalons-sur-Marne about A.D. 1000. He claimed the enjoyment of spiritual visions, and authority from on high for separation from his family and his iconoclastic idiosyncracies. He also, by like inspirations, became the opponent of many practices of the Church which had their authority in the sacred Scriptures of both the O. and N.T., and supported his position likewise by the inspired word of God. The bishop of the diocese in which Leuthard flourished Gebuin by name-treated him with perfect contempt, believing him insane, and, for want of opposition, few followers were found by Leuthard, who in despair destroyed himself by drowning.

Levellers

or RADICALS, a political and religious sect of fanatics, which arose in the army of Cromwell at the time of the difficulty between the Independents and the Long Parliament (1647), advocating entire civil and religious liberty. They were not only treated as traitors by the king, but persecuted also by Cromwell as dangerous to the state. From one of their own works, *The Leveller, or the Principles and maxims concerning Government and Religion of those commonly called Levellers* (Lond. 1658), we see that their fundamental principles included, in politics,

- 1, the impartial, sovereign authority of the law;
- 2, the legislative power of Parliament;
- 3, absolute equality before the law; and,
- 4, the arming of the people in order to enable all to secure the enforcement of the laws, and also to protect their liberties.

In religion they claimed,

- 1, absolute liberty of conscience, as true religion, with them, consisted in inward concurrence with revealed religion;
- 2, freedom for every one to act according to the best of his knowledge, even if this knowledge should be false — the government acting on the knowledge and conscience of the people through the ministers it appoints;

3, religion to be considered under two aspects: one as the correct understanding of revelation, and this is quite a private affair, in regard to which every one must stand or fall by himself; the other is its effects as manifested in actions, and these are subject to the judgment of others, and especially of the authorities;

4, they condemned all strife on matters of faith and forms of worship, considering these as only outward signs of different degrees of spiritual enlightening. This sect, like many others, disappeared at the time of the Restoration. See Weingarten, *Revolutions Kircken Englands* (Lpz. 1868); Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans* (see Index, vol. 2, Harper's edition).

Lever, Thomas

an eminent English divine, was born in Lancashire in the early part of the 16th century. He was ordained a Protestant minister in 1550. On the accession of Mary (1553) he retired to the Continent. He afterwards dissented from the Anglican Church from a partiality to Calvinism. He died in 1577. No man was more vehement in his sermons against the waste of Church revenues, and other prevailing corruptions of the court, which occasioned bishop Ridley to rank him with Latimer and Knox. Besides a number of sermons, he published a *Meditation on the Lorde's Prayer* (1551): — *Certayne Godly Exercises*: — and a *Treatise on the Danger from Synne*, etc. (1571-1575). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.; Thomas, *Biog. Dictionasry*, s.v.

Le'vi

(Heb. *Levi'*, **לוי** *£wreathed* [see below], being the same Heb. word also signifying "Levite;" Sept. and *N.T.* **Λευί** or **Λευεί**), the name of several men.

1. The third son of Jacob by his wife Leah. This, like most other names in the patriarchal history, was connected with the thoughts and feelings that gathered round the child's birth. As derived from **ל** ; to *twine*, and hence to *adhere*, it gave utterance to the hope of the mother that the affections of her husband, which had hitherto rested on the favored Rachel, would at last be drawn to her. "This time will my husband be joined (**ל**) unto me, because I have borne him three sons" (⁽⁻⁰²⁸⁴⁾Genesis 29:34). B.C. 1917. The new-born child was to be a **κοινωνίας βεβαιωτής** (Josephus, *Ant.* 1:19, 8), a new link binding the parents to each other more closely than before.

The same etymology is recognized, though with a higher significance, in ^(Gen 18:2)Numbers 18:2 (WwLy). One fact only is recorded in which he appears prominent. The sons of Jacob had come from Padan-Aram to Canaan with their father, and were with him “at Shalem, a city of Shechem.” Their sister Dinah went out “to see the daughters of the land” (^(Gen 34:1)Genesis 34:1), i.e. as the words probably indicate, and as Josephus distinctly states (*Ant.* 1:21), to be present at one of their great annual gatherings for some festival of nature-worship, analogous to that which we meet with afterwards among the Midianites (^(Num 25:2)Numbers 25:2). The license of the time or the absence of her natural guardians exposed her, though yet in earliest, youth, to lust and outrage. A stain was left, not only on her, but on the honor of her kindred, which, according to the rough justice of the time, nothing but blood could wash out. The duty of extorting that revenge fell, as in the case of Amnon and Tamar (^(2 Sam 13:22)2 Samuel 13:22), and in most other states of society in which polygamy has prevailed (compare, for the customs of modern Arabs, J. D. Michaelis, quoted by Kurtz, *Hist. of Old Covenant* i, § 82, p. 340), on the brothers rather than the father, just as, in the case of Rebekah, it belonged to the brother to conduct the negotiations for the marriage. We are left to conjecture why Reuben, as the first-born, was not foremost in the work, but the sin of which he was afterwards guilty makes it possible that his zeal for his sister’s purity was not so sensitive as theirs. The same explanation may perhaps apply to the non-appearance of Judah in the history. Simeon and Levi, as the next in succession to the first-born, take the task upon themselves. Though not named in the Hebrew text of the O.T. till 34:25, there can be little doubt that they were “the sons of Jacob” who heard from their father the wrong over which he had brooded in silence, and who planned their revenge accordingly. The Sept. does introduce their names in ver. 14. The history that follows is that of a cowardly and repulsive crime. The two brothers exhibit, in its broadest contrasts, that union of the noble and the base, of characteristics above and below the level of the heathen tribes around them, which marks much of the history of Israel. They have learned to loathe and scorn the impurity in the midst of which they lived, to regard themselves as a peculiar people, to glory in the sign of the covenant. They have learned only too well from Jacob and from Laban the lessons of treachery and falsehood. They lie to the men of Shechem as the Druses and the Maronites lie to each other in the prosecution of their blood-feuds. For the offense of one man they destroy and plunder a whole city. They cover their murderous schemes with fair words and professions of friendship. They make the very token of

their religion the instrument of their perfidy and revenge. (Josephus [*Ant.* 1. c.] characteristically glosses over all that connects the attack with the circumcision of the Shechemites, and represents it as made in a time of feasting and rejoicing.) Their father, timid and anxious as ever, utters a feeble lamentation (Blunt, *Script. Coincidences*, pt. 1, § 8), “Ye have made me a stench among the inhabitants of the land . . . I being few in number, they shall gather themselves against me.” With a zeal that, though mixed with baser elements, foreshadows the zeal of Phinehas, they glory in their deed, and meet all remonstrance with the question, “Should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?” Of other facts in the life of Levi, there are none in which he takes, as in this, a prominent and distinct part. He shares in the hatred which his brothers bear to Joseph, and joins in the plots against him (^{<0370>}Genesis 37:4). Reuben and Judah interfere severally to prevent the consummation of the crime (^{<0372>}Genesis 37:21, 26). Simon appears, as being made afterwards the subject of a sharper discipline than the others, to have been foremost — as his position among the sons of Leah made it likely that he would be — in this attack on the favored son of Rachel; and it is at least probable that in this, as in their former guilt, Simeon and Levi were brethren. The rivalry of the mothers was perpetuated in the jealousies of their children; and the two who had shown themselves so keenly sensitive when their sister had been wronged, make themselves the instruments and accomplices of the hatred which originated, we are told, with the baser-born sons of the concubines (^{<0372>}Genesis 37:2). Then comes for him, as for the others, the discipline of suffering and danger, the special education by which the brother whom they had wronged leads them back to faithfulness and natural affection. The detention of Simeon in Egypt may have been designed at once to be the punishment for the large share which he had taken in the common crime, and to separate the two brothers who had hitherto been such close companions in evil. The discipline did its work. Those who had been relentless to Joseph became self-sacrificing for Benjamin.

After this we trace Levi as joining in the migration of the tribe that owned Jacob as its patriarch. He, with his three sons, Gershon, Kohath, Merari, went down into Egypt (^{<0461>}Genesis 46:11). As one of the four eldest sons we may think of him as among the five (^{<0472>}Genesis 47:2) that were specially presented before Pharaoh. (The Jewish tradition [*Targ. Pseudojon.*] states the five to have been Zebulun, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher.) Then comes the last scene in which his name appears. When his

father's death draws near, and the sons are gathered round him, he hears the old crime brought up again to receive its sentence from the lips that are no longer feeble and hesitating. They, no less than the incestuous first-born, had forfeited the privileges of their birthright. "In their anger they slew men, and in their wantonness they maimed oxen" (marg. reading of the A. V.; Sept. **ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον**). Therefore the sentence on those who had been united for evil was, that they were to be "divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel." How that condemnation was at once fulfilled and turned into a benediction, how the zeal of the patriarch reappeared purified and strengthened in his descendants, how the very name came to have a new significance, will be found elsewhere. **SEE LEVITE.**

The history of Levi has been dealt with here in what seems the only true and natural way of treating it, as a history of an individual person. Of the theory that sees in the sons of Jacob the mythical Eponymi of the tribes that claimed descent from them — which finds in the crimes and chances of their lives the outlines of a national or tribal chronicle — which refuses to recognize that Jacob had twelve sons, and insists that the history of Dinah records an attempt on the part of the Canaanites to enslave and degrade a Hebrew tribe (Ewald, *Geschichte*, 1:466-496) — of this one may be content to say, as the author says of other hypotheses hardly more extravagant, "Die Wissenschaft verscheucht alle solche Gespenster" (*ibid.* 1:466). The book of Genesis tells us of the lives of men and women, not of ethnological phantoms. A yet wilder conjecture has been hazarded by another German critic. P. Redslob (*Die alttestamentl. Namen*, Hamb. 1846, p. 24,25), recognizing the meaning of the name of Levi as given above, finds in it evidence of the existence of a confederacy or synod of the priests that had been connected with the several local worships of Canaan, and who, in the time of Samuel and David, were gathered *together, joined*, "round the Central Pantheon in Jerusalem." Here, also, we may borrow the terms of our judgment from the language of the writer himself. If there are "abgeschmackten etymologischen Mahrchen" (Redslob, p. 82) connected with the name of Levi, they are hardly those we meet with in the narrative of Genesis. **SEE JACOB.**

2. The father of Matthat and son of Simeon (Maaseiah), of the ancestors of Christ. in the private maternal line between David and Zerubbabel (~~☞~~ Luke 3:29). B.C. post 876. Lord Hervey thinks that the name of Levi reappears in his descendant Lebbseus (*Geneal. of Christ*, p. 132). **SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.**

3. Father of another Matthat and son of Melchi, third preceding Mary, among Christ's ancestors (^{<4184>}Luke 3:24). B.C. considerably ante 22.

4. (Λευίς.) One of the apostles, the son of Alphaeus (^{<4124>}Mark 2:14; ^{<4127>}Luke 5:27, 29), elsewhere called MATTHEW *SEE MATTHEW* (^{<4109>}Matthew 9:9).

Levi'athan

(Heb. ^ˆtyw], usually derived from ^{hyw]} *æ wreath*, with adjct. ending ^ˆ; but perhaps compounded of ^{ywl} *æ wreathed*, and ^ˆTi a *sea-monster*; occurs ^{<4188>}Job 3:8; 41, I [Hebrew xl, 25], ^{<49744>}Psalms 74:14; 104:26; ^{<23701>}Isaiah 27:1; Sept. δράκων, but τὸμέγα κήτος in ^{<4188>}Job 3:8; Vulg. *Leviathan*, but *draco* in *Psa.*; Auth. Vers. "Leviathan," but "their mourning" in ^{<4188>}Job 3:8) probably has different significations, e.g.:

- (1.) A *serpent*, especially a large one (^{<4188>}Job 3:8), hence as the symbol of the hostile kingdom of Babylon (^{<23701>}Isaiah 27:1).
- (2.) Specially, the *crocodile* (^{<43401>}Job 41:1).
- (3.) A *sea-monster* (^{<4946>}Psalms 104:26); tropically, for a cruel enemy (^{<49744>}Psalms 74:14; compare ^{<2510>}Isaiah 51:9; ^{<4320>}Ezekiel 29:3).

This Heb. word, which denotes any twisted animal, is especially applicable to every great tenant of the waters, such as the great marine serpents and crocodiles, and, it may be added, the colossal serpents and great monitors of the desert. *SEE BEHEMOTH; SEE DRAGON*. In general it points to the crocodile, and Job 41 is unequivocally descriptive of that saurian. But in Isaiah and the Psalms foreign kings are evidently apostrophized under the name of Leviathan, though other texts more naturally apply to the whale, notwithstanding the objections that have been made to that interpretation of the term. "It is quite an error to assert, as Dr. Harris (*Dict. Nat. Hist. Bib.*), Mason Good (*Book of Job translated*), Michaelis (*Supp.* 1297), and Rosenmüller (quoting Michaelis in *not. ad Bsochart Wieroz.* 3:738) have done, that the whale is not found in the Mediterranean. The *Orca gladiator* (Gray) — the grampus mentioned by Lee — the *Physalus antiquorum* (Gray), or the *Rorqual de la Mediterranee* (Cuvier), are not uncommon in the Mediterranean (Fischer, *Synops. Mamm.* p. 525, and Lacepede, *H. N. des Cetac.* p. 115), and in ancient times the species may have been more numerous." *SEE WHALE*.

The word *crocodile* does not occur in the Auth. Vers., although its Greek form **κροκόδειλος** is found in the Sept. (^{<812>}Leviticus 11:29, where for the “tortoise, **בֶּחַיָּה**; it has **κροκόδειλος χερσαῖος**, Vulg. *crocodilus*); but there is no specific word in the Hebrew of which it is the acknowledged representative.” Bochart (3:769, edit. Rosenmüller) says that the Talmudists use the word *livyathân* to denote the crocodile; this, however, is denied by Lewysohn (*Zool. des Talm.* p. 155, 355), who says that in the Talmud it always denotes a *whale*, and never a *crocodile*. For the Talmudical fables about the leviathan, see Lewysohn (*Zool. des Talm.*), in passages referred to above, and Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chald. Talm.* s.v. **תַּיִל** (Smith). Some of these seem to be alluded to in 2 Esdr. 6:49, 52. The Egyptians called it *tsmok* (see Biunsen’s *AEgyptens Stellung*, 1:581), the Arabs name it *tamse* (compare **χάμψη**, Herod. 2:69); but Strabo says that the Egyptian crocodile was known by the name *stuchus*, **σοῦχος**, probably referring to the sacred species). It is not only denoted by the *leviathan* of ^{<840>}Job 41:1, but probably also by the *tannin* of ^{<828>}Ezekiel 29:3; 32:2 (compare ^{<870>}Isaiah 27:1; 51:9); and perhaps by the *reedbeast* (**הַנֶּחֱטָא**; **תַּיִל** i “spearmen”) of ^{<880>}Psalms 68:30. Others confound the leviathan with the *orca* of Pliny (9:5), i.e. probably the *Physter macrocephalus* of Linn. (see Th. Hase, *De Leviathan Jobi*, Brem. 1723); Schultens understands the fabulous *dragons* (*Comment. in Job.* p. 1174 sq.; compare Oedmann, *Satmmml.* 3:1. sq.); not to dwell upon the supposed identification with fossil species of lizards (Koch, in Lidde’s *Zeitschrift verygleich Erdk.* Magdleb. 1844). In the detailed description of Job (ch. 41), probably; the Egyptian crocodile is depicted in all its magnitude, ferocity, and indolence, such as it was in early days, when as yet unconscious of the power of man, and only individually tamed for the purposes of an imposture, which had sufficient authority to intimidate the public and protect the species, under the sanctified pretext that it was a type of pure water, and an emblem of the importance of irrigation; though the people in general seem ever to have been disposed to consider it a personification of the destructive principle. At a later period the Egyptians, probably of such places as Tentyris, where crocodiles were not held in veneration, not only hunted and slew them, but it appears from a statue that a sort of Bestiarii could tame them sufficiently to perform certain exhibitions mounted on their backs. The intense musky odor of its flesh must have rendered the crocodile at all times very unpalatable food, but breast-armor was made of the horny and ridged parts of its back. Viewed as the crocodile of the

Thebaid, it is not clear that the leviathan symbolized the Pharaoh, or was a type of Egypt, any more than of several Roman colonies (even where it was not indigenous, as at Nismes, in Gaul, on the ancient coins of which the figure of one chained occurs), and of cities in Phoenicia, Egypt, and other parts of the coast of Africa. During the Roman sway in Egypt, crocodiles had not disappeared in the Lower Nile, for Seneca and others allude to a great battle fought by them and a school of dolphins in the Heracleotic branch of the Delta. During the decline of the state even the hippopotamus reappeared about Pelusium, and was shot at in the 17th century (Radzivil). In the time of the Crusades crocodiles were found in the Crocodilon river of early writers, and in the Crocodilorum lacus, still called Moiat el-Temsah, which appear to be the Kerseos river and marsh, three miles south of Casarea, though the nature of the locality is most appropriate at Nahr-el Arsuf or el-Haddar” (For a full account of the treatment of the crocodile and its worship in Egypt, see Wilkinson’s *Anc. Egypt.* 1:243 sq.).

SEE RAHAB.

Most of the popular accounts of the crocodile have been taken from the American *alligator*, a smaller animal, but very similar in its habits to the true crocodile. See generally Herod. 2:68 sq.; Diod. Sic. 1:35, Aelian, *Hist. Anim.* 5:23; 17; 1:6; 2, Ammianus Marcell. 22:15; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 344 sq., Pococke, *East*, 1:301 sq.; Oken, *Naturgeschichte*, I, 2:329 sq.; Cuvier, *Anim. Kingd.* 2:21; Thom, in the *Halle Encyclop.* 21:456 sq.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 3:737 sq., Oedmann, 3:1 sq.; 6:53 sq.; *Annales du Museum d’histoire natu.* vol. 9, 10; Minutoli, *Trav.* p. 246 Rosenmüller, *Altertshum, sk.* IV, 2:244 sq. Denon, *Trav.* p. 291; Norden, *Reise, p.* 302.

SEE CROCODILE.

Levi ben-Gerson

SEE RALBAG.

Levi, David

a noted English Jewish writer, was born at London in 1740. He was a hatter by profession, but ardently devoted himself to the study of Jewish literature, and gained great reputation by several learned. publications, of which the principal is his *Linageua Sacra*, a dictionary and grammar of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and ‘Talmudic dialects (London, 1785-89, 3 vols. 8vo). He wrote also *Dissertations on the Prophecies of the Old Testament* (1793, 2 vols. 8vo): — *Defence of the Old Testamente, in, Letters, in*

answer to Thomas Paine's *Age of Reason* (1797, 8vo). Levi died in 1799. See Lvson's *Environs*, sup. vol. *European Magazine* (1799); *London Gent. Mag.* (1801); Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. 2, s.v.

Levings, Noah D.D.

an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Cheshire County, N. H., Sept. 29, 1796, and early removed to Troy, N. Y.; was converted about 1812; entered the New York Conference in 1818; was stationed at New York in 1827-8; at Brooklyn in 1829-30, at New Haven in 1831-2; at Albany in 1833, on Troy District in 1838, in 1843 at Vestry Street, New York; in 1844 was finally elected financial secretary of the American Bible Society. He died at Cincinnati Jan. 9, 1849. In early life his advantages for education were limited, but the vigor of his mind and untiring effort bore him above *all* obstacles, and he became one of the most popular and useful ministers of his time. During his eighteen pastoral appointments, Dr. Levings is said to have "preached nearly 4000 sermons, delivered 65 addresses and orations, and to have traveled over no less than 36,500 miles. He also delivered 275 addresses for the American Bible Society." He was an earnest and accomplished minister; many souls were converted under his labors; and as a platform speaker he had few equals amongst the ministry of his age. — *Conf. Min.* 4:327; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1849, p. 515.

Levirate

(from the law-Latin term *levir*, a husband's brother), the name applied to an ancient usage of the Hebrews (^{<OR>}Genesis 38:8 sq.), reordained by Moses (^{<OR>}Deuteronomy 25:5-10; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 23; ^{<OR>}Matthew 22:24 sq.), that when an Israelite died without leaving male issue, his brother (**μby**; *yabam'*, which was the specific term applied to this relation), resident with him, was compelled to marry the widow, and continue his deceased brother's family through the first-born son issuing from such union as the heir of the former husband (comp. Jul. Afric. in Eusebius, *Hist. Ev.* 1:7). If he was unwilling to do so, he could only be released from the obligation by undergoing a species of insult (^{<OR>}Deuteronomy 25:9). This is illustrated in the case of Ruth (ch. 3, 4), where, however, as an estate was involved. Boaz is styled by a different term (**l aḡa** an *avenger*). The Talmud contains a very subtle exposition of this statute (see Mishna, *Jebamoth*, 3:1; comp. *Eduj.* 4:8, on ^{<OR>}Deuteronomy 25:9; see also *Jebam.* 12:6; comp. Selden, *Uxor Hebr.*

1:12; (Gans, *Eherecht*, 1:167 sq.). The high-priest appears to have been free from this law (^{<OR13>}Leviticus 21:13), and there must doubtless have been other exceptions, especially in the case of aged persons and proselytes (Mishna, *Jebam.* 11:2). A similar law prevails among the natives of Central Asia (Bernary, p. 34 sq.; Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 70; Bergeron, *Voyages*, 1:28) and Abyssinia (Bruce, *Trav.* 2:223), and traces of it existed among the ancient Italians (Diod. Sic. 12:18). This law no doubt originated in the love of offspring, proverbially strong in the Eastern bosom, which sought this method at once of perpetuating a deceased person's name and of procuring progeny for the widow (Jahn's *Archeol.* § 157). **SEE KINSMAN.** The law, however, was unquestionably attended with great inconveniences, for a man cannot but think it the most unpleasant of all necessities if he must marry a woman whom he has not chosen himself. Thus we find that the brother in some instances had no inclination for any such marriage (Genesis 38; Ruth 4), and stumbled at this, that the first son produced from it could not belong to him. Whether a second son might follow and continue in life was very uncertain; *and* among a people who so highly prized genealogical immortality of name, it was a great hardship for a man to be obliged to procure it for a person already dead, and to run the risk meanwhile of losing it himself. Nor was this law very much in favor of the morals of the other sex; for, not to speak of Tamar, who, in reference to it, conceived herself justified in having recourse to most improper conduct, it may be observed that what Ruth did (^{<OR16>}Ruth 3:6-9), in order to obtain for a husband the person whom she accounted as the nearest kinsman of her deceased husband, is, to say the least; by no means conformable to that modesty and delicacy which we look for in the other sex. A wise and good legislator could scarcely have been inclined to patronize any such law but then it is not advisable directly to attack an inveterate point of honor, because, in such a case, for the most part nothing is gained; and in the present instance, as the point of honor placed immortality of name entirely in a man's leaving descendants behind him, it was so favorable to the increase of population that it merited some degree of forbearance and tenderness. Moses therefore left the Israelites still in possession of their established right, but, at the same time, he studied as much as possible to guard against its rigor and evil effects by limiting and moderating its operation in various respects. In the first place, he expressly prohibited the marriage of a brother's widow if there were children of his own alive. Before this time, brothers were probably in the practice of considering a brother's widow as part of the inheritance, and of appropriating her to

themselves, if unable to buy a wife, as the Mongols do, so that this was a very necessary prohibition. For a *successor praesumptivus in thoro*, whom a wife can regard as her future husband, is rather a dangerous neighbor for her present one's honor, and if she happen to conceive any predilection for the younger brother, her husband, particularly in a southern climate, will hardly be secure from the risk of poison. In the second place, Moses allowed, and, indeed, enjoined the brother to marry the widow of his childless brother; but if he was not disposed to do so, he did not absolutely compel him, but left him an easy means of riddance, for he had only to declare in court that he had no inclination to marry her, and then he was at liberty. This, it is true, subjected him to a punishment, which at first appears sufficiently severe — the slighted widow had a right to revile him in court as much as she pleased; and from his pulling off his shoe and delivering it to the widow, he received the appellation of Baresole, which anybody might apply to him without being liable to a prosecution. But this infliction was, after all, merely nominal, and we find that it did not prevent the rejection of the widow when there was a decided aversion to it on the part of the surviving relative (~~(Ruth~~ Ruth 4:8). The law, however, only extended to a brother living in the same city or country, not to one residing at a greater distance. Nor did it affect a brother having already a wife of his own. At least, if it had its origin in this, that by reason of the price required for a wife, often only one brother could marry, and the others also wished to do the same, it could only affect such as were unmarried; and in the two instances that occur in Genesis (ch. 38) and Ruth (ch. 4), we find the brother-in-law, whose duty it was to marry, apprehensive of its proving hurtful to himself and his inheritance. which could hardly have been the case if he had previously had another wife, or (but that was at least expensive) could have taken one of his own choice. When there was no brother alive, or when he declined the duty, the levirate law, as we see from the case of Ruth, extended to the nearest relation of the deceased husband, as, for instance, to his paternal uncle or nephew; so that at last even quite remote kinsmen, in default of nearer ones, might be obliged to undertake it. Boaz does not appear to have been very nearly related to Ruth, as he did not so much as know who she was when he met her gleaning in the fields. Nor did she know that he was any relation to her until apprised of it by her mother-in-law. Among the Jews of the present day levirate marriages have entirely ceased, so much so that in the marriage contracts of the very poorest people among them it is generally stipulated that the bridegroom's brother shall abandon all those rights to the bride to

which he could lay claim by the law in question (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht.* 2:197 sq.). See Perizon. *De constitutione div. super defuncti fratris uxore ducenda* (Hal. 1742); F. Bernary, *De Hebraor. leviratu* (Berlin, 1835); J. M. Redslob, *Die Leviratsche bei den Hebraern* (Leipsic, 1836); C. W. F. Walch, *De lege levir. ad fratres non germ. sed tribules referenda* (Götting. 1763); Htillman, *Staatszverf: d. Israel*, p. 190 sq.; Rauschenbusch, *De lege leviratus* (Götting. 1765). **SEE MARRIAGE.**

Le'vis

(Λευίς), given (1 Esdr. 9:14) as a proper name, but meaning simply a *Levite*, as correctly rendered in the parallel Hebrew passage (^{<51015>}Ezra 10:15).

Levison, Mordecai Gumpel

a learned Jewish physician and commentator, was born and educated at Berlin, where he was fellow-student of the celebrated philosopher Moses Mendelssohn. He afterwards removed to London, and was physician in one of the hospitals (1790); was then nominated by Gustavus III, of Sweden, to a professorial chair in Upsala. In 1781 he returned to his native place, but left again three years later for Hamburg, where he died February 10. 1797. His works illustrative of the Bible are *A Commentary on Ecclesiastes*, called, **hl gm tj kwf**, dedicated to Gustavus III (Hamburg, 1784). This elaborate work is preceded by five introductions, which respectively treat on the import of the book, the appropriateness of its name, Hebrew synonymes, roots, the verb and its inflexions, the names of the Deity, on the design of the Bible, etc.; whereupon follows the Hebrew text with a double commentary: one explains the words and their connection, and the other gives an exposition of the argument of the *book*: — *A Treatise on Holy Scripture*, published at the request of the king of Sweden (Lond. 1770): — *A Treatise on the Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Talmud*, entitled **hl wl b hj nm tl s** (Hamb. 1797): — *A Hebrew Lexicon*, called **μϣϛϛϣ**: — *A Work on Hebrew Synonymes*, entitled **μϣϣϣϣϣ**: — and a *Hebrew Grammar*, called, **hϣdj h ϣdqh rd** The last three works have not as yet been published. See Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, 2:238 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* vol. 2, s.v.

Le'vite

(**לְוִיָּהוּב**, *son of Levi*, or simply **לְוִי** *Levi*, for **לְוִיָּהוּב** Deuteronomy 12:18; Judges 17:9, 11 18:3; usually in the plur. and with the art. **לְוִיָּהוּבִי**; Sept. **Λευίται**), a patronymic title which, besides denoting all the descendants of the tribe of Levi (Exodus 6:25, Leviticus 25:32, etc.; Numbers 35:2; Joshua 21:3, 41), is the distinctive title of that portion of it which was set apart for the subordinate offices of the sanctuary, to assist the other and smaller portion of their own tribe, invested with the superior functions of the hierarchy (1 Kings 8:4; Ezra 2:70. John 1:19, etc.), and this is the meaning which has perpetuated itself. Sometimes, again, it is added as an epithet of the smaller portion of the tribe, and we read of “the priests the Levites” (Joshua 3:3; Ezekiel 44:15). *SEE PRIEST*. In describing the institution and development of the Levitical order, we shall treat of it in chronological order, availing ourselves of the best systematizations hitherto produced.

I. *From the Exode till the Monarchy.* — This is the most interesting and important period in the history of the Levitical order, and in describing it we must first of all trace the cause which called it into existence.

1. *Origin and Institution of the Levitical Order.* The absence of all reference to the consecrated character of the Levites in the book of Genesis is noticeable enough. The prophecy ascribed to Jacob (Genesis 49:5-7) was indeed fulfilled with singular precision, but the terms of the prophecy are hardly such as would have been framed by a later writer, after the tribe had gained its subsequent pre-eminence. The only occasion on which the patriarch of the tribe appears the massacre of the Shechemites — may indeed have contributed to influence the history of his descendants, by fostering in them the same fierce, wild zeal against all that threatened to violate the purity of their race, but generally what strikes us is the absence of all recognition of the later character. In the genealogy of Genesis 46:11, in like manner, the list does not go lower down than the three sons of Levi, and they are given in the order of their birth, not in that which would have corresponded to the official superiority of the Kohathites. There are no signs, again, that the tribe of Levi had any special pre-eminence over the others during the Egyptian bondage. As tracing its descent from Leah, it would take its place among the six chief tribes sprung from the wives of Jacob, and share with them a recognized superiority over those that bore the names of the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah. Within the tribe

itself there are some slight tokens that the Kohathites were gaining the first place. The classification of ⁽¹¹⁶⁶⁾Exodus 6:16-25 gives to that section of the tribe four clans or houses, while those of Gershon and Merari have but two each. To it belonged the house of Amram, and “Aaron the Levite” (⁽¹¹⁴⁴⁾Exodus 4:14) is spoken of as one to whom the people would be sure to listen. He married the daughter of the chief of the tribe of Judah (⁽¹¹²³⁾Exodus 6:23). The work accomplished by him, an by his yet greater brother, would naturally tend to give prominence to the family and the tribe to which they belonged, but as yet there are no traces of a caste-character, no signs of any intention to establish a hereditary priesthood. Up to this time the Israelites had worshipped the God of their fathers after their fathers’ manner. The first-born of the people were the priests of the people. The eldest son of each house inherited the priestly office. His youth made him, in his father’s lifetime, the representative of the purity which was connected from the beginning with the thought of worship (Ewald, *Alterthüm.* p. 273. and comp. PRIEST). It was apparently with this as their ancestral worship that the Israelites came up out of Egypt. The “young men” of the sons of Israel offer sacrifices (⁽¹²⁴⁵⁾Exodus 24:5). They, we may infer, are the priests who remain with the people while Moses ascends the heights of Sinai (⁽¹²²²⁾Exodus 19:22-24). They represented the truth that the whole people were “a kingdom of priests” (⁽¹²¹⁶⁾Exodus 19:6). Neither they, nor the “officers and judges” appointed to assist Moses in administering justice (⁽¹²²⁵⁾Exodus 18:25), are connected in any special manner with the tribe of Levi. The first step towards a change was made in the institution of a hereditary priesthood in the family of Aaron during the first withdrawal of Moses to the solitude of Sinai (⁽¹²³¹⁾Exodus 28:1). This, however, was one thing; it was quite another to set apart a whole tribe of Israel as a priestly caste. The directions given for the construction of the tabernacle imply no pre-eminence of the Levites. The chief workers in it are from the tribes of Judah and Dan (⁽¹²³²⁾Exodus 31:2-6). The next extension of the idea of the priesthood grew out of the terrible crisis of Exodus 32. If the Levites had been sharers in the sin of the golden calf, they were, at ally rate, the foremost to rally round their leader when he called on them to help him in stemming the progress of the evil. Then came that terrible consecration of themselves, when every man was against his son and against his brother, and the offering with which they filled their hands ($\mu\kappa\delta\upsilon, \text{Wal } \text{inæ}$ ⁽¹²²⁹⁾Exodus 32:29; comp. ⁽¹²³⁴⁾Exodus 28:41) was the blood of their nearest of kin. ‘The tribe stood forth separate and apart, recognizing even in this stern work the spiritual as higher than the natural,

and therefore counted worthy to be the representative of the ideal life of the people, “an Israel within an Israel” (Ewald, *Alterthüm.* p. 279), chosen in its higher representatives to offer incense and burnt-sacrifice before the Lord (⁽⁰⁵³⁰⁾Deuteronomy 33:9, 10), not without a share in the glory of the Urim and Thummim that were worn by the prince and chieftain of the tribe. From this time, accordingly, they occupied a distinct position. Experience had shown how easily the people might fall back into idolatry — how necessary it was that there should be a body of men, an *order*, numerically large, and, when the people were in their promised home, equally diffused throughout the country, as attestators and guardians of the truth. Without this the individualism of the older worship would have been fruitful in an ever-multiplying idolatry. The tribe of Levi was therefore to take the place of that earlier priesthood of the first-born as representatives of the holiness of the people.

The tabernacle, with its extensive and regular sacrificial service, which required a special priestly order regularly to perform the higher functions of the sanctuary, was the special occasion which also called into being the Levitical staff to aid the priests in their arduous task, inasmuch as the primitive and patriarchal mode of worship which obtained till the erection of the tabernacle, and according to which the first-born of all Israelites performed the priestly offices (comp. ⁽⁰²⁴⁵⁾Exodus 24:5 with 19:24, and see FIRST-BORN), could not be perpetuated under the newly-organized congregational service without interfering with the domestic relations of the people. It was for this reason, as well as to secure greater efficiency in the sacred offices, that the religious primogeniture was conferred upon the tribe of Levi, which were henceforth to give their undivided attention to the requirements of the sanctuary (⁽⁰⁴⁸¹⁾Numbers 3:11-13). The tribe of Levi were selected because they had manifested a very extraordinary zeal for the glory of God (⁽⁰²²⁵⁾Exodus 32:26, etc.), had already obtained a part of this religious primogeniture by the institution of the hereditary priesthood in the family of Aaron (⁽⁰²⁸¹⁾Exodus 28:1), and because, as the tribe to which Moses and Aaron belonged, they would most, naturally support and promote the institutions of the lawgiver. To effect this transfer of office, the first-born males of all the other tribes and all the Levites were ordered to be numbered, from the age of one month and upwards; and when it was found that the former were 22,273, and the latter 22,000 (see below), it was arranged that 22,000 of the first-born should be replaced by the 22,000 Levites, that the 273 first-born who were in excess of the Levites

should be redeemed at the rate of five shekels each, being the legal sum for the redemption of the first-born child (^{<04816>}Numbers 18:16), and that the 1365 shekels be given to Aaron and his sons as a compensation for the odd persons who, as first-born, belonged to Jehovah. As to the difficulty how to decide which of the first-born should be redeemed by paying this money, and which should be exchanged for the Levites, since it was natural for every one to wish to escape this expense, the Midrash (*On Numbers* 3:17) and the Talmud relate that “Moses wrote on 22,000 tickets *Levite* (ywl [˘]b), and on 273 *Five Shekels* (μyl qç çmh), mixed them all up, put them into a vessel, and then bid every Israelite to draw one. *He* who took out one with *Levite* on it was redeemed by a Levite, and he who drew one with *Five Shekels* on it had to be redeemed by payment of this sum” (*Sanhedrin*, 17, a). There is no reason to doubt this ancient tradition. It was further ordained that the cattle which the Levites then happened to possess should be considered as equivalent to all the first-born cattle which all the Israelites had, without their being numbered and exchanged one for one, as in the case of the human beings (^{<04841>}Numbers 3:41-51), so that the firstlings should not now be given to the priest, or be redeemed, which the Israelites were hereafter required to do (^{<04815>}Numbers 18:15). In this way the Levites obtained a sacrificial as well as a priestly character. They for the first-born of men, and their cattle for the firstlings of beasts, fulfilled the idea that had been asserted at the time of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt (^{<01312>}Exodus 13:12, 13).

There is a discrepancy between the total number of the Levites, which is given in ^{<04839>}Numbers 3:39 as 22,000, and the separate number of the three divisions which is given in verses 22, 28, and 34, as follows: Gershonites, 7500 + Kohathites, 8600 + Mierarites, 6200 22,300. Compare also verse 46, where it is said that the 22,273 first-born exceeded the total number of Levites by 273. The Talmud (*Bechoroth*, 5, a) and the Jewish commentators, who are followed by most Christian expositors, submit that the 300 surplus Levites were the first-born of this tribe, who, as such, could not be substituted for the first-born of the other tribes, and therefore were omitted from the total. To this, however, it is objected that if such an exemption of first-born had been intended, the text would have contained some intimation of it, whereas there is nothing whatever in the context to indicate it. Houbigant therefore suggests that a l has dropped out of the word çl ç in verse 28, making it çç, and that by retaining the former word we obtain 8300 instead of 8600, which removes all the difficulty.

Philippon, Keil, and others adopt this explanation. The number of the first-born appears disproportionately small as compared with the population. It must be remembered, however, that the conditions to be fulfilled were that they should be at once (1) the first child of the father, (2) the first child of the mother, and (3) males. (Compare on this question, and on that of the difference of numbers, Kurtz, *History of the Old Covenant*, 3:201.)

Picture for Levite 1

2. *Division of the Tribe of Levi.* — As different functions were assigned to the separate houses of the Levitical branch of the tribe, to which frequent references are made, we subjoin the following table from ^{<01166>}Exodus 6:1625, italicizing the Aaronic or priestly branch in order to facilitate these references.

N.B. — Those mentioned in the above list are by no means the only descendants of Levi in their respective generations, as is evident from the fact that, though no sons of Libni, Shimei, Hebron, etc., are here given, yet mention is made in ^{<0492>}Numbers 3:21, of the family of the Libuites and the family of the Shimeites;” in ^{<0458>}Numbers 26:28, of “the family of the Libnites;” and in ^{<0497>}Numbers 3:27; 26:58, of “the family of the Hebronites;” whilst in 1 Chronicles 23, several sons of these men are mentioned by name. Again, no sons of Mahali and Mushi are given, and yet they appear in Numbers 3 as fathers of families of the Levites. The design of the genealogy in question is simply to give the pedigrees of Moses and Aaron, and some other principal heads of the family of Levi, as is expressly stated in ^{<0165>}Exodus 6:25: “These are the heads of the fathers of the Levites according to their families.” In these heads all the other members of their families were included, according to the principle laid down in ^{<1331>}1 Chronicles 23:11: “Therefore they were in one reckoning, according to their father’s house.” Some names are also mentioned for a special purpose, e.g. the sons of Izhar, on account of Korah, who was the leader of the rebellion against Moses. These observations afford an answer to a considerable extent to the conclusions of bishop Colenso upon the number of the Levites (*The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua critically examined*) 1:107-112).

It will thus be seen that the Levitical order comprises the whole of the descendants of Gershon and Merari, and those of Kohath through Izhar and Uzziel, as well as through Amram’s second son, Moses; whilst Aaron,

Amram's first son, and his issue, constitute the priestly order. It must here be remarked that, though Kohath is the second in point of age and order, yet his family will be found to occupy the first position, because they are the nearest of kin to the priests.

3. Age and Qualifications for Levitical Service. — The only qualification for active service specified in the Mosaic law is mature age, which in ^(408B)Numbers 4:3, 23, 30, 39, 43, 47 is said to be from thirty to fifty, whilst in ^(408B)Numbers 8:24, 25 it is said to commence at *twenty-five*. Various attempts have been made to reconcile these two apparently contradictory injunctions. The Talmud (*Chol.* 24, a), Rashi (*Comment.* ad loc.), and Maimonides (*Jod Ha-Chezakel*, 3:7, 3), who are followed by some Christian commentators, affirm that from twenty-five to thirty the Levites attended in order to be instructed in their duties, but did not enter upon actual duties until they were full thirty years of age. But this explanation, as Abrabanel rightly remarks, “is at variance with the plain declaration of the text, that the Levites were called at twenty-five years of age *to wait upon the service of the tabernacle*, which clearly denotes not instruction for their ministry, but the ministry itself” (*Commentar.* on ^(408B)Numbers 8:24). Besides, the text itself does not give the slightest intimation that any period of the Levitical life was devoted to instruction. Hence Rashbam, AbenEzra, and Abrabanel, who are followed by most modern expositors, submit that the twenty-five years of age refers to the Levites' entering upon the lighter part of their service, such as keeping watch and performing the lighter duties *in* the tabernacle, whilst the thirty years of age refers to their entering upon the more onerous duties, such as carrying heavy weights, when the tabernacle was moved about from place to place, which required the full strength of a man, maintaining that this distinction is indicated in the text by the words **rwbl aqml w**, *for labor and burdens*, when the thirty years' work is spoken of (^(408B)Numbers 4:30, 31), and by the omission of the word **aqm**, *burden*, when the twenty-five years' work is spoken of (^(408B)Numbers 8:24, etc.). But it may fairly be questioned whether man is more fitted for arduous work from thirty to thirty-five than from twenty-five to thirty. Besides, the Gershonites and the Merarites, who had the charge of the heavier burdens, did not carry them at all (comp. ^(408B)Numbers 7:3-9, and sec. 4 below). According to another ancient Jewish interpretation adopted by Bahr (*Symbol.* 2:41) and others, Numbers 4 treats of the necessary age of the Levites for the immediate requirements *in the wilderness*, whilst Numbers 8 gives their age *for the promised land*,

when they shall be divided among the tribes and a larger number shall be wanted (*Siphri on Numbers 8*). Somewhat similar is Philippon's explanation, who affirms that at the first election of the Levitical order the required age for service was from thirty to fifty, but that *all future* Levites had to commence service at *twenty-five*. The Sept. solves the difficulty by uniformly reading twenty-five instead of thirty.

4. Duties and Classification of the Levites. — The commencement of the march from Sinai gave a prominence to their new character. As the tabernacle was the sign of the presence among the people of their unseen King, so the Levites were, among the other tribes of Israel, as the royal guard that waited exclusively on him. The warlike title of "host" is specially applied to them (comp. use of **abx**; in ^{<0408>}Numbers 4:3. 30; and of **hnj n**, in ^{<0019>}1 Chronicles 1:19). As such they were not included in the number of the armies of Israel (^{<0047>}Numbers 1:47; 2:33; 26:62), but were reckoned separately by themselves. When the people were at rest they encamped as guardians around the sacred tent; no one else might come near it under pain of death (^{<0051>}Numbers 1:51; 18:22). The different families pitched their tents around it, in the following manner: the Gershonites behind it on the west (^{<0023>}Numbers 3:23), the Kohathites on the south (^{<0029>}Numbers 3:29), the Merarites on the north (^{<0035>}Numbers 3:35), and the priests on the east (^{<0038>}Numbers 3:38). *SEE CAMP*. They were to occupy a middle position in that ascending scale of consecration which, starting from the idea of the whole nation as a priestly people, reached its culminating point in the high-priest, who alone of all the people might enter "within the veil." The Levites might come nearer than the other tribes, but they might not sacrifice, nor burn incense, nor see the "holy things" of the sanctuary till they were covered (^{<0045>}Numbers 4:15). When on the march no hands but theirs might strike the tent at the commencement of the day's journey, or carry the parts of its structure during it, or pitch the tent again when they halted (^{<0051>}Numbers 1:51). It was obviously essential for such a work that there should be a fixed assignment of duties, and now, accordingly, we meet with the first outlines of the organization which afterwards became permanent. The division of the tribe into the three sections that traced their descent from the sons of Levi formed the groundwork of it. The Levites were given as a gift (**μννγtn**, *Nethinim*) to Aaron and his sons, the priests, to wait upon them, and to do the subordinate work for them at the service of the sanctuary (^{<0019>}Numbers 8:19; 17:2-6). They had also to guard the tabernacle and take

charge of certain vessels, whilst the priests had to watch the altars and the interior of the sanctuary (1:50-53; 8:19; 18:1-7). To carry this out effectually, the charge of certain vessels and portions of the tabernacle, as well as the guarding of its several sides, was assigned to each of the three sections into which the tribe was divided by their respective descent from the three sons of Levi. i.e. Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, as follows:

(1.) The Kohathites, who out of 8600 persons yielded 2750 qualified for active service according to the prescribed age, and who were under the leadership of Elizaphan, had to occupy the south side of the tabernacle, and, as the family to whom Aaron the high-priest and his sons belonged, had to take charge of the holy things (𐤒𐤃𐤒𐤁 𐤈𐤓𐤌𐤌𐤍), viz., the ark, the table of shew-bread, the candlestick, the two altars of incense and burnt-offering, as well as of the sacred vessels used at the service of these holy things, and the curtains of the holy of holies. All these things they had to carry on their own shoulders when the camp was broken up (^{<04E7>}Numbers 3:27-32; 4:5-15; 7:9; ^{<05D5>}Deuteronomy 31:25), after the priests had covered them with the dark blue cloth which was to hide them from all profane gaze; and thus they became also the guardians of all the sacred treasures which the people had so freely offered. Eleazar, the head of the priests, who belonged to the Kohathites, and was the chief commander of the three Levitical divisions, had the charge of the oil for the candlestick, the incense, the daily meat-offering, and the anointing oil (^{<04E2>}Numbers 3:32; 4:16).

(2.) The Gershonites, who out of 7500 men yielded 2630 for active service, and who were under the leadership of Eliasaph, had to occupy the west side of the tabernacle, and to take charge of the tapestry of the tabernacle, all its curtains, hangings, and coverings, the pillars of the tapestry hangings, the implements used in connection therewith, and to perform all the work connected with the taking down and putting up of the articles over which they had the charge (^{<04E2>}Numbers 3:21-26; 4:22-28).

(3.) The Merarites, who out of 6200 yielded 3200 active men. and who were under the leadership of Zuriel, had to occupy the north side of the tabernacle, and take charge of the boards, bars, pillars, sockets, tent-pins, etc. (^{<04E2>}Numbers 3:33-37; 4:39, 40). The two latter companies, however, were allowed to use the six covered wagons and the twelve oxen which were offered as an oblation to Jehovah; the Gershonites, having the less heavy portion, got two of the wagons and four of the oxen; whilst the

Merarites, who had the heavier portions, got four of the wagons and eight of the oxen (^{<047B>}Numbers 7:3-9).

Thus the total number of active men which the three divisions of the Levites yielded was 8580. When encamped around the tabernacle, they formed, as it were, a partition between the people and the sanctuary; they had so to guard it that the children of Israel should not come near it, since those who ventured to do so incurred the penalty of death (^{<005E>}Numbers 1:51; 3:38; 18:22); nor were they themselves allowed to come near the vessels of the sanctuary and the altar, lest they die, as well as the priests (^{<048B>}Numbers 18:3-6). Israelites of any other tribe were strictly forbidden to perform the Levitical office, in order “that there might be no plague when the children of Israel approach the sanctuary” (^{<048D>}Numbers 3:10; 8:19; 18:5); and, according to the ancient Hebrew canons, even a priest was not allowed to do the work assigned to the Levites, nor was one Levite permitted to perform the duties which were incumbent upon his fellow Levite under penalty of death (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Kele Ha-Mikdash*, 3:10).

The book of Deuteronomy is interesting as indicating more clearly than had been done before the other functions, over and above their ministrations in the tabernacle, which were to be allotted to the tribe of Levi. Through the whole land they were to take the place of the old household priests (subject, of course, to the special rights of the Aaronic priesthood), sharing in all festivals and rejoicings (^{<629>}Deuteronomy 12:19; 14:26, 27; 26:11). Every third year they were to have an additional share in the produce of the land (^{<648>}Deuteronomy 14:28; 26:12). The people were charged never to forsake them. To “the priests the Levites” was to belong the office of preserving, transcribing, and interpreting the law (^{<679>}Deuteronomy 17:9-12; 31:26). They were solemnly to read it every seventh year at the Feast of Tabernacles (^{<699>}Deuteronomy 31:9-13). They were to pronounce the curses from Mount Ebal (^{<674>}Deuteronomy 27:14).

Such, if one may so speak, was the ideal of the religious organization which was present to the mind of the lawgiver. Details were left to be developed as the altered circumstances of the people might require. The great principle was, that the warrior-caste who had guarded the tent of the captain of the hosts of Israel should be throughout the land as witnesses that the people still owed allegiance to him. It deserves notice that, as yet, with the exception of the few passages that refer to the priests, no traces

appear of their character as a learned caste, and of the work which afterwards belonged to them as hymn-writers and musicians. The hymns of this period were probably occasional, not recurring (comp. Exodus 15; ^{<0217>}Numbers 21:17; Deuteronomy 32). Women bore a large share in singing them (^{<0153>}Exodus 15:20; ^{<0465>}Psalms 68:25). It is not unlikely that the wives and daughters of the Levites, who must have been with them in all their encampments, as afterwards in their cities, took the foremost part among the “damsels playing with their timbrels,” or among the “wise-hearted,” who wove hangings for the decoration of the tabernacle. There are, at any rate, signs of their presence there in the mention of the “women that assembled” at its door (^{<0288>}Exodus 38:8, and comp. Ewald, *Alterthüm.* p. 297).

5. Consecrations of the Levites. — The first act in the consecration of the Levites was to sprinkle them with the water of purifying (*tafj ym*), which, according to tradition, was the same used for the purification of persons who became defiled by dead bodies, and in which were mingled cedar-wood, hyssop, scarlet, and ashes of the red heifer (^{<0486>}Numbers 19:6, 9, 13), and was designed to cleanse them from the same defilement (comp. Rasli, *On Numb.* 8:7). They had, in the next place, as an emblem of further purification, to shave off all the hair from their body, “to teach thereby,” as Ralbag says, “that they must renounce, as much as was in their power, all worldly things, and devote themselves to the service of the most high God,” and then wash their garments. After this triple form of purification, they were brought before the door of the tabernacle, along with two bullocks and fine flour mingled with oil, when the whole congregation, through the elders who represented them, laid their hands upon the heads of the Levites, and set them apart for the service of the sanctuary, to occupy the place of the first-born of the whole congregation; whereupon the priests waved them before the Lord (^{<0486>}Numbers 8:5-14), which in all probability was done, as Abrabanel says, by leading them forward and backward, up and down, as if saying, Behold, these are henceforth the servants of the Lord. instead of the firstborn of the children of Israel. The part which the whole congregation took in this consecration is a very important feature in the Hebrew constitution, inasmuch as it most distinctly shows that the Levitical order proceeded from *the midst of the people* (^{<0281>}Exodus 28:1), was to be regarded as essentially identical with it, and not as a sacred caste standing in proud eminence above the rest of the nation. This principle of equality, which, according to the Mosaic law, was

not to be infringed by the introduction of a priesthood or monarchy (^{<6174>}Deuteronomy 17:14-20), was recognized throughout the existence of the Hebrew commonwealth, as is evident from the fact that the representatives of the people took part in the coronation of kings and the installment of highpriests (^{<1025>}1 Kings 2:35; with ^{<1303>}1 Chronicles 29:32), and even in the days of the Maccabees we see that it is the people who installed Simon as high-priest (1 Maccab. 14:35).

6. Revenues of the Levites. — Thus consecrated to the service of the Lord, it was necessary that the tribe of Levi should be relieved from the temporal pursuits of the rest of the people, to enable them to give themselves wholly to their spiritual functions, and to the cultivation of the arts and sciences, as well as to preserve them from contracting a desire to amass earthly possessions. For this reason they were to have no territorial possessions, but Jehovah was to be their inheritance (^{<0483>}Numbers 18:20; 26:62; ^{<5019>}Deuteronomy 10:9; 18:1, 2; ^{<0680>}Joshua 18:7). To reward their labor, which they had henceforth to perform instead of the first-born of the whole people, as well as to compensate the loss of their share in the material wealth of the nation, it was ordained that they should receive from the other tribes the tithes of the produce of the land, from which the non-priestly portion of the Levites in their turn had to offer a tithe to the priests as a recognition of their higher consecration (^{<0482>}Numbers 18:21-24, 26-32; ^{<6037>}Nehemiah 10:37). If they had had, like other tribes, a distinct territory assigned to them, their influence over the people at large would be diminished, and they themselves would be likely to forget, in labors common to them with others, their own peculiar calling (^{<6037>}Nehemiah 10:37). As if to provide for the contingency of failing crops or the like, and the consequent inadequacy of the tithes thus assigned to them, the Levite, not less than the widow and the orphan, was commended to the special kindness of the people (^{<5129>}Deuteronomy 12:19; 14:27, 29).

But, though they were to have no territorial possessions, still they required a place of abode. To secure this, and at the same time to enable the Levites to disseminate a knowledge of the law and exercise a refined and intellectual influence among the people at large, upon whose conscientious payment of the tithes they were dependent for subsistence, forty-eight cities were assigned to them, six of which were to be cities of refuge for those who had inadvertently killed any one (^{<0481>}Numbers 35:1-8). From these forty-eight cities, which they obtained immediately after the conquest of Canaan, and which were made up by taking four cities from the district

of every tribe, thirteen were allotted to the priestly portion of the Levitical tribe. Which cities belonged to the priestly portion of the tribe, and which to the non-priestly portion, and how they were distributed among the other tribes, as recorded in Joshua 21, will be seen from the following table:

Picture for Levite 2

Each of these cities was required to have an outlying suburb (*vrgjñæ* *πρόαστεία*) of meadow land for the pasture of the flocks and herds belonging to the Levites, the dimensions of which are thus described in ~~Gen 35~~ Numbers 35:4, 5: “And the suburbs [or pasture-ground] of the cities which ye shall give unto the Levites are from the wall of the city to the outside a thousand cubits round about; and ye shall measure from without the city the east corner two thousand cubits, and the south corner two thousand cubits, and the west corner two thousand cubits, and the north corner two thousand cubits, and the city in the center.” These dimensions have occasioned great difficulty, because of the apparent contradiction in the two verses, as specifying first 1000 cubits and then 2000. The Sept., Josephus (*Ant.* 4:4. 3), and Philo (*De sacer. honoribus*) get over the difficulty by reading 2000 in both verses, as exhibited in diagram I, awhile ancient and modern commentators, who rightly adhere to the text, have endeavored to reconcile the two verses by advancing different theories, of which the following are the most noticeable:

Picture for Levite 3

1. According to the Talmud (*Erubin*, 51, a), the space “measured from the wall 1000 cubits round about” was used as a common or suburb, and the space measured “from without the city on the east side,” etc., was a further tract of land of 2000 cubits, used for fields and vineyards, the former being “the suburbs” properly so called, and the latter “the fields of the suburbs,” as represented in diagram I, b. Against this view, however, which is the most simple and rational, and which is adopted by Maimonides (*Hilchoth Shemita Ve-Jobel*, 13:2), bishop Patrick, and most English expositors, it is urged that it is not said that the 2000 cubits are to be measured in all directions, but only in the east, south, etc., direction, or, as the Hebrew has it, east, south, etc., *corner* (*hap*).

Picture for Levite 4

2. It means that a circle of 1000 cubits radius was to be measured from the center of the city, and then a square circumscribed about that circle, each of whose sides was 2000 cubits long, as exhibited in diagram II. But the objection to this is that the 1000 cubits were to be measured “from the wall of the city,” and not from the center.

3. The 1000 cubits were measured perpendicularly to the wall of the city, and then perpendicular to these distances, i.e. parallel to the walls of the city, the 2000 cubits were measured on the north, south, east, and west sides, as shown in diagram III. This, however, is obviously incorrect, because the sides would not be 2000 cubits long if the city were of finite dimensions, but plainly longer.

Picture for Levite 5

4. It is assumed that the city was built in a circular form, with a radius of 1500 cubits, that a circle was then described with a radius of 2500 cubits from the center of the city, i.e. at a distance of 1000 cubits from the walls of the city, and that the suburbs were enclosed between the circumferences of the two circles, and that the corner of the circumscribed square was 1000 cubits from the circumference of the outer circle. Compare diagram IV. But the objection to this is that by Euclid, 1:47, the square of the diagonal equals the sum of the square of the sides, whereas in this figure 13500^2 does not equal $2500^2 + 2500^2$. The assigned length of the diagonal varies about 35 cubits from its actual value.

Picture for Levite 6

5. The city is supposed to be of a circular form; round it a circle is described at a distance of 1000 cubits from its walls; then from the walls 2000 cubits are measured to the north, south, east, and west corners the whole forming a starlike figure, as exhibited in diagram V. This view, which is somewhat fanciful, strictly meets the requirements of the Hebrew text.

Picture for Levite 7

6. The 1000 cubits are measured from the center in four directions at right angles to one another, and perpendicular to each of these a side of

2000 cubits long is drawn, the whole forming a square. But in this case the condition of “1000 cubits round about” is not fulfilled, the distance of the center from the corners of the square being plainly more than 1000 cubits.

Picture for Levite 8

7. The “1000 cubits round about” is equivalent to 1000 cubits square, or 305 English acres.

8. The city is supposed to be square, each side measuring 1000 or 500 cubits, and then, at a distance of 1000 cubits in all directions from the square, another square is described, as represented in diagrams VI, a, and VI, b. But this incurs the objection urged against 6, that the 1000 cubits cannot be said to be measured “round about,” the distance from the corner of the city to the corner of the precincts being plainly more than 1000 cubits. Upon a review of all these theories, we incline to the ancient Jewish view, which is stated first, and against which nothing can be said, if we take “on the south, east,” etc., simply to mean, as it often does, *in all directions*, instead of four distinct points. It presupposes that the cities were built in a circular form, which was usual in the cities of antiquity, both because the circle of all figures comprises the largest area within the smallest periphery, and because the inhabitants could reach every part of the walls in the shortest time from all directions, if necessary, for purposes of defense.

These revenues have been thought exorbitant beyond all bounds; for, discarding the unjustifiable conclusion of bishop Colenso that “forty-four people [Levites], with the two priests, and their families, had forty-eight cities assigned to them” (*The Pentateuch*, etc., 1:112), and adhering to the scriptural numbers, we still have a tribe which, at the second census, numbered 23,000 males, with no more than 12,000 arrived at man’s estate, receiving the tithes of 600,000 people; “consequently,” it is thought “that each individual Levite, without having to deduct seed and the charges of husbandry, had as much as five Israelites reaped from their fields or gained on their cattle” (Michaelis, *Laws of Moses*, 1:252). Add to this that, though so small in number, the Levites received forty-eight cities, while other tribes which consisted of more than double the number of men received less cities, and some did not get more than twelve cities. But in all these calculations the following facts are ignored:

1. The tithes were not a regular tax, but a religious duty, which was greatly neglected by the people;
2. Even from these irregular tithes the Levites had to give a tithe to the priests;
3. The tithes never increased, whereas the Levites did increase.
4. Thirteen of the forty-eight cities were assigned to the priests, and six were cities of refuge; and,
5. Of the remaining twenty-nine cities, the Levites were by no means the sole occupants or proprietors; they were simply to have in them those houses which they required as dwellings, and the fields necessary for the pasture of their cattle.

This is evident from the fact that the Levites were allowed to sell their houses, and that a special clause bearing on this subject was inserted in the Jubilee law, *SEE JUBILEE*; inasmuch as ^{<RB53>}Leviticus 25:32-34, would have no meaning unless it is presumed that other Israelites lived together with the Levites.

These provisions for abode, of course, did not apply to the Levites in the time of Moses. While wandering in the wilderness, they were supported like the other Israelites, with but slight emoluments or perquisites, and at first with comparatively little honor, amid their considerable burdens in caring for the religious cultus. But how rapidly the feeling of reverence gained strength we may judge from the share assigned to them out of the flocks, and herds, and women of the conquered Midianites (^{<RB17>}Numbers 31:27, etc.). The same victory led to the dedication of gold and silver vessels of great value, and thus increased the importance of the tribe as guardians of the national treasures (^{<RB15>}Numbers 31:50-54).

7. Modifications under Joshua and the Judges. — The submission of the Gibeonites, after they had obtained a promise that their lives should be spared, enabled Joshua to relieve the tribe-divisions of Gershon and Merari of the most burdensome of their duties. The conquered Hivites became “hewers of wood and drawers of water” for the house of Jehovah and for the congregation (^{<RB27>}Joshua 9:27). The Nethinim (*Deo dati*) of ^{<RB02>}1 Chronicles 9:2; ^{<RB43>}Ezra 2:43, were probably sprung from captives taken by David in later wars, who were assigned to the service of the tabernacle,

replacing possibly the Gibeonites who had been slain by Saul (^{<1201>}2 Samuel 21:1). *SEE NETHINIM.*

The scanty memorials that are left us in the book of Judges are rather unfavorable to the inference that for any length of time the reality answered to the Mosaic idea of the Levitical institution. The ravages of invasion, and the pressure of an alien rule, marred the working of the organization which seemed so perfect. Levitical cities, such as Aijalon (^{<1224>}Joshua 21:24; ^{<1015>}Judges 1:35) and Gezer (^{<1221>}Joshua 21:21; ^{<1165>}1 Chronicles 6:67), fell into the hands of their enemies. Sometimes, as in the case of Nob, others apparently took their place. The wandering, unsettled habits of such Levites as are mentioned in the later chapters of Judges are probably to be traced to this loss of a fixed abode, and the consequent necessity of taking refuge in other cities, even though their tribe as such had no portion in them. The tendency of the people to fall into the idolatry of the neighboring nations showed either that the Levites failed to bear their witness to the truth or had no power to enforce it. Even in the lifetime of Phinehas, when the high-priest was still consulted as an oracle, the very reverence which the people felt for the tribe of Levi becomes the occasion of a rival worship (Judges 17). The old household priesthood revives (see Kalisch, *On* ^{<1447>}*Genesis 49:7*), and there is the risk of the national worship breaking up into individualism. Micah first consecrates one of his own sons, and then tempts a homeless Levite to dwell with him as “a father and a priest” for little more than his food and raiment. The Levite, though probably the grandson of Moses himself, repeats the sin of Korah. *SEE JONATHAN.* First in the house of Micah, and then for the emigrants of Dan, he exercises the office of a priest with “an ephod, and a teraphim, and a graven image.” With this exception the whole tribe appears to have fallen into a condition analogous to that of the clergy in the darkest period and in the most outlying districts of the mediaeval Church, going through a ritual routine, but exercising no influence for good, at once corrupted and corrupting. The shameless license of the sons of Eli may be looked upon as the result of a long period of decay, affecting the whole order. When the priests were such as Hophni and Phinehas, we may fairly assume that the Levites were not doing much to sustain the moral life of the people.

The work of Samuel was the starting-point of a better time. Himself a Levite, and, though not a priest, belonging to that section of the Levites which was nearest to the priesthood (^{<1168>}1 Chronicles 6:28), adopted, as it were, by a special dedication into the priestly line and trained for its offices

(^{<0128>}1 Samuel 2:18), he appears as infusing a fresh life, the author of a new organization. There is no reason to think, indeed, that the companies or schools of the sons of the prophets which appear in his time (^{<0905>}1 Samuel 10:5), and are traditionally said to have been founded by him, consisted exclusively of Levites; but there are many signs that the members of that tribe formed a large element in the new order, and received new strength from it. It exhibited, indeed, the ideal of the Levitical life as one of praise, devotion, teaching; standing in the same relation to the priests and Levites generally as the monastic institutions of the 5th century, or the mendicant orders of the 13th did to the secular clergy of Western Europe. The fact that the Levites were thus brought under the influence of a system which addressed itself to the mind and heart in a greater degree than the sacrificial functions of the priesthood, may possibly have led them on to apprehend the higher truths as to the nature of worship which begin to be asserted from this period, and which are nowhere proclaimed more clearly than in the great hymn that bears the name of Asaph (Psalm 1,7-15). The man who raises the name of prophet to a new significance is himself a Levite (^{<0909>}1 Samuel 9:9). It is among the prophets that we find the first signs of the musical skill which is afterwards so conspicuous in the Levites (^{<0905>}1 Samuel 10:5). The order in which the Temple services were arranged is ascribed to two of the prophets, Nathan and G(ad (^{<1425>}2 Chronicles 29:25), who must have grown up under Samuel's superintendence, and in part to Samuel himself (^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 9:22). Asaph and Heman, the psalmists, bear the same title as Samuel the Seer (^{<1335>}1 Chronicles 25:5; ^{<1322>}2 Chronicles 29:30). The very word "prophesying" is applied not only to sudden bursts of song, but to the organized psalmody of the Temple (^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 25:2, 3). Even of those who bore the name of a prophet in a higher sense a large number are traceably of this tribe.

The capture of the ark by the Philistines did not entirely interrupt the worship of the Israelites, and the ministrations of the Levites went on, first at Shiloh (^{<0948>}1 Samuel 14:3), then for a time at Nob (^{<0221>}1 Samuel 22:11), afterwards at Gibeon (^{<1122>}1 Kings 3:2; ^{<1369>}1 Chronicles 16:39). The history of the return of the ark to Beth-shemesh after its capture by the Philistines, and its subsequent removal to Kirjath-jearim, points apparently to some strange complications rising out of the anomalies of this period, and affecting, in some measure, the position of the tribe of Levi. Beth-shemesh was, by the original assignment of the conquered country, one of the cities of the priests (^{<0216>}Joshua 21:16). They, however, do not appear in the

narrative, unless we assume, against all probability, that the men of Beth-shemesh who were guilty of the act of profanation were themselves of the priestly order. Levites, indeed, are mentioned as doing their appointed work (^{<0065>}1 Samuel 6:15), but the sacrifices and burnt-offerings are offered by the men of the city, as though the special function of the priesthood had been usurped by others, and on this supposition it is easier to understand how those who had set aside the law of Moses by one offense should defy it also by another. The singular reading of the Sept. in ^{<0069>}1 Samuel 6:19 (καὶ οὐκ ἠσμένισαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰεχονίου ἐν τοῖς ἀνδρασι Βαιθσαμὺς ὅτι εἶδον κιβωτὸν Κυρίου) indicates, if we assume that it rests upon some corresponding Hebrew text, a struggle between two opposed parties, one guilty of the profanation, the other — possibly the Levites who had been before mentioned — zealous in their remonstrances against it. Then comes, either as the result of this collision, or by direct supernatural infliction, the great slaughter of the Beth-shemites, and they shrink from retaining the ark any longer among them. The great Eben (stone) becomes, by a slight paronomastic change in its form, the “great Abel” (lamentation), and the name remains as a memorial of the sin and of its punishment. **SEE BETH-SHEMESH.** We are left entirely in the dark as to the reasons which led them, after this, to send the ark of Jehovah, not to Hebron or some other priestly city, but to Kirjath-jearim, round which, so far as we know, there gathered legitimately no sacred associations. It has been commonly assumed, indeed, that Abinadab, under whose guardianship it remained for twenty years, must necessarily have been of the tribe of Levi. **SEE ABINADAB.** Of this, however, there is not the slightest direct evidence, and against it there is the language of David in ^{<3152>}1 Chronicles 15:2, “None ought to carry the ark of God but the Levites, for them hath Jehovah chosen,” which would lose half its force if it were not meant as a protest against a recent innovation, and the ground of a return to the more ancient order. So far as one can see one’s way through these perplexities of a dark period, the most probable explanation — already suggested under KIRJATH-JEARIM — seems to be the following: The old names of Baaleh (^{<6159>}Joshua 15:9) and Kirjath-baal (^{<6150>}Joshua 15:60) suggest there had been of old some special strictly attached to the place as the center of a Canaanitish local worship. The fact that the ark was taken to the house of Abinadab in the *hill* (^{<0001>}1 Samuel 7:1), the Gibcah of ^{<0002>}2 Samuel 6:3, connects itself with that old Canaanitish reverence for high places which, through the whole history of the Israelites, continued to have such strong attractions for them. These may have seemed to the panic-stricken

inhabitants of that district, mingling old things and new, the worship of Jehovah with the lingering superstitions of the conquered people, sufficient grounds to determine their choice of a locality. The consecration (the word used is the special sacerdotal term) of Eleazar as the guardian of the ark is, on this hypothesis, analogous in its way to the other irregular assumptions which characterize this period, though here the offense was less flagrant, and did not involve, apparently, the performance of any sacrificial acts. While, however, this aspect of the religious condition of the people brings the Levitical and priestly orders before us as having lost the position they had previously occupied, there were other influences at work tending to reinstate them.

II. *During the Monarchy.* — The deplorably disorganized condition of the Levitical order was not much improved in the reign of the first Hebrew monarch. The rule of Samuel and his sons, and the prophetic character now connected with the tribe, tended to give them the position of a ruling caste. In the strong desire of the people for a king we may perhaps trace a protest against the assumption by the Levites of a higher position than that originally assigned them. The reign of Saul, in its later period, was at any rate the assertion of a self-willed power against the priestly order. The assumption of the sacrificial office, the massacre of the priests at Nob, the slaughter of the Gibeonites who were attached to their service, were parts of the same policy, and the narrative of the condemnation of Saul for the two former sins, no less than of the expiation required for the latter (2 Samuel 21), shows by what strong measures the truth, of which that policy was a subversion, had to be impressed on the minds of the Israelites. The reign of David, however, brought the change from persecution to honor. The Levites were ready to welcome a king who, though not of their tribe, had been brought up under their training, was skilled in their arts, prepared to share even in some of their ministrations, and to array himself in their apparel (^{<10184>}2 Samuel 6:14); and 4600 of their number, with 3700 priests, waited upon David at Hebron — itself; it should be remembered, one of the priestly cities — to tender their allegiance (^{<13126>}1 Chronicles 12:26). When his kingdom was established, there came a fuller organization of the whole tribe. Its position in relation to the priesthood was once again definitely recognized. When the ark was carried up to its new resting-place in Jerusalem, their claim to be the bearers of it was publicly acknowledged (^{<13126>}1 Chronicles 15:2). When the sill of Uzza stopped the procession, it was placed for a time under the care of Obed-edom of Gath — probably

Gath-rimmon — as one of the chiefs of the Kohathites (^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 13:13, ^{<1624>}Joshua 21:24; ^{<1318>}1 Chronicles 15:18). In the procession which attended the ultimate conveyance of the ark to its new resting-place the Levites were conspicuous, wearing their linen ephods, and appearing in their new character as minstrels (^{<1317>}1 Chronicles 15:27, 28). The Levites engaged in conveying the ark to Jerusalem were divided into six father's houses, headed by six chiefs, four belonging to Kohath, one to Gershon, and one to Merari (^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 15:5, etc.). The most remarkable feature in the Levitical duties of this period is their being employed for the first time in choral service (^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 15:16-24; 16:4-36); others, again, were appointed as door-keepers (15:23, 24). Still the thorough reorganization of the whole tribe was effected by the shepherd-king in the last days of his eventful life, that the Levites might be able at the erection of the Temple "to wait on the sons of Aaron for the service of the house of Jehovah, in the courts and the chambers, and the purifying of all holy things, and the work of the service of the house of God" (^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 23:28). This reorganization may be described as follows:

1. Number of Levites and Age for Service. — The Levites from thirty years of age and upwards were first of all numbered, when it was found that they were 38,000 (^{<1322>}1 Chronicles 23:2,3); this being about 29,500 more than at the first Mosaic census. It will be seen that, according to this statement, the Levites were to commence service at thirty years of age, in harmony with the Mosaic institution (^{<004B>}Numbers 4:3, 23, 30); while in ver. 27 of the same chapter (i.e. ^{<1327>}1 Chronicles 23:27) it is said that they were to take their share of duty at twenty years of age. Kimchi, who is followed by bishop Patrick, Michaelis, and others, tries to reconcile this apparent contradiction by submitting that the former refers to a census which David made at an earlier period, which was according to the Mosaic law (^{<004B>}Numbers 4:3), while the latter speaks of a second census which he made at the close of his life, when he found that the duties of the fixed sanctuary were much lighter and more numerous, and could easily be performed at the age of twenty, but at the same time required a larger staff of men. Against this, however, Bertheau rightly urges that,

1. The 38,000 Levites of thirty years of age given in the census of ver. 3 are the only persons appointed for the different Levitical offices, and that it is nowhere stated that this number was insufficient, or that the arrangements based thereupon, as recorded in vers. 4 and 5, were not carried out; and,

2. The chronicler plainly indicates, in ver. 25, etc., that he is about to impart a different statement from that communicated in ver. 3; for he mentions therein the reason which induced David not to abide by the Mosaic institution, which prescribes the age of service to commence at thirty, and in ver. 27 expressly points out the source from which he derived this deviating account. The two accounts are, therefore, entirely different; the one records that the Levites, in David's time, were numbered from their thirtieth year; while the other, which appears to the chronicler more trustworthy, states that David introduced the practice which afterwards obtained (^{<4317>}2 Chronicles 31:17; ^{<4318>}Ezra 3:8) of appointing Levites to office at the age of twenty.

2. *Division of the Levites according to the three great Families.* — Having ascertained their number, David, following the example of the Mosaic institution, divided the Levitical fathers' houses, according to their descent from the three sons of Levi, when it was ascertained that these three sons, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, were represented by twenty-four heads of fathers' houses (^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 23:6-23; 24:20-31), as follows:

Picture for Levite 9

3. *Classification and Duties of the Levites.* — These twenty-four fathers' houses, numbering 38,000 men qualified for active service, were then divided into four classes, to each of which different duties were assigned.

(1.) The first class consisted of 24,000 Levites. These were appointed to assist the priests in the work of the sanctuary (*λειτουργοῦντες*). They had the custody of the official garments and sacred vessels, had to deliver them when wanted, and collect and lock them up again after they had been used; to replenish the sacrificial storehouse with cattle, flour, wine, oil, incense, and other articles used as sacrifices, and mete out each time the required quantity; to provide the different spices from which the priests compounded the incense (^{<1319>}1 Chronicles 9:30); to prepare the shewbread the the other baked things used at sacrifices; to assist the priests in slaughtering the victims, and to attend to the cleaning of the Temple, etc. (^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 23:28-32; 9:29). They had most probably, also, the charge of the sacred treasury (^{<1331>}1 Chronicles 26:20-28). Like the priests, they were subdivided into twenty-four courses or companies, according to the above-named twenty-four Levitical fathers' houses, and were headed respectively by one of the twenty-four representatives of these houses.

Each of these courses was a week on duty, and was relieved on the Sabbath (2 Kings 11) by the company those turn it was to serve next, so that there were always a thousand men of this class on duty, and each man had to serve two weeks during the year. The menial work was done by the *Nethinim*, who were appointed to assist the Levites in these matters. *SEE NETHINIM.*

(2.) The second class consisted of 4000, who were the musicians (*μυγρωζμ, ὕμνοδοί*). They too were subdivided into twenty-four courses or choirs, each headed by a chief (1 Chronicles 25), and are to be traced back to the three great families of Levi, inasmuch as four of the chiefs were sons of Asaph, a descendant of Gershon (^{<1364>}1 Chronicles 6:24-28); six were sons of Jeduthun, also called Ethan (^{<1357>}1 Chronicles 15:17), a descendant of Merari (^{<1368>}1 Chronicles 6:28); and fourteen were sons of Haman, a descendant of Kohath (^{<1368>}1 Chronicles 6:18). Each of these chiefs had eleven assistant masters from his own sons and brothers, thus making together 288 (^{<1357>}1 Chronicles 25:7). Hence, when these are deducted from the 4000, there remain for each band consisting of twelve chief musicians, 154 or 155 subordinate musicians. As twelve musicians were required to be present at the daily morning and evening service, thus demanding 168 to be on duty every week, the twenty-four courses which relieved each other in hebdomadal rotation must have consisted of 4032, and 4000 given by the chronicler is simply to be regarded as a round number. Of this class, therefore, as of the former, each individual had to serve two weeks during the year.

(3.) The third class also consisted of 4000. They were the gate-keepers (*μυγρωζ, πυλωροί*, ^{<1351>}1 Chronicles 26:119), and, as such, bore arms (9:19; ^{<4302>}2 Chronicles 31:2). They had to open and shut the gates, to keep strangers and excommunicated or unclean persons from entering the courts, and to guard the storehouse, the Temple, and its courts at night. They, too, were subdivided into twenty-four courses, and were headed by twenty-four chiefs from the three great families of Levi: seven were sons of Meshelmiah, a descendant of Kohath; thirteen were from Obed-edom, a descendant of Gershon; and four were sons of Hosah, a descendant of Merari. These three families, including the twenty-four chiefs, consisted of ninety-three members, who, together with the three heads of the families, viz. Meshelmiah, Obed-edom, and Hosah, made ninety-six, thus yielding four chiefs for each course. We thus obtain a watch-course every week of

162 or 163 persons, under the command of four superior watches, one of whom was the commander-in-chief. As 24 sentinel posts are assigned to these guards, thus making 168 a week, it appears that each person only served one day in the week (1 Chronicles 26).

(4.) The fourth class consisted of 6000, who were appointed for *outward affairs* (חנמxyj h hkal mh), as scribes and judges (^{<1339>}1 Chronicles 26:29-32), in contradistinction to the work connected with the service of the sanctuary. It appears that this class was subdivided into three branches: Chenaniah and his sons were for the outward business of Israel (^{<1339>}1 Chronicles 26:29); Hashabiah of Hebron and his brethren, numbering 1700, were officers west of Jordan, “in all the business of the Lord and in the service of the king” (ver. 30); whilst Jerijah, also of Hebron, and his brethren, numbering 2700 active men, were rulers east of Jordan “for every matter pertaining to God and affairs of the king” (vers. 31, 32). It will thus be seen that this class consisted of Kohathites, being descendants of Izhar and Hebron.

The Levites lived for the greater part of the year in their own cities, and came up at fixed periods to take their turn of work (1 Chronicles 25, 26). The predominance of the number twelve as the basis of classification might seem to indicate monthly periods, and the festivals of the new moon would naturally suggest such an arrangement. The analogous order in the civil and military administration (^{<1370>}1 Chronicles 27:1) would tend to the same conclusion. It appears, indeed, that there was a change of some kind every week (^{<1325>}1 Chronicles 9:25; ^{<1374>}2 Chronicles 23:4, 8); but this is, of course, compatible with a system of rotation, which would give to each a longer period of residence, or with the permanent residence of the leader of each division within the precincts of the sanctuary. Whatever may have been the system, we must bear in mind that the duties now imposed upon the Levites were such as to require almost continuous practice. They would need, when their turn came, to be able to bear their parts in the great choral hymns of the Temple, and to take each his appointed share in the complex structure of a sacrificial liturgy, and for this a special study would be required. The education which the Levites received for their peculiar duties, no less than their connection, more or less intimate, with the schools of the prophets (see above), would tend to make them, so far as there was any education at all, the teachers of the others (there is, however, a curious Jewish tradition that the schoolmasters of Israel were of the tribe of Simeon [Solom. Jarchi on ^{<0407>}Genesis 49:7, in Godwyn’s

Moses and Aaron], the transcribers and interpreters of the law, the chroniclers of the times in which they lived. We have some striking instances of their appearance in this new character. One of them, Ethan the Ezrahite, takes his place among the old Hebrew sages who were worthy to be compared with Solomon, and (Psalm 89, title) his name appears as the writer of the 39th Psalm (^{<110&B>}1 Kings 4:31; ^{<3157>}1 Chronicles 15:17). One of the first to bear the title of “scribe” is a Levite (^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 24:6), and this is mentioned as one of their special offices under Josiah (^{<4913>}2 Chronicles 34:13). They are described as “officers and judges” under David (^{<1329>}1 Chronicles 26:29), and, as such, are employed “in all the business of Jehovah, and in the service of the king.” They are the agents of Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah in their work of reformation, and are sent forth to proclaim and enforce the law (^{<4478>}2 Chronicles 17:8; 30:22). Under Josiah the function has passed into a title, and they are “the Levites that taught all Israel” (^{<4488>}2 Chronicles 35:3). The two books of Chronicles bear unmistakable marks of having been written by men whose interests were all gathered round the services of the Temple, and who were familiar with its records. The materials from which they compiled their narratives, and to which they refer as the works of seers and prophets, were written by men who were probably Levites themselves, or, if not, were associated with them.

This reorganization effected by David, we are told, was adopted by his son Solomon when the Temple was completed (^{<1484>}2 Chronicles 8:14, etc.). The revolt of the ten tribes, and the policy pursued by Jeroboam, led to a great change in the position of the Levites. They were the witnesses of an appointed order and of a central worship. Jeroboam wished to make the priests the creatures and instruments of the king, and to establish a provincial and divided worship. The natural result was that they left the cities assigned to them in the territory of Israel and gathered round the metropolis of Judah (^{<4413>}2 Chronicles 11:13, 14). Their influence over the people at large was thus diminished, and the design of the Mosaic polity so far frustrated; but their power as a religious order was probably increased by this concentration within narrower limits. In the kingdom of Judah they were from this time forward a powerful body, politically as well as ecclesiastically. They brought with them the prophetic element of influence. in the wider as well as in the higher meaning of the word. We accordingly find them prominent in the war of Abijah against Jeroboam (^{<4430>}2 Chronicles 13:10-12). They are, as before noticed, sent out by Jehoshaphat

to instruct and judge the people (^{<1498>}2 Chronicles 19:8-10). Prophets of their order encourage the king in his war against Moab and Ammon, and go before his army with their loud hallelujahs (^{<1497>}2 Chronicles 20:21), and join afterwards in the triumph of his return. The apostasy that followed on the marriage of Jehoram and Athaliah exposed them for a time to the dominance of a hostile system; but the services of the Temple appear to have gone on, and the Levites were again conspicuous in the counter-revolution effected by Jehoiada (2 Chronicles 23), and in restoring the Temple to its former stateliness under Jehoash (^{<1495>}2 Chronicles 24:5). They shared in the disasters of the reign of Amaziah (^{<1494>}2 Chronicles 25:24) and in the prosperity of Uzziah, and were ready, we may believe, to support the priests, who, as representing their order, opposed the sacrilegious usurpation of the latter king (^{<1497>}2 Chronicles 26:17). The closing of the Temple under Ahaz involved the cessation at once of their work and of the privileges (^{<1493>}2 Chronicles 28:24). Under Hezekiah they again became prominent, as consecrating themselves to the special work of cleansing and repairing the Temple (^{<1492>}2 Chronicles 29:12-15); and the hymns of David and of Asaph were again renewed. In this instance it was thought worthy of special record that those who were simply Levites were more "upright in heart" and zealous than the priests themselves (^{<1494>}2 Chronicles 29:34); and thus, in that great Passover, they took the place of the unwilling or unprepared members of the priesthood. Their old privileges were restored, they were put forward as teachers (^{<1492>}2 Chronicles 30:22), and the payment of tithes, which had probably been discontinued under Ahaz, was renewed (^{<1490>}2 Chronicles 31:4). The genealogies of the tribe were revised (ver. 17), and the old classification kept its ground. The reign of Manasseh was for them, during the greater part of it, a period of depression. That of Josiah witnessed a fresh revival and reorganization (^{<1488>}2 Chronicles 34:8-13). In the great Passover of his eighteenth year they took their place as teachers of the people, as well as leaders of their worship (^{<1488>}2 Chronicles 35:3, 15). Then came the Egyptian and Chaldaean invasions, and the rule of cowardly and apostate kings. The sacred tribe likewise showed itself unfaithful. The repeated protests of the priest Ezekiel indicate that they had shared in the idolatry of the people. The prominence into which they had been brought in the reigns of the two reforming kings had apparently tempted them to think that they might encroach permanently on the special functions of the priesthood, and the sin of Korah was renewed (^{<3440>}Ezekiel 44:10-14; 48:11). They had, as the

penalty of their sin, to witness the destruction of the Temple and to taste the bitterness of exile.

III. After the Captivity. — The position taken by the Levites in the first movements of the return from Babylon indicates that they had cherished the traditions and maintained the practices of their tribe. They, we may believe, were those who were specially called on to sing to their conquerors one of the songs of Zion (De Wette on Psalm 137). It is noticeable, however, that in the first body of returning exiles they were present in a disproportionately small number (^{<4126>}Ezra 2:36-42). Those who did come took their old parts at the foundation and dedication of the second Temple (^{<4180>}Ezra 3:10; 6:18). In the next movement under Ezra their reluctance (whatever may have been its origin) was even more strongly marked. None of them presented themselves at the first great gathering (^{<4185>}Ezra 8:15). The special efforts of Ezra did not succeed in bringing together more than 38, and their place had to be filled by 220 of the Nethinim (ib. 20). There is a Jewish tradition (Surenhusius, *Mishna, Sota*, 9:10) to the effect that, as a punishment for this backwardness, Ezra deprived them of their tithes, and transferred the right to the priests. Those who returned with him resumed their functions at the Feast of Tabernacles as teachers and interpreters (^{<4607>}Nehemiah 8:7), and those who were most active in that work were foremost also in chanting the hymn-like prayer which appears in Nehemiah 9 as the last great effort of Jewish psalmody. They were recognized in the great national covenant, and the offerings and tithes which were their due were once more solemnly secured to them (^{<4607>}Nehemiah 10:37-39). They took their old places in the Temple and in the villages near Jerusalem (^{<4629>}Nehemiah 12:29), and are present in full array at the great feast of the Dedication of the Wall. The two prophets who were active at the time of the return, Haggai and Zechariah, if they did not belong to the tribe, helped it forward in the work of restoration. The strongest measures were adopted by Nehemiah, as before by Ezra, to guard the purity of their blood from the contamination of mixed marriages (^{<4503>}Ezra 10:23), and they were made the special guardians of the holiness of the Sabbath (^{<4632>}Nehemiah 13:22). The last prophet of the O.T. sees, as part of his vision of the latter days, the time when the Lord “shall purify the sons of Levi” (^{<3983>}Malachi 3:3).

The guidance of the O.T. fails us at this point, and the history of the Levites in relation to the national life becomes consequently a matter of inference and conjecture. The synagogue worship, then originated, or

receiving a new development, was organized irrespectively of them [see SYNAGOGUE], and thus throughout the whole of Palestine there were means of instruction in the law with which they were not connected. This would tend materially to diminish their peculiar claim on the reverence of the people; but where priests or Levites were present in the synagogue they were still entitled to some kind of precedence, and special sections in the lessons for the day were assigned to them (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on ^{<0B>}Matthew 4:23). During the period that followed the captivity they contributed to the formation of the so-called Great Synagogue. The Levites, with the priests, theoretically constituted and practically formed the majority of the permanent Sanhedrim (Maimonides in Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on ^{<0B>}Matthew 26:3), and as such had a large share in the administration of justice even in capital cases. In the characteristic feature of this period, as an age of scribes succeeding to an age of prophets, they, too, were likely to be sharers. The training and previous history of the tribe would predispose them to attach themselves to the new system as they had done to the old. They accordingly may have been among the scribes and elders who accumulated traditions. They may have attached themselves to the sects of Pharisees and Sadducees. But in proportion as they thus acquired fame and reputation individually, their functions as Levites became subordinate, and they were known simply as the inferior ministers of the Temple. They take no prominent part in the Maccabaeian struggles, though they must have been present at the great purification of the Temple.

How strictly during this post-exilian period the Levitical duties were enforced, and how severely any neglect in performing them was punished, may be gathered from the following description in the Mishna: “The Levites had to guard twenty-four places: five were stationed at the five gates of the Mountain of the House (**tybh rh yr [ç]**), four at the four corners inside, five at the five gates of the outer court, four at its four corners inside, one at the sacrificial storehouse, one at the curtain depository, and one behind the holy of holies. The inspector of the Mountain of the House went round through all the guards [every night] with burning torches before him. If the guard did not immediately stand up, the inspector of the Mountain of the House called out to him, ‘Peace be with thee!’ and if he perceived that he was asleep, he struck him with his stick, and even had the liberty of setting his garments on fire, and when it was asked, ‘What is that noise in the court?’ they were told, ‘It is the noise of a Levite who is beaten, or whose clothes have been burnt, because he

slept when on duty' "(*Middoth*, 1:1, 2). It is thought that allusion is made to the fact in the Apocalypse when it is said "Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments" (^{<ref>Revelation 16:15</ref>). As for the Levites who were the singers, they were summoned by the blast of the trumpet after the incense was kindled upon the altar, when they assembled from all parts of the spacious Temple at the orchestra which was joined to the fifteen steps at the entrance from the women's outer court to the men's outer court. They sung psalms in antiphonies, accompanied by three musical instruments — the harp, the cithern, and cymbals — while the priests were pouring out on the altar the libation of wine. On Sunday they sung Psalm 24, on Monday Psalm 48, on Tuesday Psalm 82, on Wednesday Psalm 94, on Thursday Psalm 81, on Friday Psalm 93, and on the Sabbath Psalm 92. Each of these psalms was sung in nine sections, with eight pauses (**μῦϣϣρ**), and at each pause the priests blew trombones, when the whole congregation fell down every time worshipping on their faces (*Tamid*, 7:3, 4).}

The Levites had no prescribed canonical dress like the priests, as may be seen from the fact which Josephus narrates, that the singers requested Agrippa "to assemble the Sanhedrim in order to obtain leave for them to wear linen garments like the priests... contrary to the laws" (*Ant.* 20:9, 6). But, though they wore no official garments at the service, yet the Talmud says that they ordinarily wore a linen outer-garment with sleeves, and a head-dress; and on journeys were provided with a staff, a pocket, and a copy of the Pentateuch (*Joma*, 122, a). Some modifications were at this period introduced in what was considered the necessary qualification for service. The Mosaic law, it will be remembered, regarded age as the only qualification, and freed the Levite from his duties when he was fifty years old; now that singing constituted so essential a part of the Levitical duties, any Levite who had not a good voice was regarded as disqualified, and if it continued good and melodious, he was retained in service all his lifetime, irrespective of age, but if it failed he was removed from that class which constituted the choristers to the gate-keepers (Maimonides, *Hilchoth Kele Ha-Kodesh*, 3:8). During the period of mourning a Levite was exempt from his duties in the Temple.

The Levites appear but seldom in the history of the N.T. Where we meet with their names it is as the type of a formal, heartless worship, without sympathy and without love (^{<ref>Luke 10:32</ref>). The same parable indicates Jericho as having become — what it had not been originally (see ^{<ref>Joshua}}

21:1 Chronicles 6) — one of the great stations at which they and the priests resided (Lightfoot, *Cent. Chorograph.* 100:47). In ~~<B19>~~John 1:19 they appear as delegates of the Jews — that is, of the Sanhedrim coming to inquire into the credentials of the Baptist, and giving utterance to their own Messianic expectations. The mention of a Levite of Cyprus in ~~<A06>~~Acts 4:36, shows that the changes of the previous century had carried that tribe also into "the dispersed among the Gentiles." The conversion of Barnabas and Mark was probably no solitary instance of the reception by them of the new faith, which was the fulfillment of the old. If "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (~~<A07>~~Acts 6:7), it is not too bold to believe that their influence may have led Levites to follow their example; and thus the old psalms, and possibly also the old chants of the Temple service, might be transmitted through the agency of those who had been specially trained in them to be the inheritance of the Christian Church. Later on in the history of the first century, when the Temple had received its final completion under the younger Agrippa, we find one section of the tribe engaged in a new movement. With that strange unconsciousness of a coming doom which so often marks the last stage of a decaying system, the singers of the Temple thought it a fitting time to apply for the right of wearing the same linen garment as the priests, and persuaded the king that the concession of this privilege would be the glory of his reign (Joseph. *Ant.* 20:8, 6). The other Levites at the same time as for and obtained the privilege of joining in the Temple choruses, from which hitherto they had been excluded. The destruction of the Temple so soon after they had attained the object of their desires came as with a grim irony to sweep away their occupation, and so to deprive them of every vestige of that which had distinguished them from other Israelites. They were merged in the crowd of captives that were scattered over the Roman world, and disappear from the stage of history. The rabbinic schools, that rose out of the ruins of the Jewish polity, fostered a studied and habitual depreciation of the Levitical order as compared with their own teachers (M'Caul, *Old Paths*, page 435). Individual families, it may be, cherished the tradition that their fathers, as priests or Levites, had taken part in the services of the Temple. If their claims were recognized, they received the old marks of reverence in the worship of the synagogue (comp. the Regulations of the Great Synagogue of London, in Margoliouth's *Hist. of the Jews in Great Britain*, 3:270), took precedence in reading the lessons of the day (Lightfoot, *Ior. Heb.* on ~~<A02>~~Matthew 4:23), and pronounced the blessing at the close (Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, 6:790). Their existence was

acknowledged in some of the laws of the Christian emperors (Basnage, l.c.). The tenacity with which the exiled race clung to these recollections is shown in the prevalence of the names (Cohen, and Levita or Levy) which imply that those who bear them are of the sons of Aaron or the tribe of Levi, and in the custom which exempts the first-born of priestly or Levitical families from the payments which are still offered, in the case of others, as the redemption of the first-born (Leo of Modena, in Picart's *Ceremonies Religieuses*, 1:26; Allen's *Modern Judaism*, page 297). In the mean time, the old name had acquired a new signification. The early writers of the Christian Church applied to the later hierarchy the language of the earlier, and gave to the bishops and presbyters the title (ἱερεῖς) that had *belonged* to the sons of Aaron, while the deacons were habitually spoken of as Levites (Suicer, *Thes.* s.v. [Λευίτης](#)).

Though the destruction of the Temple and the dispersion of the Jews have necessarily done away with the Levitical duties which were strictly local, yet the Levites, like the priests, still exist, have to this day certain functions to perform, and continue to enjoy certain privileges and immunities. On those festivals whereon the priests pronounce the benediction on the congregation of Israel during the morning service, as prescribed in ⁴⁰⁶²Numbers 6:22-27. the Levites have "to wait on the priests," and wash their hands prior to the giving of the said blessing. At the reading of the law in the synagogue, the Levite is called to the second section, the first being assigned to the priest. *SEE HAPHTARAH*. Moreover, like the priests, the Levites are exempt from redeeming their first-born, and this exemption even extends to women of the tribe of Levi who marry Israelites, i.e. Jews of any other tribe.

IV. Literature. — Mishna, *Erachin*, 2:3-6; *Tamid*, 7:3,4; *Succa*, 5:4; *Bikkurim*, 3:4; Maimonides, *Jod Ha-Chezaka*, *Hilchoth Kele Ha-Mikash*, 3:1-11; Michaelis, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*, sec. 52 (English translation, 1:252 sq.); Bahr, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, 2:3, 39, 165, 342, 428; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel mon der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels*, pages 126, 204, 387-424 (Bruns. 1847); the same, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel von der Vollendung es zweiten Tempels*, 1:55-58, 63-66, 141 (Nordhausen, 1855); Saalschitz, *Das Mosaische Recht*, 1:89-106 (Berl. 1853); the same, *Archaologie der Hebraer*, volume 2, chapter 78, page 342 (Konigsb. 1856); Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archiologie*, 1:160 (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1858); Kalisch, *Historical and Critical Commentary on Genesis*, pages 735-744 (Lond. 1848); Brown,

Antiquities, 1:301-347; Godwyn, *Moses and Aaron*, 1:5; Witsius, *Dissert. II. de Theocrat. Israelitar.*; Jennings, *Antiquities*, pages 184-206; Carpzov, *Apparat. Crit.* (see Index); Saubert, *Comm. de Sacerdot. et sacris Hebr. personis*, in *Opp.* page 283 sq.; Gramberg, *Krit. Geschichte d. Religionsideen des Alten Test.* volume 1, 100:3; Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* 2:6; Ugolino, *Sacerdot. Hebr.* chapter 12, in his *Thesaur.* volume 13; Schacht, *Animadvers. ad ken.* page 525 sq.; Bauer, *Gottesd. Verfassung.* 2:377 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* page 368 sq.; Willisch, *Defiliis Levitarum* (Lips. 1708).

Levites, Military,

a name given to such ministers in the time of the Commonwealth as filled the office of chaplain in the regiments of the Parliamentary army.