THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Leviticus - Lokman

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

so called in the Vulgate from treating chiefly of the Levitical service; in the Heb. arqyw; *and he called*, being the word with which it begins; in the Sept. Λευ τικόν; the third book of the Pentateuch, called also by the later Jews µynhKot rwOT, "law of the priests," and twOBrq; t rwOT, "law of offerings." In our treatment of it we have especial regard to the various sacrifices enumerated.

I. *Contents.* — Leviticus contains the further statement and development of the Sinaitic legislation, the beginnings of which are described in Exodus. It exhibits the *historical* progress of this legislation; consequently, we must not expect to find the laws detailed in it in a systematic form. There is, nevertheless, a certain order observed, which arose from the nature of the subject, and of which the plan may easily be perceived. The whole is intimately connected with the contents of Exodus, at the conclusion of which book that sanctuary is described with which all external worship was connected (Exodus 35-40).

Leviticus begins by describing the worship itself (chapters 1-17), and concludes with personal distinctions and exhortations as to the worshippers (chapters 18-27). More specifically the book may be divided into seven leading sections.

(I.) *The Laws directly relating to Sacrifices* (chapters 1-7). — At first God spoke to the people out of the thunder and lightning of Sinai, and gave them his holy commandments by the hand of a mediator; but henceforth his presence is to dwell not on the secret top of Sinai, but in the midst of his people, both in their wanderings through the wilderness and afterwards in the Land of Promise. Hence the first directions which Moses receives after the work is finished have reference to the offerings which were to be brought to the door of the tabernacle. As Jehovah draws near to the people in the tabernacle, so the people draw near to Jehovah in the offering. Without offerings none may approach him. The regulations respecting the sacrifices fall into three groups, and each of these groups again consists of a decalogue of instructions. Bertheau has observed that this principle runs through all the laws of Moses. They are all modeled after the pattern of the ten commandments, so that each distinct subject of legislation is always treated of under ten several enactments or provisions.

1. The first group of regulations (chapters 1-3) deals with three kinds of offerings: the burnt-offering (hl;wo), the meat-offering (hj;nim;), and the thank-offering (jb;z,µymæv;).

a. The burnt-offering (chap. 1) in three sections. It might be either

(1) a male without blemish from the *herds* (rq;B;hi^m;) (verses 3-9), or

(2) a male without blemish from *the flocks,* or lesser cattle (^a;x;hi) (verses 10-13), or

(3) it might be fowls, an offering of turtle-doves or young pigeons (verses 14-17). The subdivisions are here marked clearly enough, not only by the three *kinds* of sacrifice, but also by *the form* in which the enactment is put. Each begins with, "If his offering," etc., and each ends with, "An offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto Jehovah."

b. The next group (chapter 2) presents many more difficulties. Its parts are not so clearly marked, either by prominent features in the subject-matter, or by the more technical boundaries of certain initial and final phrases. We have here the meat-offering, or bloodless offering, in four sections:

(1) in its uncooked form, consisting of fine flour with oil and frankincense (verses 1-3);

(2) in its cooked form, of which three different kinds are specified-baked in the oven, fricel, or boiled (verses 4-10);

(3) the prohibition of leaven, and the direction to use salt in all the meat-offerinrgs (verses 11-13);

(4) the oblation of first-fruits (verses 14-16).

c. *The Sheltamins,* "peace-offering" (A.V.), or "thankoffering" (Ewald) (chapter 3), in three sections. Strictly speaking, this falls under two heads: first, when it is of the *herd;* and, secondly, when it is of the *flock.* But this last has again its subdivision; for the offering, when of the flock, may be either a lamb or a goat. Accordingly, the three sections are, verses 1-5; 7-11; 12-16. Verse 6 is merely introductory to the second class of sacrifices, and verse 17 a general conclusion, as in the case of other laws. This concludes the first decalogue of the book.

2. The laws concerning the sin-offering and the trespass- (or guilt-) offering (chapter 4, 5). The sin-offering (chap. iv) is treated of under four specified cases, after a short introduction to the whole in verses 1, 2:

(1) the sin-offering for the priest, 3-12;
(2) for the whole congregation, 13-21;
(3) for a ruler, 22-26;
(4) for one of the common people, 27-35.

After these four cases, in which the offering is to be made for four different classes, there follow provisions respecting three several kinds of transgression for which atonement must be made. It is not quite clear whether these should be ranked under the head of the sin-offering or of the trespass-offering. *SEE OFFERING*. We may, however, follow Bertheau, Baumgarten, and Knobel in regarding them as special instances in which a sin-offering was to be brought. The three cases are: first, when any one hears a curse, and conceals what he hears (verse 1); secondly, when any one touches, without knowing or intending it, any unclean thing (verses 2, 3); lastly, when any one takes an oath inconsiderately (verse 4). For each of these cases the same trespass-offering, "a female from the flock, a lamb or kid of the goats," is appointed; but, with that mercifulness which characterizes the Mosaic law, express provision is made for a less costly offering where the offerer is poor.

This decalogue is then completed by the three regulations respecting the guilt-offering (or trespass-offering): first, when any one sins " through ignorance in the holy things of Jehovah" (verses 14,16); next, when a person, without knowing it, "commits any of these things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of Jehovah" (17-19); lastly, when a man lies and swears falsely concerning that which was entrusted to him, etc. (verses 20-26). This decalogue, like the preceding one, has its characteristic words and expressions. The prominent word which introduces so many of the enactments is vpn, "soul" (see ‹0302›Leviticus 4:2, 27; ‹0501›Leviticus 5:1, 2, 4, 15,17; 6:2), and the phrase, "If a soul shall sin" (‹0302›Leviticus 4:2), is, with occasional variations having an equivalent meaning, the distinctive phrase of the section. As in the former decalogue the nature of the offerings, so in this the person and the nature of the offense are the chief features in the several statutes.

3. Naturally upon the law of sacrifices follows the law of the priests' duties when they offer the sacrifices (chapter 6, 7). Hence we find Moses directed to address himself immediately to Aaron and his sons (Leviticus 6:2, 18–6:9, 25, A.V.). In this group the different kinds of offerings are named in nearly the same order as in the two preceding decalogues, except that the offering at the consecration of a priest follows, instead of the thankoffering, immediately after the meat-offering, which it resembles, and the thank-offering now appears after the trespass-offering. There are, therefore, in all, six kinds of offering, and in the case of each of these the priest has his distinct duties. Bertheau has very ingeniously so distributed the enactments in which these duties are prescribed as to arrange them all in five decalogues. We will briefly indicate his arrangement.

(1.) The first decalogue.

(a.) "This is the law of the burnt-offering" (6:9, A.V.), in five enactments, each verse (verses 9-13) containing a separate enactment.

(b.) "'And this is the law of the meat-offering" (verse 14), again in five enactments, each of which is, as before contained in a single verse (verses 14-18).

(2.) The next decalogue is contained in verses 19-30.

(a.) Verse 19 is merely introductory; then follow, in five verses, five distinct directions with regard to the offering at the time of the consecration of the priests, the first in verse 20 the next two in verse 21, the fourth in the former part of ver. 22, and the last in the latter part of verse 22 and verse 23.

(b.) "This is the law of the sin-offering" (verse 25). Then the five enactments, each in one verse, except that two verses (27, 28) are given to the third.

(3.) The third decalogue is contained in Leviticus 7:1-10, the laws of the trespass-offering. But it is impossible to avoid a misgiving as to the soundness of Bertheau's system when we find him making the words "It is most holy," in verse 1, the first of the ten enactments. This he is obliged to do, as verses 3 and 4 evidently form but one.

(4.) The fourth decalogue, after an introductory verse (verse 11), is contained in ten verses (verses 12-21).

(5.) The last decalogue consists of certain general laws about the fat, the blood, the wave-breast, etc., and is comprised again in ten verses (verses 23-33), the verses, as before, marking the divisions.

The chapter closes with a brief historical notice of the fact that these several commands were given to Moses on Mount Sinai (verse 35-38).

(II.) *An entirely historical section* (chapters 8-10), in three parts. —

1. In chapter 8 we have the account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons by Moses before the whole congregation. They are washed; he is arrayed in the priestly vestments and anointed with the holy oil; his sons also are arrayed in their garments, and the various offerings appointed are offered.

2. In chapter 9 Aaron offers, eight days after his consecration, his first offering for himself and the people: this comprises for himself a sin- and burnt- offering, and a peace- (or thank-) offering. He blesses the people, and fire comes down from heaven and consumes the burnt-offering.

3. Chapter 10 tells how Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, eager to enjoy the privileges of their new office, and perhaps too much elated by its dignity, forgot or despised the restrictions by which it was fenced round (comp. Exodus 30:7, etc.), and, daring to "offer strange fire before Jehovah," perished because of their presumption.

With the house of Aaron began this wickedness in the sanctuary; with them, therefore, began also the divine punishment. Very touching is the story which follows. Aaron, though forbidden to mourn his loss (verses 6, 7), will not eat the sin-offering in the holy place; and when rebuked by Moses, pleads in his defense, "Such things have befallen me: and if I had eaten the sin-offering today, should it have been accepted in the sight of Jehovah?" Moses, the lawgiver and the judge, admits the plea, and honors the natural feelings of the father's heart, even when it leads to a violation of the letter of the divine commandment.

(II.) *The laws concerning purity and impurity,* and the appropriate sacrifices and ordinances for putting away impurity (chapters 11-16). The first seven decalogues had reference to the putting away of *guilt.* By the appointed sacrifices the separation between man and God was healed. The next seven concern themselves with the putting away of *impurity.* That chapters 11-15 hang together so as to form one series of laws there can be

no doubt. Besides that they treat of kindred subjects, they have their characteristic words, amf hamf, " unclean," "uncleanness," rwhf rhf, "clean," which occur in almost every verse. The only question is about chapter 16, which by its opening is connected immediately with the occurrence related in chapter 10. Historically it would seem, therefore, that chapter 16 ought to have followed chapter 10. As this order is neglected, it would lead us to suspect that some other principle of arrangement than that of historical sequence has been adopted. This we find in the solemn significance of the great day of atonement. The high-priest on that day made atonement "because of the *uncleanness* of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins" (<03616>Leviticus 16:16), and he "reconciled the holy place and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar" (verse 20). Delivered from their guilt and cleansed from their pollutions, from that day forward the children of Israel entered upon a new and holy life. This was typified both by the ordinance that the bullock and the goat for the sin-offering were burnt without the camp (verse 27), and also by the sending away of the goat laden with the iniquities of the people into the wilderness. Hence chapter 16 seems to stand most fitly at the end of this second group of seven decalogues. It has reference, we believe, not only (as Bertheau supposes) to the putting away, as by one solemn act, of all those uncleannesses mentioned in chapters 11-15, and for which the various expiations and cleansings there appointed were temporary and insufficient, but also to the making of atonement, in the sense of hiding sin or putting away its guilt. For not only do we find the idea of cleansing as from defilement, but far more prominently the idea of reconciliation. The often-repeated word rpk), "to cover, to atone," is the great word of the section.

1. The first decalogue in this group refers to clean and unclean flesh (chapter 6). Five classes of animals are pronounced unclean. The first four enactments declare what animals may or may not be eaten, whether

(1) beasts of the earth (verses 2-8), or
(2) fishes (verses 9-12), or
(3) birds (verse 13-20), or
(4) creeping things with wings. The next four are intended to guard against pollution by contact with the carcass of any of these animals:
(5) verses 24-26;
(6) verses 27, 28;

(7) verses 29-38;
(8) verse 39-40. The ninth and tenth specify the last class of animals which are unclean for food,
(9) 41, 42, and forbid any other kind of pollution by means of them,
(10) verse 43-45. Verse 46 and 47 are merely a concluding summary.

2. (a.) Women's purification in childbed (chap. 12). The whole of this chapter, according to Bertheau, constitutes (1) the first law of this decalogue.

(b.) The remaining nine are to be found in the next chapter (13), which treats of the signs of leprosy in man and in garments:

(2) verses 1-8;
(3) verses 9-17;
(4) verses 18-23;
(5) verses 24-28;
(6) verses 29-37;
(7) verses 38, 39;
(8) verses 40, 41;
(9) verses 42-46;
(10) verses 47-59.

This arrangement of the several sections is not altogether free from objection, but it is certainly supported by the characteristic mode in which each section opens. Thus, for instance, <0302> Leviticus 12:2 begins with [yrAtiyKaVaæ, <0302> Leviticus 13:2 with hyhiyaKaadaæ; verse 9 with hyhitaKaæ [irix; [gn,and so on, the same order being always observed, the substantive being placed first, then yKæand then the verb, except only in verse 42, where the substantive is placed after the verb.

3. "The law of the leper in the day of his cleansing," i.e., the law which the *priest* is to observe in purifying the leper (<0301> Leviticus 14:1-32). The priest is mentioned in ten verses, each of which begins one of the ten sections of this law: verses 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20. In each instance the word ^hKoiis preceded by w consecut. with the perf. It is true that in verse 8, and also in verse 14, the word ^hKoioccurs twice; but in both verses there is MS. authority, as well as that of the Vulg. and Arab. versions, for the absence of the second. Verses 21-32 may be regarded as a

supplemental provision in cases where the leper is too poor to bring the required offering.

4. The leprosy in a house (14:33-57). It is not so easy here to trace the arrangement noticed in so many other laws. There are no characteristic words or phrases to guide us. Bertheau's division is as follows:

(1) verses 34, 35;
(2) verses 36, 37;
(3) verse 38;
(4) verse 39;
(5) verse 40;
(6) verses 41, 42;
(7) verses 43-45.

Then, as usual, follows a short summary which closes the statute concerning leprosy, verses 54-57.

5, 6. The law of uncleanness by issue, etc., in two decalogues (Leviticus 15:1-15; 15:16-31). The division is clearly marked, as Bertheau observes, by the form of cleansing, which is so exactly similar in the two principal cases, and which closes each series: (1) verses 13-15; (2) verses 28-30. We again give his arrangement, though we do not profess to regard it as in all respects satisfactory.

(a.) (1) Verses 2, 3; (2) verse 4; (3) verse 5; (4) verse 6; (5) verse 7; (6) verse 8; (7) verse 9; (8) verse 10; (9) verses 11, 12 [these Bertheau considers as one enactment, because it is another way of saying that either the *man* or *thing* which the unclean person touches is unclean; but, on the same principle, verses 4 and 5 might just as well form one enactment]; (10) verses 13-15.

(b.)

(1) Verse 16;
(2) verse 17;
(3) verse 18;
(4) verse 19;
(5) verse 20;
(6) verse 21;
(7) verse 22;
(**8**) verse 23;

(9) verse 24;
(10) verses 28-30.

In order to complete this arrangement, he considers verses 25-27 as a kind of supplementary enactment provided for an irregular uncleanness, leaving it as quite uncertain, however, whether this was a later addition or not. Verses 32 and 33 form merely the same general conclusion which we have had before in 14:54-57.

7. The last decalogue of the second group of seven decalogues is to be found in chapter 16, which treats of the great day of atonement. The law itself is contained in verses 1-28. The remaining verses, 29-34, consist of an exhortation to its careful observance. In the act of atonement three persons are concerned: the high-priest, in this instance Aaron; the man who leads away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness; and he who burns the skin, flesh, and dung of the bullock and goat of the sin-offering without the camp. The last two have special purifications assigned them-the second because he has touched the goat laden with the guilt of Israel, the third because he has come in contact with the sin-offering. The ninth and tenth enactments prescribe what these purifications are, each of them concluding with the same formula, hn,j}Mhi l a,awbo y;^ke,y r ę}ai], and hence distinguished from each other. The duties of Aaron, consequently, ought, if the division into decades is correct, to be comprised in eight enactments. Now-the name of Aaron is repeated eight times, and in six of these it is preceded by the perf. with 1 consecut., as we observed was the case before when "the priest" was the prominent figure. According to this, then, the decalogue will stand thus:

(1) Verse 2, Aaron not to enter the holy place at all times;

(2) verses 3-5, with what sacrifices and in what dress Aaron is to enter the holy place;

(3) verses 6, 7, Aaron to offer the bullock for himself, and to set the two goats before Jehovah;

(4) Aaron to cast lots on the two goats;

(5) verses 9, 10, Aaron to offer the goat on which the lot falls for Jehovah, and to send away the goat for Azazel into the wilderness;

(6) verses 11-19, Aaron to sprinkle the blood both of the bullock and of the goat to make atonement for himself. for his house, and for the whole congregation, as also to purify the altar of incense with the blood;

(7) verses 20-22, Aaron to lay his hands on the living goat, and confess over it all the sins of the children of Israel;

(8) verses 23-25, Aaron after this to take off his linen garments, bathe himself, and put on his priestly garments, and then offer his burnt-offering and that of the congregation;

(9) verse 26, the man by whom the goat is sent into the wilderness to purify himself;

(10) verses 27-28, what is to be done by him who burns the sin-offering without the camp.

(IV.) *Laws chiefly intended to mark the Separation between Israel and the Heathen Nations* (chapters 17-20). — We here reach the great central point, of the book. All going before was but a preparation for this. Two great truths have been established: first, that God call only be approached by means of appointed sacrifices; next, that man in nature and life is full of pollution, which must be cleansed. Now a third is taught, viz., that not by several cleansings for several sins and pollutions can guilt be put away. The several acts of sin are but so many manifestations of the sinful nature. For this, therefore, also must atonement be made by one solemn act, which shall cover all transgressions, and turn away God's righteous displeasure from Israel. Israel is now reminded that it is the holy nation. The great atonement offered, it is to enter upon a new life. It is a separate nation, sanctified and set apart for the service of God. It may not, therefore, do after the abominations of the heathen by whom it is surrounded. Here, consequently, we find those laws and ordinances which especially distinguish the nation of Israel from all other nations of the earth.

Here again we may trace, as before, a group of seven decalogues; but the several decalogues are not so clearly marked, nor are the characteristic phrases and the introductions and conclusions so common. In ch. 18 there are twenty enactments, and in chapter 19, thirty. In chapter 17 on the other hand, there are only six, and in chapter 20 there are fourteen. As it is quite manifest that the enactments in chapter 18 are entirely separated by a fresh

introduction from those in chapter 17, Bertheau, in order to preserve the usual arrangement of the laws in decalogues, would transpose this chapter, and place it after chapter 19. He observes that the laws in chapter 17, and those in Leviticus 20:1-9, are akin to one another, and may very well constitute a single decalogue, and, what is of more importance, that the words in Leviticus 18:1-5 form the natural introduction to this whole group of laws: "And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, I am Jehovah your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do; and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their ordinances," etc. There is, however, a point of connection between chapters 17 and 18 which must not be overlooked, and which seems to indicate that their position in our present text is the right one. All the six enactments in chapter 17 (verses 3-5, verses 6, 7, verses 8, 9, verses 10-12, verses 13,14, verses 15) bear upon the nature and meaning of the sacrifice to Jehovah as compared with the sacrifices offered to false gods. It would seem, too, that it was necessary to guard against any license to idolatrous practices which might possibly be drawn from the sending of the goat for Azazel into the wilderness, *SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF*, especially, perhaps, against the Egyptian custom of appeasing the evil spirit of the wilderness and averting his malice (Hengstenberg, *Mose u. Egypten*, page 179; Movers, *Phonicier,* 1:369). To this there may be an allusion in verse 7. Perhaps, however, it is better and more simple to regard the enactments in these two chapters (with Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, II, 1:245) as directed against two prevalent heathen practices, the eating of blood and fornication. It is remarkable, as showing how intimately moral and ritual observances were blended together in the Jewish mind, that abstinence "from blood and things strangled, and fornication," was laid down by the apostles as the only condition of communion to be required of Gentile converts to Christianity. Before we quit this chapter one observation may be made. The rendering of the A.V. in verse 11, "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," should be, "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement *by means of the life."* This is important. It is not blood merely as such, but blood as having in it the principle of life that God accepts in sacrifice; for, by thus giving vicariously the life of the dumb animal, the sinner confesses that his own life is forfeit.

In chapter 18, after the introduction to which we have already alluded, verses 1-5 — and in which God claims obedience on the double ground

that he is Israel's God, and that to keep his commandments is life (verse 5) — there follow twenty enactments concerning unlawful marriages and unnatural lusts. The first ten are contained one in each verse (verses 6-15). The next ten range themselves in like manner with the verses, except that verses 17 and 23 contain each two. Of the twenty the first fourteen are alike in form, as well as in the repeated hLgit]ad hw;r[,

In chapter 19 are three decalogues, introduced by the words, "Ye shall be holy, for I Jehovah your God am holy," and ending with, “Ye shall observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them. I am Jehovah." The laws here are of a very mixed character, and many of them a repetition merely of previous laws. Of the three decalogues, the first is comprised in verses 3-13, and may be thus distributed:

(1) verse 3, to honor father and mother;
(2) verse 3, to keep the Sabbath;
(3) verse 4, not to turn to idols;
(4) verse 4, not to make molten gods (these two enactments being separated on the same principle as the first and second commandments in the Great Decalogue or Two Tables);
(5) verses 5-8, of thank-offerings;
(6) verses 9, 10, of gleaning;
(7) verse 11, not to steal or lie;
(8) verse 12, not to swear falsely;
(9) verse 13, not to defraud one's neighbor;
(10) verse 13, the wages of him that is hired, etc.

The next decalogue, verses 14-25, Bertheau arranges thus: verse 14, verse 15, verse 16a, verse 16b, verse 17, verse 18, verse 19a, verse 19b, verses 20-22, verses 23-25. We object, however, to making the words in 19a, "Ye shall keep my statutes," a separate enactment. There is no reason for this. A much better plan would be to consider verse 17 as consisting of two enactments, which is manifestly the case.

The third decalogue may be thus distributed: verse 26a, verse 26b, verse 27, verse 28, verse 29, verse 30, verse 31, verse 32, verses 33, 34, verses 35, 36.

We have thus found five decalogues in this group. Bertheau completes the number seven by transposing, as we have seen, chapter 17, and placing it immediately before chapter 20. He also transfers verse 27 of chapter 20 to

what he considers its proper place, viz., after verse 6. It must be confessed that the enactment in verse 27 stands very awkwardly at the end of the chapter, completely isolated as it is from all other enactments; for verses 22-26 are the natural conclusion to this whole section. But. admitting this, another difficulty remains, that, according to him, the seventh decalogue begins at verse 10, and another transposition is necessary, so that verses 7, 8 may stand after verse 9, and so conclude the preceding series of ten enactments. It is better, perhaps, to abandon the search for complete symmetry than to adopt a method so violent in order to obtain it.

It should be observed that chapter 18:6-23, and chapter 20:10-21, stand in such a relation to one another that the latter declares the penalties attached to the transgression of many of the commandments given in the former. But, though we may not be able to trace in chapters 17 -20 seven decalogues, in accordance with the theory of which we have been speaking, there can be no doubt that they form a distinct section of themselves, of which 20:22-26 is the proper conclusion.

Like the other sections, it has some characteristic expressions:

(a) “Ye shall keep my judgments and my statutes" (ytQjæfPvjmæ) occurs <03804>Leviticus 18:4, 5, 26; 19:37; 20:8, 22, but is not met with either in the preceding or the following chapters.

(b) The constantly recurring phrases, "I am Jehovah," "I am Jehovah your God," "Be ye holy, for I am holy," "I am Jehovah which hallow you." In the earlier sections this phraseology is only found in <03144>Leviticus 11:44, 45, and <02313>Exodus 31:13. In the section which follows (chapter 21-25) it is much more common, this section being in a great measure a continuation of the preceding.

(V.) We come now to the last group of decalogues — that contained in chapters 21-26:2. The subjects comprised in these enactments are —

1. The personal purity of the priests. They may not defile themselves for the dead; their wives and daughters must be pure, and they themselves must be free from all personal blemish (chapter 21).

2. The eating of the holy things is permitted only to priests who are free from all uncleanness: they and their household only may eat them (chapter 22:16).

3. The offerings of Israel are to be pure and without blemish (chapter 22:17-33).

4. The last series provides for the due celebration of the great festivals when priests and people were to be gathered together before Jehovah in holy convocation (chapter 23, 25), with an episode (chapter 24).

Up to this point we trace system and purpose in the order of the legislation. Thus, for instance, chapter 11-16 treats of external purity; chapter 17-20 of moral purity; chapter 21-23 of the holiness of the priests, and their duties with regard to holy things; the whole concluding with provisions for the solemn feasts on which all Israel appeared before Jehovah. We will again briefly indicate Bertheau's groups, and then append some general observations on this whole section.

a. Leviticus 21, ten laws, as follows:

(1) verses 1-3;
(2) verse 4;
(3) verses 5, 6;
(4) verses 7, 8;
(5) verse 9;
(6) verses 10, 11;
(7) verse 12;
(8) verses 13, 14;
(9) verses 17-21;
(10) verses 22, 23.

The first five laws concern all the priests; the sixth to the eighth, the high-priest; the ninth and tenth, the effects of bodily blemish in particular cases.

b. Leviticus 22:1-16.

(1) verse 2;
(2) verse 3;
(3) verse 4;
(4) verses 4-7;
(5) verses 8, 9;
(6) verse 10;
(7) verse 11;
(8) verse 12;

(9) verse 13;
(10) verses 14-16.

c. <03217>Leviticus 22:17-33.

(1) verses 18-20;
(2) verse 21;
(3) verse 22;
(4) verse 23;
(5) verse 24;
(6) verse 25;
(7) verse 27;
(8) verse 28;
(9) verse 29;
(10) verse 30; and a general conclusion in verses 31-33.

d. Leviticus 23.

(1) verse 3;
(2) verses 5-7;
(3) verse 8;
(4) verses 9-14;
(5) verses 15-21;
(6) verse 22;
(7) verses 24, 25;
(8) verses 27-32;
(9) verses 34, 35;
(10) verse 36; verses 37, 38 contain the conclusion, or general summing up of the Decalogue.

On the remainder of the chapter, as well as chapter 24, see below.

e. <03501>Leviticus 25:1-22.

(1) verse 2;
(2) verses 3, 4;
(3) verse 5;
(4) verse 6;
(5) verses 8-10;
(6) verses 11, 12;
(7) verse 13;

(8) verse 14;
(9) verse 15;
(10) verse 16; with a concluding formula in verses 18-22.

f. ⁰³²⁵Leviticus 25:23-38.

(1) verses 23, 24;
(2) verse 25;
(3) verses 26, 27;
(4) verse 28;
(5) verse 29;
(6) verse 30;
(7) verse 31;
(8) verses 32, 33;
(9) verse 34;
(10) verses 35-37; the conclusion to the whole in verse 38.

g. ⁰³²⁹Leviticus 25:39-26:2.

(1) verse 39;
(2) verses 40-42;
(3) verse 43;
(4) verses 44, 45;
(5) verse 46;
(6) verses 47-49;
(7) verse 50;
(8) verses 51, 52;
(9) verse 53;
(10) verse 54.

It will be observed that the above arrangement is only completed by omitting the latter part of chapter 23 and the whole of chapter 24. But it is clear that ⁰³³⁹Leviticus 23:39-44 is an addition, containing further instructions respecting the Feast of Tabernacles. Verse 39, as compared with verse 34, shows that the same feast is referred to; while verses 37, 38 are no less manifestly the original conclusion of the laws respecting the feasts — which are enumerated in the previous part of the chapter. Chapter 24, again, has a peculiar character of its own. First, we have a command concerning the oil to be used in the lamps belonging to the tabernacle, but this is only a repetition of an enactment already given in ⁰²⁷⁰Exodus 27:20, 21, which seems to be its natural place. Then follow directions about the

shewbread. These do not occur previously. In Exodus the shewbread is spoken of always as a matter of course. concerning which no regulations are necessary (comp. ⁰²⁵⁰Exodus 25:30; 35:13; 39:36). Lastly come certain enactments arising out of a historical occurrence. The son of an Egyptian father by an Israelitish woman blasphemes the name of Jehovah, and Moses is commanded to stone him in consequence; and this circumstance is the occasion of the following laws being given:

(1) That a blasphemer, whether Israelite or stranger, is to be stoned (comp. ⁰²²⁸Exodus 22:28);

(2) That he that kills any man shall surely be put to death (comp. ⁰²¹²Exodus 21:12-27);

(3) That he that kills a beast shall make it good (not found where we might have expected it, in the series of laws ⁰²¹³Exodus 21:28-22:16);

(4) That if a man cause a blemish in his neighbor he shall be requited in like manner (comp. ⁰²¹²Exodus 21:22-25).

(5) We have then a repetition in an inverse order of verses 17, 18; and

(6) the injunction that there shall be one law for the stranger and the Israelite;

(7) finally, a brief notice of the infliction of the punishment in the case of the son of Shelomith, who blasphemed.

Not another instance is to be found in the whole collection in which any historical circumstance is made the occasion of enacting a law. Then, again, the laws (2), (3), (4), (5), are mostly repetitions of existing laws, and seem here to have no connection with the event to which they are referred. Either, therefore, some other circumstances took place at the same time with which we are not acquainted, or these isolated laws, detached from their proper connection, were grouped together here, in obedience perhaps to some traditional association.

(VI.) These decalogues are now fitly closed by words *of promise and threat-promise* of largest, richest blessing to those that hearken unto and do these commandments; threats of utter destruction to those that break the covenant of their God. Thus the second great division of the law closes like the first, except that the first part, or Book of the Covenant, ends (⁰²³⁰Exodus 23:20-33) with promises of blessing only. There nothing is said

of the judgments which are to follow transgression, because as yet the covenant had not been made. But when once the nation had freely entered into that covenant, they bound themselves to accept its sanctions its penalties, as well as its rewards. Nor call we wonder if in these sanctions the punishment of transgression holds a larger place than the rewards of obedience; for already was it but too plain that "Israel would not obey." From the first they were a stiff-necked and rebellious race, and from the first the doom of disobedience hung like a fiery sword above their heads.

(VII.) *On Vows.* — The legislation is evidently completed in the last words of the preceding chapter: "These are the statutes, and judgments, and laws which Jehovah made between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses." Chapter 27 is an *appendix,* again closed, however, by a similar formula, which at least shows that the transcriber considered it to be an integral part of the original Mosaic legislation, though he might be at a loss to assign it its place. Bertheau classes it with the other less regularly grouped laws at the beginning of the book of Numbers. He treats the section Leviticus 27-Numbers 10:10 as a series of supplements to the Sinaitic legislation.

II. *Integrity.* — This is very generally admitted. Those critics even who are in favor of different documents in the Pentateuch assign nearly the whole of this book to one writer, the Elohist, or author of the original document. According to Knobel, the only portions which are not to be referred to the Elohist are — Moses's rebuke of Aaron because the goat of the sin-offering had been burnt (Leviticus 10:16-20); the group of laws in chapters 17-20; certain additional enactments respecting the Sabbath and the feasts of Weeks and of Tabernacles (23, part of verse 2, from hwhy ydqmw, and verse 3, verses 18, 19, 22, 39-44); the punishments ordained for blasphemy, murder, etc, (Leviticus 24:10-23), the directions respecting the sabbatical year (Leviticus 25:18-22), and the promises and warnings contained in chapter 26.

With regard to the section chapter 17-20, Knobel does not consider the whole of it to have been borrowed from the same sources. Chapter 17 he believes was introduced here by the Jehovist from some ancient document, while he admits, nevertheless, that it contains certain Elohistic forms of expression, as rcb lkw "all flesh," verse 14; vpn, soul" (in the sense of "person"), verses 10-12, 15 hyjy " beast," verse 13, ˆbrq; "offering,"

verse 4, jyr]jiwqoyn, "a sweet savor," verse 6; "a statute forever," and "after your generations," verse 7. But it cannot be from the Elohist, he argues, because (a) he would have placed it after chapter 7, or at least after chapter 15; (b) he would not have repeated the prohibition of blood, etc., which he had already given; (c) he would have taken a more favorable view of his nation than that implied in verse 7; and, lastly, (d) the phraseology has something of the coloring of chapter 18-20 and 26, which are certainly not Elohistic. Such reasons are too transparently unsatisfactory to need serious discussion. He observes further that the chapter is not altogether Mosaic. The first enactment (verses 1-7) does indeed apply only to Israelites, and holds good, therefore, for the time of Moses. But the remaining three contemplate the case of strangers living among the people, and have a reference to all time.

Chapters 18-20, though they have a Jehovistic coloring, cannot have been originally from the Jehovist. The following peculiarities of language, which are worthy of notice, according to Knobel *(Exod. und Leviticus erklart,* in the *"Kurzg. Exeg. Hdbuch."* 1857), forbid such a supposition, the more so as they occur nowhere else in the O.T.: [bir; "lie down to" and "gender," <031823>Leviticus 18:23; 19:19, 20:16, lbT, "confusion," <031823>Leviticus 18:23; 20:12; fql, "gather," <031909>Leviticus 19:9; 23:22; frP, "grape," <031910>Leviticus 19:10; hrEvi "near kinswomen," <031817>Leviticus 18:17; trQBæ "scourged," <031920>Leviticus 19:20; hvpjj, "free," *ibid.;* [qi[}qit b,tK, "print marks," <031928>Leviticus 19:28; ayqhe "vomit," in the metaphorical sense, <031825>Leviticus 18:25, 28; 20:22, hl;r][', "uncircumcised," as applied to fruit-trees, 19:23; and tdl/m, "born," 18:9, 11; as well as the Egyptian word (for such it probably is) znef][ovi "garment of divers sorts," which, however, does occur once beside in <052211>Deuteronomy 22:11.

According to Bunsen, chapter 19 is a genuine part of the Mosaic legislation, given, however, in its original form, not on Sinai, but on the east side of the Jordan; while the general arrangement of the Mosaic laws may perhaps be as late as the time of the judges. He regards it as a very ancient document, based on the Two Tables, of which, and especially of the first, it is, in fact, an extension, consisting of two decalogues and one pentad of laws. Certain expressions in it he considers as implying that the people were already settled in the land (verses 9, 10,13, 15), while, on the other hand, verse 23 supposes *a future* occupation of the land. Hence he

concludes that the revision of this document by the transcribers was incomplete, whereas all the passages may fairly be interpreted as looking forward to a future settlement in Canaan. The great simplicity and lofty moral character of this section compel us, says Bunsen, to refer it at least to the earlier time of the judges, if not to that of Joshua himself.

III. *Authenticity, etc.* — Some critics, however, such as De Wette, Gramberg, Vatke, and others, have strenuously endeavored to prove that the laws contained in Leviticus originated in a period much later than is usually supposed; but the following observations sufficiently support their Mosaical origin. and show that the whole of Leviticus is historically genuine. The laws in chapters 1-7 contain manifest vestiges of the Mosaical period. Here, as well as in Exodus, when the priests are mentioned, Aaron and his sons are named; as, for instance, in <3001004>Leviticus 1:4, 7, 8, 11, etc. The tabernacle is the sanctuary, and no other place of worship is mentioned anywhere (<3001003>Leviticus 1:3, 3:8, 13, etc.). The Israelites are always described as a congregation (<3004013>Leviticus 4:13 sq.), under the command of the *elders of the congregation* (<3004016>Leviticus 4:16), or of a *ruler* (<3004022>Leviticus 4:22). Everything has reference to life in a camp, and that camp commanded by Moses (<3004012>Leviticus 4:12, 21; 6:11; 14:8; 16:26, 28). A later writer could scarcely have placed himself so entirely in the times, and so completely adopted the modes of thinking of the age of Moses; especially if, as has been asserted, these laws gradually sprung from the usages of the people, and were written down at a later period with the object of sanctioning them by the authority of Moses. They so entirely befit the Mosaical age that, in order to adapt them to the requirements of any later period, they must have undergone some modification, accommodation, and a peculiar mode of interpretation. This inconvenience would have been avoided by a person who intended to forge laws in favor of the later modes of Levitical worship. A forger would have endeavored to identify the past as much as possible with the present.

The section in chapter 8-10 is said to have a mythical coloring. This assertion is grounded on the miracle narrated in <3009024>Leviticus 9:24. But what could have been the inducement to forge this section? It is said that the priests invented it in order to support the authority of the sacerdotal caste by the solemn ceremony of Aaron's consecration. But to such an intention the narration of the crime committed by Nadab and Abihu is strikingly opposed. Even Aaron himself here appears to be rather remiss in the observance of the law (comp. 10:16 sq., with 4:22 sq.). Hence it would

seem that the forgery arose from an opposite or anti-hierarchical tendency. The fiction would thus appear to have been contrived without any motive which could account for its origin.

In chapter 17 occurs the law which forbids the slaughter of any beast except at the sanctuary. This law could not be strictly kept in Palestine, and had therefore to undergo some modification (Deuteronomy 12). Our opponents cannot show any rational inducement for contriving such a fiction. The law (<3176>Leviticus 17:6, 7) is adapted to the nation only while emigrating from Egypt. It was the object of this law to guard the Israelites from falling into the temptation to imitate the Egyptian rites and sacrifices offered to he-goats (μyrwe[æ æ *seirim,* "devils," Sept. ματαῖα, Vulg. *daemones),* which word signifies also daemons represented under the form of hegoats, and which were supposed to inhabit the desert (comp. Jablonsky, *Pantlheon AEgyptiacum,* 1:272 sq.).

The laws concerning food and purifications appear especially important if we remember that the people emigrated from Egypt. The fundamental principle of these laws is undoubtedly Mosaical, but in the individual application of them there is much that strongly reminds us of Egypt. This is also the case in Leviticus 18 sq., where the lawgiver has manifestly in view the two opposites, Canaan and Egypt. That the lawgiver was intimately acquainted with Egypt is proved by such remarks as hint at the Egyptian marriages with sisters (<3183>Leviticus 18:3); a custom which stands as an exception among the prevailing habits of antiquity (Diod. Siculus, 1:27; Pausanias, *Attica,* 1:7).

The book of Leviticus has a prophetical character. This is especially manifest in chapters 25, 26, where the law appears in a truly sublime and divine attitude, and when its predictions refer to the whole futurity of the nation. It is impossible to say that these were *vaticinia ex eventu,* unless we would assert that this book was written at the close of Israelitish history. We must rather grant that passages like this are the real basis on which the authority of later prophets is chiefly built. Such passages prove also in a striking manner that the lawgiver had not merely an external aim, but that his law had a deeper purpose, which was clearly understood by Moses himself. That purpose was to regulate the national life in all its bearings, and to consecrate the whole nation to God. Seen especially, <3251>Leviticus 25:18 sq. Although this section has a general bearing, it is nevertheless manifest that it originated in the times of Moses. At a later period, for

instance, it would have been impracticable to promulgate the law concerning the Sabbath and the year of jubilee; for it was soon sufficiently proved how far the nation in reality remained behind the ideal Israel of the law. The sabbatical law bears the impress of a time when the whole legislation, in its fullness and glory, was directly communicated to the people in such a manner as to attract, penetrate, and command.

IV. We must not quit this book without a word on what may be called *its spiritual meaning.* That so elaborate a ritual looked beyond itself we cannot doubt. It was a prophecy of things to come; a shadow whereof the substance was Christ and his kingdom. We may not always be able to say what the exact relation is between the type and the antitype. Of many things we may be sure that they belonged only to the nation to whom they were given, containing no prophetic significance, but serving as witnesses and signs to them of God's covenant of grace. We may hesitate to pronounce with Jerome that "every sacrifice, nay, almost every syllable — the garments of Aaron and the whole Levitical system — breathe of heavenly mysteries;" but we cannot read the Epistle to the Hebrews and not acknowledge that the Levitical priests "served the pattern and type of heavenly things" — that the sacrifices of the law pointed to and found their interpretation in the Lamb of God — that the ordinances of outward purification signified the truer inward cleansing of the heart and conscience from dead works to serve the living God. One idea, moreover, penetrates the whole of this vast and burdensome ceremonial, and gives it a real glory, even apart from any prophetic significance. Holiness is its end. Holiness is its character. The tabernacle is holy — the vessels are holy — the offerings are most holy unto Jehovah — the garments of the priests are holy. All who approach him whose name is "Holy," whether priests who minister to him or people who worship before him, must themselves be holy. It would seem as if, amid the camp and dwellings of Israel, was ever to be heard an echo of that solemn strain which fills the courts above, where the seraphim cry one to another, Holy, Holy, Holy.

V. *Commentaries*. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole or major part of this book, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Origen, *Selecta* (in *Opp.* 2:179); also *Homiliae (ibid.* 4:184); Ephrem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in Syriac, in *Opp.* 2:236); Theodoret, *Quaestiones* (in Greek, in *Opp.* 1); Isidorus Hispalensis, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* 1); Bede, *Quaestiones* (in *Opp.* 8); also *In Levit. (ibid.* 4); Hesychius,

In Levit. (in Greek, Paris, 1581, 4to; also in the *Biblia Max. Patr.* 12); Claudius Taurinensis, *Praefatio* (in Mabillon, *Veter. Analect.* page 90); Hugo St.Victor, *Annotationes* (in *Opp.* 1); Rupertus Tuitiensis, *In Levit.* (in *Opp.* 1:220); Radulphus Flaviacensis, *Commentaria* (Col. 1536, folio; also in the *Biblia Max. Patr.* 17:47); Pesiktha-Minus, *Commentarius* (includ. Numbers and Deut.] (from the Heb. in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 15:997; 16 sq.); Phrygio, *AExplanatio* [together with 1 Timothy] (Basil. 1543, 4to; 1596, 8vo); Brentius, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 1); Chytraeus, *Enarrationes* (Vitemb. 1569, 1575, 8vo) Serranus, *Commentarius* (Antwp. 1572, 1609, fol.); Brocardus, *Interpretatio* (L.B. 1580, 8vo); Babington, *Notes* (in *Works,* page 349); Pelargus, *Commentarins* (Lips. 1604, 4to); Lorinus, *Commentarii* (Ludgun. 1619, 1622; Duac. 1620; Antwerp, 1620, fol.); Willet, *Sixfold Commentarie* (Lond. 1631, fol.); Franzius, *Conmmentarius* (Lips. 1696, 4to); Spanheim, *Observationes* (in Opp. 3:617); Cocceius, *Observationes* (in *Opp.* 1:158); *Patrick, *Commentary* (Lond. 1698, 4to; also in Patrick, Lowth, and Whitby's *Commentary);* Dassovius, *Scholia* (Kilom. 1707, 4to); Hagemann, *Betrachtungen* (Brunswick, 1741, 4to); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1824, 8vo); Horsley, *Notes* (in *Bibl. Crit.* 1); *Bertheau, *Die Sieben Gruppen Mos. Gesetze* (Lpz. 1840, 8vo); James, *Sermons* (Lond. 1847, 8vo); *Bonar, *Commentary* (Lond. 1851 [3d ed.], 1861; N.Y. 1851, 8vo); *Bush, *Notes* (N.Y. 1852,12mo); Cumming, *Readings* (Lond. 1854, 12mo); *Knobel, *Erklarung* [includ. Exod.] (volume 2 of the *Kurtzgef. Exeg. Hdbch.* Lpz. 1857, 8vo); Newton, *Thoughts* (Lond. 1857,12mo); *Kalisch, *Commentary* (London, 1857 sq., 2 volumes, 8vo); Seiss, *Gospel in Levit.* (Phila. 1860, 12mo); *Keil, *Commentar* (in volume 2 of his Pentateuch, Leipsic, 1862, Edinb. 1866, 8vo); Siphra, *Commentar* (in Heb. Vienna, 1862, folio); Wogue, *Levitique* (volume 3 of his *Pentateuque,* Par. 1864, 8vo); *Murphy, *Commentary* (Lond. and Andover, 1872, 8vo). *SEE PENTATEUCH*.

Levity

is a term used to designate a certain lightness of spirit in opposition to gravity. Nothing can be more proper than for a Christian to wear an air of cheerfulness, and to watch against a morose and gloomy disposition. But, though it be his privilege to rejoice, yet he must be cautious of that volatility of spirit which characterizes the unthinking, and marks the vain professor. To be cheerful without levity, and grave without austerity, forms both a happy and dignified character. *SEE IDLE WORDS*.

Levy

(smk, *mas, tribute,* as usually rendered), a *tax* or requirement of service imposed by Eastern kings for public works, hence a *gang* or company of men impressed into such service (<110513>1 Kings 5:13, 14; 9:15). In two passages other terms (hl;[; <111021>1 Kings 9:21; µWr, <043128>Numbers 31:28) are employed in connection with this, to denote the *exaction* of tribute. *SEE TRIBUTE*.

Lew Chew

SEE LOO CHOO.

Lewd

(πονηρός, *bad,* <441705>Acts 17:5), Lewdness (ῥαδιοϋργημα, *mischief* <441814>Acts 18:14), are used elsewhere in their proper sense of *licentiousness* (hMzæ, etc., <071906>Judges 20:6; Ezekiel often; <241115>Jeremiah 11:15; 13:27; <280409>Hosea 6:9; once for tWlbj;æ, the *parts of shame*, <280210>Hosea 2:10).

Lewin, Hirschel,

a Jewish rabbi who was born in 1721 in Poland, and died at Berlin in 1800, is noted for his attitude towards Moses Mendelssohn. Lewin was chief rabbi of Prussia in the days of the great Jewish philosopher, and severely censured Mendelssohn for rationalistic views expressed in his correspondence with Lavater, *SEE MENDELSSOHN*, and in his translation of the Pentateuch into German. To the credit of Lewin, however, it must be stated that he by no means condemned or permitted the condemnation of Mendelssohn as a heretic, as Landau and other Polish rabbis were inclined to do. See Gratz. *Gesch. der Juden,* 11:45 sq.

Lewis, Isaac, D.D.

a Congregational minister, was born January 21, 1746 (O.S.), in Stratford (now Huntington), Connecticut; graduated at Yale College in 1765; entered the ministry in March, 1768; and was ordained pastor at Wilton, Connecticut, October 26, 1768. He resigned his charge in June, 1786, and was installed October 18, 1786, pastor in Greenwich, and there he labored until December 1, 1818, when he gave up the work on account of the infirmities of age. He died August 27, 1840. In 1816 he was made a

member of Yale College Corporation, but resigned in 1818. He published a few occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals of the Anmerican Pulpit,* 1:662.

Lewis, John Nitchie

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Westchester County, N.Y., in 1808. He graduated at Yale College in 1828, and studied theology both at Andover and Princeton, and was licensed at Goshen, N.Y., in 1832. He preached for a number of years, principally in the State of New York, and was then chosen secretary of the Central American Education Society in New York. He was for some time editor of the *Seaman's Magazine,* and wrote a Manual for the Presbyterian Church. He died in 1861. — Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac,* 1863.

Lewis, Moses

a Methodist minister, was born in Roxbury, Vermont, May 19, 1797, and early decided upon the ministry as his work of life. He entered the traveling connection in 1831 in the New Hampshire Conference. After five years of faithful and successful labors as an itinerant, failing health compelled him to retire from the effective ranks, with the hope of resuming his place as a pastor at no distant day with recuperated physical strength, which, however, he never realized. During thirty-four years he sustained either a supernumerary or superannuated relation to his Conference. In 1844 the New Hampshire Conference was divided, and the Vermont Conference constituted, and of it Lewis, living within the limits of the new Conference, became a member. He died September 26, 1869. "In the domestic circle brother Lewis was beloved and honored; in the community, active and reliable; and in the Church, a pillar of strength, a safe counselor, and a liberal contributor to all the interests of the Church of his choice." — *Minutes of Conf.* 1870 (see Index).

Lewis, Thomas

an Independent minister, was born in 1777. He was pastor of an Independent congregation at Islington, England, from 1804 till 1852, the year of his death. His published works are,

1. *Christian Duties in the various Relations of Life* (1839): —

2. *Religious State of Islington for the last Forty Years* (1842): —

3. *Christian Privileges* (1847). — Allibone, *Dictionary of British and American Authors,* volume 2, s.v.

Lewis, Zechariah

a Presbyterian minister, studied theology at Philadelphia, and was licensed by the Fairfield West Association in 1796. In the autumn of that year he became tutor in Yale College, and held that office until 1799. He was elected a trustee of Princeton Seminary in 1812. For six years he acted as corresponding secretary of the Religious Tract Society, afterwards the American Tract Society. Having resigned that position in 1820, he was elected one of the secretaries of the United Foreign Missionary Society. He died in 1862. Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac,* 1863, s.v.

Leyczon Nobla

is the name of a poem which was extensively circulated among the Waldenses in the 15th century. It exhorts to repentance and to Christian life, and treats of the temptations to which the wicked subject the pious and the good, and of the punishments for sin. Some, among them Dickhoff, contend that the poem originated with the Bohemian Brethren, but Ebrard and Herzog incline to the general opinion that the "Leyczon" belongs to the Waldensian literature. The name it bears is derived from the first words of the poem, which are *"Leyczon noblsa" (lectio,* sermon). See *Zeitschrift hist. theol.* 1864,1865; Herzog, *Die romewsischen Waldenser,* etc. (Halle, 1853).

Leydecker, Melchior

a Calvinistic theologian, was born at Middelburg in 1642. He became pastor in the province of Zealand in 1662, was appointed professor at Utrecht in 1678, and died in 1721. He was an ardent exponent of the doctrines of the Reformed Church, and violently opposed the systems of Cocceius and Descartes, the works of Drusius, Spencer's book *De Legibus Hebraeorum,* and the Lutheran tendencies of Witsius. Very learned in theological, rabbinical, and ecclesiastical literature, he distinguished himself by wielding a strong pen in favor of the Reformed theological system. Among his apologetical works are *De veritate Jidei Reformatae ejusdemque sanctitate, s. Comnmentarius ad Catech. Palatin.* (Ultrajecti. 1694, 4to): — *De oeconomia trium personarum in negotio salutis hum. libri iv, quibus universa Reformata fides certis principiis congruo nexu*

explicatur (Traj. ad Rhen. 1682,12mo): — *Veritas evangelica troiumphans de erroribus quorumvis seculorum — opus, quo principia fidei Reformatae demonstrantur* (Traj. 1688, 4to): — also, *Historia ecclesice Africanae illustrata pro ecclesiae Reformate veritate et libertate* (Ultraj. 1690,4to). His controversial works against Cocceius met with great success, because they discussed the question with great clearness. Among them we notice his *Synopsis controversiarum de foedere et testamento Dei, quae hodie in Belgio moventur* (Traj. 1690, 8vo): — *Vis veritatis s. disquisitionum ad nonnullas controversias, quae hodie in Belgio moventur de oeconomia foederum Dei, libri v* (Traj. 1679, 4to): — *Fax veritatis* (Leidoe, 1677, 4to). When yet a youthful student at the university Leydecker had paid special attention to Biblical studies, and, guided by a learned rabbi, made rapid strides in the exploration of Biblical lore. In after life, when, tired of polemical and clerical pursuits, he looked about for a field on which he might profitably venture, this department of theological study allured him anew. Attempting to fit the works of Godwin *(Moses and Aaron)* and Cunseus *(De Republica Hebreor.)* to his academical purposes, he soon discovered their insufficiency, and set about to prepare himself a more copious treatise, which is everywhere marked by a vigorous and independent judgment. While he conceals not his aversion to the "futilities" of the Talmud, he quotes the great rabbins with respect. He, moreover, keeps a sharp eye on the extravagancies of Christian writers, and his work censures with evenhanded justice the well-known rabbinism of the Buxtorfs and the *Egyptism* of Spencer *(De Legibus Hebr.).* It is only characteristic of this unsparing criticism of the orthodox author that he adds an appendix of severe animadversion against the cosmogony of Thomas Burnet, to whose *Theoria telluris* he prefixes the predicate *profana.* The six dissertations of this appendix, whatever may be thought of the author's views, are valuable for their learning, and interesting as closely bearing on the questions now raised on the Mosaic cosmogony. Especial mention among his Biblical works is due to his archaeological treatise entitled *De Republica Hebraeoarum* (Amst. 1704, thick fol. vol.), which is one of the largest repertories ever written on the wide subject of Hebrew antiquities, and exhibits in an eminent degree vast stores of scriptural, rabbinical, and historical learning. Added to the interest of the subject are dissertations on the Hebrew laws and customs, both political and religious, interwoven in a historical narrative, in which the sacred history is developed, by epochs, from the earliest period to the latest. The author, in his progress, learnedly investigates the history, *pari*

passu, of the leading Gentile nations, very much after the manner of Shuckford and Russell in their *Connections.* This valuable work, on which Leydecker's fame deserves mainly to depend, is singularly enough ignored in Schweizer's sketch of the author in Herzog (see below). A complete list of his works is to be found in the *Unpartheiische Kirchen-Hist. A. u. N. Test.*, etc., 2:625. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:360; Gass, *Dozmengeschichte*, volumes 1-3; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* volume 2, s.v.

Leyden, John of

SEE BOCHOLD.

Leyden, Lucas van

one of the most celebrated painters of the early Dutch school, noted for his success in sacred art, was born in Leyden in 1494. His talents were early developed in the school of Cornelius Engelbrechsten, an artist of repute in his day. He commenced engraving when scarcely nine years of age. His picture of St. Hubert, painted when he was only twelve, brought him very high commendation; and the celebrated print, so well known to collectors by the name of "Mohammed and the Monk Sergius," was published in 1508, when he was only fourteen. He practiced successfully almost every branch of painting, was one of the ablest of those early painters who engraved their own works, and he succeeded. like Albert Dürer, in imparting certain qualities of delicacy and finish to his engravings that no mere engraver ever attained. His pictures are noted for clearness and delicacy in color, variety of character, and expression; but his drawing is hard and Gothic in form. His range of subjects was very wide, and embraced events in sacred history, incidents illustrative of the manners of his own period, and portraits. He died in 1533.

Leyden, School of, Theologians Of The,

is the name given to that class of Dutch theologians who follow in the wake of the rationalistic professors of the University of Leyden (founded in 1575) and of whom J.H. Scholten (in 1840 professor in Franeker, since 1843 in Leyden) and his pupils are at present the main interpreters. The Leyden school is in reality nothing more nor less than a Dutch Tübingen school. In his younger days Scholten belonged to the orthodox school, and at one time (1856) even went forth to battle against the negative criticism of Baur and his Tübingen confreres; but in 1864 he came out boldly in

defense of the very man and principles he had previously warred against, and in a short time became the principal leader in the movement of modern Dutch theologians "to establish a connection between the faith of the Reformers and our own... to unite the old traditions with the new opinions" (the Rationalism of the Tübingen theologians). *"Man,"* the Leyden school teaches, "arrives at a knowledge of the truth by the holy Scriptures, but they must not be understood as containing the only revelation from God; he also reveals himself to the world through the hearts of all believers. The Bible is the source of the original religion. There is a difference between the Scriptures and the word of God. The latter is what God reveals in the human spirit concerning his will and himself. The writing down of the communication is purely human; therefore the Bible cannot be called a revelation.... To prove the certainty of the facts of revelation historical criticism must be called in." Unfortunately, however, with them "historical criticism" means nothing else than the application of that negative criticism of the German Rationalists De Wette, Ewald, and Hitzig, and they dispose of the "historical by asserting (e.g. Kuenen) that we cannot go further back than the middle of the 8th century before Christ, or the time of Hosea and Amos; that "all the preceding times are enveloped in hopeless myth. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the founders of Israel, are not persons, but personifications. They are purely ideal figures, for modern 'historical' inquiry teaches us that races are not derived from one progenitor, but many. The development and preservation of Israel — its whole history were the result of purely national causes." Christianity itself, they came naturally enough, from such grounds, to regard as "neither superhuman nor supernatural. It is the highest point of the development of human nature itself, and in this sense it is natural and human in the highest acceptation of those terms. It is the mission of science to put man in a condition to comprehend the divine volume presented by Christianity." But what the idea of the modern theologians of Holland is on the relation of science to faith we may well learn from Prof. Opzoomer, of Utrecht University *(The Truth anc its Sources of Knowledge,* page 43): "Science is not to appear before the bar of faith, but faith before that of science; for it is not the credibility of knowledge, but of faith, that is to be proved.... Science needs no justification.... The believer, on the contrary, must justify his faith, and that before the bar of science. Thus, as a matter of course, the final decision and the supreme power rest with science." Great indeed is the science of Opzoomer, and in like ratio is the insignificance of the thing he calls faith. His manner of rejecting miracles is the old threadbare argument

of Hume. "Modern science is established on the experience acquired by the observance of nature. What experience teaches is the touchstone for testing the historical value of the accounts that reach us from past ages." Again, and more positively: "It is the duty of the historian to reject every narrative which is in manifest contradiction with everything known to him concerning the time of its alleged occurrence.... Nothing in all nature gives probability to the supposition that moral and religious greatness can be established by dominion over natural phenomena" *(The Nature of Knowledge,* pages 31, 33). "We know nothing of the supernatural; to us there is not a single miracle" *(The Spirit of the new Tendency,* page 28). "Experience — it, and it alone! What is beyond it is from an evil source. For our knowledge there is but one way — the way of observation" *(Free Science,* page 26). Perhaps we can do no better than insert here a resume by Dr. Hurst of the object of the Dutch modern theologians, as follows: " 1. History must be reconstructed; for every miracle must disappear from the Biblical narrative, since philosophy teaches that there can be no miracles. 2. Philosophy must be liberated from the so-called divine revelation, because the history of the present time, or experience, teaches that there can be nothing supernatural; hence there never was. Thus the argument whirls in a hopeless circle; history demonstrates from (untrue) philosophy, and philosophy from (untrue) history, that there is no such thing as miracle, nor even anything supernatural! Can we wonder at the sorry plight of the modern theologians which Pierson (formerly pastor of the Walloon Church in Rotterdam, now professor at Heidelberg University) divulges on the very first page of his *Mirror of the Times:* We do not conceal the fact that our theology is involved in ceaseless vacillation?" Besides Scholten we have Kuenen, the great exegetical scholar, and Ravenhoff, the ecclesiastical historian, both professors at Leyden, actively engaged in promoting the interests of these Rationalistic opinions, and, unfortunately enough for Christianity in Holland, it must be confessed that at present no Dutch theologians exert more influence over the young theologians of that country than professor Scholten and his associates just mentioned. See Dr. Hurst in the *Meth. Quart. Rev.* 1871 (April), page 250 sq.; and his *Hist. of Rationalism,* page 368 sq.; Scholten, *De Leer der Hervormde Kerk in hare grondbeginselen nit de bronnen voorgesteld en beordeeld.* (1848; 2d ed. 1850; 4th ed. 1861); and his article on "Modern Materialism and its Causes" in *Progress of Religious Thought in the Protest. Ch. of France* (Lond. 1861), page 10 sq. *SEE REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH.* (J.H.W.)

Leydt, Johannes

a prominent minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, was born in Holland in 1718, and came early to America. He studied theology under the Reverend John Frelinghuysen and J.H. Goetschius, was licensed in 1748, and became pastor of the united churches of New Brunswick and Six-mile Run, New Jersey. In the great Coetus and Conferentic conflict he was actively identified with the former, which insisted upon the education of ministers in this country, and upon an independent Church organization separate from the Reformed Church of the mother country. In this "liberal and progressive" movement Mr. Leydt was a powerful leader. He published several pamphlets in its favor, and was one of the most prominent men in the establishment of Queen's College (now Rutgers) in 1770. He was one of its first trustees. He was president of the General Synod in 1778. An ardent patriot of the Revolutionary War, he preached boldly on the great questions of the time, arousing much enthusiasm among the people, “and counseling the young men to join the army of freedom." His active and useful ministry closed only with his life in 1783. He is represented to have been an instructive, laborious, and faithful minister, an impressive preacher, a favorite at installations of pastors, organization of churches, and other public services. He was a healer of the breaches of Zion, as well as an intrepid leader in an important crisis of the Church and of the *country*. — *Historical Sermon* by R.H. Steele, D.D.; Corwin, *Manual of the Reformned Church*, s.v. (W.J.R.T.)

Leyser

SEE LYSER.

L'Hopital

SEE HOPITAL.

Liar

SEE LIE.

Libanius

a celebrated sophist of the 4th century, noted as a friend of the emperor Julian, was born about A.D. 314 at Antioch, where he studied in early youth, devoting his attention to the purest classic models. After a stay of

four years at Athens, where he attracted much attention, he pursued his studies at Constantinople, and here entered upon a brilliant career as teacher, which excited the envy of others, especially of the sophist Bemarchius, his former instructor. The latter falsely charged him with the practice of sorcery and many vices, so that the prefect was persuaded to expel him from the city, A.D. 346. He went to Nice, and shortly after to Nicomedia, and there pleasantly passed five years with great success as an instructor, and returned, by invitation of emperor Julian, who had frequently attended his lectures, to Constantinople, only to leave it, however, shortly after, on account of the opposition still existing. He retired, by permission of Cessar Gallus, to his native city. Here he continued to reside till his death which is supposed to have occurred after the accession of Arcadius, A.D. 395. In the death of Julian, Libanius lost much of his hope for the restoration of paganism. He complains to the gods that they had granted so long a life to Constantius, and only so brief a career to Julian. He interchanged many letters with Julian. Under Valens he defended himself successfully against a charge of treason, and seems to have obtained the emperor's favor. He besought from him a law, in which Libanius himself, on account of his own natural offspring by a mistress, was personally interested, granting to natural children a share in their father's property at his death. Libanius was the preceptor of Basil and Chrysostom; and, although himself a pagan to the end, always maintained friendly relations with these Christian fathers. He was a warm advocate for tolerance, and sought to defend the Manichaeans of the East from the violent measures directed against them. He addressed Theodosius in one of his *Discourses* in defense of the heathen temples, which the monks were eager to despoil. He lived long enough to see Christianity everywhere triumphant, and his personal efforts no longer applauded. Separate works of Libanius have from time to time been discovered and edited, but many yet lie in MS. only in different libraries. His style is rhetorically correct, but, in accordance with the spirit of his times, highly artificial. Gibbon's criticism may be considered too severe *(Decline and Fall*, chapter 24). Among the writings of Libanius are his *Progymnasmata*, or Examples of Rhetorical Exercises, divided into thirteen sections; and *Discourses*, many of which were never pronounced, nor designed for that purpose. Some of the latter are moral dissertations, after the fashion of the times, on such subjects as Friendship, Riches, Poverty. One is entitled *Mova Sia*, a lament on the death of Julian. Another, the most interesting of all his writings, is his autobiography, which he first wrote at the age of sixty years, entitled

Βίος ἢ λόγος περὶ πῆς ἑαυτοῦ τυχῆς. A fragment of his *Discourses,* addressed to Theodosius in defense of the heathen temples, was discovered by Mai in 1823 in the Vatican. 'The *Declamlations* , exceeding forty in number, are exercises on imaginary subjects. There are not less than 2000 *Letters* addressed to over 500 persons, among whom are Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom. He wrote also a *Life of Demosthenes,* and *Arguments to the Orations of Demosthenes.* There is no complete edition of Libanius. His *Discourses* and *Declamations* were edited by Reiske (Lips. 1791-97, 4 volumes, 8vo). The most copious edition of his *Letters* (1605 in the Greek, and 522 translated into Latin) is that by J.C. Wolf (Amsterd. 1738, fil.). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* volume 8, s.v.; Wetzer u.Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* volume 6, s.v.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog.* volume 2, s.v.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Emnpire,* chapters 23, 24; Sievers, *Leben des Libanius* (Berl. 1868).

Lib'anus

*(*Λίβανος*)*, the Gracized form of the name of Mount LEBANON *SEE LEBANON* (q.v.), used in the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. 4:48; 5:55; 2 Esdr. 15:20; Judith 1:7; Ecclus. 24:13; 1, 12) and by classical writers. *SEE ANTILIBANUS*.

Libation

(Lat. *libatio,* from *libare,* "to pour out;" literally any thing *poured out)* is used, in the sacrificial language of the ancients, to express an affusion of liquors poured upon victims to be sacrificed to a deity. The quantity of wine for a libation among the Hebrews was the fourth part of a hin, rather more than two pints. Libations were poured on the victim after it was killed, and the several pieces of it were laid on the altar, ready to be consumed by the flames (<0360>Leviticus 6:20; 8:25, 26; 9:4; 16:12, 20). These libations usually consisted of unmixed wine *(*ἔνσπονδος*, merum),* but sometimes also of milk, honey, and other fluids, either pure or diluted with water. The libations offered to the Furies were always without wine. The Greeks and Latins offered libations with the sacrifices, but they were poured on the victim's head while it was living. So Sinon, relating the manner in which he was to be sacrificed, says, he was in the priest's hands ready to be slain, was loaded with bands and garlands; that they were preparing to pour upon him the libations of grain and salted meal *(AEn.* 2:130, 131). Likewise Dido, beginning to sacrifice, pours wine between the

horns of the victim *(AEn.* 4). The wine was usually poured out in three separate streams. Libations always accompanied a sacrifice which was offered in concluding a treaty with a foreign nation, and that here they formed a prominent part of the solemnity is clear from the fact that the treaty itself was called σπονδαί. But libations were also made independent of any other sacrifice, as in solemn prayers, and on many other occasions of public and private life, as before drinking at meals, and the like. St. Paul describes himself, as it were, a victim about to be sacrificed, and that the accustomed libations of meal and wine were already, in a measure, poured upon him: "For I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand" (2 Timothy 4:6). The same expressive sacrificial term occurs in Philippians 2:17, where the apostle represents the faith of the Philippians as a sacrifice, and his own blood as a libation poured forth to hallow and consecrate it: "Yea, and if I be offered, σπένδομαι, upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ, I joy and rejoice with you all." The word libation was frequently extended in its signification, however, to the whole offering of unbloody sacrifices of which this formed a part, and which consisted not only in the pouring of a little wine upon the altar, but were accompanied by the presentation of fruit and cakes. Cakes in particular were peculiar to the worship of certain deities, as to that of Apollo. They were either simple cakes of flour, sometimes also of wax, or they were made in the shape of some animal, and were then offered as symbolical sacrifices in the place of real animals, either because they could not easily be procured, or were too expensive for the sacrificer. This custom prevailed even in the houses of the Romans, who at their meals made an offering to the Lares in the fire which burned upon the hearth. The libation was thus a sort of heathen "grace before meat." See Watson, *Bibl. and Theol. Dict*. 5.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.

Libel

is the technical name of the document which contains the accusation framed against a minister before ecclesiastical courts. *SEE FAMA CLAMOSA*. In England, libel, in the ecclesiastical courts, is the name given to the formal written statement of the complainant's ground of complaint against the defendant. It is the first stage in the pleadings after the defendant has been cited to appear. The defendant is entitled to a copy of it, and must answer the allegations contained in it upon oath. In Scotland, the libel is a document drawn up, as usual, in the form of a syllogism, the major proposition stating the name and nature of the crime, as condemned

by the Word of God and the laws of the Church; the minor proposition averring that the party accused is guilty, specifying facts, dates, and places; and then follows the conclusion deducing the justice of the sentence, if the accusation should be proven. By the term *relevancy* is meant whether the charge is one really deserving censure, or whether the facts alleged, if proved, would afford sufficient evidence of the charge. A list of witnesses is appended to the copy of the libel served in due time and form on the person accused. One of the forms is as follows: "Unto the Reverend the Moderator and Remanent Members of the —— Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church, The Complaint of A and B, a committee appointed to prosecute the matter after-mentioned (or of Mr. A.B., merchant in ——, a member of said Church); Sheweth, That the Reverend C.D., minister of the —— Congregation of ——, has been guilty of the sin of *(here state the denomination of the offense, such as "drunkenness," "fornication," or such like).* In so far as, upon the —— day of ——, 1800, or about that time, and within the house of ——, situated in —— street, ——, he, the said C.D. *(here the circumstances attending the offense charged are described, as, for example, "did drink whiskey or some other spirituous liquor to excess, whereby he became intoxicated"),* to the great scandal of religion and disgrace of his sacred profession; may it therefore please your reverend court to appoint service of this libel to be made on the said Reverend C.D., and him to appear before you to answer to the same; and on his admitting the charge, or on the same being proved against him, to visit him with such censure as the Word of God and the rules and discipline of the Church in such cases prescribe, in order that he and all others may be deterred from committing the like offenses in all time coming, or to do otherwise in the premises as to you may appear expedient and proper. According to justice, etc. List of witnesses." — Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Libellatici

is the name of that class of the lapsed who received from the heathen magistrate a written certificate (libellue) as a warrant for their security; either testifying that they were not Christians, or containing a dispensation from the necessity of sacrificing to the gods in confirmation of their adherence to heathenism. Another class of the lapsed were the *sacrificati* — that is, those who had offered sacrifice to the heathen gods in testimony of their renunciation of the faith; manother the *traditores,* because they had delivered up into the hands of the heathen either copies of the sacred writings, baptismal registers, or any other property of the Church. See

Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1 (see Index); Mosheim, *Commentary* (see Index). *SEE LAPSED*.

Libelli Pacis Or Letters Of Peace.

In Egypt and Africa many of those who had fallen away in time of persecution, in order the more readily to obtain pardon for their offenses, resorted to the intercession of persons destined to suffer martyrdom by securing from them *libelli pacis*, letters of peace; papers in which these returning apostates were commended as worthy of communion and Church membership. In this way they were again taken into communion sooner than the rules of the Church otherwise allowed. From this practice the pope claims a precedent for the exercise of his pretended power to grant spiritual indulgences, which seem to have been used first about the middle of the second century. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Mosheim, *Commentary* (see Index). *SEE INDULGENCES*; *SEE LAPSED*.

Liberalism

SEE RATIONALISM.

Liberality

is a term denoting a generous disposition of mind, exerting itself in giving largely. It is thus distinguished from its synonymes generosity and bounty. Liberality implies acts of mere giving or spending; generosity, acts of greatness; bounty, acts of kindness. Liberality is a natural disposition; generosity proceeds from elevation of sentiment; bounty from religious motives. Liberality denotes freedom of spirit; generosity, greatness of soul; bounty, openness of heart.

Liberality Of Sentiment,

a generous disposition a man feels towards another who is of a different opinion from himself; or, as one defines it, "that generous expansion of mind which enables it to look beyond all petty distinctions of party and system, and, in the estimate of men and things, to rise superior to narrow prejudices." Unfortunately, liberality of sentiment is often a cover for error and skepticism on the one hand, and is most generally too little attended to by the ignorant and bigoted on the other. "A man of liberal sentiments," says an eminent English writer, "must be distinguished from him who has no religious sentiments at all. He is one who has seriously and effectually

investigated, both in his Bible and on his knees, in public assemblies and in private conversations, the important articles of religion. He has laid down principles, he has inferred consequences; in a word, he has adopted sentiments of his own. He must be distinguished also from that tame, undiscerning domestic among good people, who, though he has sentiments of his own, yet has not judgment to estimate the worth and value of one sentiment beyond another. Now a generous believer of the Christian religion is one who will not allow himself to try to propagate his sentiments by the commission of sin. No collusion, no bitterness, no wrath, no undue influence of any kind, will he apply to make his sentiments receivable; and no living thing will be less happy for his being a Christian. He will exercise his liberality by allowing to those who differ from him as much virtue and integrity as he possibly can."

There are, among a multitude of arguments to enforce such a disposition, the following worthy of our attention:

"**1.** We should exercise liberality in union with sentiment because of the different capacities, advantages, and tasks of mankind. Religion employs the capacities of mankind just as the air employs their lungs and their organs of speech. The fancy of one is lively, or another dull. The judgment of one is elastic, of another feeble, a damaged spring. The memory of one is retentive, that of another is treacherous as the wind. The passions of this man are lofty, vigorous, rapid; those of that man crawl, and hum, and buzz, and, when on wing, sail only round the circumference of a tulip. Is it conceivable that capability, so different in everything else, should be all alike in religion? The advantages of mankind differ. How should he who has no parents, no books, no tutor, no companions, equal him whom Providence has gratified with them all; who, when he looks over h the treasures of his own knowledge, can say, this I had of a Greek, that I learned of a Roman; this information I acquired of my tutor, that was a present of my father; a friend gave me this branch of knowledge, an acquaintance bequeathed me that? The tasks of mankind differ; so I call the employments and exercises of life. In my opinion, circumstances make great men; and if we have not Caesars in the State, and Pauls in the Church, it is because neither Church nor State are in the circumstances in which they were in the days of those great men. Push a dull man into a river, and endanger his life, and suddenly he will discover invention, and make efforts beyond himself. The world is a fine school of instruction. Poverty, sickness, pain, loss of children, treachery of friends, malice of

enemies, and a thousand other things, drive the man of sentiment to his Bible, and, so to speak, bring him home to a repast with his benefactor, God. Is it conceivable that he whose young and tender heart is yet unpracticed in trials of this kind can have ascertained and tasted so many religious truths as the sufferer has?

2. We should believe the Christian religion with liberality, because every part of the Christian religion inculcates generosity. Christianity gives us a character of God; but what a character does it give! GOD IS LOVE. Christianity teaches the doctrine of Providence; but what a providence! Upon whom doth not its light arise? Is there an animalcule so little, or a wretch so forlorn, as to be forsaken and forgotten of his God? Christianity teaches the doctrine of redemption; but the redemption of whom? — of all tongues, kindred, nations, and people; of the infant of a span, and the sinner of a hundred years old: a redemption generous in its principle, generous in its price, generous in its effects; fixed sentiments of divine munificence, and revealed with a liberality for which we have no name. In a word, the illiberal Christian always acts contrary to the spirit of his religion: the liberal man alone thoroughly understands it.

3. We should be liberal, because no other spirit is *exemplified* in the infallible guides whom we profess to follow. I set one Paul against a whole army of uninspired men: 'Some preach Christ of good-will, and some of envy and strife. What then? Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. One eateth all things, another eateth herbs; but why dost THOU judge thy brother? We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.' We often inquire, What was the doctrine of Christ, and what was the practice of Christ? Suppose we were to institute a third question, Of what TEMPER was Christ?

4. We should be liberal as well as orthodox, because truths, especially the truths of Christianity, do not want any support from our illiberality. Let the little bee guard its little honey with its little sting; perhaps its little life may depend a little while on that little nourishment. Let the fierce bull shake his head, and nod his horn, and threaten his enemy, who seeks to eat his flesh. andl wear his coat, and live by his death: poor fellow! his life is in danger; I forgive his bellowing and his rage. But the Christian religion — is that in danger? And what human efforts can render that false which is true, that odious which is lovely? Christianity is in no danger, and therefore it gives

its professors life and breath, and all things except a power of injuring others.

5. Liberality in the profession of religion is a wise and innocent policy. The bigot lives at home; a reptile he crawled into existence, and there in his hole he lurks a reptile still. A generous Christian goes out of his own party, associates with others, and gains improvement by all. It is a Persian proverb, 'A liberal hand is better than a strong arm.' The dignity of Christianity is better supported by acts of liberality than by accuracy of reasoning; but when both go together, when a man of sentiment call clearly state and ably defend his religious principles, and when his heart is as generous as his principles are inflexible, he possesses strength and beauty in an eminent degree." See *Thed Miscellany,* 1:39; Draper, On *Bigotry;* Newton, Cecil, and Fuller's *Wars;* Wayland, *Discourses.*

Liberatus

a deacon of the Church of Carthage, flourished in the 6th century. He was in Rome A.D. 533, when pope John II received the bishops sent by the emperor Justinian I to consult him on the heresies broached by the monks, designated Acoemetne (or, as Liberatus terms them, Acumici), who had imbibed Nestorian opinions. He was again at Rome in 535, having been sent the previous year, together with the bishops Caius and Petrus, by the synod held at Carthage under Reparatus, bishop of that see, to consult pope John II on the reception into the Church of those Arians who recanted their heresies. John was dead before the arrival of the African delegates; but they were received by pope Agapetus, his successor. When, in 552. Reparatus was banished by Justinian to Euchaida, or Eucayda. Liberatus accompanied him and probably remained with him till the bishop's death in 563. Nothing further is known of him. Liberatus is the author of a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical history, entitled *Breviarium Caussae Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum* (from the ordination of Nestorius, A.D. 428, to the time of the fifth oecumenical [or second Constantinopolitan] council, A.D. 553). In this work he is charged with partiality to the Nestorians, or with following the Nestorians too implicitly. It is contained in most editions of the *Concilia* (volume 5, edit. Labbe; volume 6. edit. Coleti; volume 9, edit. Mansi). In those of Crabbe (volume 2, fol., Cologn., 1538 and 1551) are some subjoined passages derived from various extant sources illustrative of the history, which are omitted by subsequent editors. Hardouin omitted the *Breviarium.* It was

separately published, with a revised text, and a learned preface and notes, and a dissertation, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Galland, volume 12 (Venice, 1778, fol.). — Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biograph,* 2:777.

Liber Diurnus

ROMANÔRUM PONTIFICUM is the name given by the see of Rome to a collection of formulas used in its correspondence and other business transactions. These formulas are very like those written for secular affairs by the monk Marculph (about 660) and others, and received from the compiler the name of *Liber Diurnus* because they relate to *negotia diurna* (see Marino Marini, *Diplonmatica pontifiscia,* ed. nov. Romans 1852 sq., page 64). They are interesting as scientific and historical monuments as well as for their practical use; and this is specially the case with the *Liber Diurnus Pontificalis,* which contains copies of the letters addressed by the Roman bishops to the emperor, the empress, consuls, kings, patriarchs, bishops, and other members of the clergy, and in general to all who were in any way concerned in the nomination of the Roman bishops; the *professio pontificia,* the exemptions granted on the occasion of nominating neighboring bishops, on bestowing the pallium (q.v.), conferring privileges and immunities, etc. On all these points, and the manner in which these things were practiced from the 6th to the 8th century, the *Liber Diurnus* contains more or less complete information, particularly on the relations existing between the see of Rome and the emperor, the mode of election of the Roman bishops, the ritual, etc. To judge from its contents, this collection was probably written before the year 752, for it speaks of the relation between the see of Rome and the eparchs, who were abolished in that year; but, on the other hand, it must be posterior to 685, for in caput 2, tit. 9, the emperor Constantine (Pogonatus) is spoken of as being already dead. It must also have been written under some successor of Agatho (t 682), as this Roman bishop is also mentioned as dead. Garnerius supposed it to have been composed in the time of Gregory II, somewhat after 714, on the ground that in the second *professio fidei pontificis,* given in the *Liber Diurnus,* there are expressions and views which correspond exactly to those we find in the letters of that pope to the emperor Leo. It is likely, though, that the *Liber Diurnus* existed originally in a more elementary form before it assumed that under which it is known at present, for the different MS. copies of it differ somewhat from each other. The *Liber Diurnus* was frequently consulted by all writers on canon law, such

as no of Chartres, Anselm of Lucca, Deusdedit, Gratian (c. 8, dist. 16). As the ritual and various points of law underwent modifications in the course of time, it was less used, and its existence even came to be concealed by the popes for fear lest it might recall their former dependence upon the emperors and eparchs. Still there were copies of it in existence, and a codex contained in the library of the Vatican was published in 1660 by the care of Lucas Holstenius; it was, however, at once suppressed by the Roman see. Hoffmann *(Novas collectio scriptorum ac monumentorum*, Lipsiae, 1733, 4to, 1:389) attributes to Baluze (in the remarks on Petrus de Marca, *De concordia sacerdotii ac imperil*, lib. 1, cap. 9, No. 8) the statement that at the time of Holstenius the Vatican library possessed no codex of the *Liber Diurnzus*, and that his publication was based upon a MS. entrusted to him by the Cistercian monk Hilarius Rancatus. But as both editions of the works of P. de Marca, published at Paris by Baluze, state only (lib. 2, cap. 16, No. 8) that Holstenius's publication of the *Liber Diurmus* was suppressed, and Baluze again, in his notes appended to Anton. Augustinus, *De emnendatione Gratiani*, lib. 1, dialogus 20, § 13 (ed. Par. 1760, page 433), says that there were various copies of the *Liber Diurnus* in existence, from one of which, that in the Vatican library, Holstenius published his edition, it seems reasonable to suppose that Hoffmann's statement lacks support. As for Rancatus, Mabillon names Leo Allatius, and not Holstenius, as the party to whom he imparted the MS. (see also Cave, *Scriptorum eccl. hist. literaria*, Basle, 1741, 1:621). The MS. of the Vatican has actually been described by Pertz *(Italienische Reise*, in *Archiv. f. altere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 5:27). He says that it is an 8vo volume of parchment,and that, according to the statement found on its firstpages, it dates from the 8th century. The Jesuit Joannes Garnerius, with the aid of a similar codex and a MS. found in Paris,. published in 1680 another edition of the *Liber Dimurnus*, "cum privilegio regis Christianissimi." Mabillon, in the *Museum Italicum* (folio II, 2:32 sq.), published additions to it by means of the MS. which had been used by Leo Allatius. With the aid of all these works, Hoffmann published a new edition of it in the *Nova collectio cit.* (volume 2), which was subsequently done also by Riegger (Vienna, 1762, 8vo). All this gave rise afterwards to collections of formulas to replace the obsolete *Liber Diurnus.* There are several such collections still extant in MS. Among them the *Formulariumn et stylus scriptorum curiae Romanae*, from John XXII to Gregory XII and John XXIII, in *Summa cancellaria Joannis XXII.* We may also consider as belonging to this class of works the *Rituum ecclesiasticorum sive*

ceremoniarum libri tres of bishop Augustinus Patricius Piccolomini, printed by Hoffmann (2:269 sq.), and containing a description of the rites accompanying the election of the popes in the 14th century. Collections of formulas similar to the *Liber Diurntus* were also made for the use of bishops, abbots, etc. See Rockinger, *Nachweisunqen über Formelbücher v. xiii-xvi Jahrhund.* (Munich, 1855, pages 64,126,173, 183, etc.); Palacky, *Ueber Formelbücher* (Prague, 1842); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:366; Wetzer u.Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* volume 5, s.v.

Liberia

or the United States of Liberia, a negro republic in Western Africa, on the upper coast of Upper Guinea. The boundaries are not definitely fixed, but provisionally the River Thebar has been adopted as the north-western, and the San Pedro as the eastern frontier. The republic has a coast-line of 600 miles, and extends back 100 miles, on an average, but with the probability of a vast extension into the interior as the tribes near the frontier desire to conclude treaties providing for the incorporation of their territories with Liberia. The present area is estimated at 9700 square miles. The republic owes its origin to the "American Colonization Society," which was established in December, 1816, for the purpose of removing the negroes of the United States from the cramping influences of American slavery, and placing them in their own fatherland. There, it was hoped, they would be able to refute, by practical demonstration, the views of those American politicians who contended that the institution of American slavery was essentially righteous and signally beneficent. The society, in November, 1817, sent two agents to Western Africa, the Reverend Dr. Ebenezer Burgess and Samuel J. Mills, to select a favorable location for a colony of American negroes. After visiting Gambia, Sierra Leone, and Sherbro, they fixed upon the last-named place. The first expedition of emigrants, 86 in number, was sent out in February, 1820. After various disappointments, the emigrants succeeded in obtaining a foothold on Cape Mesurado, in lat. 60 19' N., long. 100 49' W., where now stands Monrovia, the capital of the republic of Liberia. The purchase of the Mesurado territory, including Cape Mesurado and the lands, forming nearly a peninsula, between the Mesurado and the Junk rivers about 36 miles along the coast, with an average breadth of about two miles, was effected in December 1821. For a hundred years the principal powers of Europe, in particular France and England, had repeatedly tried to gain possession of this territory, but the native chiefs had invariably refused to part with even one acre, and were

known to be extremely hostile to the whites. On January 7, 1822, the smaller of the two islands lying near the mouth of the Mesurado River was occupied by the colonists, who called it Perseverance Island. They remained here until April 25, when they removed to Mesurado Heights, and raised the American flag. The colony henceforth grew, and expanded in territory and influence, taking under its jurisdiction from time to time the large tribes contiguous. In 1846 the board of directors of the American Colonization Society invited the colony to proclaim their independent sovereignty, as a means of protection against the oppressive interference of foreigners, and a special fund of $15,000 was raised to buy up the national title to all the coast from Sherbro to Cape Palmas, in order to secure to the new nationality continuity of coast. In July 1847, the declaration of independence, prepared by Hilary Teoge, was published. Representatives of the people met in convention, and promulgated a constitution similar to that of the United States. Soon after the new republic was recognized by England and France; in 1852 it was in treaty stipulations with England, France, Belgium, Prussia, Italy, the United States, Denmark, Holland, Hayti, Portugal, and Austria.

The constitution of Liberia, like that of the United States, establishes an entire separation of the Church from the State, and places all religious denominations on an equal footing, but all citizens of the republic must belong to the negro race. In 1885 the total population of Liberia was estimated to number 750,000, of which number about 20,000 were Americo-Liberians, and the remainder were aboriginal inhabitants. The most important tribes within and near the limits of the republic are the following:

1. The Veys, extending from Gallinas, their northern boundary, southward to Little Cape Mount; they stretch inland about two days' journey. They invented, some 20 years ago, an alphabet for writing their own language, and, next to the Mandingoes, they are regarded as the most intelligent of the aboriginal tribes. As they hold constant intercourse with the Mandingoes and other Mohammedan tribes in the far interior, Mohammedanism is making rapid progress among them. The Anglican missionary, bishop Payne, has recently suggested a plan of occupying the country of the Veys with an extensive and vigorous mission, and the mission-school opened by the Episcopalians at Totocorch, which is nearer to Cape Mount than to Monrovia, is regarded as the first outpost towards the vast interior.

2. The Pessehs, who are located about seventy miles from the coast, and extend about one hundred miles from north to south, are entirely pagan. They may be called the peasants of West Africa, and supply most of the domestic slaves for the Veys, Bassas, Mandingoes, and Kroos. A missionary effort was attempted among them about fifteen years ago by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, but it was abandoned in consequence of the death of the first missionary, George L. Seymour.

3. The Barline tribe, living about eight days' journey north-east from Monrovia, and next interior to the Pessehs, has recently been brought into treaty relations with Liberia. According to a report of 1858, half the population of their capital, Palaka, consisted of Mohammedans who had come from the Manni country, but the latest explorer, W. Spencer Anderson, states that there are at present no Mohammedans in the Barline country.

4. The Bassas occupy a coast-line of over sixty miles, and extend about the same distance inland. They are the great producers of palm-oil and canewood, which are sold to foreigners by thousands of tons annually. In 1835 a mission was begun among these people by the American Baptist Missionary Union, whose missionaries studied the language, organized three schools, embracing in all nearly a hundred pupils, maintained preaching statedly at three places, and occasionally at a great many more, and translated large portions of the New Testament into the Bassa language. Notwithstanding this promising commencement, the mission has been now (1872) for several years suspended. But the Southern Baptist Convention has lately resumed missionary operations among the Bassas. Great results for the spreading of Christianity are expected from the missionary labors of Mr. Jacob W. Vonbrunn, a son of a subordinate king of the Grand Bassa people.

5. The Kroo, who occupy the region south of the Bassa, extend about seventy miles along the coast, and only a few miles inland. They are the sailors of West Africa, and never enslave or sell each other. About thirty years ago a mission was established among them by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions at Settra Kroo, but it has long since ceased operations.

6. The Greboes, who border upon the south-eastern boundaries of the Kroos, extend from Grand Sesters to the Cavalla River, a distance of about seventy miles. In 1834 a mission was established among them by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which continued

in operation for seven years. A Church was organized, the language reduced to writing, and parts of the New Testament and other religious books translated into it; but in 1842 the mission was transferred to Gabun. A mission established by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States among the same tribe a few years previously still continues in operation, and has recently established at Bohlean a missionary station, about seventy miles from the coast.

7. The Mandingoes, who are found on the whole eastern frontier of the republic, and extend back to the heart of Soudan, are the most intelligent tribe within the limits of Liberia. They have schools and mosques in every large town, and, by their great influence upon the neighboring tribes, they have contributed in no little degree to abate the ignorance and soften the manners of the native population of Liberia. One of the greatest obstacles to the progress of Christian missions among the aboriginal tribes is the climate, and the difficulty of acclimatization. Thus the Basle Missionary Society, which in 1827 established a promising mission, was in 1831 compelled to abandon it when four of the eight missionaries had succumbed to the climate.

At the close of the year 1871 the churches among the Americo-Liberians and the missions among the natives were all more or less connected with the Protestant churches of the United States. The Methodist Episcopal Church, which sent her first missionary to Liberia in 1832, has subsequently organized the Liberia Mission into an Annual Conference, with a missionary bishop (since 1884 William Taylor) at its head. In 1888 the mission had 24 missionaries, including supernumeraries, 60 local preachers, 2342 Sunday-school scholars. 38 churches, of an aggregate value of $31,044. There were 127 baptisms and 60 deaths. In 1889 the number of members was 2755, probationers 244, local preachers 54. 'The intense interest which has been aroused among civilized nations by the explorations of Livingstone, and still later of Stanley, in the heart of Africa, has been heroically followed up by Bishop Taylor and the missionary band led by him, especially along the Congo River; and the native chiefs have granted lands and subsidies for the purpose of establishing churches and building schools at very many of the prominent points. The impetus thus given to commerce and improvements in Africa, has, to some degree, extended to Liberia likewise, and the country is gradually advancing to an independent position, both politically and ecclesiastically, especially as the evangelistic labors of Bishop Taylor and his coadjutors are conducted on

the plan of " self support," by means of agricultural pursuits on the part of the missionaries, whose first expenses in outfit and travel only are met by direct contributions. A new sera may therefore be now said to have dawned upon the "Dark Continent," in a religious, as well as secular point of view, and Liberia, which is the oldest of the modern mission fields there, will doubtless still continue to be the center of missionary action, at least for the immense and densely populated middle region of that quarter of the globe. The Protestant Episcopal Church likewise has a bishop there, and its mission in 1889 had 60 stations, 17 clergy, 17 candidates for orders (8 Liberians), 6 postulants (3 Liberian and 3 native), confirmations 106, communicants 612, marriages 12, burials 32, Sunday-school scholars 908, boarding and day-scholars 877, total contributions, $1,416,56. There are 22 day-schools, 11 boarding-schools, and 29 Sunday-schools in all connected with the mission. The Baptist churches in Liberia have mostly been organized by the Southern Board of American Baptists. Their work was suspended during the war, and the American Baptist Missionary Union commenced their work in Liberia with the understanding that the Southern Board would not resume the work; but in 1870 the Southern Baptists sent an agent to Africa with a view of renewing their labors there. The Missionary Union continued, however, to give a partial support to several pastors. In March, 1868, the Baptist churches of Liberia organized the "Liberian Baptist Missionary Union" for "the evangelization of the heathen" within the borders of the Republic of Liberia, "and contiguous thereto." At this first meeting of the union ten Baptist churches were represented, and twelve fields of missionary labor were designated and commended to the care of the nearest churches. The Baptist churches have a training-school for preachers and teachers at Virginia. The Presbyterian Church of the United States has congregations at Monrovia, Kentucky, Harrisburg, Greenville or Sinou, Marshall, Robertsport, and a few other places, with an aggregate membership of about 280. The Liberian churches in union with those of Gaboon and Corisco form the presbytery of Western Africa. The Alexander High-school is intended to be an academy of high grade, conducted under the supervision of the Presbytery, and designed especially to aid young men preparing for the ministry. It is situated on a farm of about twenty acres, eighteen miles from Monrovia, near the St. Paul's River. The American Lutherans have three stations in Liberia. See Newcomb, *Cyclopaedia of Missions; Annual Reports of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church; Baptist Missionary Magazine*, July 1872; *Proceedings of the Board of Missions of the*

Protestant Episcopal Church, October 1871; *Annual Reports of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church;* Grundemann, *Missionsatlas;* Stockwell, *The Republic of Liberia* (New York, 1868); Blyden (professor in Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone, W.A.), *The Republic of Liberia, its Status and ifs Field (Meth. Quart. Rev.* July 1872, art. 6). (A.J.S.)

Liberius

ST., pope of Rome, was a native of the Eternal City. He succeeded Julius I May 22, 353. The Semi-Arians, countenanced by the emperor Constantius, had then the ascendency; and both the Council of Arles (353) and that of Milan (355) condemned Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria. As Liberius, together with some other Western bishops, refused to subscribe to this condemnation, he was arrested by order of the emperor, and taken to Milan, where he held a conference with Constantius, which terminated in a sentence from the emperor deposing Liberius from his office, and banishing him to Bercea, in Thrace. Felix, a deacon at Rome, was consecrated bishop. A petition was presented to the emperor by the principal ladies of Rome in favor of Liberius, but it was not till 358 that Liberius was restored to his see. The assertion that Liberius, during his confinement at Beroea, approved in several letters of the deposition of Athanasius, and subscribed to the confession of faith drawn up by the court party at the Council of Sirmium, is a matter of great improbability, and depends chiefly upon the genuineness of his correspondence with Athanasius. The dependence of Liberius on the emperor had a mischievous influence upon many of the Italian bishops, and we need not wonder that at the Council of Rimini Arianism was openly countenanced. It is not true, as asserted by some, that Liberius subscribed the Rimini confession of faith. He ended his career in orthodoxy, and died in 366. He was succeeded by Damasus I. Liberius is said to have built the Basilica on the Esquiline Mount, which has been called Liberiana, from his name, and is now known by the name of Santa Maria Maggiore. He is commemorated in the Romish Church Aug. 27, and in the Greek Church September 23. See Gfrörer, *Kirchengesch.* II, 1:254-285; Hefele, *P. Liberius,* in the *Tüb. theol. Quartalschr.* (1853), 2:261 sq.; and *Conciliengesch.* 1:626-714; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:372.

Liber Pontificâlis

de vitis Romanorum Pontificum, GESTA ROMANORUM PONTIFICUM, LIBER GESTORUM PONTIFICALIUM, are the names of a history of the bishops of Rome from the apostle Peter down to Nicolas I (t 867), to which those of Adrian II and of Stephen VI (t 891) were subsequently added. On the authority of Onuphrio Pavini, the first editors of this *Liber Pontificalis* considered as its author Anastasius, abbot of a convent at Rome, and librarian of the church under Nicolas I; but more thorough researches have proved this *liber* to vary greatly in style, and even in views manifested in the different biographies, and therefore led to the supposition that the work is not all by the same author. This belief is further strengthened by the fact that already Anastasius, on some occasions, made use of passages from the *Liber Pontificalis,* and that there are MSS. extant which can with certainty be ascribed to the close of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century, and which contain extracts from the *Liber Pontificalis.* In the early part of the 17th century, several writers put forth arguments in favor of the last-mentioned views. Among them are Emanuel of Schelstrate, librarian of the Vatican *(Dissertatio de antiquis Romanorum Pontificumn catalogis, ex quibus Liber Pontificalis concinnatus sit, et de Libri Pontificalis auctore ac prmstantia* [Romae, 1692, fol.; reprinted in Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores,* 3:1 sq.]), Joannes Ciampini (magister brevium gratiae: *Examen Librai Pontificalis sive vita rum Romanorum Pontificum, quae sub nomine Anastasii bibliothecarii circumferuntur* [Romans 1688, 4to; reprinted in Muratori, page 33 sq.]), and others. The supposition that the codex was compiled by pope Damasus, the successor of Liberius, as maintained by the authors of the *Origines,* is untenable. The correspondence between Damnasus and Jerome which is adduced in support of this view is evidently spurious (see Schelstrate, *Dissertatio,* etc.). The author or authors are unknown, but the information it contains is valuable. It is now generally thought to have been written about the 4th century.

The oldest source known at present of the *liber* is generally considered to have been a list of the popes down to Liberius, and probably written during his life (352-366), as it makes no mention of his death (see Schelstrate, *Dissertatio,* etc., chapter 2, 3; Hefele, *Tübinger theolog. Quartalschrift,* 1845, page 312 sq.). The original MS. of this so-called *Codex Liberii* is now lost. In 1634 a copy was made of it from an Antwerp MS. by Bucher, the Bollandists give one in the *Acta Sanctorunm,* April, volume 1:1675,

and Schelstrate another from a Vienna codex. These three texts are given side by side in the *Origines de l'eglise Romaine, par les membres de la communauute de Solermes* (Paris, 1826), volume 1.

Another list of the popes extends down to Felix IV (t 530). It was first published in a codex of the Vatican Library by Christine of Sweden, afterwards by Sylvester of Henschen and Papebroch, and is also found in the introduction of the first volume of the *Acta Sanctorum* for April, in Schelstrate, and in the above-mentioned *Origines,* page 212. There are transcripts of French origin, and the original MS. of this so-called *Catalogus Felicis IV* is lost, but the two at present in existence are evidently copies of the same original, as results from a careful comparison of them by Schelstrate. That the author of it must have consulted the *Catalogus Liberii* is evident from the fact that its errors are repeated in it. They both omit the names of the consuls and emperors between Liberius and John I (523), and commence again at the reign of the latter, and of his successor, Felix IV (al. III). Schelstrate already correctly surmised from this fact that the author lived in the time of these two popes, which view is also supported by the completeness and thoroughness with which their history, in particular, is treated. Still, as to the author, there is no definite information. The numerous references to the archives of the Roman Church, in which, moreover, the first MS. was discovered, would make it probable that the author was himself a librarian of the archives, if the confusion and even incorrectness of some parts did not militate against this view. Aside from the similarity of this collection with the *Catalogus Liberii,* which extends so far that whole passages are copied literally, or nearly so, from the one into the other, the *Catalogus Felicis IV* differs from the *Liberii* principally by its full particulars on the ordination, by its mention of the birthplace of the popes, and their funerals, which the author may have derived from tradition and other similar sources, pseudo-decretals and canons, martyrologies, etc. The only parts which have heretofore been considered worthy of full confidence are those which coincide with the *Catalogues Liberii,* and those which refer to the times of John and Felix, when the author would be better acquainted with the facts than with those of preceding periods.

Both lists were subsequently continued, and this is what produced the *Liber Pontificalis.* This filiation, however, can only be traced by the aid of MSS. The oldest copy known belongs to the close of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century. It ends at the death of Conon (686-687). A

rather incomplete Codex rescriptus, discovered by Pertz *(Archiv.* page 50 sq.) at Naples, gives the list of the popes down to Conon; it must have been written, at the latest, in the early part of the 8th century. Another is found in a codex of the cathedral chapter of Verona, ending also with Conon, but to it was added afterwards a list of the names of the popes down to Paul I (t 767). This MS. was published in the fourth volume of Bianchini's collection, but, unfortunately, we have no description of this codex; it was to have been given in the fifth volume, which never appeared (see Rostell, *Beschreibung der Stadt* [illegible] *Romans* 1:209, 210), so that it is impossible clearly to establish its relation to the Neapolitan MS. A continuation of this first work goes down to Gregory II (from 714), and is to be found in the Codex of the Vatican, No. 5269, which must be a copy of an older MS. (Schelstrate, chapter 5, § 3). Then there is another continuation from the second part of the 8th century, contained in a codex of the Ambrosian Library of Milan (M. no. 77, 4to), which is of the same date. The biographies close with Stephen III (t 757), and at the end is simply remarked, "xcv Paulus sedit annis x, mensibus ii, diebus v" (Muratori, *Rerum Ital. Scriptores,* 3:7). The variations on this MS. are given by Muratori under the letter A. It belonged originally to the convent of Bobbio. According to a very plausible supposition of Niebuhr, the above-mentioned Neapolitan Codex came also from that convent. It will probably be possible, when the subject shall have been more thoroughly studied, to trace a connection between the two, and the *Liber Pontiicalis* also. After the middle of the 8th century there appeared several continuations, as is shown by the numerous MSS. of them in existence (see, in Muratori, B, C, D; and Pertz, who gives notices of several MSS. of the kind). Some of these codices extend down to Nicolas I (t 867), others to Stephen VI (t 891), which is as far as the so-called *Liber Pontificalis* extends.

If from what we have stated it is concluded that the work dates back as far as the 7th century, it is clearly impossible that the librarian Anastasius should have been its author. He could at best only have continued it. Schelstrate thinks that the biography of Nicolas I can alone be ascribed to him (c. 8, § 10); while Ciampini is induced by some peculiarities of the style to consider him also as the author of the four preceding ones (1.c. sect. 5, 6). Ii the present state of the question it is impossible to decide between the two opinions. But it is clearly a mistake to attribute the biographies of Adrian II and Stephen IV to a certain *Bibliothecarius*

Gulielntus, as is generally done (Ciampini names the librarian Zachary, sect. 4, 7, 8). This error originated in an inscription in the Vatican Codex (3762, fol. 90 b-96), which, however, states only that a certain Peter Guillermus of Genoa, librarian of the convent of S. AEgidius, wrote this Vatican Codex in the year 1142 (see Giesebrecht, in the *Kieler Allgem1. Monatsschrift,* etc., April, 1852, pages 266, 267; *Monumental Germaniae,* 11:318).

The sources of the *Liber Pontificalis,* besides those above mentioned, consist partly in traditions, partly in MS. documents, and remaining monuments, auch as buildings, inscriptions, etc. The collection of canon law of the 7th or 8th century, published by Zachary from a codex of Modena, stands in close connection with the *Liber Pontificalis* (see Zaccaria, *Dissertazioni varie Italiane a storia eccleslastica appartenenti,* Romans 1780, volume 2, diss. 4; reproduced by Galland, *De vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge,* Mogunt. 1770, 4to, 2:679 sq.); yet it is not to be considered as one of its sources, but rather appears to have been based on the *Liber Pontificalis.* The *Liber Pontificalis* has become particularly valuable for the correctness of the information since the latter part of the 7th century, when the Roman archives were regularly organized, and the continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis* could only be intrusted to the librarians or other members of the clergy having free access to the archives. The *Liber Pontificalis* is especially useful for the history of particular churches, ecclesiastical institutions, the discipline, etc. Schelstrate names as its first edition Peter Crabbe's *Concilien* (Cologne, 1538); but this is neither complete nor well connected. It only contains extracts on each pope, like Baronius's *Annutles* and subsequent collections of canons, and as the "editio priinceps," the edition of J. Busäus (Mayence, 1602, 4to) is generally accepted, which is based on a MS. of Marcus Welser, of Augsburg. It was followed by the edition of Hannibal Fabrotti (Par. 1649), for which several codices were consulted. Lucas Holstenius prepared another by collating Busaus's with a number of MSS., and, although never published, it was greatly used by Schelstrate and others (see Schelstrate, cap. 5, No. 3 sq.). From the hands of Schelstrate the MS. of Holstenius passed into the library of the Vatican in 1734 (see Dudik, *Iter Romanum,* part 1 [Vienna, 1855, page 169]). The next edition was published by Francis Bianchini (Romans 1718, folio), and this served as a basis for Muratori's, contained in the 3d volume of his *Scriptores rearum Italicarulm* (1723); Bianchini's work was continued by his nephew, Joseph

Bianchini (volumes 2-4, Romans 1735; there was to have been a 5th volume, but it never appeared). There also appeared at Rome an edition by John and Peter Joseph Vignoli (1724, 1752, 1755, 3 volumes, 4to). Risstell recently undertook another for the *Monumenta Germaniae,* while Giesebrecht announced for the same work a continuation of the *Libel Pontificalis* (see Giesebrecht, *Ueber die Quellen d. früheren Papstgesch.,* art. ii in the *Kieler Allgem. Monatsschrift f. Wissenschajft u. Literatur,* April 1852, pages 257-274).

The investigations made on this subject permit us to distinguish three continuations of the *Liber Pontificalis.*

1. From an unknown source have been composed three histories of the popes:

(a) one is contained in the Vatican Codex 3764, extending from Laudo (912) to Gregory VII, and belonging to the end of the 11th century. It is reproduced in the first volume of Vignoli's edition of the *Liber Pontificalis.*

(b) The second, in the codex of the library of Este, 6:5, and extending as far down, was written during Gregory's lifetime.

(c) The third, dating from the time of Paschal II, in the early part of the 12th century (in the library of *Maria sopra Minerva* at Rome).

2. Another continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis,* composed in the 12th century, extends from Gregory VII to Honorius II (1124-1129). Onuphrius Panvini and Baronius name as its author either the subdeacon Pandulph of Pisa or a Roman librarian named Peter Constant. Gaetani published in 1638 a biography of Gelasius II alone, and asserted that the continuation of the *Liber Pontifticis* down to Innocent III was due to cardinal Pandulph Masca of Pisa, and was written in the time of Innocent III. But Papebroch brings forth very plausible arguments to prove that the subdeacon Peter of Pisa wrote only the biography of Paschal II, and that the subsequent ones are due to the subdeacon Peter of Alatri, still Muratori, in the 3d volume of the *Scriptores,* gives this collection of biographies under the name of Pandulph of Pisa, and the question of authorship has not been further inquired into since. Giesebrecht (page 262 sq.) maintains that the Codex Vaticanus 3762, of the 12th century, is the original from which all the other IMSS. were copied (also the codex No. 2017, of the 14th century, in the Barberini Library at Rome; comp. Vignoli, *Liber Pontisf* volume 3; Pertz, *Archiv.*

page 54), and also that the author of the life of Paschal I was the cardinal-deacon Peter. The life of Gelasiuts II and that of Calixtus II were written by Pandulph after 1130, as is shown by his own statement (Muratori, 3:389, 419). The similarity of style shows that he wrote also the life of Ionorius II. But it is highly probable that Pandulph is the same person afterwards designated as the cardinal-deacon of the church of St.Cosmas and Damianus, a nephew of Hugo of Alatri, cardinal-priest and for a long time governor of Benevento. Peter and Pandulph were partisans of Anacletus II, and were afterwards declared schismatics by the adherents of Innocent II; this put an end to their work.

3. Another continuation originated at the close of the 12th century. Baronius designates it as the *Acta Vaticana,* but Muratori published it under the name of the cardinal of Aragon. Nicolas Roselli (a Dominican, made cardinal in 1351, t in 1362) caused a collection of old historical documents to be prepared, which contained the lives of the popes from Leo IX to Alexander III (omitting Victor III and Urban II), and also the biography of Gregory IX. Pertz *(Archiv.* page 97) says that these biographies are borrowed from the *Liber censzuum camereas apostolicae* of Cencius Camerarius, who in 1216 became pope under the name of Honorius III. But these also are not the work of Cencius himself, but of some anterior writer. The life of Adrian IV was written by his relative, cardinal Boso, from materials furnished by himself, during the reign of Alexander III. The life of Alexander III was written at the same time, and most likely also by Boso, who probably wrote most of the whole collection. The introduction is taken from Bonizo's collection of canons, the biographies of John XII, and from Leo IX down to Gregory VII are adapted from the *ad Ameicum* of the same writer; subsequent ones down to Eugenius III are based on the records, but after that they become more complete, resting on Boso's own experience, as he then lived at Rome. For subsequent biographies the sources are much more numerous. We might also mention, as a compendium of the whole, the *Actus Pontificum Romanorum* of the Augustinian monk Amaricus Angerii, written in 1365, and extending from St. Peter to John XII (1321), which is to be found in Eccard, *Corpus hist. medii cevi,* 2:1641 sq., and in Muratori, volume 3, part 2: — Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 8:367 sq. See Baxmann, *Politik der Papste* (Elberfeld, 1868), vol. i (see Index); Watterich, *Vitae Romanorum Pontificum* (Lpz. 1862); Piper, *Einleit. in die monumentale Theologie* (Gotha, 1867); De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea* (1857).

Liber Sextus And Septimus

SEE CANONS AND DECRETALS, COLLECTIONS OF.

Lib'ertine

(Λιβερτῖνος, for the Latin *libertinus*, a *freed-man)* occurs but once in the N.T., "Certain of the synagogue, which is called (the synagogue) of the *Libertaies*, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians," etc. (Acts 6:9). There has been much diversity in the interpretation of this word. The structure of the passage leaves it doubtful how many synagogues are implied in it. Some (Calvin, Beza, Bengel) have taken it as if there were but one synagogue, including men from all the different cities that are named. Winer *(N.T. Gramm.* page 179), on grammatical grounds, takes the repetition of the article as indicating a fresh group, and finds accordingly two synagogues, one including Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians; the other those of Cilicia and Asia. Meyer *(Comment.* ad loc.) thinks it unlikely that out of 480 synagogues at Jerusalem (the number given by rabbinic writers, *Megill.* 73:4; *Ketub.* 105:1) there should have been one, or even two only, for natives of cities and districts in which the Jewish population was so numerous (in Cyrene one fourth, in Alexandria two fifths of the whole [Josephus, *Ant.* 14:7, 2; 14:10, 1; 19:5, 2; *War,* 2:13, 7; *Ap.* 2:4]), and on that ground assigns a separate synagogue to each of the proper names. Of the name itself there have been several explanations.

1. The other names being local, this also has been referred to a town called *Libertum,* in the proconsular province of Africa. This, it is said, would explain the close juxtaposition with Cyrene. Suidas recognizes Λιβερτῖνοι as ὄνομα ἔθνους, and in the Council of Carthage in 411 (Mansi, 4:265-274, quoted in Wiltsch, *Handbuch der Kirchlich. Geogr. §* 96) we find an *Episcopus Libertinemsis* (Simon. *Onornasticon N. Test.* page 99). Against this-hypothesis it has been urged (1) that the existence of a *town* Libertum, in the 1st century, is not established; and (2) that if it existed, it can hardly have been important enough either to have a synagogue at Jerusalem for the Jews belonging to it, or to take precedence of Cyrene and Alexandria in a synagogue common to the three.

2. Conjectural readings have been proposed, especially *Libyans,* either in the form Λιβοστίνων ((Ecumen., Beza, Clericus,Valckenaer), or Λιβύων (Schultness, *De Char. Sp.* S. page 162, in Meyer, ad loc.); inasmuch as Libertini here occurs among the names of nations, and Josephus *(Ant.* 12:1,

and *Apion.* 2:4) has told us that many Jews were removed by Ptolemy, and placed in the cities of Libya. The difficulty is thus removed, but every rule of textual criticism is against the reception of a reading unsupported by a single MS. or version.

3. Taking the word in its received meaning as = *freedmen,* Lightfoot finds in it a description of natives of Palestine, who, having fallen into slavery, had been manumitted by Jewish masters *(Exc. on* <4400>*Acts 6:9).* In this case, however, it is hardly likely that a body of men so circumstanced would have received a Roman name.

4. Grotius and Vitringa explain the word as describing Italian freedmen who had become converts to Judaism. In this case, however, the word "proselytes" would most probably have been used; and it is at least unlikely that a body of converts would have had a synagogue to themselves, or that proselytes from Italy would have been united with Jews from Cyrene and Alexandria.

5. The earliest explanation of the word (Chrysostom) is also that which has been adopted by the most recent authorities. The *Libertini* are Jews who, having been taken prisoners by Pompey and other Roman generals in the Syrian wars, had been reduced to slavery, and had afterwards been emancipated, and returned, permanently or for a time, to the country of their fathers. Of the existence of a large body of Jews in this position at Rome we have abundant evidence. Under Tiberius, the *Senatus-Consultum* for the suppression of Egyptian and Jewish mysteries led to the banishment of 4000 "libertini generis" to Sardinia, under the pretense of military or police duty, but really in the hope that the malaria of the island might be fatal to them. Others were to leave Italy unless they abandoned their religion (Tacitus, Anal. 2:85; comp. Sueton. *Tiber.* c. 36). Josephus *(Ant.* 18:3, 5), narrating the same fact, speaks of the 4000 who were sent to Sardinia as Jews, and thus identifies them with the "libertinum genus" of Tacitus. Philo *(Legat. ad Caiunm,* page 1014, C) in like manner says that the greater part of the Jews of Rome were in the position of freedmen (ἀπελευθερωθέντες), and had been allowed by Augustus to settle in the Trans-Tiberine part of the city, and to follow their own religious customs unmolested (comp. Horace, *Sat.* 1:4, 143; 1:9, 70). The expulsion from Rome took place A.D. 19; and it is an ingenious conjecture of Mr. Humphreys *(Comm. on Acts,* ad loc.) that those who were thus banished from Italy may have found their way to Jerusalem, and that, as having

suffered for the sake of their religion, they were likely to be foremost in the opposition to a teacher like Stephen, whom they looked on as impugning the sacredness of all that they most revered. The synagogue in question had doubtless been built at the expense of these manumitted Jews, and was occupied by them. Libertini is thus to be regarded as a word of Roman origin, and to be explained with reference to Roman customs. Among the Romans this term was employed to denote those who had once been slaves, but had been set at liberty, or the children of such persons (see Adam's *Romans Ant.* pages 34, 41 sq.; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Ingenui, Libertus). This view is further confirmed by the fact that the word συναγωγῆς does not occur in the middle of the national names, but stands first, and is followed by τῆς λεγομένης, whence it clearly appears that Λιβερτῖνοι is at least not the name of a country or region. On this subject, see further in Bloomfield, Kuinll, Wetstein, etc., on Acts 6:9; and comp. D. Gerdes, *De Synog. Libertinoraum* (Gron. 1736); J.F. Scherer, *De Synag. Libertin.* (Argent. 1754); Briam, *De Libertinis* (Hafn. 1698); Cademann, *De schola Libertinorum* (Lips. 1704); Lösner, *Obs. in N. Test.* page 180; Deyling, *Observ.* 2:437 sq.; K. Döring, *Ep. qua synagogam Libert. scholamn Latinamz fuisse conjicit* (Laube, 1755). *SEE DISPERSED*; *SEE SLAVERY*.

Libertines

THE, or as they called themselves, *Spiritualists*, were a Pantheistic and Antinomian sect of the Reformation days. They appeared first in the Netherlands as an ultra division of the "Brethren of the Free Spirit." They spread into France, and, by the interest they manifested in political affairs, gained considerable influence also in Switzerland, especially in Geneva. The impulse given to thought by the Reformation gave rise also to many errors, which flourished by the side of evangelical truth. "Lofty as our ideas of the Reformation should be, we must not be blind to the fact that.... Protestantism [referring especially to the Continent] bears sad evidence of early mismanagement" (Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, page 37). Foremost among the heretics of this period were the Brethren of the Free Spirit, who, although hotly persecuted, had never been entirely exterminated, and who were yet numerous in Germany and the Netherlands. They now suddenly emerged from the secrecy in which they had lately hidden themselves, as soon as the power of the Church began to wane. Luther clearly saw, however, that not to Romanism, but to Protestantism as well, the influence of the Libertines must be baneful, and he took an early

opportunity to warn the Christians of those countries against them (Gieseler, *Kirchenlesch.* 3 [1], 557). Calvin also had to contend against the influence of these Rationalists, and, in speaking of them, mentions a certain Coppin, of Lille, as the first who attempted to introduce, as early as 1529, the doctrines of the Free Spirit in his native city. This Coppin was soon eclipsed by his disciple Quintin, of Hennegaui, who, with his companions Bertrand, became the leader of the sect in France in 1534, and with whom a priest called Plocquet (Pocques) connected himself. These two, for Bertrand soon died, are represented as uneducated but shrewd men, who made religion a means of securing earthly goods, and who were very successful in the attempt. They openly professed to have found the principle of "moral falsehood" (or mental reservation) inculcated in the Scriptures, and, in consequence, thought it but right to profess Roman Catholicism when among Roman Catholics, and Protestantism when with Protestants. They are said to have made 4000 proselytes in France alole. They did not, moreover, confine their attempts at deceit to the lower classes, but, on the contrary, endeavored to gain proselytes among the learned and in the higher walks of society; they succeeded even in gaining the ear of the queen Margaret of Navarre, sister of Francis I, who received them, as also a certain Lefevre d'Etaples and others, at her court, and daily consulted with them. They made great use of allegory, figures of speech, etc., taking their authority from the precept, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

We have said above that the system of the Libertines was pantheistic; it was, in fact, pure pantheism. They held that there is one universal spirit, which is foundi in every creature, and is the Spirit of God. This one spirit and God is distinguished from itself according as it is considered in heaven or on earth. "Deum a se ipso diversum esse, quod alius omnino in hoc mundo sit quam in coelo" (Calvin, *Instr . adv. Libert.* 100:11). All creatures, angels, etc., are nothing in themselves, and have no real existence aside from God. Man is preserved only by the Spirit of God, which is in him, and exists only luntil that spirit again departs from him; instead of a soul, it is God himself who dwells in man, and all his actions, all that takes place in the world, is direct from him, is the immediate work of God ("Quiduid in mundo lit, opus ipsius [Dei] directo censendum esse," c. 13). Everything else, the world. the flesh, the devil, souls, etc., are by this system considered as illusions, mere suppositions *(opinatio).* Even sin is not a mere negation of right, but, since God is the active agent of all

actions, it can be but an illusion also, and will disappear as soon as this principle is recognized ("Peccatum — non solum aiunt boni privationem esse, sed est illis opinatio, quae evanescit et aboletur, cum nulla habetur ejus ratio," c. 12. Pocquet says, in regard to that, “Et quia omnia quae fiunt extra Deum, nihil sunt quam vanitas," c. 23). There is, therefore, but one evil, and that evil is this very illusion, this imagination of evil, of a distinction between it and the right. Thus the original fall or sin was nothing else than a separation of man from God, or rather the result of man's desire to be something by himself, separating himself from sunion and identity with God. Thus unintentionally man subjected himself to the world and to Satan, and became himself an illusion, a smoke which passes away and leaves nothing behind. So Pocquet says. "Ideo scriptuim est (?), 'Qui videt peccatum, peccatum ei manet et veritas in ipso non est'" (in Calvin, c. 23). From the Libertine point of view the nature of Christ did not materially differ from ours; he consisted, like other human beings, in divine spirit, such as dwells in us all, and in the sacrifice only the illusionary, or worldly part, was lost. However considered the whole history of Christ, and especially his crucifixion, death, and resurrection, had for them but a symbolical significance; his passion, etc., was, according to Calvin's strong expression, only "une farce on moralite jouee pour nous figurer le mystere de notre salut" — only a type of the idea that sin was effaced and atoned for, while in reality, and in God's view, it was of no account in itself ("Chr. solum velut typus fuit, in quo contemplamur ea, quae ad salutem nostram requirit scriptura; e.g. cum aiunt, Christum abolevisse peccatum, sensus eorum est, Christum abolitioneem illam in persona sua representasse," c. 17). But in so far as we are one in spirit with Christ, all that he underwent is as if we had undergone it; his exclamation, "It is finished," is true as well for us as for himself; sin has lost all significance so far as we are concerned, and the fight against sin, repentance, mortification of the flesh, etc., are no longer necessary. Neither can nor should the spirituialist be any longer subject to suffering, since Christ has suffered all. Here the idea and the reality, however, are in conflict ("Nam scriptum est: Factus sum totus homo. Cum factus sit totus homo *[tout homme*, in a twofold sense], accipiens naturam humanam, ac mortuus sit, potestne adhuc in his inferioribus locis mori? Magni esset erroris hoc credere," etc., *ibidem*, c. 23). Of course man should be born anew, but this new birth is secured when he regains the state of innocence of Adam before the fall; when in absolute filial unity with God, he neither sees nor knows sin, or, in other words, when he is no longer able to distinguish it from righteousness

(modo ne amplius opinemur), and when able to follow the dictates of God's Spirit by virtue of natural impulse ("Sed si adhuc committamus delictum et ingrediamur hortum voluptatis, qui adhuc nobis prohibitus est, ne quid velimus facere, sed sinamus nos duci a vohulttate Dei. Alioqui non essemus exuti veteri serpente, qui est primus parens noster Adam, et videremus peccatum, sicut ipse et uxor ejus, etc. Nunc vivificati sumus cum sectundo Adamo; qui est Christus, non cernendo amplius peccatum, quia est mortuum," etc. *ibidem;* compare c. 18). Such a twice-born one is Christ, is God himself, to whom the Libertine returns after death, to be absorbed in him ("Hoc enim imaginantur, animam hominis, quae est Deus, ad seipsam redire, cum ad mortem ventum est, non ut tanquam anima humana, sed tanquam Deus ipse vivat, sicuti ab initio," c. 3 and 22).

The consequences of such principles are obviolus: they lead naturally to sensuality, to the emacipation of to flesh and the laying aside of all restrictions; make men look upon propriety or ownership as a wrong, as opposed to the principles of love, and, in fact, a theft, though this principle was not carried into practice. Calvin called its principal advocates "doctores *passivae* caritatis." Ordilnary or legal marriage comes to be looked upon as a mere carnal bond, and therefore dissoluble; true marriage, such as satisfies both body and mind, being a union of each to each; communion of saints extended not merely to the worldly possessions, but also to the very bodies of the saints. In short, spiritualism soon degenerated into open and avowed sensualism and materialism. But this is the very feature which gave it its influence with some classes in Geneva. The example of their bishops and of the cathedral canons had excited their imagination by inclining them to self-indulgence and licentiousness, and political circumstances operated in favor of the same result. Soon, however, the real principles of the Libertines appeared in their full light, and created a reaction, some women having gone so far as to quote Scripture to authorize their excesses, insisting especially on the fact of God's first command to our first parents having been "to increase and multiply" ("Crescite et multiplicamini super terram. En prima lex, quam ordinavit Deus, qua vocabatur lex nature," c. 23). *SEE COMMUNISM*; "Free Love" in the article MARRIAGE *SEE MARRIAGE* . As Calvin had favored political libertinism, those who considered themselves aggrieved by the practice of the spiritualists turned also against him, and this politico-religious reaction went as far as irreligion and atheism, as in the case of Jacob Gruet, whose ultraradical principles in politics and rationalism in

religion led to his trial before the courts of Geneva July 27, 1547. Yet no one really did more to counteract the principles of the Libertines than did Calvin himself. First, in 1544, he brought all their secret principles to light in one of his works (see *Instit.* 3:3, § 14). Afterwards, in 1547, he warned the faithful of Rhouen against an ex-Franciscan monk who was inculcating libertine doctrines, and who met with some success, especially among women of the higher classes. Under Calvin's influence Farel also took up the pen against the Libertines *(Le glaive de la parole veritable, tire contre le bouclier de defense, duquel un cordelier s'est voulu servir pour approuver ses fausses et damnables opinions* [Geneva, 1550; see Kirchhofer, *Theol. Studien und Krit.* 1831]). The queen of Navarre was highly offended at Calvin for denouncing the leaders of the Libertines who were then at her court; he therefore wrote to her a letter which is a remarkable specimen of respectful remonstrance (August 28, 1545; in French, see J. Bonnet, *Lettres de J. Calvin,* 1:111 sq.; Latin, *Epist. et Resp.* ed. Amst. page 33). It is, in fact, due to his efforts that this sect, this baneful curse, left France to take refuge in its native country, Belgium, and that it finally disappeared altogether. Against the Libertines of Geneva the attacks were for a long time unavailing; they cannot be considered to have been successfully ended until after the insurrection of May 15, 1555, when the principal leaders were either exiled or imprisoned. See Calvin, *Aux ministres de l'eglise de Neufchatel contre la secte fanatique et furieuse des Libertins qui se nomment Spirituels* (Genesis 1544, 8vo; 1545, and other editions); *Contre un Franciscain, sectateur des erreurs des Libertins, adresse a l'eglise de Rouen* (20 Aout, 1547 [both these have been published together in 1547, in the *Opluscules,* page 817 sq., and by P. Jacob, page 293 sq.; Lat. by Des Gallars, in *Opusc. onmn.* Genesis 1552; *Opp.* ed. Amst. 8:374 sq.]); *Picot, Hist. de Geneve;* Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* 3:1, page 385; Hundeshagen, in the *Theol. Stude. ud Krit.* (1845); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:374-380. (J.H.W.)

Liberty

"The idea of liberty," says Locke, "is the idea of a power in any agent to do or forbear any particular action, according to the determination or thought of the mind, whereby either of them is preferred to the other. When either of them is not in the power of the agent, to be produced by him according to his volition, then he is not at liberty, but under necessity." From this, and the extract which follows, it will be seen that Locke's ideas of *liberty* and *of power* are very nearly the same. "Every one," he observes, "finds in

himself a power to begin or forbear, continue or put an end to, several actions in himself. From the consideration of the extent of this power of the mind over the actions of the man, which every one finds in himself, arise the ideas of liberty and necessity." These definitions, however, merely extend to the ability of the individual to execute his own purposes without obstruction; whereas Locke, in order to do justice to his own decided opinion on the subject, ought to have included also in his idea of liberty a power over the determinations of the will. "By the liberty of a moral agent," says Dr. Reid, "I understand a power over the determinations of his own will. If, in any action, he had power to will what he did, or not to will it, in that action he is free. But if, in every voluntary action, the determination of his will be the necessary consequence of something involuntary in the state of his mind, or of something in his external circumstances, he is not free; he has not what I call the *liberty* of a moral agent, but is subject to necessity." On the other hand, some affirm that necessity is perfectly consistent with human liberty; that, is, that the most strict and inviolable connection of cause and effect does not prevent the full, free, and unrestrained development of certain powers in the agent, or take away the distinction between the nature of virtue and vice, praise and blame, reward and punishment, but is the foundation of all moral reasoning. "I conceive," says Hobbes, " that nothing taketh beginning from itself, but from the action of some other immediate agent without itself; and that therefore, when first a man hath an appetite or will to do something to which immediately before he had no appetite nor will, the cause of his will is not the will itself, but something else not in his own disposing; so that whereas it is out of controversy that of voluntary action the will is the necessary cause, and by this which is said the will is also caused by other things whereof it disposeth not. it followeth that voluntary actions have all of them necessary causes, and therefore are necessitated. I hold that to be a sufficient cause to which nothing is wanting that is needful to the producing of the effect. The same is also a necessary cause. For if it be possible that a sufficient cause shall not bring forth the effect, then there wanteth somewhat which was needful to the producing of it, and so the cause was not sufficient; but if it be impossible that a sufficient cause should not produce the effect, then is a sufficient cause a necessary cause (for that is said to produce an effect necessarily that cannot but produce it). Hence it is manifest that whatsoever is produced a hath had a sufficient cause to produce it, or else it had not been, and therefore also voluntary actions are necessitated." "I conceive liberty," he observes, "to be rightly

defined in this manner: Liberty is the absence of all impediments to action that are not contained in the nature and intrinsical quality of the agent: as, for example, the water is said to descend freely, or to have liberty to descend by the channel of the river, because there is no impediment that way, but not across, because the banks are impediments; and, though the water cannot ascend, yet men never say it wants the liberty to ascend, but the faculty or power, because the impediment is in the nature of the water, and intrinsical. So also we say, he that is tied wants the liberty to go, because the impediment is not in him, but in his bands; whereas we say not so of him that is sick or lame, because the impediment is in himself. I hold that the ordinary definition of a free agent — namely, that a free agent is that which, when all things are present that are needful to produce the effect, can nevertheless not produce it implies a contradiction, and is nonsense; being as much as to say the cause may be sufficient, that is to say, necessary, and yet the effect shall not follow." He afterwards defines a moral agent to be one that acts from deliberation, choice, or will, not from indifference; and, speaking of the supposed inconsistency between choice and necessity, he adds: "Commonly, when we see and know the strength that moves us, we acknowledge necessity; but when we do not, or mark not the force that moves us, we then think there is none, and thus conclude that it is not cause, but liberty, that produceth the action. Hence it is that we are apt to think that one doth not choose this or that who of necessity chooses it; but we might as well say fire doth not burn because it burns of necessity." The general question is thus stated by Hobbes in the beginning of his treatise: the point is not, he says, "whether a man can be a free agent; that is to say, whether he can write or forbear, speak or be silent, according to his will, but whether the will to write or the will to forbear come upon him according to his will, or according to anything else in his power. I acknowledge this liberty, that I can do if I will; but to say I can will if I will, I take to be an absurd speech. In fine, that freedom which men commonly find in books, that which the poets chant in the theaters and the shepherds on the mountains, that which the pastors teach in the pulpits and the doctors in the universities, and that which the common people in the markets, and all mankind in the whole world, do assent unto, is the same that I assent unto, namely, that a man hath freedom to do if he will; but whether he hath freedom to will is a question neither the bishop nor they ever thought on." Thus it will readily be perceived that Hobbes entirely denies the main point at issue, namely, the *freedom of the will* itself, and confines the subject — as his definition — purely to *liberty of action.* This

latter is simply a *physical* question, and applies to all agents, whether human, animal, or even material; that liberty which concerns, and indeed constitutes, a being as a *moral* agent, is quite a different thing. - Hobbes as a materialist, and therefore a necessitarian, of course finds no room for this kind of moral or self-determining power.

It is unquestionable that the source of most of the confusion on the subject is in the ambiguity lurking under the term *necessity,* which includes both kinds of necessity, moral and physical. The double meaning of the word has been the chief reason why persons who were guided more by their own feelings and the customary associations of language than by formal definitions have altogether rejected the doctrine, while persons of a more logical turn, who could not deny the truth of the abstract principle, have yet, in their explanation of it and inference from it, fallen into the same error as their opponents. The partisans of necessity have given up their common sense, as they supposed, to their reason, while the advocates of liberty rejected a demonstrable truth from a dread of its consequences, and both have been the dupes of a word. The obnoxiousness of the name unquestionably has been the cause of nearly all the difficulty and repugnance which many who really hold the doctrine find in admitting it. It was to remove this prejudice that Dr. Jonathan Edwards was induced to write his celebrated treatise on the Will. In a letter written expressly to vindicate himself from the charge of having, in his great work, confounded moral with physical necessity, he says: "On the contrary, I have largely declared that the connection between antecedent things and consequent ones, which take place with regard to the acts of men's wills, which is called moral necessity, is called by the name of necessity improperly, and that all such terms as *must cannot, impossible, unable, irresistible, unavoidable, invisible,* etc., when applied here, are not employed in their proper signification, and are either used nonsensically and with perfect insignificance, or in a sense quite diverse from their original and proper meaning and their use in common speech, and that such a necessity as attends the acts of men's wills is more properly called *certainty* than *necessity."* The well-known definition of Edwards on this subject is in the following words; " The plain and obvious meaning of the words *freedom* and *liberty,* in common speech, is *power, opportunity,* or *advantage that any one has to do as he pleases,* or, in other words, his being free from hinderance, or impediment in the way of doing or conducting in any respect as he wills. I say not only doing, but conducting, because a

voluntary forbearing to do, sitting still, keeping silence, etc., are instances of persons' conduct about which liberty is exercised, though they are not so properly called doing. And the contrary to liberty, whatever name we call that by, is a person's being hindered or unable to conduct as he will, or being necessitated to do otherwise." The radical defect in this definition as to the question in hand is that liberty, as thus defined, relates solely to *action* (or non-action, as the case may be), and not to the will at all. Thus, by a singular method of *petitio principii,* the very possibility of all freedom of will is excluded. The real point at issue is but casually named, and arbitrarily dismissed as a contradiction. That point is not whether a man may act as he wills (this, again, is mere physical liberty), but whether the will has a self-determining power; whether, in other words, a man may *will* in opposition to external influences, usually called motives. This question the universal experience of mankind has determined in the affirmative. On these two grounds, 1, the essential fallacy as to the point in dispute, and, 2, the unanimous testimony of consciousness as to the spontaneity of volition, the fundamental position of Edwards has been so successfully attacked, as, for instance (to name only Calvinistic writers), by Tapspan and Bledsoe, that it may now be regarded as failing to meet the present theological status of the question. *SEE WILL*.

True liberty evidently consists simply in *freedom from external constraint.* That Gods is free in this sense, at least in his acts, all must admit, inasmuch as there is no conceivable power that could coerce him. It is likewise obvious that he is equally free in his volitions, unless we suppose a system of arbitrary *laws* or absolute line *of policy* which shuts him up to a certain line of conduct. So far as these may be the resultant. or expression of his own nature, they might perhaps be admitted without essentially impairing our notions of his freedom. So, again, of man; if the motives, by which alone, if at all, it is claimed that his volitions are governed, are self-originated, or derive their governing weight from the influence which his own mind imparts to them, he may still be said to be free in at least the strict sense of the definition. If, however, these preponderating elements consist in his own *desires,* and if, further, these desires are beyond his own control (whether by reason of natural predisposition, inveterate habit, or the divine or satanic interposition), then it must still remain dubious if his liberty amounts to the measure of a, rational, moral, and accountable agent. In the humans sphere this is precisely the point of difficulty, but its determination as a matter of fact, if indeed possible, belongs properly under

another head. *SEE MOTIVE*. In, the divine sphere, on the other hand, the difficulty arisesfrom the so-called system of fore-ordination, which is tenaciously held by Calvinistic divines, being either assumed as a metaphysical dogma, or inferred from certain scriptural statements, and as strenuously denied by others. *SEE PREDESTINATION*.

The ground assumed on this vexed question by Sir William Hamilton and Mansell is that liberty and necessity are both incomprehensible, both being beyond. the limits of legitimate thought; that they are among those questions which admit of no certain answer, the very inability to answer them proving that dogmaticdecisions on either side are the decisions of ignorance, not of knowledge. "How the will can possibly be free," says Hamilton, "must remain to us, under the present limitation of our faculties, wholly incomprehensible. We are unable to conceive an absolute commencement; we cannot, therefore, conceive a free volition. A determination by motives cannot, to our understanding, escape from necessitation — nay, were we even to admit as true what we cannot think as possible, still the doctrine of a motiveless volition would be only casualistic, and the free acts of an indifferent are morally and rationally as worthless as the fore-ordained passions of a determined will. *How,* therefore, I repeat, moral liberty is possible in man or God we are utterly unable speculatively to understand. But practically *the fact* that we are free is given to us in the consciousness of our moral accountability; and this fact of liberty cannot be reargued on the ground that it is incomprehensible, for the philosophy of the conditions proves, against the necessitarian, that things there are which *may,* nay, *must* be true, of which the understanding is wholly unable to construe to itself the possibility. But this philosophy is not only competent to defend the fact of our moral liberty, possible, though inconceivable, against the assault of the fatalist; it retorts against himself the very objection of inconceivability by which the fatalist had thought to triumph over the libertarian. It shows that the scheme of freedom is not more inconceivable than the scheme of necessity; for, whilst fatalism is a recoil from the more obtrusive inconceivability of an absolute commencement, on the fact of which commencement the doctrine of liberty proceeds, the fatalist is shown to overlook the equal but less obtrusive inconceivability of an infinite non-commencement, on the assertion of which non-commencement his own doctrine of necessity must ultimately rest. As equally unthinkable, the two counter, the two one-sided schemes, are thus theoretically balanced." Sir William, however as it seems to us, in

this extract does not closely adhere to the conditions of the problem. According to his own admission, it is not *the fact* of a self-determining power in the will that is "inconceivable," but only the mode (the *how)* of its exercise. This, like many other well-known processes, is a mystery. Again, it is not claimed that the will acts *without motive,* but only that it is not *controlled by* external motive; that it has the power of itself choosing what motive shall be strongest with it, irrespective of the intrinsic force of that motive. It is this distinction that preserves-as no other can-the truly *moral* character of the agent.

"The endless controversy concerning predestination and free-will," says Mansell, "whether viewed in its speculative or in its moral aspect, is but another example of the hardihood of human ignorance. The question has its philosophical as well as its theological aspect: it has no difficulties peculiar to itself; it is but a special form of the fundamental mystery of the co-existence of the infinite and the finite." "The vexed question of liberty and necessity, whose counter arguments become a by-word for endless and unprofitable wrangling, is but one of a large class of problems, some of which meet us at every turn of our daily life and conduct, whenever we attempt to justify in theory that which we are compelled to carry out in practice. Such problems arise inevitably whenever we attempt to pass from the sensible to the intelligible world, from the sphere of action to that of thought, from that which appears to us to that which is in itself. In religion, in morals, in our daily business, in the care of our lives, in the exercise of our senses, the rules which guide our practice cannot be reduced to principles which satisfy our reason." Those theologians, on the other hand, who deny that the divine predestination extends to the individual acts of men in general, think that they thus more effectually obviate the whole difficulty. In the divine foreknowledge of all human actions they admit the *certainty* of their occurrence, but find no *causative* power, such as seems to enter essentially into the predeterminations of an Almighty will. As to the argument that such foreknowledge rests upon, and therefore implies fore-ordination, they contend that this is a reversal of the true order (comp. 4029Romans 8:29), and that God's prescience is a simple knowing beforehand by his peculiar power of intuition, not any conclusion or inference from what he may or may not determine. *SEE PRESCENCE*.

See Hobbes's treatise *Of Liberty and Necessity;* also his *Option about Liberty and Necessity;* also *Questions concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance clearly stated and debated between Dr. Bramhall and Thomas*

Hobbes; Leibnitz's *Essais de Theodicee*, a collection of papers which passed between Mr. Leibnitz and Dr. Clarke; Collins's *Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty;* Clarke's *Remarks upon a Book entitled "A Philosophical Inquiry concerning Human Liberty;"* Edwards's *Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will; Essay on the Genius and Writings of Edwards*, prefixed to the London edition of his works, 1834, by H. Rogers; J. Taylor's introduction to his edition of Edwards *On the Will;* Hartley's *Observations on Man;* Belsham's *Elements of the Philosophy of the Mlind;* Cousin's *Elements of Psychology* (Prof. Henry's translation); Sir William Hamilton's *Philosophy, and Lectures on Metahysics; Mansell's Limits of Religious Thought;* Herbert Spencer's *First Principles;* Stewart's *Philosophy of the Active and Moral Powers of Man;* Tappan's *Review of Ldwards's Inquiry into the Freedoms of the Will;* Mill's *System of Logic;* Jouffroy's *Introduction to Ethics;* Blakey's *History of the Philosophy of Mind;* Hazard, *On the Will;* Bledsoe, On *the Will;* Whedon, *On the Will.* *SEE NECESSITARIANS*

Lib'nah

(Heb. *Libnah'*, הנבל *transparency*, as in Exodus 24:10), the name of two places. *SEE SHIHOR-LIBNATH*.

1. (Sept. Λεβωνᾶ v.r. Λεμωνᾶ.) The twenty-first station of the Israelites in the desert, between Rimmonparez and Rissah (Numbers 33:20, 21); probably identical with LABAN (Deuteronomy 1:1), and perhaps situated near wady *el-Ain*, west of Kadesh-Barnea. *SEE EXODE*.

2. (Sept. Λεβνά, sometimes Λοβνά, occasionally Λοβνάν, and even Λεβονά.) One of the royal cities of the Canaanites (Joshua 12:15), taken and destroyed by Joshua immediately after Makkedah and before Lachish (Joshua 10:29-32, 39). It lay in the plain within the territory assigned to Judah (Joshua 15:42), and became one of the Levitical towns in that tribe, as well as an asylum (Joshua 21:13; 1 Chronicles 6:57). In the reign of king Jehoram, Libnah is said to have revolted from him (2 Kings 8:22; 2 Chronicles 21:10). From the circumstance of this revolt having happened at the same time with that of the Edomites, it has been supposed by some to have reference to another town of the same name situated in that country. But such a conjecture is unnecessary and improbable, for it appears that the Philistines and Arabians revolted at the same time (2 Chronicles 21:16). Libnah of Judah rebelled because it

refused to admit the idolatries of Jehoram; and it is not said in either of the passages in which this act is recorded, as of Edom, that it continued in revolt "unto this day." It may be inferred either that it was speedily reduced to obedience, or that, on the re-establishment of the true worship, it spontaneously returned to its allegiance, for we find it was the native place of the grandfather of two of the last kings of Judah (<12231>2 Kings 23:31; 24:18; <24501>Jeremiah 52:1). It appears to have been a strongly fortified place, for the Assyrian king Sennacherib was detained some time before it when he invaded Judaea in the time of Hezekiah. *SEE HEZEKIAH*. On completing or relinquishing the siege of Lachish — which of the two is not quite certain — Sennacherib laid siege to Libnah (<12908>2 Kings 19:8; <23708>Isaiah 37:8). While there he was joined by Rabshakeh and the part of the army which had visited Jerusalem (<12908>2 Kings 19:8; <23708>Isaiah 37:8), and received the intelligence of Tirhakah's approach; and it would appear that at Libnah the destruction of the Assyrian army took place, though the statements of Herodotus (2:141) and of Josephus *(Ant.* 10:1, 4) place it at Pelusium (see Rawlinson, Herod. 1:480). Libnah was the native place of Hamutal or Hamital, the Queen of Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz (<12231>2 Kings 23:31) and Zedekiah (24:18; <24501>Jeremiah 52:1). It is in this connection that its name appears for the last time in the Bible. It existed as a village in the time of Eusebius and Jerome, and is placed by them in the district of Eleutheropolis *(Onomast.* s.v. Λοβανά*;* compare Josephus, *Ant.* 10:5, 2). Dr. Robinson was unable to discover the least trace of its site *(Bib. Res.* 2:389). Stanley inclines to find the site at *Tell es-Safieh (Sinai and Pal.* pages 207, 258); but this is probably Gath. Van de Velde suggests *Arak el-Mensahiyeh,* a hill about four miles west of Beit-jebrsin *(Memoir,* page 330), which seems to answer to the requirements of location. It stood near Lachish, west of Makkedah, and probably also west of Eleutheropolis (Keil, *Comment. on <06102>Joshua 10:*29), and was situated in the district immediately west of the hill region, in the vicinity of Ether, Ashan, etc. (<06542>Joshua 15:42).

Libnath

SEE SHIHOR-LIBNATH.

Libneh

SEE POPLAR.

Lib'ni

(Heb. *Libni'*, ynbel , *white;* Sept. Λοβενεί, Λοβενί), the first-named of the two sons of Gershon, the son of Levi (<02006>Exodus 6:17; <04003>Numbers 3:18, 21; <13006>1 Chronicles 6:17; comp. <04006>Numbers 26:58); elsewhere called LAADAN (<13207>1 Chronicles 23:7; 26:21). B.C. post. 1856. His son is called Jahath (<13020>1 Chronicles 6:20, 43), and his descendants were named LIBNITES (<04002>Numbers 3:21; 26:58). In <13029>1 Chronicles 6:29, by some error he is called the son of Mahli and the father of Shimei.

Lib'nite

(Heb. *Libni'*, ynbel ,being a patronymic of the same form from *Libni;* Sept. Λοβενί), a descendant of Libni the Levite (<04002>Numbers 3:21; 26:58).

Liborius

ST., fourth bishop of Manes, a disciple of St. Pavacius, flourished from the middle to the close of the 4th century. The existing documents on his life are quite untrustworthy, and relate only that he was a pious man, performed sundry miracles, and that he was a fast friend of St. Martin of Tours. See the Bollandists for July 23; Tillemont, *Memoires*, 10:307; Mabillon, *De Pontif. Cenomasnnensibus.* His body was transferred in the 9th century from Mans to Paderborn by order of Biso, bishop of the latter place. See Pertz, *Script.* 4 (6), 149 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 7:380.

Libra

(pound), the name sometimes given to the seventy suffragans of the bishop of Rome, from the circumstance that there were seventy solidi or parts in the Roman libra.

Libraries

In the early Church, as soon as churches began to be erected, it was customary to attach libraries to them. In these were included not only the liturgical and other Church books, and MS. copies of the holy Scriptures in the original languages, but also homilies and other theological works. That they were of some importance is evident from the manner in which they are referred to by Eusebius and Jerome, who mention having made use of the libraries at Jerusalem and Caesarea. Eusebius says he found the principal part of the materials for his Ecclesiastical History in the library at

Jerusalem. One of the most famous was that attached to the church of St. Sophia, which is supposed to have been commenced by Constantine, but was afterwards greatly augmented by Theodosius the Younger, in whose time there were not fewer than one hundred thousand books in it, and a hundred and twenty thousand in the time of Basilicus and Zeno. No doubt a particular reason for thus collecting hooks was their great expense and rarity before the art of printing enabled men to possess themselves the works they needed for thorough research. In churches where the itinerant system prevailed libraries possessed by churches would even in our very day prove a source of pleasure, and timesaving as well. Indeed, in some of the larger cities here and there, cogregations are already advocating this plan.

Libri Carolini

SEE CAROLINE BOOKS.

Lib'ya

(Λιβύα or Λιβύη), a name which, in its largest acceptation, was used by the Greeks to denote the whole of Africa (Strabo, 2:131); but *Libya Proper*, which is the Libya of the New Testament (<44210>Acts 2:10), and the country of the *Lubim* in the Old, was a large tract lying along the Mediterranean, to the west of Egypt (Strabo, 17:824). It is called *Pentapolittana Regio* by Pliny *(Hist. Nat.* 5:5), from its five cities, Berenice, Arsinoe, Ptolemais, Apollonia, and Cyrene; and *Libya Cyrenaica* by Ptolemy *(Geog.* 4:5), from Cyrene, its capital. See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr*. s.v. The name of Libya occurs in <44210>Acts 2:10, where " the dwellers in the parts of Libya about Cyrene" are mentioned among the stranger Jews who came up to Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost. This obviously means the Cyrenaica. Similar expressions are used by Dion Cassius **(**Λιβύη ἡ περὶ Κυρήνην, *53:*12) and Josephus (ἡ πρὸς Κυρήνην Λιβύη, *Ant.* 16:6, 1). *SEE CYRENE*. In the Old Test. it is the rendering sometimes adopted of fWP (<24609>Jeremiah 46:9; <26305>Ezekiel 30:5; 38:5), elsewhere rendered PHUT (<01006>Genesis 10:6, <26710>Ezekiel 27:10).

Libya is supposed to have been first peopled by, and to have derived its name from, the *Lehabim* or *Lubin* (<01013>Genesis 10:13; <34309>Nahum 3:9; see Gesenius, *Montum. Phan.* page 211; comp. Michaelis, *Spicil.* 1:262 sq.; Vater, *Comment.* 1:132). These its earliest inhabitants, appear, in the time of the Old Testament, to have consisted of wandering tribes, who were

sometimes in alliance with Egypt (compare Herod. 4:159), and at others with the Ethiopians, as they are said to have assisted both Shishak, king of Egypt, and Zerah the Ethiopian in their expeditions against Judea (<14C12>2 Chronicles 12:4: 14:8; 16:9). In the time of Cambyses they appear to have formed part of the Persian empire (Herod. 3:13), and Libyans formed part of the immense army of Xerxes (Herod. 7:71, 86). They are mentioned by Daniel (<27114>Daniel 11:43) in connection with the Ethiopians and Cushites. " They were eventually subdued by the Carthaginians; and it was the policy of that people to bring the nomad tribes of Northern Africa which they mastered into the condition of cultivators, that by the produce of their industry they might be able to raise and maintain the numerous armies with which they made their foreign conquests. But Herodotus assures us that none of the Libyans beyond the Carthaginian territory were tillers of the ground (Herod. 4:186,187; compare Polybius, 1:161,167, 168,177. ed. Schweighaeuser). Since the time of the Carthaginian supremacy, the country, with the rest of the East, has successively passed into the hands of the Greeks, Romans, Saracens, and Turks." *SEE AFRICA*.

Lib'yan

(only in the plur.), the rendering adopted in the A.V. of two Heb. names, µyBalu *(Lubbim',* Sept. Λίβυες), <27114>Daniel 11:43 (elsewhere written µybWl, *"Lubim,"* <14213>2 Chronicles 12:3; 16:8; <34309>Nahum 3:9; prob. i.q. µybh;l] *"Lebabim."* <01003>Genesis 10:13 <13011>1 Chronicles 1:11) and fWP *(Put,* <24609>Jeremiah 46:9; Sept. Λίβυες*;* elsewhere rendered "Libya," <26505>Ezekiel 30:5; 38:5; "Phut," or "Put"). *SEE LIBYA*.

Lice

Picture for Lice

(ˆKe *ken,* perh. from ˆnK; to *nip;* only once in the sing. used collectively, <23106>Isaiah 2:6, and there doubtful, where the Sept., Vulg., and Engl. Vers. confound with ˆKe *so,* and render ταῦτα, *haec,* "in like manner;" elsewhere plural, µyNKe <02616>Exodus 8:16, 17, 18; <19A531>Psalm 105:31: Sept. σκνῖφες, verse 17 σκνίψ, v.r. σκνῖπες*;* Vulg. *sciniphes,* in Psalm *cinifes;* also the cognate sing. collective µNKe *cinnam,* <02817>Exodus 8:17, 18, Sept. and Vulg. σκνῖφες, *sciniphes),* the name of the creature employed in the third plague upon Egypt, miraculously produced from the dust of the land. Its exact

nature has been much disputed. Dr. A. Clarke has inferred, from the words "*in* man and *in* beast," that it was the *acarus sanguisuqus,* or "tick" *(Comment. on* QDBG *Exodus 8:*16). Michaelis remarks *(Suppl. ad Lex.* 1174) that if it be a Hebrew word for *lice* it is strange that it should have disappeared from the cognate tongues, the Aramaic, Samaritan, and Ethiopic. The rendering of the Sept. seems highly valuable when it is considered that it was given by learned Jews resident in Egypt, that it occurs in the most ancient and best executed portion of that version, and that it can be elucidated by the writings of ancient Greek naturalists, etc. Thus Aristotle, who was nearly contemporary with the Sept. translators of Exodus, mentions the κνῖπες (the σκνῖφες of the Sept.) among insects able to distinguish the smell of honey *(Hist. Animnal.* 4:8) and refers to species of birds which he calls σκνιποφάγα, that live by hunting σκνῖπες (8:6). His pupil Theophrastus says, "The κνῖπες are born in certain trees, as the oak, the fig-tree, and they seem to subsist upon the sweet moisture which is collected under the bark. They are also produced on some vegetables" *(Hist. Plant.* 4:17, and 2, ult.). This description applies to *aphides,* or rather to the various species of "gall-flies" *(Cynips,* Linn.). Hesychius, in the beginning of the third century, explains σκνίψ as "a green four-wcinged creature," and quotes Phrynichus as applying the name to a sordid wretch, and adds, "From the little creature among trees, which speedily devours them." Philo (A.D. 40) and Origen, in the second century, who both lived in Egypt, describe it in terms suitable to the gnat or mosquito (Philo, *Vita Mosis,* 1:97, 2, ed. Mangey; Origen, *Homilia tertia introd.),* as does also Augustine in the third or fourth century *(De Convenientia,* etc.). But Theodoret, in the same age, distinguishes between σκνῖπες and κώνωπες *(Vitac Jacobi).* Suidas (A.D. 1100) says σκνίψ, "resembling gnats," and adds, "a little creature that cats wood." These Christian fathers, however, give no authority for their explanations, and Bochart remarks that they seem to be speaking of gnats under the name σκνῖπες, which word, he conjectures, biased them from its resemblance to the Hebrew. Schleusner adds *(Glossema in Octateuch)* σκνῖφες, "less than gnats," and *(Lex. Cyrilli,* MS. Brem.), "very small creatures like gnats." From this concurrence of testimony it would appear that not lice, but some species of gnats, is the proper rendering, though the ancients, no doubt, included other species of insects under the name. Mr. Bryant, however, gives a curious turn to the evidence derived from ancient naturalists. He quotes 'Theophrastus, and admits that a Greek must be the best judge of the meaning of the Greek word, but urges that the Sept. translators

concealed the meaning of the Hebrew word, which he labors to prove is *lice,* for fear of offending the Ptolemies, under whose inspection they translated, and the Egyptians in general, whose detestation of lice was as ancient as the time of Herodotus (2:37) (but who includes "any *other* foul creature"), and whose disgust, he thinks, would have been too much excited by reading that their nation once swarmed with those creatures through the instrumentality of the servants of the God of the Jews *(Plagues of Egypt,* Lond. 1794, page 56, etc.). This suspicion, if admitted, upsets all the previous reasoning. But a plague of lice, upon Bryant's own principles, could not have been more offensive to the Egyptians than the plague on the River Nile, the frogs, etc., which the Sept. translators have not mitigated. Might it not be suggested with equal probability that the Jews in later ages had been led to interpret the word lice as being peculiarly humiliating to the Egyptians (see Josephus, 2:14, 3, who, however, makes the Egyptians to be afflict*ed with phthiriasis).* The rendering of the Vulg. affords us no assistance, being evidently formed from that of the Sept., and not being illustrated by any Roman naturalist, but found only in Christian Latin writers (see Facciolati, s.v.). The other ancient versions, etc., are of no value in this inquiry. They adopt the popular notion of the times, and Bochart's reasonings upon them involve, as Rosenmüller (apud Bochart) justly complains, many unsafe permutations of letters. If, then, the Sept. be discarded, we are deprived of the highest source of information. Bochart's reasoning upon the form of the word *(Hieroz.* 3:518) is unsound, as, indeed, that of all others who have relied upon etymology to furnish a clew to the insect intended. It is strange that it did not occur to Bochart that if the plague had been lice it would have been easily imitated by the magicians, which was attempted by them, but in vain (Exodus 8:18). Nor is the objection valid that if this plague were gnats, etc., the plague of flies would be anticipated, since the latter most likely consisted of one particular species having a different destination, *SEE FLY*, whereas this may have consisted not only of mosquitoes or gnats, but of some other species which also attack domestic cattle, as the *oest rus,* or *tabanus,* or *zimb* (Bruce, *Travels,* 2:315, 8vo), on which supposition these two plagues would be sufficiently distinct. *SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT*. But, since mosquitoes, gnats, etc., have ever been one of the evils of Egypt, there must have been some peculiarity attending them on this occasion which proved the plague to be "the finger of God." From the next chapter, verse 31, it appears that the flax and the barley were smitten by the hail; that the former was beginning to grow, and that the latter was in the ear, which,

according to Shaw, takes place in Egypt in March. Hence the *kinnim* would be sent about February, i.e., before the increase of the Nile, which takes place at the end of May or beginning of June. Since, then, the innumerable swarms of mosquitoes, gnats, etc., which every year affect the Egyptians, come, according to Hasselquist, at the increase of the Nile, the appearance of them in February would be as much a variation of the course of nature as the appearance of the *oestruts* in January would be in England. They were also probably numerous and fierce beyond example on this occasion, and, as the Egyptians would be utterly unprepared for them (for it seems that this plague was not announced), the effects would be signally distressing. Bochart adduces instances in which both mankind and cattle, and even wild beasts, have been driven by gnats from their localities. It may be added that the proper Greek name for the gnat is ἐμπίς, and that probably the word κώνωψ, which much resembles κνίψ, is appropriate to the mosquito. Hardouin observes that the κνῖπες of Aristotle are not the ἐμπίδες, which latter is by Pliny always rendered *culices*, a word which he employs with great latitude. *SEE GNAT*. For a description of the evils inflicted by these insects upon man, see Kirby and Spence, *Introduction to Entymology*, Lond. 1828, 1:115, etc.; and for the annoyance they cause in Egypt, Maillet, *Descript. de l'Egypte* par l'Abbe Mascrier,(Paris, 1755), 90:37; Forskal, *Descr. Animal.* page 85. Michaelis proposed an inquiry into the meaning of the word σκνῖφες to the Societ des Savants, with a full description of the qualities ascribed to them by Philo, Origen, and Augustine *(Recueil*, etc. Amst. 1744). Niebuhr inquired after it of the Greek patriarch, and also of the metropolitan at Cairo, who thought it to be a species of gnat found in great quantities in the gardens there, and whose bite was extremely painful. A merchant who was present at the inquiry called it *dubabel-keb*, or the *dog-fly (Description de l'Arabie*, Pref. pages 39, 40). Besides the references already made, see Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Exod.;* Michaelis, *Suppl. ad Lex. Hebraic.* 1203 sq.; Oedmann, *Verm. Samml. aus der Naturkunde*, 1:6, 74-91; Bakerus, *Annotat. in Et. M.* 2:1090; Harenberg, *Observ. Crit. de Insectis AEgypt. infestantibus*, in *Miscell. Lips. Nov.* 2:4, 617-20; Geddes, *Crit. Rem.* on (0182)Exodus 8:17; Montanus, *Critic. Sac.* on (0182)Exodus 8:12; Kitto, *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:572. *SEE GNAT*.

> "The advocates of the other theory, that *lice* are the animals meant by *kinnim*, and not *gnats*, base their arguments upon these facts:
>
> **(1)** because the *kinnim* sprang from the dust, whereas gnats come

from the waters;

(2) because *gnats,* though they may greatly irritate men and beasts, cannot properly be said to be 'in' them;

(3) because their name is derived from a root (ˆWK) which signifies to 'establish,' or to 'fix,' which cannot be said of *gnats;*

(4) because, if *gnats* are intended, then the fourth plague of flies would be unduly anticipated;

(5) because the Talmudists use the word *kinnlah* in the singular number to mean a *louse;* as it is said *(Shab.* 14:107, b), 'As is the man who slays a camel on the Sabbath, so is he who slays a *louse* on the Sabbath'" (Smith).

"The entomologists, Kirby and Spence, place these minute but disgusting insects in the very front rank of those which inflict direct injury upon man. A terrible list of examples they have collected of the ravages of this and closely allied parasitic pests. They remark that, 'for the quelling of human pride, and to pull down the high conceits of mortal man, this most loathsome of all maladies, or one equally disgusting, has been the inheritance of the rich, the wise, the noble, and the mighty; and in the list of those that have fallen victims to it, you will find poets, philosophers, prelates, princes, kings, and emperors. It seems more particularly to have been a judgment of God upon oppression and tyranny, whether civil or religious. Thus the inhuman Pheretima mentioned by Herodiotus, Antiochus Epiphanes, the dictator Sylla, the two Herods, the emperor Maximin, and, not to mention more, the persecutor of the Protestants, Philip the Second, were carried off by it' *(Introd. to Entomol.* volume 4). The Egyptian plague may have been somewhat like that dreadful disease common in Poland, and known as *plica Polonica,* in which the hair becomes matted together in the most disgusting manner, and is infested with swarms of vermin. Each hair is highly sensitive, bleeds at the root on the least violence, and if but slightly pulled feels exquisite pain. Lafontaine, whom Hermann calls a very exact describer, affirms that millions of lice appear on the wretched patient on the third day of this disease *(Mem. Apterol.* page 78). These insects form the order *Anoplura* of Leach, and *Parasitat* of Latreille. Most mammalia, if not all, and probably all birds, are infested by them; each beast and bird, as is stated, having its own proper

species of louse, and sometimes two or more. Three distinct species make the human body their abode." *SEE INSECT*.

License

the name given to the liberty and *warrant to preach.*

(1.) In the Presbyterian Church it is regularly conferred by the Presbytery on those who have passed satisfactorily through the prescribed curriculum of study. When a student has fully completed his course of study at the theological hall, he is taken on trials for license by the Presbytery to which he belongs. These trials consist of an examination on the different subjects taught in the theological hall, his personal religion, and his motives for seeking to enter the ministerial office. He also delivers a lecture on a passage of Scripture, a homily, an exercise and additions, a popular sermon, and an exegesis; and, lastly, he is examined on Church History, Hebrew and Greek, and on divinity generally. It is the duty of the presbytery to criticize each of these by itself, and sustain or reject it separately, as a part of the series of trials, and then, when the trials are completed, to pass a judgment on the whole by a regular vote. If the trials are sustained, the candidate is required to answer the questions in the formula, and, after prayer, is licensed and authorized to preach the Gospel of Christ, and exercise his gifts as a probationer for the holy ministry, of which license a regular certificate is given if required. He is simply a layman or lay candidate for the clerical office, preaching, but not dispensing the sacraments. *SEE ORDINATION*.

(2.) In the Methodist churches it is. conferred on laymen who are believed to be competent for this office, and it is from persons thus brought into the ministry, *SEE LAY PREACHING*, that the Church is supplied with ministers. *SEE LOCAL PREACHERS*; *SEE LICENTIATE*.

(3.) In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States the word license is used to designate the grant given by the bishop to a candidate for orders, authorizing him to read services and sermons in a church in the absence of a minister; also the liberty to preach, which the bishop may give to those who have been ordained deacons if he judge them to be qualified. See the Ordering of Deacons in the Prayer-book, where the bishop says to those lie is ordaininmg, "Take thou the authority to read the Gospel in the Church of God, and to *preach* the same, if thou be thereto licensed by the bishop himself."

See Staunton's *Ecclesiastical Dlictioniarg,* s.v.; Eadie, *Ecclesialstical Dictionary,* s.v. *SEE PREACHING*.

Licentiate

(from Lat. *licet,* it is lawful), one of the four ancient university degrees. It is no longer in use in England, except at Cambridge as a degree of medicine. In France and Germany, however, where it is more general, a licentiate is a person who, having undergone the prescribed examination, has receive(d permission to deliver lectures in the university. When the degree is given as an honor, it is intermediate between *Bachelor of Arts* and *Doctor.*

Licentiate

is a person authorized by the Church authorities to preach, and who thus becomes eligible to a pastoral charge. *SEE LICENSE*.

Licinius

SEE CONSTANTINE THE GREAT.

Lichtenberg, Johann Conrad,

a German theologian, was born at Darmstadt December 9, 1689. In 1707 he entered the University of Giessen, and then attended successively those of Jena, Leipsic, and Halle; in the latter he finished his academical course in 1711. Soon after he accepted a call as vicar to Neun-Kirchen, in the grand-duchy of Hesse; in 1716 he became pastor of the same place; in 1719, pastor of Upper Ramstadt; in 1733, metropolitan of the diocese of the bailiwick Lichtenberg; in 1745, town pastor at Darmstadt, and examiner of teachers; and in 1749, superintendent. He died July 17, 1751. His knowledge was extensive, embracing not only theology, but also mathematics and physics. Astronomical studies, especially, had a lasting interest for him; the latter he knew skillfully how to weave into his sermons in a simple and popular manner, thus captivating the attention of the audience. He contributed largely to Church music. The various books which he composed are all of an ascetical character; we only mention *Texte zur Kirchenmusik* (Darmst. 1719, 1720, 8vo); *Ermunternde Stimmen aus Zion* (ibid. 1722, 8vo); *Geistliche Betrachtungen über gewisse in den Evangeliis enthaltene Materien* (ibid. 1721, 8vo). — Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands,* 2:296 sq.

Lidbir

SEE LO-DEBAR.

Lie

(prop. bzK; ψεῦδος), an intentional violation of truth. In Scripture we find the word used to designate all the ways in which mankind denies or alters truth in word or deed, as also evil in general. In general the good is in it designated as the truth, evil as its opposite, or lie, and consequently the devil (being the contrary to God) as the father of lies, and liars or impious persons as children of the devil. Hence the Scriptures most expressly condemn lies (<430844>John 8:44; <540109>1 Timothy 1:9, 10; <662127>Revelation 21:27; 22:15). When, in <450304>Romans 3:4, it is said that all men are liars, it is synonymous with saying that all are bad. The Bible nowhere admits of permitted, praiseworthy, or pious lies, yet it recommends not to *proclaim* the truth when its proclamation might prove injurious. Hence Christ commands (<400706>Matthew 7:6) not to present the truth of the Gospel to those who are unworthy when he recommends, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine." In <431612>John 16:12 we see that he could not tell his disciples all that he would have wished to tell them on account of their weakness. He did not answer the inquiries of Pilate (<431909>John 19:9), nor of Caiaphas (<402663>Matthew 26:63). But we nowhere find that either in levity, or to do others good, or to glorify God, Christ ever spoke an untruth. Peter, on the contrary, denied both Christ by word in the moment of danger (<402669>Matthew 26:69 sq.; <411466>Mark 14:66 sq.; <422256>Luke 22:56 sq.; <431817>John 18:17 sq.) and the evangelical truth by his actions (<480212>Galatians 2:12,14). But Paul, in <442305>Acts 23:5, made use of an implication to clear himself, or, at any rate, concealed part of the truth in order to create dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and thus save himself. Strict truthfulness requires that we should never alter the truth, either in words or actions, so as to deceive others, whether it be for pleasure, or to benefit others or ourselves, or even for the best cause. Yet, although there can, absolutely considered, be no injurious truth. it is not expedient to tell all truth to those who are not able to receive or comprehend it. Thus evil might result from telling everything to children, fools, mischief-makers, spies, etc. But this does not imply that we I may tell them that which is not true, only that we are to remain silent when we perceive that the truth would be useless, or might result in inflicting injury on ourselves or others. This, of course, does

not apply to perjury, as this is positive lying, and indeed, by its calling on God, becomes diabolical lying, the Father of truth being invoked to confirm a lie, and the highest attribute of man, his consciousness of God, is made use of to deceive others, and to gain an advantage. *SEE OATH*. But there are varieties of untruthfulness which do not belong to the domain of ethics, but to aesthetics. Such are parables, jests in word or deed, tales and fables, the usual formulas of politeness, mimicry *(ὑπόχρισις)*, etc., which are not calculated to deceive. But the aesthetic untruthfulness or suppression of the truth can also be abused. In morals, however, all depends on the improvement of conscience, and a correct, firm consciousness of God's presence and knowledge. These cannot be obtained by mere commandments or moral formulas, but by strengthening the moral sense, fortifying the will — in fact, by awakening and strengthening the moral power. Morality is an inner life; those only call be called liars who willfully oppose the truth by word or deed, or by conscious untruthfulness seek to lead others into error or sin; in short, to injure them physically or spiritually. As regards so-called "necessary" lies, they also are condemned by the God of all truth; nor even in this world of imperfection, where there are so many ingenious illusions, is there any just occasion for their use. That truthfulness is a limited duty must necessarily be conceded, since the non-expression of the truth is in itself a limitation of it. The Bible mentions instances of lies in good men, but without approving them, as that of Abraham (<01212>Genesis 12:12; 20:2), Isaac (Genesis 26), Jacob (Genesis 27), the Hebrew midwives (<02115>Exodus 1:15-19), Michal (<091914>1 Samuel 19:14 sq.), David (1 Samuel 20), etc. — Krehl, *Neutest. Wosrterbuch.*

There are various kinds of lies.

1. The pernicious lie, uttered for the hurt or disadvantage of our neighbor.

2. The officious lie, uttered for our own or our neighbor's advantage.

3. The ludicrous and jocose lie, uttered by way of jest, and only for mirth's sake in common converse.

4. Pious frauds, as they are improperly called, pretended inspirations, forged books, counterfeit miracles, are species of lies.

5. Lies of the conduct, for a lie may be told in gestures as well as in words; as when a tradesman shuts up his windows to induce his creditors to believe that he is abroad.

6. Lies of omission, as when an author wilfully omits what ought to be related; and may we not add,

7. That all equivocation and mental reservation come under the guilt of lying?

The evil and injustice of lying appear,

1. From its being a breach of the natural and universal right of mankind to truth in the intercourse of speech.

2. From its being a violation of God's sacred law (Philippians 4:8; Leviticus 19:11; Colossians 3:9).

3. The faculty of speech was bestowed as an instrument of knowledge, not of deceit; to communicate our thoughts, not to hide them.

4. It is esteemed a reproach of so heinous and hateful a nature for a man to be called a liar that sometimes the life and blood of the slanderer have paid for it.

5. It has a tendency to dissolve all society, and to indispose the mind to religious impressions.

6. The punishment of it is very severe, the loss of credit, the hatred of those whom we have deceived, and an eternal separation from God in the world to come (Revelation 21:8; 22:15: Psalm 101:7).

See Grove's *Moral Philos.* volume 1, chapter 11; Paley's *Moral Philos.* volume 1, chapter 15; Doddridge's *Lect.* lect. 68; Watts's *Sermons,* volume 1, serm. 22; Evans's *Serm.* volume 2, serm. 13; South's *Serm.* volume 1, serm. 12; Dr. Lamont's *Serm.* volume 1, serm. 11 and 12. *SEE TRUTH.*

Liebknecht, Johann Georg

a German theologian, was born at Wasungen April 23, 1679. In 1699 he entered the University of Jena. Besides pursuing the common course, he was led by Dr. Danz into a thorough study of the Talmud and Rabbinical literature. He also gave especial attention to the science of mathematics. On the latter he gave lectures after he was graduated A.M. in 1703. These

were highly approved by many scholars, e.g. by the philosopher Leibnitz, with whom he corresponded. His devotion to mathematics, however, did not cause him to neglect his theological studies, for he afterwards lectured with success on exegesis of the Old and New Testaments. In 1706 he was called as professor of mathematics to the University of Halle, but was obliged to decline this, as well as the call of tutor to two princes, in 1707, because his health failed him. In the same year, however, he accepted a call as professor of mathematics to the University of Giessen. In 1715 he became a member of the Imperial Leopold Society, and in 1716 of the Royal Prussian Society of Sciences. In 1719 he became doctor of divinity, in 1721 professor extraordinary of theology, and in 1725 was advanced to the ordinary or full professorship; and was also made assessor of the consistory and superintendent at Giessen. He died September 17, 1749. Although many of his numerous productions are in the department of mathematics, yet his dissertations on exegesis, Church history, and dogmatical theology prove him to have been a profound, acute, and investigating theologian. Besides his contributions to the *Actal Eruditorum,* we mention *Progr. penecostale, causae Spiritus S. caritatis immemorem hacetificem,* etc. (Gissa, 1717, 4to): — *Diss. hist. theol. de evangelicae veritatis ante reformationem in Hassia confessionibus* (ibid. 1727, 4to): — *Von dem Tode u. dessen eingebildete Bitterkeit* (ibid. 1733, 8vo): — *Diss. theol. de Deo et attributis divinis, in qua Art. I Aug. Conf.* etc. (ibid. 1736, 4to): — *Adscensio Christi ante adscensionem in caelos nulla, Diss. theol. qua Socinianorum commenta,* etc. (ibid. 1737, 4to). — Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands,* volume 2, s.v.

Lieutenant

(only in the plur. µynÞ¤ÞrÞDiv]jÞa} *achashdaspenin',* from the Sanscrit *ksatrapa,whence* the Greek ἐξατράπης, and finally σατράπης, a *satrap,* see *Gotting. Gel. Anz.* 1839, page 805; Lassen, *Zeitschr. für d. Morgenl.* 3:161; Bockh, *Corpus Inscr.* No. 2691, c) occurs in [17012]Esther 3:12; 8:9; 9:3; [15012]Ezra 8:38; so in the Chald. form (rendered "princes," [27012]Daniel 3:2, 3, 27; 6:1-7) a *satrap,* i.e. governor or viceroy of the large provinces among the ancient Persians, possessing both civil and military power, and being in the provinces the representatives of the sovereign, whose state and splendor they also rivalled (see Brisson, *De regio Pers. principatu,* 1, § 168; Heeren, *Ideen,* 1:489 sq.). *SEE SATRAP*.

Life

(properly yj;, usually in the plur. with a sing. meaning, µyYæ;, Gr. ζωή), generally of physical life and existence, as opposed to death and non-existence (<01017>Genesis 2:7; 25:7; <42165>Luke 16:25; <44725>Acts 17:25; <46022>1 Corinthians 3:22; 15:19; <58708>Hebrews 7:3; <59044>James 4:14; <66111>Revelation 11:11; 16:3). *SEE LONGEVITY*. The ancients generally entertained the idea that the vital principle (which they appear to have denoted by the term *spirit*, in distinction from the soul itself, comp. <52353>1 Thessalonians 5:23) resided particularly in the blood, which, on that account, the Jews were forbidden to use as food (<03711>Leviticus 17:11). *SEE BLOOD*. Other terms occasionally rendered "life" in the Scriptures are vp,n,(*ne'phesh*, a *living* creature), µ/y (*yorn*, a *day*, i.e., a lifetime), βίος (lifetime), πνεῦμα (*breath*, i.e., spirit), ψυχή (*soul*, or animating principle).

The term life is also used more or less figuratively in the following acceptations in Scripture:

(1.) For existence, life, absolutely and without end, immortality (<58716>Hebrews 7:16). So also "tree of life," or of immortality, which preserves from death (<66207>Revelation 2:7; 22:2. 14; <01009>Genesis 2:9; 3:22); "bread of life" (<43655>John 6:35, 51); "way of life" (<19611>Psalm 16:11; <44228>Acts 2:28); "water of life," 1. living fountains of water, perennial (<66717>Revelation 7:17); crown of life, the reward of eternal life (<59012>James 1:12; <66210>Revelation 2:10). *SEE BOOK*; *SEE BREAD*; *SEE CROWN*; *SEE FOUNTAIN*; *SEE TREE*, etc.

(2.) The manner of life, conduct, in a moral respect; "newness of life" (<45604>Romans 6:4); "the life of God," i.e., the life which God requires, a godly life (<49418>Ephesians 4:18; <61003>2 Peter 1:3).

(3.) The term "i.e." is also used for spiritual life, or the holiness and happiness of salvation procured by the Savior's death. In this sense, *life* or *eternal life* is the antithesis of *death* or *condemnation*. Life is the image of all good, and is therefore employed to express it (<05015>Deuteronomy 30:15; <43616>John 3:16, 17, 18, 36; 5:24, 39. 40; 6:47; 8:51; 11:26; <45512>Romans 5:12, 18; <62501>1 John 5:1); *death* is the consummation of evil, and so it is frequently used as a strong expression in order to designate every kind of evil, whether temporal or spiritual (<24208>Jeremiah 21:8; <26818>Ezekiel 18:28; 33:11; <45132>Romans 1:32; 6:21; 7:5, 10, 13, 24; <43650>John 6:50, 8:21).

(4.) *Life* is also used for *eternal life*, i.e., the life of bliss and glory in the kingdom of God which awaits the true disciples of Christ (Matthew 19:16, 17; John 3:15; 1 Timothy 4:8; Acts 5:20; Romans 5:17; 1 Peter 3:7; 2 Timothy 1:1).

(5.) The term *life* is also used of God and Christ or the Word, as the absolute source and cause of all life (John 1:4; 5:26, 39; 11:25; 12:50; 14:6; 17:3; Colossians 3:4; 1 John 1:1, 2; 5:20). *SEE DEATH*.

Life Everlasting.

SEE ETERNAL LIFE; *SEE FUTURE LIFE*.

Lift

(prop. acn; αἴρω), besides having the general sense of raising, is used in several peculiar phrases in Scripture. *To lift up the* HANDS is, among the Orientals, a common part of the ceremony of taking an oath: "I have lift up mine hand unto the Lord," says Abraham (Genesis 14:22); "I will bring you into the land concerning which I lift up my hand" (Exodus 6:8), which I promised with an oath. *To lift up one's hand against any one* is to attack him, to fight him (2 Samuel 18:28; 1 Kings 11:26). *To lift up one's face* in the presence of any one is to appear boldly in his presence (2 Samuel 2:22; Ezra 9:6. (See also Job 10:15; 11:15.) *To lift up one's hands, eyes, soul,* or *heart unto the Lord* are expressions describing the sentiments and emotion of one who prays earnestly or desires a thing with ardor.

Lifters

and ANTILIFTERS, a name given about the opening of the 18th century to the congregations at Killmarnock, in the west of Scotland, who, according to Sir John Sinclair, differed on the paltry question whether it was necessary for the minister to *lift* in his hand the plate of bread before its distribution in the Lord's Supper, the Lifters holding this to be essential, the others regarding it as a matter of no moment. They were also called *New Lights,* and the others *Old Lights,* terms that have been applied in other cases somewhat similar. — Gregoire, *Hist.* 1:61; quoted from Sinclair, *Works,* 1:375-6; Williams, *Religious Encyclop.* s.v.

Light

(properly rwa, *or* φῶς, from its *shining)* is represented in the Scriptures as the immediate result and offspring of a divine command (01 01 03 Genesis 1:3), where doubtless we are to understand a reappearance of the celestial luminaries, still partially obscured by the haze that settled as a pall over the grave of nature at some tremendous cataclysm which well-nigh reduced the globe to its pristine chaos, rather than their actual formation, although they are subsequently introduced (01 01 14 Genesis 1:14 sq.). In consequence of the intense brilliancy and beneficial influence of light in an Eastern climate, it easily and naturally became, with Orientals, a representative of the highest human good. From this idea the transition was an easy one, in corrupt and superstitious minds, to deift the great sources of light. *SEE SUN*; *SEE MOON*. When "Eastern nations beheld the sun shining in his strength, or the moon walking in her brightness, their hearts were secretly enticed, and their mouth kissed their hand in token of adoration (18 31 26 Job 31:26, 27). *SEE ADORATION*. This 'iniquity' the Hebrews not only avoided, but when they considered the heavens they recognized the work of God's fingers, and learned a lesson of humility as well as of reverence (19 08 03 Psalm 8:3 sq.). On the contrary, the entire residue of the East, with scarcely any exception, worshipped the sun and the light, primarily, perhaps, as symbols of divine power and goodness, but, in a more degenerate state. as themselves divine; whence, in conjunction with darkness, the negation of light, arose the doctrine of dualism, two principles, the one of light, the good power, the other of darkness, the evil power, a corruption which rose and spread the more easily because the whole of human life, being a checkered scene, seems divided as between two conflicting agencies, the bright and the dark, the joyous and the sorrowful, what is called prosperous and what is called adverse." But in the Scriptures the purer symbolism is everywhere maintained (see Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s.v.). "All the more joyous emotions of the mind, all the pleasing sensations of the frame, all the happy hours of domestic intercourse, were habitually described among the Hebrews under imagery derived from light (11 11 36 1 Kings 11:36; 23 58 08 Isaiah 58:8, 17 08 16 Esther 8:16; 19 97 11 Psalm 97:11). The transition was natural from earthly to heavenly, from corporeal to spiritual things, and so light came to typify true religion and the felicity which it imparts. But as light not only came from God, but also makes man's way clear before him, so it was employed to signify moral truth, and preeminently that divine system of truth which is set forth in the Bible, from its earliest gleamings onward to

the perfect day of the great sun of righteousness. The application of the term to religious topics had the greater propriety because the light in the world, being accompanied by heat, purifies, quickens, enriches, which efforts it is the peculiar province of true religion to produce in the human soul (<232820>Isaiah 8:20, <400416>Matthew 4:16; <199105>Psalm 119:105; <610119>2 Peter 1:19; <490508>Ephesians 5:8; <550110>2 Timothy 1:10; <600219>1 Peter 2:9)."

Besides its physical sense (<401702>Matthew 17:2; <440903>Acts 9:3, 12:7; <470406>2 Corinthians 4:6), the term *light* is used by metonymy for a fire giving light (<411454>Mark 14:54; <422256>Luke 22:56), for a torch, candle, or lamp (<441629>Acts 16:29); for the material light of heaven, as the sun, moon, or stars (<19D607>Psalm 136:7; <590117>James 1:17). In figurative language it signifies a manifest or open state of things (<401027>Matthew 10:27; <421203>Luke 12:3), and in a higher sense the eternal source of truth, purity, and joy (<620105>1 John 1:5). God is said to dwell in light inaccessible (<540616>1 Timothy 6:16), which seems to contain a reference to the glory and splendor that shone in the holy of holies, where Jehovah appeared in the luminous cloud above the mercy seat, and which none but the high-priest, and he only once a year, was permitted to approach (<031602>Leviticus 16:2; <261022>Ezekiel 1:22, 26, 28). This light was typical of the glory of the celestial world. *SEE SHEKINAH*. Light itself is employed to signify the edicts, laws, rules, or directions that proceed from ruling powers for the good of their subjects. Thus of the great king of all the earth the Psalmist says, "Thy word is a light unto my path" (<199105>Psalm 119:105), and "Thy judgments are as the light" (<280605>Hosea 6:5). Agreeably to the notion of lights being the symbols of good government, light also signifies protection, deliverance, and joy. Light also frequently signifies instruction both by doctrine and example (<401516>Matthew 5:16; <430535>John 5:35), or persons considered as giving such light (<401514>Matthew 5:14; <450219>Romans 2:19). It is applied in the highest sense to Christ, the true light, the sun of righteousness, who is that in the spiritual which the material light is in the natural world, the great author not only of illumination and knowledge, but of spiritual life, health, and joy to the souls of men (<236001>Isaiah 60:1). "Among the personifications on this point which Scripture presents we may specify,

(1.) God. The apostle James (1:17) declares that 'every good and perfect gift cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,' obviously referring to the faithfulness of God and the constancy of his goodness, which shine on undimmed and unshadowed. So Paul (<540616>1 Timothy 6:16), 'God who dwelleth in the light

which no man can approach unto.' Here the idea intended by the imagery is the incomprehensibleness of the self-existent and eternal God.

(2.) Light is also applied to Christ: 'The people who sat in darkness have seen a great light' (<40416>Matthew 4:16; <42232>Luke 2:32; <43104>John 1:4 sq.). 'He was the true light;' 'I am the light of the world' (<43812>John 8:12 ; 12:35, 36).

(3.) It is further used of angels, as in <471114>2 Corinthians 11:14: 'Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light.'

(4.) Light is moreover employed of men: John the Baptist 'was a burning and a shining light' (<43535>John 5:35); 'Ye are the light of the world' (<40514>Matthew 5:14; see also <441347>Acts 13:47; <490508>Ephesians 5:8)." *SEE LIGHTS*.

Light, Divine.

SEE KNOWLEDGE; *SEE RELIGION*.

Light, Inward.

SEE QUAKERS.

Light Of Nature.

SEE NATURE.

Light, Friends of

SEE FREE CONGREGATIONS.

Light, George C.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Westmoreland County, Virginia, February 28, 1785.

In 1792 his father removed to Kentucky, and in 1799 to Ohio, where in 1803 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1804 the son was converted at a campmeeting; in 1806 he entered the itinerant ministry in the Western Conference, and in 1807 he was ordained deacon. Locating after his marriage in 1808, he was employed as a surveyor till 1822, when he entered the Kentucky Conference. From this time until 1859 he labored actively as an itinerant preacher, filling the most important stations in Kentucky, Missouri, and Mississippi. He died February 27, 1859. Mr.

Light was held to be one of the most eloquent and useful ministers in the West during many years. No man of his day, it is thought, had greater control over the popular mind. Camp, *Sketch of the Rev. G.C. Light* (Nashville, 1860).

Light, Old and New

SEE UNITED PRESBYTERIANS.

Lightfoot, John

(1), D.D., a noted English divine and Hebraist, was born at Stoke-upon-Trent in 1602. He was educated first at a grammar-school at Morton Green, in Cheshire, and afterwards at Cambridge. He was remarkable, at Cambridge and afterwards, for his eloquence and his proficiency in Latin and Greek. Quitting the university, he became assistant at the well-known school of Repton, in Derbyshire. A year or two after he entered into orders, and settled at Norton-under-Hales, in Shropshire, where he began the study of the Hebrew, which ripened into the most familiar and consummate knowledge of the whole range of Biblical and Rabbinical literature. In 1627 he accepted the cure of Stone, in Staffordshire. Two years later he removed to Hornsey, in order to be near the library of Sion College, and later accepted the rectory of Ashford, in Staffordshire. Here he remained during the turbulent years which led to the death of Charles I, the establishment of the Commonwealth, and the temporary subversion of the Church of the Church of England. During the civil war he was identified with the Presbyterians, and became a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, where he displayed great courage and learning in opposing many of those tenets which the divines were endeavoring to establish. While in London he was minister of St. Bartholomew's. In 1653 he was presented by Parliament with the living of Great Munden, in Hertfordshire. In 1655 he entered upon the office of vice-chancellor of Cambridge, to which he was chosen that year, having taken the degree of doctor in divinity in 1652. The living of Great Munden was given to Dr. Lightfoot by Parliament, and upon the restoration of Charles II it was bestowed upon another person. Through the influence of Sheldon, then bishop of London, Lightfoot was, however, reinstated in his living, as well as confirmed in the mastership of Catharine Hall, which he had offered to resign, he having previously complied with the terms of the Act of Uniformity. Through the influence of Sir Orlando Bridgeman he was

appointed to a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Ely, where he died peaceably, December 6, 1675. "Lightfoot was a very learned Hebraist for his time, but he was not free from the unscienitific crotchets of the period, holding, for example, the inspiration of the vowel-points, etc. He has done good service to theology by pointing out and insisting upon the close connection between the Talmudical and Midrashic writings and the New Testament, which, to a certain extent, is only to be understood by illustrations from the anterior and contemporaneous religious literature' (Chambers). His object at first was "to produce one great and perfect work — a harmony of the four evangelists, with a commentary and prolegomena. But the little probability of his being able to publish at once so vast a work as he saw it would become were he to carry out the idea in its completeness — in an age when brevity was essential to everything which issued from the press — determined him to give to the world from time to time the result of his labors in separate treatises. The subject matter of these treatises may be classed under the general heads of chronology, chorography, investigation of original texts and versions, examination of Babbinical comments and paraphrases" (Kitto). Lightfoot's works are: *Erubhin, or Miscellanies, Christian, and Judaical* (1629): — *A few and new Observations upon the Book of Genesis* (1642): — A *Handful of Gleanings out of the Book of Exodus* (1643): — *The Harmony of the four Evlangelists among themselves and with the O.T.* (1644): — *A Commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles,* 1st part (1645): — *The Harmony,* 2d part (no date): — *The Temple Service in the Days of our Savior* (1649): — *The Harmony,* 3d part (1649): — *The Temple (1650*): — *Horce Hebraicae et Talmnudicae* (1658): — *Horae,* etc., *upon the Gospel of St. Mark* (1661; new ed. by Reverend R. Gandell, Oxf 1859, 4 volumes, 8vo): — *Jewish and Talmudical Exercitations upon St. Luke: — Jewish,* etc., *upon St. John: — Horace Hebraicae,* etc., *Acts of the Apostles: — Horae,* etc., *upon the first Epistle to the Corinthians.* During the latter years of his life he contributed the most valuable assistance to the authors of Walton's *Polyglot Bible,* Castell's *Heptaglot Lexicon,* and Pool's *Symnopsis Criticorum.* His works were published entire, (1) with a preface by Dr. Bright and a life by the editor, John Strype, at London in 1684 (2 volumes, fol.); (2) at Amsterdam in 1686 (2 volumes, fol.); (3) at Utrecht, by John Leusden, in 1699 (3 volumes, fol.); and (4) by Pitman, at London, in from 1822-25 (13 volumes, 8vo), which is the best edition, and contains a very elaborate biography of Lightfoot. Dr. Adam Clarke says: "In Biblical criticism I consider Lightfoot the first of all English writers; and in this I

include his learning, his judgment, and his usefulness." See, besides the biographies connected with the various collections of his works, *Brevis Descriptio Vitce J. Lightfoot* (1699); Kitto, *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.* volume 2, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* volume 8, s.v.

Lightfoot, John

(2), an English divine and botanist, was born in Gloucestershire in 1735. He was educated for the Church, became chaplain to the duchess of Portland, and obtained the livings of Sheldon and Gotham. He also devoted himself specially to the study of botany, and, in company with Pennant, explored the Hebrides about 1772, and published in 1777 a valuable "Flora of Scotland" *(Hora Scotica,* 2 volumes), with excellent figures. He died in 1788. — Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary,* page 1425.

Lightning

(properly qrB; *barak',* Daniel 10:6; collectively *lightninqs,* Psalm 144:6; 2 Samuel 22:15; Ezra 1:13; plur. Job 38:35; Psalm 18:15; 77:19, etc.; trop. the *brightness* of a glittering sword, Ezekiel 21:15, 33; Deuteronomy 32:41, etc.; (ἀστραπή, Matthew 24:27 28:3; Luke 10:18; 11:36; 17:24; Revelation 4:5; 8:5; 11:19; 16:18; once qzB; *baza'c, a flash* of lightning, Ezekiel 1:14; less properly rwa, *dr, light,* Job 37:3, 11, 25; dyPaj; *lalppid',* a burning *torch,* Exodus 20:18; fig. zyzaj; *chaziz',* an *arrow,* i.e., *ethunder-fash,* Zechariah 10:1; comp. Job 28:26; 38:25). Travelers state that in Syria lightnings are frequent in the autumnal months. Seldom a night passes without a great deal of lightning, which is sometimes accompanied by thunder and sometimes not. A squall of wind and clouds of (dust are the uasual forerunners of the first rains. *SEE PALESTINE*. To these natural phenomena the sacred writers frequently allude. In directing their energies, "the Lord hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet; the mountains quake at him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at his presence; his fury is poured out like fire. and the rocks are thrown down by him" (Nahum 1:3-6). The terrors of the divine wrath are often represented by thundler and lightning; and thunder, on account of its awful impression on the minds of mortals. is also spoken of in Scripture as the "voice of the Lord" (Psalm 135:7; 144:6; 2 Samuel 22:15; Job 28:26; 37:4, 5; 38:25; 40:9; Zechariah 9:14; Revelation 4:5; 16:18 -21). On account of the fire attending their *light,*

they are the symbols of edicts enforced with destruction to those who oppose them, or who hinder others from giving obedience to them (<19146>Psalm 144:6; <38914>Zechariah 9:14; <19814>Psalm 18:14; <66045>Revelation 4:5; 16:18). Thunders and lightnings, when they proceed from the throne of God (as in <66045>Revelation 4:5), are fit representations of God's glorious and awful majesty; but whenfire comes down from heaven upon the earth, it expresses some judgment of God on the world (as in <66209>Revelation 20:9). The voices, thunders, lightnings, and great hail, in <66168>Revelation 16:18-21, are interpreted expressly of an exceeding great plague, so that men blasphemned on account of it (see Wemyss, *Symb. Dict.* s.v.). *SEE THUNDER*.

Lights

I. The use of artificial light in baptism was practiced in the Church at an early day, although it was opposed in this instance as in its use for communion service, etc. But where it was used it was the practice, in addition to the ceremony of putting on white garments at baptism, to place lighted tapers in the hands of the baptized. Gregory Nazianzen says: "The station where, immediately after baptism, thou shalt be placed before the altar, is an emblem of the glory of the life to come; the psalmody with which thou shalt be received is a foretaste of those hymns and songs of a better life; and the lamps which thou shalt light are a figure of those lamps of faith wherewith bright and virgin souls shall go forth to meet the Bridegroom." Others say that the lamp was designed to be a symbol of their own illumination, and to remind the candidates of the words of Christ, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." In some baptisms the attendants were clothed in white, and carried tapers. At the baptism of the younger Theodosius, the leaders of the people were all clothed in white, and all the senators and men of quality carried lamps.

Lighted candles were, according to St. Jerome *(Epist. cont. Vigilant.* cap. 3; comp. also Cave, *Prim. Christ.* lib. 1, c. 7, page 203), sometimes used in the Eastern churches when the Gospel was read, and were designed to show the joy of those who received the glad tidings, and also to be a symbol of the light of truth. The lighting of candles on the communion table is observed only in the Romish Church. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dictionary,* s.v.; Bingham, *Aniquities of the Christ. Church,* book 12, chapter 4, sect. 4; Alt, *Christlich. Cultus* (1851), page 95; Herzog, *Real-*

Encyklop. 8:517 sq.; Aschbach, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* 2:769 (Kerzen). *SEE CANDLES*.

II. Lights were employed by the Apostolic Church, but for no other purpose than to obviate the inconvenience of assembling for worship in the dark. Their use as a matter of religion, or, rather, of superstition, is of far less ancient date, although it has been defended as a primitive custom, and might, of course, be traced even to Jewish antiquity, if such a precedent were esteemed of any value. In all probability, artificial light was used during the daytime, and for a symbolical purpose, about the 4th century, if we accept the statement of St. Paulinus, bishop of Sola (A.D. 353-431), who, speaking of the great numbers of wax-lights which burned about the altars, making the night more splendid than the day, adds that the light of the day itself was made more glorious by the same means:

"Nocte dieque mliclant. Sic nox splendore dici
Fulget: et ipsa dies ccelesti illnstris honore
Plus micat inlumeris lucem geminata lucernis."
***(Paulin. Nat. 3,* S. Felicis.)**

(Compare also Isidore, *Origin.* 7:12.) But this custom was severely condemned by many. *SEE LAMPS*.

III. The practice of lighting candles on the altar, which prevailed, and still prevails, in the Romish Church, was abolished in England at the Reformation.

Those candles which (according to one of the Injunctions of Edward VI, set forth in 1547) have been suffered to remain upon the Lord's table are sometimes designated as "lights on the communion table." But it is to be noticed that no *lights* are ever used in the English churches, only candles, which are never lighted, the lighting of any such candles at an evening service being merely for a necessary purpose. *SEE ALTAR*.

Lights, Feast of

SEE EPIPHANY.

Lign-aloe

Picture for Lign-aloe

(only in the plur. µyIl{h'a} *ahalitm',* <04246>Numbers 24:6, Sept. σκηναί, Vulg. *tabernacula;* <20717>Proverbs 7:17, Sept. οικον, Vulg. *aloe,* A.V. "aloes;" or fem. tl{h'a} *ahaloth',* <19508>Psalm 45:8, Sept. στακτή, Vulg. *gutta,* A.V. "aloes;" <22014>Song of Solomon 4:14, ἀλώθ, *aloe,* "aloes"), a kind of perfume which interpreters have by common consent regarded as derived from some Oriental tree, and compared with the *agallochum (*ἀγάλλοχον*)* or *aloe-wood (*ξυλαλόη*),* described by Dioscorides (1:21) in the following terms: "It is a wood brought from India and Arabia, resembling thyine-wood, compact, fragrant, astringent to the taste, with great bitterness; having a skin-like bark.... . It is burned for frankincense." Pliny likewise speaks of it as being derived from the same region *(Nat. Mist.* 27:5). Later writers, as Orobasius, AEtius, and P. AEgineta, mention it, but give no further description. Arabic authors, however, as Rhases, Serapion, and others, were well acquainted with the substance, of which they describe several varieties; and the Latin translator of Avicenna (52:132) gives "agallochum," "xylaloe," and "lignum aloes" as equivalent to the *aghlajûn, aghalûkhi,* and ûd of the text. Royle *(Illustr. of Himal. Bot.* page 171) has traced the same substance in the *aggur,* a famous aromatic wood obtained in the bazaars of Northern India under three names: 1, *aod-i-hindi;* 2, a variety procured from Surat, but not differing essentially from 3, *aod-i-kimari,* said to come from China, doubtless the *alcanmerium* of Avicenna. Garcias ab Hosto (Clusius, *Exot. Hist.),* writing on this subject near Surat, says that "it is called in Malacca *garo,* but the choicest sort *calambac."* Paul a Bartholin (in Vyacarana, page 205) likewise distinguishes three sorts, "one common, very odorous, and of great price, called *aghil;* the black, which is termed *kár-aghhil* or *kal-agam;* the third, producing a flower, named *mogarim,* properly *mangalyam* or *malligandhiyal."*

There is considerable confusion among naturalists in their attempts to identify the exact tree which yields the far-famed wood. "Dr. Roxburgh states that *uguru* is the Sanscrit name of the incense or aloe-wood, which in Hindostanee is called *ugur,* and in Persian *aod-hindi,* and that there is little doubt that the real *calambac,* or *agallochum* of the ancients, is yielded by an immense tree, a native of the mountainous tracts east of and southeast from Silhet, in about 24° of N. latitude. This plant, he says,

cannot be distinguished from thriving plants, exactly of the same age, of the *Garo de Malacca,* received from that place, and growing in the garden of Calcutta. He further states that small quantities of *agallochum* are sometimes imported into Calcutta by sea from the eastward, but that such is always deemed inferior to that of Silhet *(Flora Ind.* 2:423). The *Garo de Malacca* was first described by Lamarck *(Encyclopädie Methodique,* 1:47 sq.), from a specimen presented to him by Sonnerat as that of the tree which yielded the *bois d'aigle* of commerce. Lamarck named this tree *Aquilaria Malaccensis,* which Cavanilles afterwards changed unnecessarily to *Aquilariac ouvata.* As Dr. Roxburgh found that his plant belonged to the same genus, he named it *Aquilaria agallochum,* but it is printed *Agallocha* in his *Flora Indica,* probably by an oversight. He is of opinion that the *Agallochum secundarium* of Rumphius *(Herb. Amb.* 2:34, t. 10), which that author received tinder the name of *Agallochum Malaccense,* also belongs to the same genus, as well as the *Sinfu* of Kaempfer *(Amaen. Exot.* page 903), and the *Ophispermum sinense* of Loureiro. This last-named missionary describes a third plant, which he names *Aloexylum agaellochulln,* representing it as a large tree growing in the lofty mountains of Champava, belonging to Cochin China, about 13° of IT. lat. near the great river Lavum, and producing *calambac (Flora Cochin Chinenisis,* edit. Wildenow, 1:327). This tree, belonging to the class and order *Decandria monogynia* of Linnaeus, and the natural family of *Leguaminosae,* has always been admitted as one of the trees yielding *agallochum.* But, as Loureiro himself confesses that he had only once seen a mutilated branch of the tree in flower, which, by long carriage, had the petals, anthers, and stigma much bruised and torn, it is not impossible that this may also belong to the genus Aquilaria, especially as his tree agrees in so many points with that described by Dr. Roxburgh. Rumphius has described and figured a third plant, which he named *Arbor excaecans,* from 'Blindhout,' in consequence of its acrid juice destroying sight, whence the generic name of *Excaecaria;* the specific one of *agallochum* he applied because its wood is similar to, and often substituted for *agallochum,* and he states that it was sometimes exported as such to Europe, and even to China. This tree, the *Exccecaria agallochum,* of the Linnaean class and order *Dimecia triandria,* and the natural family of *Euphorbiaecae,* is also very common in the delta of the Ganges, where it is called *Geria;* 'but the wood-cutters of the Sunderbunds,' Dr. Roxburgh says, 'who are the people best acquainted with the nature of this tree, report the pale, white, milky juice thereof to be highly acrid and very dangerous.' The only use made of

the tree, as far as Dr. Roxburgh could learn, was for charcoal and firewood. Agallochum of any sort is, he believed, never found in this tree, which is often the only one quoted as that yielding agila-wood; but, notwithstanding the negative testimony of Dr. Roxburgh, it may, in particular situations, as stated by Rumphius, yield a substitute for that fragrant and longfamed wood. In Arabian authors numerous varieties of agallochum are mentioned (Celsus, *Hierobot.* page 143). Persian authors mention only three:

1. *Aod-i-hindi;* that is, the Indian;
2. *Aod-i-chini,* or Chinese kind (probably that from Cochin China);
3. *Sumunduri,* a term generally applied to things brought from sea, which may have reference to the inferior variety from the Indian islands.

In old works, such as those of Bauhin and Ray, three kinds are also mentioned:

1. *Agallochum praestantissimum,* also called *Calambac;*
2. *A. Officinarum,* or *Palo de Aguilla* of Linschoten;
3. *A. sylvestre,* or *Aguillae brava.*

But, besides these varieties, obtained from different localities, perhaps from different plants, there are also distinct varieties, obtainable from the same plant. Thus, in a MS. account by Dr. Roxburgh, to which Dr. Royle had access, it is stated, in a letter from B1. K. Dick, at Silhet, that four different qualities may be obtained from the same tree: 1st, *Ghurki,* which sinks in water, and sells from 12 to 16 rupees per seer of 2 lbs.; 2d, *Doinl,* 6 to 8 rupees per seer; 3d, *Siniula,* which floats in water, 3 to 4 rupees; and 4, 4th, *Chrunm,* which is in small pieces, and also floats in water, from 1 to 1 1/2 rupees per seer, and that sometimes 80 lbs. of these four kinds may be obtained from one tree. All these *tuggur-trees,* as they are called, do not produce the *aggur,* nor does every part of even the most productive tree. The natives cut into the wood until they observe dark-colored veins yielding the perfume; these guide them to the place containing the *aggur,* which generally extends but a short way through the center of the trunk or branch. An essence, or *attur,* is obtained by bruising the wood in a mortar, and then infusing it in boiling water, when the *attur* floats on the surface. Early decay does not seem incident to all kinds of *agallochum,* for we possess specimens of the wood gorged with fragrant resin *(Illustr. Him. Bot.* page 173) which show no symptoms of it, but still it is stated that the

wood is sometimes buried in the earth. This may be for the purpose of increasing its specific gravity. A large specimen in the museum of the East-India House displays a cancellated structure in which the resinous parts remain, the rest of the wood having been removed, apparently by decay." Notwithstanding the uncertainty respecting the identity of some of the above-described varieties, we have, at all events, two trees ascertained as yielding this fragrant wood — one, *Aquilaria agallochum,* a native of Silhet, and the other *A. ovata* or *Mallaccensis,* a native of Malacca, although it is still not clear that they are anything more than local variations of the same species. The former is described as a magnlicent tree, growing to the height of 120 feet, being 12 feet in girth. "The bark of the trunk is smooth and ash-colored, that of the branches gray and lightly striped with brown. The wood is white, and very light and soft. It is totally without smell, and the leaves, bark, and flowers are equally inodorous" *(Script. Heb.* page 238). The fragrance appears to reside wholly in the resin deposited in the pores, and is developed by heat. Both plants belong to the Linnaean class and order *Decandria monogynia,* and the natural family of *Aquilarineae.*

"It is extremely interesting to find that the Malay name of the substance in question, which is *agila,* is so little different from the *ahalim* of the Hebrew; not more, indeed, than may be observed in many well-known words, where the hard *g* of one languasge is turned into the aspirate in another. It is therefore probable that it was by the name *agila (aghil* in Rosenmüller, *Biblic. Bot.* page 234) that this wood was first known in commerce, being conveyed across the bay of Bengal to the island of Ceylon or the peninsula of India, which the Arab or Phoenician traders visited at very remote periods, and where they obtained the early-known spices and precious stones of India. It is not a little curious that captain Hamilton *(Account of the East Insdies,* 1:68) mentions it by the name of *agala,* an odoriferous wood at Muscat. We know that the Portuguese, when they reached the eastern coast from the peninsula, obtained it under this name, whence they called it *pao d'aguila,* or *eagle-wood,* which is the origin of the generic name *Aquilaria.*

"It must be confessed, however, that, notwithstanding all that has been written to prove the identity of the *ahalim-trees* with the *aloes-wood* of commerce, and notwithstanding the apparent connection of the Hebrew word with the Arabic a*ghlagûn* and the Greek *agallochon,* the opinion is not clear of difficulties. In the first place, the passage in 0206 Numbers 24:6,

'as the *ahalim* which Jehovah hath planted,' is an argument against the identification with the *Aquiluria agallochum.* The Sept. seem to have read µyl ha ;, *ohalim', tents;* and they are followed by the Vulg., the Syriac, the Arabic, and some other versions. If this is not the true reading — and the context is against it — then if *ahalim* be the *Aq. agallochum,* we must suppose that Balaam is speaking of trees concerning which, in their growing state, he could have known nothing at all. Rosenmuller *(Schol. in V.T.* ad <0246>Numbers 24:6) allows that this tree is not found in Arabia, but thinks that Balaam might have become acquainted with it from the merchants. Perhaps the prophet might have seen the wood. But the passage in Numbers manifestly implies that he had seen the *ahalim growing,* and that in *all* probability they were some kind of trees sufficiently known to the Israelites to enable them to understand the allusion in its full force. But if the *ahalim* be the *agallochum,* then much of the illustration would have been lost to the people who were the subject of the prophecy; for the *Aq. agallochum* is found neither on the banks of the Euphrates, where Balaam lived, nor in Moab, where the blessing was enunciated. Michaelis *(Supp.* pages 34, 35) believes the Sept. reading to be the correct one, though he sees no difficulty, but rather a beauty, in supposing that Balaam was drawing a similitude from a tree of foreign growth. He confess that the parallelism of the verse is more in favor of the *tree* than the *tent;* but he objects that the lign-aloes should be mentioned before the cedars, the parallelism requiring, he thinks, the inverse order. But this is hardly a valid objection, for what tree was held in greater estimation than the cedar? And even if *ahalim* be the *Aq. agallochum,* yet the latter clause of the verse does no violence to the law of parallelism, for of the two trees the cedar 'is greater and more august.' Again, the passage in <1908>Psalm 45:8 would perhaps be more correctly translated thus: 'The myrrh, aloes, and cassia, perfuming all thy garments, brought from the ivory palaces of the *Minni,* shall make thee glad.' The Minni, or Minaei, were inhabitants of spicy Arabia, and carried on a great trade in the exportation of spices and perfumes (Pliny, 12:14, 16; Boclhart, *Phaleg,* 2:22, 135). As the *myrrh* and *cassia* are mentioned as coming from the Minni, and were doubtless natural prodiuctions of the country, the inference is that *aloes,* being named with them, *were* also a production of the same region." But *SEE MINNI.*

See generally Abulfeda, in Busching's *Magazin,* 4:277; Bokin, in *Notices et Extraits de la Biblioth. du Roi,* 2:397; Linneus, *Pflanzensystem nach*

Houttyn (Nounb. 1777), 2:422 sq.; Michaelis, *Supplem.* page 32; Wahl, *Ostindien*, 2:772; the *Fundgruben des Orients.* 5:372; Bondi, *Or-Esther*, page 13; Sylv. de Saez, *ad* Abdollatiphi *Descrip. AEg.* page 320. *SEE ALOE*.

Liguori, Alfonzo Maria De

a Roman Catholic bishop, and founder of the Order of Redemptorists, was born September 27, 1696, at Naples. He was descended from a noble family, and the son of a royal officer; from his mother, who was a fervid Catholic, he imbibed in early childhood a glowing devotedness to the Church of Rome. Educated in an institution of the priests of the Oratory, he made such rapid progress that he obtained in the sixteenth year of his life the degree of LL.D. In accordance with the wish of his parents he became a lawyer, but the loss of an important lawsuit so mortified him that he resolved to enter the priesthood. He overcame the violent opposition of his father, and took orders in 1725. Soon after he entered the Congregation of the Propaganda at Naples, and began to labor with great zeal for the religious awakening of the lowest classes in Naples and the neighboring provinces. In order to enlarge the sphere of his labors he concluded to establish a new religious congregation. The first house of the, new congregation was established with the assistance of twelve companions at Scala; the chief task of the members was declared to be "to devote themselves to the service of the poorest and most abandoned souls." Three years later the second house was established at Cionani, in the diocese of Salerno. The rule of the new congregation, which Liguori had drawn up with the assistance of several prominent men, was confirmed by a brief of pope Benedict XIV, dated February 22, 1749, and Liguori was elected superior general for his lifetime. The archbishopric of Palermo, which king Charles III of Naples offered to him, Liguori declined, but in 1762 he had, at the request of pope Clement XIII, to accept the bishopric of Sta. Agata de' Goti. A general chapter of the congregation unanimously declared that no new superior general should be elected in place of Liguori,. but that the latter should appoint a vicar general top reside over the congregation in his place. 'The feeble state of his health repeatedly induced him to ask the pope to accept his resignation, but his wish was not granted until 1775. He retired to the house of his congregation at Nocera de' Pagani, where he spent the remainder of his life in composing theological and, in particular, ascetical worls. In consequence of the intrigues of several prominent members of his order, and the government of Naples, which, against his

will, caused the rules of his order to be changed, he was compelled to resign its supreme management. He died August 1, 1787. In 1796 He received from Pius VI the title "Venerable," in 1816 he was beautified, and on May 26, 1839, was canonized by pope Gregory XVI. In 1871 Pius IX conferred upon him the title and rank of a "Doctor Ecclesiao." Liguori was a very prolific writer, the best known among his works being the *Theologia Mosrlis*(Naples, 3 volumes): — *Hono Apostolicus* (Venice, 1782, 3 volumes): — *Institutio Catechetica* (Bassano, 1768): — *Praxis Confessarii*. Complete editions of his works have been published at Paris (1835 sq., in 16 volumes), at Monza (70 volumes), and other places. His works have been translated into French and German, and, in great part, into English, Spanish, Polish, and other European languages. The principles of casuistry explained by Liguori have been received with much favor by the Ultramontane school of the Roman Catholic theologians, and his moral theology, which is a modification of the so-called "probabilistic system" of the age immediately before his own, is largely used in the direction of consciences. Few writers in modern times have gone so far in the defense of the extremest ultra-papal theories and practices as Liguori, and, while his honesty and zeal are undoubted, he stands forth in the recent history of the Roman Church as a representative of the very worst tendencies of casuists. In the ordinary concerns of life, where there is no suspicion and no warning, he elaborately teaches how falsehood and trickery between man and man may be most advantageously practiced, and how far cheating and stealing on the part of tradesmen and servants may be venially carried on, and without incurring mortal sin. See Connelly, *Reasons for abjuring Allegiance to the See of Rome* (Lond. 1852); *Lond. Qu. Rev.* 1856, page 396; *Christian Remembr.* 1854 (Januaty), page 38; 1855 (October), page 407. Biographies of Liguori have been written by Giatini *(Vita del beato Albns. Liguoeil*, Rome, 1815), Jeancard *(Vie du C. A. Liguori*, Louvain, 1829), Klotts (Aix-la-Chapelle, 1835), Schick (Schaffhausen, 1853), and others. In English we have a very good biographical *Life of St. Alde Liguori* (London, 1848, 2 volumes, 8vo). For an account of the religious order founded by Liguori, *SEE REDEMPTORISTS*. (A.J.S.)

Liguorians

SEE REDEMPTORISTS.

Li'gure

(μν,ι, *le'shenm,* supposed to be from an old root preserved in the Arab., and signifying *to taste) oc*curs but twice (Exodus 28:19; 39:12) as the name of the first stone in the third row on the high-priest's breastplate, where the Sept. renders λιγύριον (apparently alluding to the above derivation), and is followed by the Vulg. *ligyurius,* as well as the A.V. So also Josephus *(War,* 5:5,7). " The word *ligulre* is unknown in modern mineralogy. Phillips *(Mineraslogy,* page 87) mentions *ligurite,* the fragments of which are uneven and transparent, with a vitreous luster. It occurs in a sort of talcose rock in the banks of a river in the Apennines" (Smith). The classical ligure (or λυγκούριον*)* was thought to be a species of amber (see Moore, *Anc. Min.* page 106), although ancient authors speak uncertainly respecting it (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 37:11, 13; Theophrastus, *De lalpid.* c. 50), and assign a false derivation to the name (see Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* page 763). The Hebrew word has been thought to designate the same stone as the JACINTH (Braunius, *De vestitu sacerd.* 2:14), although others adhere to the *opal* as corresponding better with the ancient figure (Rosenmüller, *Sch. in Lexod.* 28:19). "Dr. Woodward and some old commentators have supposed that it was some kind of *belemnite,* because, as these fossils contain bituminous particles, they have thought that they have been able to detect, upon heating or rubbing pieces of them the absurd origin which Theophrastus (Frag. 2:28, 31; 15:2, edit. Schneider) and Pliny (H.N. 37:3) ascribe to the *lyncyrium.* As to the belief that *amber* is denoted by this word, Theophrastus, in the passage cited above, has given a detailed description of the stone, and clearly distinguishes it from *electron,* or amber. Amber, moreover, is too soft for engraving upon, while the *lynncyrium* was a hard stone, out of which seals were made." *SEE GEM*. Beckmann *(Hist. Invent.* 1:87, Bohn) believes, with Braun, Epiphanius, and J. de Laet, that the description of the *lyncyrium* agrees well with the *hyacinth-stone* of modern mineralogists, especially that species which is described as being of an orange-yellow color, passing on into a reddish-brown (see Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* IV, 1:28). The hyacinth is a variety of crystallized zircon, containing also iron, which usually gives it a reddish or brown color. It generally occurs in four-sided prisms, terminated by four rhombic planes. It is diaphanous, glossy, and hard. It occurs in the beds of rivers, the best being brought from the West Indies, but is now little esteemed as a gem, although the ancients used it for engraving. "With this supposition (that the *lyncyrium* is identical with the

jacinth or hyacinth) Hill *(Notes on Theophrastus on Stones, §* 50, page 166) and Rosenmüller *(Mineral. of Bible,* page 36; *Bib. Cab.)* agree. It must be confessed, however, that this opinion is far from satisfactory; for Theophrastus, speaking of the properties of the *lyncyrium,* says that it attracts not only light particles of wood, but fragments of iron and brass. Now there is no peculiar attractive power in the hyacinth; nor is Beckmann's explanation of this point sufficient. He says: 'If we consider its (the *lyncyrium's)* attracting of small bodies in the same light which our hyacinth has in common with all stones of the glassy species. I cannot see anything to controvert this opinion, and to induce us to believe the *lyncyrium* and the tourmaline to be the same.' But surely the *lyncyrium,* whatever it be, had in a marked manner *magnetic properties;* indeed, the term was applied to the stone on this very account, for the Greek name *ligurion* appears to be derived from λείχειν, 'to lick,' 'to attract,' and doubtless was selected by the Sept. for this reason to express the Hebrew word, which has a similar derivation. Hence Dr. Watson *(Philos. Tirans.* 51:394) identifies the Greek h*yncyrium* with the *tournmaline,* or, more definitely, with the red variety known as *rubellite,* which is a hard stone, and used as a gem, and sometimes sold for *red sapphire.* Tourmaline becomes, as is well known, electrically polar when heated. Beckmann's objection, that had Theophrastus been acquainted with the tourmaline, he would have remarked that it did not acquire its attractive power till it was heated,' is answered by his own admission on the passage, quoted from the *Hist. de l'Academie* for 1717, page 7 (see Bechmann, 1:91). Tourmaline is a mineral found in many parts of the world. The duke de Noya purchased two of these stones in Holland, which are there called *aschentrikker.* Linnaus, in his preface to the *Flora Zeylandica,* mentions the stone under the name of *lapis electricus* from Ceylon. The natives call it *tournamal (Philippians Trans.* 1.c.). Many of the precious stones which were in the possession of the Israelites during their wanderings were no doubt obtained from the Egyptians, who might have procured from the Tyrian merchants specimens from even India and Ceylon, etc. The fine specimen of rubellite now in the British Museum belonged formerly to the king of Ava."

Lik'hi

(Heb. *Likchi',* y j ae]l ;æ*learned,* otherwise *captivator;* Sept. Λακειά v.r. Λακίμ, Vulg. *Leci),* the third named of the four sons of Shemidah or Shemida, son of Manasseh (<130719>1 Chronicles 7:19; comp. <061702>Joshua 17:2).

He does not appear to have had a numerous if any progeny, as his name does not occur in the account of the Manassite families (Numbers 26:32). B.C. post 1856.

Lilburne, John

a Quaker preacher, noted for his republicanism, was born of an old family in Durham County in 1618. In his early youth he was a clother. He entered the ministry after he had suffered greatly by prosecution for his opposition to the government. His intrepid defense of his rights as a free-born Englishman before the dreaded bar of the High-Church party gained for him the familiar appellation of "freeborn John." He was condemned to receive five hundred lashes at the cart-tail, and to stand in the pillory; but his spirit was only aroused by this disgraceful punishment. His name became the watchword of the party known as *Levellers.* During the Revolution he fought bravely against the king at Edge Hill and Marston Moor, where he led a regiment. Lilburne's chief fault was the want of a more statesmanlike spirit, so that he was continually sinking from the leading position he might have held, in virtue of his integrity and intrepidity, to that of a demagogue. He boldly accused Cromwell and Ireton of treason, and the former tried in vain to make him comprehend the real situation of affairs, and seems at last to have given him up in despair, and to have prosecuted him from necessity, while he valued his steady qualities and incorruptible nature. Reduced to quiescence under the iron hand of the protector, his political enthusiasm subsided into the religious, and the famous John Lilburne became a preacher among the Quakers. He died August 29, 1657. — Appleton's *Cyclop. of Biography,* page 497.

Lilienthal, Michael

a German theologian, was born at Liebstadt, in Prussia, September 8, 1686. He studied theology at Kuieigsberg and Jena, and became professor in the University of Rostock. He afterwards visited Holland, where he studied philology and archaeology, and after his return was for some years professor at Konigsberg. In 1714 he became assistant librarian of that university, and in 1719 was appointed dteacon oif one of the churches at Heidelberg. He was made member of the Academy of Berlin ill 1711, and of that of Strasburg in 1733. He died at Kidnigsberg January 23, 1750. His principal works are *Biblisch-exegetische Bibliothek* (Kinigsb. 1740-1744, 3 volumes, 8vo): — *Biblischer Archivarius d. Heiligen Schrift* (Konsigsb.

1745-1746, 2 volumes, 4to: it contains a list of Biblical commentators, arranged in the order of the difficult passages): — *Theologisch-homelit. Archivarius* (Konigsberg, 1749, 4to). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:413; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 31:225. (J.N.P.)

Lilienthal, Theodor Christopher

an eminent German theologian and writer, was born at Kionigsberg October 8, 1711. He studied at the university of his native place, and afterwards at Jena and Tübingen, and, after making a journey through Holland and England, spent some time in the University of Halle. He was soon after appointed adjunct professor at Königsberg, and in 1744 became extraordinary professor and doctor of theology. In 1746 he was made pastor of the community of Neu-Rossgärten, and subsequently became ordinary professor of theology, and church and school counsellor. He died March 17, 1782. Among his works we notice *Die gute Sache sder göttlichen Offenbarung wider die Feinde derselben erwiesen u. gerettet* (Königsberg, 1750-82. 16 volumes, additions and variations to the first four iparts appeared in 1778, and also an augmented addition in the same year). It gives a full collection of the divers objections that have been urged against Christianity, and answers every one. It is consequently useful as a book of reference on this subject, like Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel History,* although, on account of its bulk and its antiquated apologetic stand-point, it is less sit to be in itself used as a weapon against incredulity. He wrote also *De Canone Missae Gregoriano* (Leyden, 1739, 8vo): — *Historia beatae Dorothea, Prussiae patronae, fabulis variis maculata* (Dantzig, 1743, 4to): — *Commentatio critica duorum codicum Biblia Hebraica continentium* (Dantzig, 1769, 4to), and a large number of sermons, dissertations, etc. See Schröckh, *K. Gesch. seit d. Reformation,* 6:291; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* 8:413; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale,* 31:226. (J.N.P.)

Lilith

SEE SCREECH-OWL.

Lillie, John, D.D.

a minister originally of the Refoirmed (Dutch), but afterwards of the Presbyterian Chiurch, was born in Kelso, Scotland, December 16, 1812; graduated with the highest honors at the University of Edinburgh at the age

of twenty-one years, prosecuted his theological studies for two years at Eidinburgh, then came to America, and completed his course at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, New Brunswick, N.J. In 1835 he was installed pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Kingston, N.Y. In 1841 he took charge of the grammar-school of the New York University, and in 1843 of a congregation which had gathered about him in the University Chapel, and afterwards (1846) occupied their new church in Stanton Street. From 1844 until 1848 he was the editor of the *Jewish Chronicle.* He was employed by the American (Baptist) Bible Union as one of its translators from 1851 to 1857. In 1855 he received the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh. In 1858 he accepted the call offered to him by the Presbyterian Church, Kingston, N.Y., and he there labored until his death, February 23, 1867. Dr. Lilie's published productions is are not numerous, but highly creditable. His revisions and translation of the *epistles to the Thessalonions,* the *Second Epistle of Peter,* those *of John* and *Jude,* and the *Revelation,* for the Anglo-American edition of "Lange's Commentary," have won the highest encomiums. He was also the author of a small work on *The Perpetuity of the Earth,* in which he developed his premillennial views. Dr. Lillie was an earnest Christian, a ripe scholar, and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Aima.* 1868, page 117; *Kingston Arus and Journal,* February 1867; *Mem. Sermnon,* by Reverend W. Irvin; *British and Foreign Evangelical Review,* 59:619.

Lily

Picture for Lily 1

(ˆvWv, *shushan',* from its *whiteness,* <1079>1 Kings 7:19; also ˆv/v, *shoshan',* <1072>1 Kings 7:22, 26; <2216>Song of Solomon 2:16; 4:5; 5:13; 6:2, 3; 7:2; and hN;v/v, *shoshannah',* <1405>2 Chronicles 4:5; <2201>Song of Solomon 2:1, 2; <2345>Hosea 14:5 *SEE SHUSHAN*; *SEE SHOSHANNIM*; Sept. and N.T. κρίνον, <4368>Matthew 6:28: <4227>Luke 12:27). There are, no doubt, several plants indigenous in Syria which might come under the denomination of lily, when that name is used in a general sense, as it often is by travelers and others. The term *shoshan* or *sosuns* seems also to have been employed in this sense. It was known to the Greeks *(σοῦσον),* for Dioscorides (3:116) describes the mode of preparing an ointment called *susinon,* which others, he savs, call κρινινόν, that is, *lilinum.* So Atheneus (12:513)

identities the Persian *susona* with the Greek *krinon.* The Arabic authors also use the word in a general sense, several varieties being described under the head *sosun.* The name is applied even to kinds of *Iris,* of which several species, with various colored flowers, are distinguished. But it appears to us that none but a plant which was well known and highly esteemed would be found occurring in so many different passages. Thus, in <1079>1 Kings 7:19-26, and <1405>2 Chronicles 4:5, it is mentioned as forming the ornamental work of the pillars and of the brazen sea, made of molten brass, for the house of Solomon, by Hiram of Tyre. In Canticles the word is frequently mentioned; and it is curious that in five passages, <2202>Song of Solomon 2:2 and 16; 4:5; 6:2 and 3, there is a reference to feeding among lilies, which appears unaccountable when we consider that the allusion is made simply to an ornamental or sweet-smelling plant; and this the *shushans* appears to have been from the other passages in which it is mentioned. Thus, in <2201>Song of Solomon 2:1, 'I am the rose of Sharon and the *lily* of the valleys;' verse 2, 'as the *lily* among thorns, so is my love among the daughters;' verse 13, 'his lips like *lilies,* dropping sweetsmelling myrrh;' 7:2, 'thy belly is like an heap of wheat set about with *lilies.'* If we consider that the book of Canticles is supposed to have been written on the occasion of the marriage of Solomon with a princess of Egypt, it is natural to suppose that some of the imagery may have been derived from her native country, and that the above lily may be a plant of Egypt rather than of Palestine. Especially does the water-lily, or lotus of the Nile, seem suitable to most of the above passages. Thus Herodotus (2:92) says. 'When the waters have risen to their extremest height, and all the fields are overflowed, there appears above the surface an immense quantity of plants of the lily species, which the Egyptians call the lotus; having cut down these, they dry them in the sun. The seed of the flowers, which resembles that of the poppy, they bake, and make into a kind of bread: they also eat the root of this plant, which is round, of an agreeable flavor, and about the size of an apple. There is a second species of the lotus, which grows in the Nile, and which is not unlike a rose. The fruit, which grows from the bottom of the root, resembles a wasp's nest: it is found to contain a number of kernels of the size of an olive-stone, which are very grateful either fresh or dried.' All this exists even to the present day. Both the roots and the stalks form articles of diet in Eastern countries, and the large farinaceous seeds of both the nymphaea and nelumbium are roasted and eaten. Hence possibly the reference to feeding among lilies in the above-quoted passages" This flower (the *Nymhaea Lotus.* of Linnaeus, and the *beshnin,*

of the modern Arabs) grows plentifully in Lower Egypt, flowering during the period of the aninual inundation. There can be little doubt the "lilywork" spoken of in <1079>1 Kings 7:19, 22, was an ornament in the form of the Egyptian lotus. There wre eformerly three descriptions of water-lily in Egypt, but one (the red-flowered lotus) has disappeared. "The flower," says Burckhardt, speaking of the white variety, or *Nymphaea lotus,* "generally stands on the stalk from one to two feet above the surface of the water. When the flowers open completely, the leaves form a horizontal disk, with the isolated seed-vessel in the midst, which bends down the stall by its weight, and swims upon the surface of the water for several days until it is engulfed. This plant grows at Cairo, in a tank called Birket el-Rotoli, near one of the northern suburbs where I happen to reside. It is not found in Upper Egypt, I believe, but abounds in the Delta, and attains maturity at the time when the Nile reaches its full height. I saw it in great abundance and in full flower. covering the whole inundated plain, on October 12, 1815, near the ruins of Tiney, about twelve miles south-east from Mansoura, on the Damietta branch. It dies when the water retires." Among the ancient Egyptians the lotus was introduced into all subjects as an ornament, and as the favorite flower of the country, but not with the holy character usually attributed to it, though adopted as an emblem of the god Nophre-Atmi (Wilkinson's A*ncient Egyptians,* 1:57, 256). As the Hebrew architecture was of the Phoenico-Egyptian style, nothing was more natural than the introduction of this ornament by Solomon into the Temple. It was in like manner borrowed by the Assyrians in their later structures (Layard's *Nineveh,* 2:356). Mr. Bardwell, the architect, in his work entitled *Temples, Ancient and Modern* (1837), says, "The two great columns of the pronaos in Solomon's Temple were of the usual proportions of Egyptian columns, being five and a half diameters high; and as these gave the great characteristic feature to the building, Solomon sent an embassy to fetch the architect from Tyre to superintend the molding and casting of these columns, which were intended to be of brass. Observe how conspicuous is the idea of the vase (the 'bowl' of our translation), rising from a cylinder ornamented with lotus-flowers; the bottom of the vase was partly hidden by the flowers, the belly of it was overlaid with net-work, ornamented by seven wreaths, the Hebrew number of happiness, and beneath the lip of the vase were two rows of pomegranates, one hundred in each row. These superb pillars were eight feet in diameter and forty-four feet high, supporting a noble entablature fourteen feet high." *SEE JACHIN AND BOAZ.* "In confirmation of the above identification of the lily of the

O.T. with the lotus-flower, we may adduce also the remarks of Dr. W. C. Taylor in his *Bible Illustrated by Egyptian Monuments*, where he says that the lilies of the 45th and 59th Psalms have puzzled all Biblical critics. The title, 'To the chief musician upon *Shoshannim,'* has been supposed to be the name of some unknown tune to which the psalm was to be sung. But Dr. Taylor says 'the word *shoshannim* is universally acknowledged to signify lilies, and lilies have nothing to do with the subject of the ode. But this hymeneal ode was intended to be sung by the female attendants of the Egyptian princess, and they are called "the lilies," not only by a poetic reference to the lotus lilies of the Nile, but by a direct allusion to their custom of making the lotus lily a conspicuous ornament of their head-dress.' Thus, therefore, all the passages of O.-T. Scripture in which *shushan* occurs appear to be explained by considering it to refer to the lotus lily of the Nile" (Kitto). "Lynch enumerates the 'lily' as among the plants seen by him on the shores of the Dead Sea, but gives no details which could lead to its identification *(Exped. to the. Jordane,* page 286). He had previously observed the water-lily on the Jordan (page 173), but omits to mention whether it was the yellow *(Nuphar lutea)* or the white *(Nymphaea alba).* 'The only "lilies" which I saw in Palestine,' says Professor Startley, 'in the months of March and April, were large yellow water-lilies, in the clear spring of 'Ain AMellahah, near the lake of Merom' *(S. and Pal.* page 429). He suggests that the name “lily” ‘may include the numerous flowers of the tulip or amaryllis kind which appear in the early summer or the autumn of Palestine.' The following description of the Hûleh-lily by Dr. Thomson *(The Land and the Book,* 1:394), were it more precise, would perhaps have enabled botanists to identify it: 'This Huleh-lily is very large, and the three inner petals meet above and form a gorgeous canopy, such as art never approached, anld king never sat under, even in his utmost glory. We call it Huleh-lily because it was here that it was first discovered. Its botanical name, if it have one, I am unacquainted with.... Our flower delights most in the valleys, but is also found on the mountains. It grows among thorns, and I have sadly lacerated my hands in extricating it from them. Nothing can be in higher contrast than the luxuriant velvety softness of this lily, and the crabbed, tangled hedge of thorns about it. Gazelles still delight to feed among them; and you can scarcely ride through the woods north of Tabor, where these lilies abound, without frightening them from their flowery pasture.' "

Picture for Lily 2

On the other hand, some of the passages in which *shoshanz* occurs evidently refer to *a field* variety, as <2201002>Song of Solomon 2:1, 2, and the tubular shape of the trumpet is sufficient to explain the transfer of the word to that musical instrument. *SEE SHOSHANNIM*. "The Hebrew word is rendered 'rose' in the Chaldce Targum, and by Maimonides and other Babbinical writers, with the exception of Kimchi and Ben-Melech, who in <110719>1 Kings 7:19 translated it by 'violet.' In the Judaeo-Spanish version of the Canticles *shoishan* and *shôshannâh* are always translated by *rosa,* but in <280405>Hosea 14:5 the latter is rendered *lirio.* But κρίνον, or 'lily,' is the uniform rendering of the Sept., and is, in all probability, the true one, as it is supported by the analogy of the Arabic and Persian *susan,* which has the same meaning to this day, and by the existence of the same word in Syriac and Coptic. The Spanish *azucena,* 'a white lily,' is merely a modification of the Arabic; but, although there is little doubt that the word denotes some plant of the lily species, it is by no means certain what individual of this class it especially designates. Father Souciet *(Recueil de diss. Crit.* 1715) labored to prove that the lily of Scripture is the 'crown imperial,' the Persian *tusai,* the κρίνον βασιλικόν of the Greeks, and the *lFritillaria imperialis* of Linnums. So common was this plant in Persia that it is supposed to have given its name to Susa, the capital (Athen. 12:1; Bochart, *Phaleg.* 2:14); but there is no proof that it was at any time common in Palestine, and *'the* lily' *par excellence* of Persia would not of necessity be 'the lily' of the Holy Land. Dioscorides (1:62) bears witness to the beauty of the lilies of Syria and Pisidia, from which the best perfume was made. He says (3:106 [116]) of the κρίνον βασιλικόν that the Syrians call it σασᾶ *(=shushcan),* and the Africans ἀβίβλαβον, which Bochart renders in Hebrew characters ˆb l byba white shoot.' Kühn, in his note on the passage, identifies the plant in question with the *Liliumz candidumn* of Linnaeus. It is probably the same as that called in the Mishna ‘king's lily' *(Kilaimi,* 5:8). Pliny (21:5) defines κρίνον as 'rubens lilium;' and Dioscorides, in another passage, mentions the fact that there are lilies with purple flowers, but whether by this he intended the *Lilium martagon* or *Chalcedonicunm,* Kühn leaves undecided. Now in the passage of Athenaus above quoted it is said, Σοῦσον γὰρ ειναι τῇ ῾Ελλήνων φωνῇ τὸ κρίνον. But in the *Etymologicum Mazgnums* (s.v. Σοῦσα) we find τὰ γὰρ λείρια ὑπὸ τῶν Φοινίκων σοῦσαλέγρεται. As the *shushans* is thus identified both with κρίνον, the red or purple lily, and with λείριον,

the white lily, it is evidently impossible, from the word itself, to ascertain exactly the kind of lily which is referred to. If the *shushan* or *shoshlannah* of the O.T. and the κρίνον of the Sermon on the Mount be identical, which there seems no reason to doubt, the plant designated by these terms must have been a conspicuous object on the shores of the Lake of Gennesaret (<4006B>Matthew 6:28; <4212>Luke 12:27); it must have flourished in the deep, broad valleys of Palestine (<2201>Song of Solomon 2:1), among the thorny shrubs (<2202>Song of Solomon 2:2) and pastures of the desert (<2216>Song of Solomon 2:16; 4:5; 6:3), and must have been remarkable for its rapid and luxuriant growth (<2805>Hosea 14:5; Ecclus. 39:14). The purple flowers of the *khob*, or wild artichoke, which abounds in the plain north of Tabor and in the valley of Esdraelon, have been thought by some to be the 'lilies of the field' alluded to in <4006B>Matthew 6:28 (Wilson, *Lands of the Bible*, 2:110). A recent traveler mentions a plant, with lilac flowers like the hyacinth, and called by the Arabs *usweih*, which he considered to be of the species denominated lily in Scripture (Bonar, *Desert of Sinai*, page 329)." Tristram strongly inclines to identify the scarlet, anemone *(Anemone coronaria* with the Scripture "lily" *(Nat. Hist. of Bible*, page 464).

Picture for Lily 3

In the N. Test. the word "lily" occurs in the well-known and beautiful passage (<4006B>Matthew 6:28), 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you that even Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these;' so also in <4212>Luke 12:27. Here it is evident that the plant alluded to must have been indigenous or grow in wild in the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee, must have been of an ornamental character, and, from the Greek term κρίνον being applied to it, of a liliaceous nature. The name κρίνον occurs in all the old Greek writers (see Dioscor. 3:116; compare Claudian. *Epithal. seren.* 126; Martial, 5:37, 6 sq.; Calpurn. 6:33; Athen. 15:677, 680; Virgil, *Ecl.* 10:25; Pliny, 15:7; 21:11). Theophrastus first uses it, and is supposed by Sprengel to apply it to species of *Varscissus* and to *Lilium candidumn.* Dioscorides indicates two species, but very imperfectly: one of them is supposed to be the *Lilium candidum*, and the other, with a reddish flower, may be *L. martagon* or *L. Chalcedonicum.* He alludes more particularly to the lilies of Syria and of Pamphylia being well suited for making the ointment of lily. Pliny enumerates three kinds, a white, a red, and a purple-colored lily. Travelers in Palestine mention that in the month of January the fields and groves everywhere abound in various species of lily, tulip, and narcissus.

Benard noticed, near Acre, on Jan. 18th, and about Jaffa on the 23d, tulips, white, red, blue, etc. Gumpenberg saw the meadows of Galilee covered with the same flowers on the 31st. Tulips figure conspicuously among the flowers of Palestine, varieties probably of *Tulijpas Gesneriana* (Kitto's *Palestine,* page 215). So Pococke says, 'I saw many tulips growing wild in the fields (in March), and any one who considers how beautiful those flowers are to the eye would be apt to conjecture that these are the lilies to which Solomon in all his glory was not to be compared.' This is much more likely to be the plant intended than some others which have been adduced, as, for instance, the scarlet *amaryllis,* having white flowers with bright purple streaks, found by Salt at Adowa. Others have preferred the *Crown imperial,* which is a native of Persia and Cashmere. Most authors have united in considering the white lily, *Lilium candidume,* to be the plant to which our Savior referred; but it is doubtful whether it has ever been found in a wild state in Palestine. Some, indeed, have thought it to be a native of the New World. Dr. Lindley, however, in the *Gardeners' Chronicle* (2:744), says, 'This notion cannot be sustained, because the white lily occurs in all engraving of the annunciation, executed somewhere about 1480 by Martin Schongauer; and the first voyage of Columbus did not take place till 1492. In this very rare print the lily is represented as growing in an ornamental vase, as if it were cultivated as a curious object.' This opinion is confirmed by a correspondent at Aleppo *(Gardeners' Chronicle,* 3:429), who has resided long in Syria, but is acquainted only with the botany of Aleppo and Antioch: 'I never saw the white lily in a wild state, nor have I heard of its being so in Syria. It is cultivated here on the roofs of the houses in pots as an exotic bulb, like the daffodil.' In consequence of this difficulty, the late Sir J.E. Smith was of opinion that the plant alluded to under the name of lily was the *Amaryllis lutea* (now *Oporasnthus lutteus),* 'whose golden liliaceous flowers in autumn afford one of the most brilliant and gorgeous objects in nature, as the fields of the Levant are overrun with them; to them the expression of Solomon, in all his glory, not being arrayed like one of them, is peculiarly appropriate.' Dr. Lindley conceives it to be much more probable that the plant intended by our Savior was the *Ixiolirion montanum,* a plant allied to the *amaryllis,* of very great beauty, with a slender stem, and clusters of the most delicate violet flowers, abounding in Palestine, where colonel Chesney found it in the most brilliant profusion (l.c. page 744). In reply to this, a correspondent furnishes an extract of a letter from Dr. Bowring, which throws a new light upon the subject: 'I cannot describe to you with botanical accuracy the lily

of Palestine. I heard it called by the title of *Lilia Syriaca,* and I imagine under this title its botanical characteristics may be hunted out. Its color is a brilliant red; its size about half that of the common tiger lily. The white lily I do not remember to have seen in any part of Syria. It was in April and May that I observed my flower, and it was most abundant in the district of Galilee, where it and the *Rhododendron* (which grew in rich abundance round the paths) most strongly excited my attention.' On this Dr. Lindley observes, 'It is clear that neither the white lily, nor the *Oporanthus luteus, nor Ixiolirion,* will answer to Dr. Bowring's description, which seems to point to the Chalcedonian or scarlet *martagon* lily, formerly called the lily of Byzantium, found from the Adriatic to the Levant, and which, with its scarlet turban-like flowers, is indeed a most stately and striking object' *(Gardeners' Chronicle,* 2:854)" (Kitto). As this lily (the *Lilium Chalcedonicum* of botanists) is in flower at the season of the year when the Sermon on the Mount is supposed to have been spoken (May; but it is probable that our Savior's discourse on Providence, contaning the allusion to the lily, occurred on a different occasion, apparently about October; see Strong's *Harmony of the Gospels, §* 52), is indigenous in the very locality, and is conspicuous, even in the garden, for its remarkable showy flowers, there can now be little doubt that it is the plant alluded to by our Savior. "Strand *(Flor. Palest.)* mentions it as growing near Joppa, and Kitto *(Phys. Hist. of Palest.* page 219) makes especial mention of the *L. candidum* growing in Palestine; and, in connection with the habitat given by Strand, it is worth observing that the lily is mentioned (<2002>Song of Solomon 2:1) with the rose of *Sharon."*

By some the lily is supposed to be meant by the term t l Xbij } *(chabatstse'leth,* "rose"), in <2335>Isaiah 35:1; <2002>Song of Solomon 2:1. For further details, consult Oken, *Lehrb. d. Naturgesch.* II, 1:757; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* 4:138; Celsius, *Hierobot.* 1:383 sq.; Billerbeck, *Flosta Class.* page 90 sq.; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* page 1385; *Penny Cyclopaedia,* s.v. Lotus.

Limbo Or Limbus

meaning *a border or department,* is used by Romanists as the name of the place of some of the departed, which the schoolmen who first held this doctrine (see below) believed to be situated on the limb, i.e., the edge or border of hell. *SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE*. There are five places to which the Church of Rome consigns departed spirits. Heaven is the

residence of the holy, and hell of the finally damned. Besides these she enumerates *limbus infantum* the department for infants; *limbus patrum*, the department of the fathers; and *purgatory*. Hell is placed lowest, purgatory next, then *limbus* for infants; and finally is enumerated a place for those who died before the advent of Christ. According to the Roman Catholic view, until Christ's death and resurrection, which constituted the decisive moments of the work of redemption, the doors of heaven were closed to all *(Catech.* <4002>*Romans* 1:2, 7); since then they have been permanently open to all perfect saints. This doctrine was first advanced by pope Benedict XII, and afterwards sanctioned by the Council of Florence (Perrone, 5:213). According to this theory, until the coming of Christ, the souls of all departed were, without exception, sent into the place of punishment, or *infernus*, as is (according to Romish views) still the case with those who die without having arrived at perfection, or with some penance still to be performed for sin. At present they use the word *infernus* to convey the idea that all sinners are in some place outside of heaven, and that, on account of their different personal qualities, they are divided into different classes, which have nothing in common except their exclusion from the happiness of heaven, and therefore divide these *abdita receptacula* (Augustine. *Enchiridion ad Laurent. §* 109), of which the place of punishment consists, into,

1, hell, in its fullest sense, that terrible, immense prison in which the damned, who died in a state of mortal sin, are to remain forever *(Cat.* <4006>*Romans* 1:6, 3, 5);

2, purgatory, in which the souls of believers, and of those who are justified, suffer until they are entirely free from sin;

3, the bosom of Abraham, where the saints who died before the coming of Christ were received, and where, while free from torments, they were nevertheless, on account of original sin, prevented by the daemons from beholding othe glory of God until the coming o the Redeemer, whose merits freed them from these bonds, and opened to them the doors of heaven. Compare here the statement of the early English reformers in "the *Institution of a Christian Man"* on the fifth article of their creed: "Our Savior Jesus Christ, at his entry into hell, first conquered and oppressed both the devil and hell, and also death itself... afterwards he spoiled hell, and delivered and brought with him from thence all the souls of those righteous and good men which, from the fall of Adam, died in the favor of

God, and in the faith and belief of this our Savior, which was then to come." The doctrine of the Church, as expressed in the symbols, names no other divisions. The third place which, in ecclesiastical phraseology, is usually called *Limbus patrum,* is even represented sometimes as a quiet habitation, and at other times as an unpleasant prison *(misera illius custodiae molestia),* which two views, being difficult to conciliate, gave rise to many intricate questions unavoidable as soon as an attempt is made to establish such a detailed topography of the places of future life. The limbo of Dante is placed in the outermost of the nine circles of his *Inferno.* No weeping is heard within it, but perpetual sighs tremble on the air, breathed by an infinite crowd of women, men, and children, afflicted, but not tormented. These inhabitants are not condemned on account of sin, but solely because it was their fortune to live before the birth of Christ, or to die unbaptized. The poet was grieved at heart, as well he might be, when he recognized in this sad company many persons of great worth (comp. Milman, *Latin Christianity,* book 14, chapter 2).

From the authorities of the Church, we find that the admission of the belief in a purgatory had in the West great influence on the ideas concerning the future. The scholastics, in the course of time, erected these views into a system. Besides the above-named three places of abode for departed spirits deprived of heavenly felicity recognized in the Roman Catholic Catechism, they asserted the existence of a fourth, intended for children who died previous to baptism. Bellarmine (*Purg.* 2:7) considers it a very difficult question to decide whether there may not be a fifth, in which the purified souls remain until their final admittance into the kingdom of heaven, and which must consequently be situated somewhere between purgatory and heaven (Beda, *Hist.* 5:13; Dionysius Carthusianus, *Dial. de jud. particul.* 31; Ludi Blosius, *Monil. Spirit.* 13). The necessity of ascribing to each of these *loca paenalia* its special position accounts sufficiently for the fact that the word *limbus* is made to answer both for the place where the saints who lived before Christ remain, and for the abode of children who died without baptism. It appears to have been first set forth by Thomas Aquinas, and to have been at once adopted by the Church. Hell is considered as situated in the center of the earth; next comes purgatory, which surrounds hell; then the *Limbus infantum, or puerorum;* and finally, as the central point between hell and heaven, the *Limbus Patrum,* or *Sinus Abrahae.* Of course each different place has its own special punishments: in hell it is *paena aeterna damni et sensus;* in purgatory, *paena temporalis damni et*

sensus; in the Limbus infantum, *paena damni aeterna;* and in the Limbus patrum, *poena damni temporalis* (Thom. Aq. 3, d. 22, q. 2, a. 1, q. 2, 4; d. 21, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2; d. 45, q. 1, a. 1, q. 2, 3, 3, q. 52, 2, 4, 4; d. 45, q. 1, a. q. 2, etc., *Eleucidar.* 64; Dante, Inf. 4; comp. 31 sq.; Durand, *De S. Port. Sentt.* 3, d. 22, q. 4; Sonnius, *Demonstr. rel. Chr.* 2:3, 15, and 2:4, 1; Bellarmine, *Purg.* 2:6; Andradius, *Defins. Trid. Synod.* 2:299).

The *Limbus patrum* is exclusively reserved to the saints of the Mosaic dispensation. They suffer only by the consciousness that they are deprived, in consequence of original sin, from beholding God, and by an ardent longing for the coming of their Messiah. Since Christ has atoned for original sin, and freed them from imprisonment, this limbo is empty, and no longer of any importance in a religious sense. It is called *Limbus inferni,* "quia erat poenae carentiae," *Sinus Abrahae* "propter requiem, quia erat exspectatio glori' " (Bellarmine, *De Christo,* 4:10; Becanus, *Append. spurg. Calv.).* This view is defended partly by means of some passages in Scripture (such as Genesis 37:35; 1 Samuel 28; Zechariah 9:11; Luke 16:23; 20:37; 23:43; John 8:56; Hebrews 11:5; 1 Peter 3:19); but especially by oral tradition. This last is the more available because, with the exception of the later attempts at locating the different places, the Western Church has always taught the same things on this point, at least since St. Augustine *(De civ. Dei,* 20:15), that the limbus in general was only the *capult mortum* which the doctrine of the purgatory had yet left to the old Church. The Greek Church, on the other hand, holds no such views (Smith, *De Eccles. Graec. starcti.* 1678, page 103; Heineccius, *Abbildung d. alten u. neuen griech. Kirche,* 1711, 2:103).

The doctrine of the *Limbus infantum,* or, rather, of the fate of unbaptized children, is insisted on with much greater force. On this point, however, the consequences of the system and the natural feelings of humanity come into conflict, and therefore the Church has never officially proclaimed its views as to the exact nature of it, so that a certain latitude is given for different opinions concerning it. The fathers early held different opinions on this point. Ambrosius *(Oral.* 40) does not venture to give any view concerning unbaptized children. Gregory of Nazianzum *(Oralt. in s. Bapt.* 40:21) claims that τοὺς μήτο δοξασθήσεσθαι, μήτο κολασθήσεσθαι περὶ τοῦ δικαίου κριτοῦ; and Gregory of Nvssa (ed. Paris, 1615, 2:770) only denies in the very mildest manner their being ἐν ἀλγεινοῖς. Pelagius knew better where they do not go to than where they do go. In accordance with his general theory, St. Augustine consigns them "ad ignem aeternum

damnaturum iri;" but at the same time he admits that theirs is the slightest punishment consequent to original sin; their damnation is even so very slight that he expresses the doubt, "an eis, ut nulli essent, quam ut ibi essent, potius expediret," and declares "definire se non posse, quae, qualis et quanta erit" *(Sermo* 294, n. 3 sq.; *Enchirid.* c. 93; *De pecc. merit.* i, c. 16, n. 2; *Contra. Julian.* 5:44; *Epist. ad Hieron.* 131). This is the view most generally held in the Roman Catholic Church. General councils held at Lyons and at Florence decided that both those who died in mortal sin and those who were only tainted by original sin went down to the *infernus,* but that their punishments were different. In this respect the damnation of unbaptized children became *de fide,* as it had to be in some way distinguished from that of adults. Carrying out this view, the most distinguished scholastics, such as Peter Lombard *(Sent.* 2, d. 33), Thomas Bonaventura, and Scotus, assign to them only *poena damni,* in contradistinction from *piena sensus.* The contrary assertion of Petavius *(De Deo,* 9:10, 10) is based on an error. Gregory of Rimini alone makes an exception, and for this reason received the name of *tortor infantum* (Sarpi, *Storia del Conc. di Trento,* 2; Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* 1:142, n. 128).

Now, although the essential nature of the *poena damni* consists in the deprivation of the happiness of seeing God, there exists a difference in the manner of applying the idea to children and their inheritance of original sin. In the fifth session of the Council of Trent the Dominicans advocated the stricter view, making of the *limbus infantum* a dark, underground prison, while the Franciscans placed it above in a region of light. Others made the condition of these children still better: they supposed them occupied with studying nature, philosophizing on it, and receiving occasional visits from angels and saints. As the council thought it best not to decide this point, theologians have since been free to embrace either view. Bellarmine *(De amiss. grat.* 6:6) considers their state, like Lombard, as one of sorrow, On the contrary, cardinal Sfondrani *(Nodus praedest. dissol.* 1:1, 23, and 1:2, 16) and Peter Godoy (compare Thomas, *Quaest.* 5 *de nalo,* a. 2) consider them as enjoying all the natural happiness of which they are capable. They do not even know that supernatural happiness consists in the *visio clara Dei,* and can feel no pain from this, to them unknown, exclusion. Finally, Perrone (5:275), who takes *Concil. Tr.* sess. 5, c. 4, as including in *de fide* only the want of the *supernaturalis beatitudo,* says: " 'Si spectetur *relative* ad supernaturalem beatitudinem habet talis status rationem poenae et damnationis; si vero spectetur idem status in se sive *absolute,* cum per

peccatum de naturalibuis nihil amiserint, talis erit ipsorum conditio, qualis fuisset, si Adam neque peccasset neque elevatus ad supernaturalem statum fuisset, i.e., in conditione purae nature." This attempt at conciliation agrees so well with the Roman Catholic view of original sin, that on this account it has been admitted *(Conc. Tr.* sess. 5:2, 3, 5, and sess. 6; Bellarmine, *grat. prim. horn.* 5). Moreover, it is well known that Roman Catholic principles are of great elasticity in their application, so that there is alwavs some way for the Church of getting out of difficulties. Thus, while the Catechism (2:2, 28) continues to assert that, aside from baptism, there is "nulla alia salutis comparande ratio," we learn from the theologians, from Duns Scotus down to Klee *(Dogm.* 3:119), that the mere *desiderium baptismi* can be considered as valid for the children while set in the mothers' womb, and is equivalent to the actual performance of the rite of baptism on the child. What becomes of the children who, though baptized, die soon after baptism, and who thus lose the *meritum e congruo* necessary for justification, cannot here be taken into consideration.

Protestantism has taken but little notice of all these views. It was considered by many that these theories were too unimportant. The old Protestant Church, on the contrary, tried to prove the untenability on Biblical or philosophical grounds of this changeable doctrine, its late origin, and its inner contradictions. Neither did it forget the impossibility of separating the *paena damni* and *paena senstus* (Calvin, 3:16, 9; Aretits, *Loci.* 17; Ryssenius, *Summa,* 18:3, 4; B. Pictet, 2:265; Gerhard, 27:8, 3; S. Niemann, *De distinct. Pontif. in interno classib.* 1689). The old Protestant theologians considered it as an undeniable truth that there exist no other divisions than heaven and hell in the, to us, unknown world; also that there can be no further distinction between the souls of the departed than that based on belief and unbeliet, causing the former to be blessed and the latter to be damned. Still there arose questions which it was difficult for them to settle: the Reformed theologians disposed of them in a comparatively easy manner, for, as they admitted only of a gradual difference between the two dispensations, and upheld the identity of the action of grace and faith possible to both, they found no difficulty in ascribing blessedness to the saints of the old dispensation. It is well known that Zwingle went even further. Thus they also disposed of the doctrine of predestination, at least in regard to elect children, in which the *fides seminalis* was presupposed, and no one could deny, in view of 40194Matthew 19:14, that children dying in infancy can also be among the elect. The Lutherans solved the two

questions in a different manner: in order to justify the qualitative equality of the Jewish and Christian faith, they were obliged to assert the retrospective power of Christ's merits. With regard to children, they found a still greater difficulty on account of their stricter conception of original sin and their doctrine concerning baptism, which bears such close resemblance to that of the Roman Catholic Church. The only way in which they could dispose of it was to have recourse to the free power of God, who can give salvation in other than the general way. Thus reasons Gerhard when he says, "Quasi non possit Dens extraordinarie cum infantibus Christianorum parentum per preces ecclesim et parentum sibi oblatis agere" (9:282). Also Buddeus (5:1, 6): "'In infantibus parentum Christianorum, qui ante baptismum moriuntur per gratiam quamdam extraordinariam fidem produci; ad infidelium autem infantes quod attinet, salutem aeternam iis tribuere non audemus." See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:415; *Biblioth. Sacra,* 1863, 1. *SEE LIFE, ETERNAL*; *SEE PREDESTINATION*; *SEE ELECTION*; *SEE SALVATION*; *SEE GRACE*; *SEE SIN*; *SEE INFANTS*; *SEE BAPTISM (OF INFANTS)*.

Limborch, Philip Van

an eminent Dutch theologian, was born at Amsterdam June 19, 1633. He first studied ethics, history, and philosophy at his native place, and then applied himself to divinity under the Remonstrants. From Amsterdam he went to Utrecht, and attended the lectures of Voetius, and other divines of the Reformed religion. In 1657 he became pastor of the Remonstrants at Gonda, and remained there until 1667, when he removed to Amsterdam as pastor. The following year he was called to the chair of divinity in the Remonstrant college at the latter place, which position he held until his death, April 30, 1712. Limborch was on intimate terms with Locke, and corresponded with him regularly for several years on the nature of human liberty (see Locke's *Ietters,* Lond. 1727, 3 volumes, fol.). Limborch was gentle in his disposition, tolerant of the views of others, learned, methodical, of a retentive memory, and, above all, had a love for truth, and engaged in the search of it by reading the Scriptures with the best commentators. Next to Arminius himself, and Simon Episcopius, Limborch was one of the most distinguished of the Arminian theologians, "who exerted a beneficial reaction upon Protestantism by their thorough scientific attainments, no less than by the mildness of their sentiments" (Hatgenbach's *History of Doctrines,* 2:214). In 1660, having found among the papers of Episcopius, his maternal uncle, several letters relating to

ecclesiastical affairs, he arranged a collection with Hartsocker, *Epistolae praestantium et eruditorum Virorums* (8vo). Limborch was specially noted for his doctrinal works. His principal work is *Theologia Christiana* (1686; 4th ed. Amst. 1715, 4to), translated, with improvements from Wilkins, Tillotson, Scott, and others, by William Jones, under the title, *A complete System or Body of Divinity, both speculative mind practical, founded on Scripture and Reason* (Lond. 1702, 2 volumes, 8vo). This was the first and most complete exposition of the Arminian doctrine, displaying great originality of arrangement, and admirable perspicuity and judicious selection of material. The preparation of the work was undertaken at the request of the Remonstrants (q.v.). His other works are, *De veritate religionis Christianae* (1687), the result of a conference with the learned Jew, Dr. Orobius: — *Historia Inquisitionis* (1692, fol.; translated by Samuel Chandler, under the title *The History of the Inquisition*, to which is prefixed a large introduction concerning the rise and progress of persecution, and the real and pretended causes of it, London, 1731, 2 volumes, 4to). He is also the author of an exegetical work, *Commentarius in Acta Apos. et in Epistolas ad Romanos et ad Hebreos* (Rotterdam, 1711, fol.). "This commentary, though written in the interest of the author's theological views, is deserving of attention for the good sense, clear thought, and acute reasoning by which it is pervaded" (Kitto). In addition, he edited many of the works of the principal Arminian theologians. See Niceron, *Hist. des Honlares illustres*, 11:39-53; Abrah. des Armorie van der Hoeven, *De Jo. Clerico et Philippo a Limrborch.* (Amstelod. 1845, 8vo); Hoefer, *Nouv. Biogr. Genzerale*, 31, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8, s.v.; Farrar, *Crit. History of Free Thought*, page 386, 392; *Methodist Quarterly Review*, July 1864, page 513.

Limbus

SEE LIMBO.

Lime

(dyc'as*id*, perh. from its *boiling* or effervescing when slaked; <23:3312>Isaiah 33:12; <3001>Amos 2:1; rendered "plaster" in <5002>Deuteronomy 2:2, 4; the same word is used for lime in Arab. and Syr.), a well-known mineral substance, which is a very prevalent ingredient in rocks, and, combined with carbonic acid, forms marble, chalk, and limestone, of various degrees of hardness and every variety of color. Limestone is the prevailing

constituent of the mountains of Syria; it occurs under various modifications of texture, color, form, and intermixture in different parts of the country. The purest carbonate of lime is found in calcareous spar, whose crystals assume a variety of forms, all, however, resulting from a primary rhomboid. Under the action of fire, carbonate of lime loses its carbonic acid and becomes caustic lime, which has a hot, pungent taste. *SEE CHALK*. If lime be subjected to an intense heat, it fuses into transparent glass. When heated under great pressure, it melts, but retains its carbonic acid. The modern mode of manufacturing common or "quick" lime was known in ancient times. Lime is obtained by calcining or burning marble, limestone, chalk, shells, bones, and other substances to drive off the carbonic acid. From <232212>Isaiah 32:12 it appears that lime was made in a kiln lighted with thorn-bushes. Dr. Thomson remarks, "It is a curious fidelity to real life that, when the thorns are merely to be destroyed, they are never cut up, but are set on fire where they grow. They are only *cut up* for the lime-kiln" *(Land and Book*, 1:81). *SEE FURNACE*. In <330201>Amos 2:1 it is said that the king of Moab "burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime." The interpretation of the Targum and some of the rabbins is that the burnt bones were made into lime and used by the conqueror for plastering his palace. The same Hebrew word occurs in <052702>Deuteronomy 27:2-4: "Thou shalt set thee up great stones, and *plaister* them with *plaister;* and thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law." It is probable that the same mode of perpetuating inscriptions was followed as we know was customary in Egypt. In that country we find paintings and hieroglyphic writing upon plaster, which is frequently laid upon the natural rock, and, after the lapse of perhaps more than three thousand years, we find the plaster still firm, and the colors of the figures painted on it still remarkably fresh. The process of covering the rock with plaster is thus described: " 'The ground was covered with a thick laver of fine plaster, consisting of lime and gypsum, which was carefully smoothed and polished. Upon this a thin coat of lime white-wash was laid, and on it the colors were painted, which were bound fast either with animal glue or occasionally with wax" *(Egyptian Antiq.*, in *Lib. of Entertaining Knowl.)*. *SEE PLASTER*. If it be insisted that the words of the law were actually cut in the rock, it would seem best to understand that the Hebrew word *sid* does not here mean a "plaister," but indicates that the stones, after they had been engraved, were covered with a coat of tenacious lime white-wash, employed for similar purposes by the Egyptians, who, when the face of a rock had been sculptured in relievo, covered the whole with a coat of this wash, and then

painted their sculptured figures (Kitto's *Pict. Bible,* note ad loc.). *SEE MORTAR*.

Limina Martyrum

(the houses of the martyrs), a phrase sometimes used in ancient writers to designate *churches.*

Limiter

(limnitour), the name given to an itinerant and begging friar employed by a convent to collect its dues and promote its temporal interests within certain *limits,* though under the direction of the brotherhood who employed him. Occasionals the limiter is a person of considerable importance. See Russell's *Notes; Works of the English and Scottish Reformers,* 2:536. 542.

Lincoln, Ensign

a noted philanthropist and lay minister in the Baptist Church, was born at Hingham, Massachusetts, January 8, 1779. He was brought into the Church when about nineteen years old, under the ministry of the Rev. Dr. Baldwin. He had been apprenticed to a printer, and in 1800 he commenced business on his own account. He also advanced the interests of Christian truth by preaching, for which he was licensed about 1801, and, though he was not ordained, and therefore never relinquished his secular profession, he preached, and prayed, and performed the ordinary offices of a minister of the Gospel with all the holy fervor of an apostle. He won the unaffected respect of all men, as a generous neighbor, an honest friend, and a virtuous citizen. He died December 2, 1832. "If I should live to the age of Methuselah," he remarked, "I could find no better time to die." Mr. Lincoln was prominent in the organization of the Evangelical Tract Society, the Howard Benevolent Society, the Boston Baptist Foreign Mission Society, the Massachusetts Baptist Education Society, and other institutions of a similar character. He edited Winchell's Watts, the *Pronouncing Bible,* and the series of beautiful volumes styled *The Christian Library.* His own *Scripture Questions* and *Sabbath-school Class-book* are well known. See Dr. Sharp's *Funeral Sermons American Baptist Magazine,* April 1833. (J.H.W.)

Linda Or Lindanus, William Damiasus Van

a Roman Catholic prelate, noted as a controversialist, born at Dordrecht, Holland, in 1525, was professor of Romish theology at Louvain and Dillingen; later, dean in the Hague, and then bishop of Ghent. He is remarkable for the severity which characterized his acts as inquisitor. In 1562 he was appointed by Philip II bishop of Rusemond. He died in 1568 or 1588. His most popular work was *Panoplia Evangelica* (1563). See A. Havensius, *Vita G. Lindani* (1609). — Thomas, *Biogr. Dict.* page 1433; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, volume 12. s.v.

Lindblom, Jacob Axel

a Swedish prelate, was born in Ostrogothia in 1747. He was professor of belleslettres in the University of Upsal, became bishop of Linkoping in 1789, and was afterwards chosen archbishop of Upsal. He died in 1819. — Thomas, *Biographical Dictionary*, page 1433.

Linde, Christoph Ludwig

a German theologian, was born at Schmalkalden June 5, 1676. In 1698 he attended the University of Erfurt, and the following year that of Leipsic. After he was graduated he became tutor, first at Leipsic, in order to develop his knowledge more fully, and in 1705 at his native place. In 1706 he accepted a call as preacher to Farnbach, in 1729 he returned to Schmalkalden as subdeacon and in 1736 was chosen pastor. He died August 27, 1753. His productions are mostly dedicated to the youth and school-teachers of the Lutheran Church; we mention only his *Theologia in Hymnis* (Schmalkalden, 1712, 8vo). — Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Lindewood, Lindwood, Or Lyndewood, William

an English prelate who flourished in the 15th century, was divinity professor at Oxford in the time of Henry V, and bishop of St. David's in 1434. He died in 1446. He wrote *Constitutiones Provinciales Ecclesic Anglicance* (Oxon. 1679, fol.). — Lowndes's *Bibl. Mar.* page 1135; Marvin's *Leg. Bibl.* page 482; Allibone's *Dictionary of British and American Authors,* 2:1101.

Lindgerus (Ludgerus), St.,

a noted theologian, was born about the year 743 in Friesland. He became a disciple of St. Boniface, who admitted him to holy orders, and afterwards he went for four years and a half to England to perfect himself under the renowned Alcuin, then at the head of the school of York. He returned in 773, and in 776 was ordained priest by Alberic, successor of St. Gregory. He preached the Gospel with great success in Friesland, converted large numbers, and founded several convents, but was obliged to quit the country in consequence of the invasion of the Saxons. He then went to Rome to consult with the pope, Adrian II, and withdrew for three years to the monastery of Mount Cassin. Charlemagne having repulsed the Saxons and liberated Friesland, Lindgerus returned, preached the Gospel to the Saxons with great success, as also in Westphalia, and founded the convent of Werden. In 802 he was, against his wishes, appointed bishop of Mimigardeford, which was afterwards called Münster. He always enjoyed the favor of Charlemagne, notwithstanding the intrigues of enemies jealous of his usefulness. He died in A.D. 809. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* volume 19, s.v.

Lindsay, John

(1), a learned English divine, who flourished about the middle of the 17th century, was educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, and for many years officiated as a minister of the nonjuring society in Trinity Chapel, Aldersgate Street, and is said to have been their last minister. He was also for some time a corrector of the press for Mr. Bowyer, the printer. He finished a long and useful life June 21, 1768. Mr. Lindsay published a *Short History of the Regal Succession,* etc., *with Remarks on Whiston's Scripture Politics,* etc. (1720, 8vo); a translation of Mason's *Vindication of the Chucrch of England* (1726, reprinted in 1728), which has a large and elaborate preface, containing "a full and particular series of the succession of our bishops, through the several reigns since the Reformation," etc. In 1747 he published Mason's *Two Sermons preached at Court in* 1620. See *Genesis Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Lindsay, John

(2), a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Lynn, Massachusetts, July 18, 1788; was converted in 1807; entered the New England Conference in 1809; was agent for the Wesleyan University in 1835-6; in 1837 was

transferred to the New York Conference, and made presiding elder on New Haven District; next he filled two stations in New York City; in 1842 he was agent for the American Bible Society; was transferred in 1845 to the Troy Conference; was appointed to the Albany District in 1846; and died at Schenectady February 10, 1850. Mr. Lindsay was an impressive and successful preacher, and a man of noble benevolence. He was very active in the founding of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, and the Wesleyan University. — *Minutes of Conf.* 4:460; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism,* volume 2, chapter 41. (G.L.T.)

Lindsey, Theophilus

an eminent English Unitarian minister, was born at Middlewich, in Cheshire, June 20, 1723 (O.S.). He entered St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1741, and, after taking his degrees, was elected fellow in 1747. About this time he commenced his clerical duties at an Episcopal chapel in Spital Square, London. Later he became domestic chaplain to Algernon, duke of Somerset, after whose death he traveled two years on the Continent with Algernon's son. On his return, about 1753, he was presented to the living of Kirkby Wiske, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, and in 1756 he removed to that of Piddletown, in Dorsetshire. In 1760 he married a step-daughter of his intimate friend archdeacon Blackburne, and in 1763, chiefly for the sake of enjoying his society, took the living of Catterick. Lindsey, who had felt some scruples respecting subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles even while at Cambridge, began now to entertain serious doubts concerning the Trinitarian doctrines, and by 1769 his association with the Reverend William Turner, a Presbyterian minister at Wakefield, and Dr. Priestley, then a Unitarian minister at Leeds, gave a more decided coloring to his Antitrinitarian views, and he actually began to contemplate the duty of resigning his living. He was induced to defer that step by an attempt which was made in 1771, by several clergymen and gentlemen of the learned professions, to obtain relief from Parliament in the matter of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and in which he joined heartily, traveling upwards of 2000 miles in the winter of that year to obtain signatures to the petition which was prepared. The petition was presented on the 6th of February 1772, with nearly 250 signatures, but, after a spirited debate, its reception was negatived by 217 to 71. It being intended to renew the application to Parliament at the next session, Lindsey still deferred his resignation, but when the intention was abandoned he began to prepare for that important step. He drew up, in July 1773, a copious and

learned "Apology," and, notwithstanding the attempts of his diocesan and others to dissuade him from the step, he formally resigned his connection with the Established Church, and, selling the greatest part of his library to meet his pecuniary exigencies, he proceeded to London, and on the 17th of April 1774, began to officiate in a room in Essex Street, Strand, which, by the help of friends, he had been enabled to convert into a temporary chapel. His desire being to deviate as little as possible from the mode of worship adopted in the Church of England, he used a liturgy very slightly altered from that modification of the national church-service which had been previously published by Dr. Samuel Clarke. This modified liturgy, as well as his opening sermon, Lindsey published. His efforts to raise a Unitarian congregation proving successful, lie commenced shortly afterwards the erection of a more permanent chapel in Essex Street, which was opened in 1778. His published "Apology" having been attacked in print by Mr. Burgh, an Irish M.P., by Mr. Bingham, and by Dr. Randolph, Lindsey published a "Sequel" to it in 1776, in which he answered those writers. In 1781 he published *The Catechist, or an Inquiry into the Doctrine of the Scriptures concerning the only True God and Object of Religious Worship;* in 1783, *A Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship Reform the Reformation to our own Times,* an elaborate work, which had been several years in preparation; and in 1785, anonymously, *An Exanination of Mr. Robinson of Cambridge's Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, by a late Member of the University.* In 1788 he published *Vindicise Priestleicane,* a defense of his friend Dr. Priestley, in the form of an address to the students of Oxford and Cambridge; and this was followed, in 1790, by a *Second Address to the Students of Oxford and Cambridge relating to Jesus Christ and the Origin of the great Errors concerning him.* In 1782 he invited Dr. Disney, who then left the Established Church for the same reasons as himself, to become his colleague in the ministry at Essex Street; and in 1793, on account of age and growing infirmities, he resigned the pastorate entirely into his hands, publishing on the occasion a farewell discourse (which he felt himself unable to preach) and a revised edition, being the fourth, of his liturgy. In 1795 he reprinted, with an original preface, the *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* which Dr. Priestley had recently published in America in reply to Paine's *Age of Reason;* and in 1800 he republished in like manner another of Priestley's works, on the knowledge which the Hebrews had of a future state. Lindsey's last work was published in 1802, entitled *Conversations on the Divine Government, showing that everything*

is from God and for good to all. He died on the 3d of November 1808. Besides copious biographical notices of Lindsey, which were published in the *Monthly Repository* and *Monthly Magazine* of December 1808, the Reverend Thomas Belsham published, in 1812, a thick octavo volume of *Memoirs,* in which he gives a full analysis of Lindsey's works and extracts from his correspondence, together with a complete list of his publications. Two volumes of his sermons were printed shortly after his death. Sec *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Robert Hall, in his *Works* (11th ed. 1853). 4:188 sq.; *London Quarterly Review,* 8:422 sq.

Lindsley, James Harvey

a Baptist preacher, was born in North Branford, Connecticut, May 5, 1787. Brought to consider his spiritual condition through a severe illness. he sought and found pardon in December, 1810. Shortly after he began a course of study with the view of entering the ministry, and graduated at Yale College in 1817. For a number of years his health was so poor as to forbid his preaching, and he was engaged in teaching. He introduced into the Baptist denomination the religious meetings styled "'Conference of the Churches," and was chairman of the first two. His first regular preaching was in Stratford, in a store hired by himself in 1831, and in the same year he received a regular license to preach. For five years he had charge of the churches in Milford and Stratfield. In 1836 his health became impaired. He ceased preaching, and for a part of the year assisted in the compilation of the *Baptist Select Hymns.* He died December 29, 1843. Mr. Lindsley was a ready writer, and a large contributor to several of the periodicals of the day. His articles took a wide range, including politics, religion, moral reform, literature, and especially natural science. — Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit,* volume 6.

Lindsley, Philip

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Morristown, N.J., December 21, 1786, and graduated in the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1804. After teaching for some time, and completing his theological course, he was licensed in 1810. and went to Newtown, Long Island, where he preached as a stated supply. In 1812 he became senior tutor in Princeton College, and in 1813 was appointed to the professorship of languages, and chosen secretary of the board of trustees. To these offices were added those of librarian and inspector of the college, and in 1817, when he was

ordained, that of vice-president. In 1824 he agreed to go to Nashville, solely induced thereto by the new and wide field of exertion which lay before him there. He continued more than a quarter of a century at Nashville, and his reputation as a teacher was so high in the South and West' that it was said that every university in those regions had solicited him to accept its headship. He was twice invited to preside over Dickinson College, in Pennsylvania, and was actually elected provost of the University of Pennsylvania in 1834. From this period he was successively moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, member of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries at Copenhagen, professor of ecclesiastical polity and Biblical archeology in the New Albany Seminary (Indiana), 1850. He removed from New Albany in April, 1853, and returned to Nashville, where he died May 23, 1856. Dr. Lindsley's works have been published entire, with an introductory notice of his life and labors by Leroy J. Halsey (Philadel. 1865, 3 volumes, 8vo). Their contents are as follows: volume 1, *Educational Discourses;* volume 2, *Sermons and Religious Discourses;* volume 3, *Miscellaneous Discourses and Essays.* — Sprague, *Annals,* 4:465.

Lindwood

SEE LINDEWOOD.

Line

(represented by the following terms in the original: לֶבֶל, *che'bel,* a *measuring-line,* 10102 2 Samuel 8:2; 30717 Amos 7:17; hence a *portion* as divided out by a line, 19606 Psalm 16:6; elsewhere “cord," "portion," etc. קָו or קַו, *kav,* a *measuring-line,* 23417 Isaiah 34:17; 26403 Ezekiel 47:3; either for construction, 18805 Job 38:5; 23413 Isaiah 44:13; 24039 Jeremiah 31:39; 38016 Zechariah 1:16, or for destruction, 12213 2 Kings 21:13; 25208 Lamentations 2:8; 23411 Isaiah 34:11; metaph., a *rule* or norm, 23817 Isaiah 28:17, 10, 13; like the Gr. κανών, 47013 2 Corinthians 10:13, 15, 16; 48616 Galatians 6:16; 50916 Philippians 3:16; also the *rim,* e.g. of a laver, 11023 1 Kings 7:23; 14042 2 Chronicles 4:2; or *string* of a musical instrument, put for *sound,* q.d. accord, 19904 Psalm 19:4; where Sept. ὁ φθόγγος, and so 45018 Romans 10:18, Vulg. *sonus;* once, *strength,* 23802 Isaiah 18:2, where "a nation meted out" should be rendered a *most mighty* nation: in three of the above passages, 11023 1 Kings 7:23; 24039 Jeremiah 31:39; 38016 Zechariah 1:16, the text reads חֶוְקָה, *ke'veh,* of the same import; and in 06218 Joshua 2:18, 21, occurs תִּקְוָה

tikvah', a cord, from the same root. Other terms less proper are: fWj, *chut, a thread,* for measuring a circumference, <110715>1 Kings 7:15; "fillets," <242221>Jeremiah 52:21; elsewhere generally a "thread." lytbæ; *pathil', a cord,* for measuring length, <264003>Ezekiel 40:3; elsewhere a "thread," "lace," etc., especially the string for suspending the signet-ring in the bosom, rendered "bracelets" in <013818>Genesis 38:18, 25. drç, *se'red, the awl* or stylus with which an artist graves the sketch of a figure in outline, to be afterwards sculptured in full, <234413>Isaiah 44:13). There can be little doubt that the Hebrews acquired the art of measuring land from the ancient Egyptians, with whom it was early prevalent (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egypt.* 2:256). In <061809>Joshua 18:9 we read, "And the men went out and passed through the land, and described it by cities into seven parts in a book, and came again to Joshua to the host at Shiloh." These circumstances clearly indicate that a survey of the whole country was made, and the results entered carefully in a book (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.). This appears to be the earliest example of a topographical survey on record, and it proves that there must have been some knowledge of mensuration among the Hebrews, as is moreover evinced by the other topographical details in the book of Joshua.

Lineage

(πατριά, paternal *descent, "kindred,"* <440325>Acts 3:25; "family," <490315>Ephesians 3:15), a family or race (<420204>Luke 2:4). *SEE GENEALOGY*.

Linen

has been made in the A. Version or elsewhere the representative of a considerable number of Hebrew and Greek terms, to most of which it more or less nearly corresponds. The *material* designated by them in general is no doubt principally, and perhaps by some of them exclusively, the product of the flax-plant; but there is another plant which, as being a probable rival to it, may be most conveniently considered here, namely, HEMP *SEE HEMP* . *SEE SILK*; *SEE WOOL*.

Hemp is a plant which in the present day is extensively distributed, being cultivated in Europe, and extending through Persia to the southernmost parts of India. In the plains of that country it is cultivated on account of its intoxicating product, so well known as *bang;* in the Himalayas both on this account and for its yielding the ligneous fiber which is used for sack and

rope making. Its European names are no doubt derived from the Arabic *kinnab,* which is supposed to be connected with the Sanscrit *shanapee.* There is no doubt therefore, that it might easily have been cultivated in Egypt. Herodotus mentions it as being employed by the Thracians for making garments. "These were so like linen that none but a very experienced person could tell whether they were of hemp or flax; one who had never seen hemp would certainly suppose them to be linen." Hemp is used in the present day for smockfrocks and tunics; and Russia sheeting and Russia duck are well known. *Cannabis* is mentioned in the works of Hippocrates on account of its medical properties. Dioscorides describes it as being employed for making ropes, and it was a good deal cultivated by the Greeks for this purpose. Though we are unable at present to prove that it was cultivated in Egypt at an early period, and used for making garments, yet there is nothing improbable in its having been so. Indeed, as it was known to various Asiatic nations, it could hardly have been unknown to the Egyptians, and the similarity of the word *husheesh* to *the* Arabic *shesh* would lead to a belief that they were acquainted with it, especially as in a language like the Hebrew it is more probable that different names were applied to totally different things, than that the same thing had two or three different names. Hemp might thus have been used at an early period, along with flax and wool, for making cloth for garments and for hangings, and would be much valued until cotton and the finer kinds of linen came to be known.

1. PISHTEH´ (hTvP, or, rather, according to Gesenius, tvP, *pe'sheth,* from vvP; to *card)* is rendered "linen" in <03847>Leviticus 13:47, 48, 52, 59; <05211>Deuteronomy 22:11; <24301>Jeremiah 13:1; <26417>Ezekiel 44:17, 18; and "flax" in <06016>Joshua 2:6; <07054>Judges 15:14; <20313>Proverbs 31:13; <23919>Isaiah 19:9; <26403>Ezekiel 40:3, <28205>Hosea 2:5, 9. It signifies

(1.) *flax.* i.e., the material of linen, <23919>Isaiah 19:9; <05211>Deuteronomy 22:11; <20313>Proverbs 31:13, where its manufacture is spoken of; also a line or rope made of it, <26403>Ezekiel 40:3; <07040>Judges 14:4; so "stalks of flax," i.e., woody flax, <06016>Joshua 2:6 (where the Sept. has λινοκαλάμη, *Vulg. stipulae lini.* but the Arabic Vers. stalks of *cotton);* and

(2.) wrought flax. i.e., *linen* cloth, as made into garments. e.g. generally, <03847>Leviticus 13:47, 48, 52, 59; <05211>Deuteronomy 22:11; <26417>Ezekiel 44:17; a girdle, <24301>Jeremiah 13:1. a mitre a pair of drawers worn by the priests, <26418>Ezekiel 44:18. A cognate term is hTvP, *pishtah',* the plant "flax" as

growing, <0209>Exodus 9:31; spec. a *wick,* made of linen, i.e., of "flax," <2403>Isaiah 42:3, or "tow," <2417>Isaiah 43:17. To this exactly corresponds the Greek λίνον (whence English *linen),* which, indeed, stands for *pishteh* or *pishtah* in the Sept. (at <0209>Exodus 9:31; <2309>Isaiah 19:9; 43:3). It signifies properly the flax-plant (Xenophon, *Ath.* 2:11, 12), but in the N.T. is only used of *linen* raiment (<6516>Revelation 15:6; comp. Homer, *Il.* 9:661; *Od.* 13:73), also the *wick* of a lamp, as being composed of a strip or ravelings of linen (<4020>Matthew 12:20), where the half-expiring flame is made the symbol of an almost despairing heart, which will be cheered instead of having its religious hopes extinguished by the Redeemer. In <1304>John 13:4, 5 occurs the Latin term *linteum,* in its Greek form λέντιον, literally a *linen* cloth, hence a "towel" or *apron* (comp. Galen, *Comp. Med.* 9; Suetonius, *Calig.* 26).

This well-known plant was early cultivated in Egypt (<0209>Exodus 9:31; <2309>Isaiah 19:9; comp. Pliny, 19:2; Herod. 2:105; Iasselquist, *Trav.* page 500), namely, in the Delta around Pelusium ("linum Pelusiacum," Sil. Ital. 3:25, 375; "linteum Pelusium," Phaedr. 2:6, 12); but also in Palestine (<0602>Joshua 2:6, <2807>Hosea 2:7; compare Pococke. *East,* 1:260), the stalk attaining a height of several feet (see <0602>Joshua 2:6; compare Hartmann, *Hebr.* 1:116). Linen or tow was employed by the Hebrews, especially as a branch of female domestic manufacture (<2813>Proverbs 31:13), for garments (<1014>2 Samuel 6:14; <2417>Ezekiel 44:17; <1347>Leviticus 13:47; <6516>Revelation 15:6; comp. Philo, 2:225), girdles (<2401>Jeremiah 31:1), thread and ropes (<2403>Ezekiel 40:3; <0713>Judges 15:13), napkins (<2412>Luke 24:12; <1940>John 19:40), turbans (<2418>Ezekiel 44:18), and lamp-wick (<2403>Isaiah 40:3; 43:17; <4020>Matthew 12:20). For clothing they used the "fine linen" (dB; ὀθόνη, <1357>1 Chronicles 15:27, where the Sept. has βύσσινος*:* see Hartmann, 3:38; compare <1604>Leviticus 16:4, 23; <2417>Ezekiel 44:17), perhaps the Pelusiac linen of Egypt (see Mishna, *Joma,* 3:7), of remarkable whiteness (comp. <2706>Daniel 12:6; <6516>Revelation 15:6; see Plutarch, *Isis,* c. 4), with which the fine Babylon linen manufactured at Borsippa doubtless corresponded (Strabo, 16:739), being the material of the splendid robes of the Persian monarchs (Strabo, 14:719; Curt. 8:9), doubtless the *karpas,* sPirK; of <1006>Esther 1:6 (see Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* page 715). Very poor persons wore garments of unbleached flax *(*ὠμόλινον, *linum crudum,* i.q. *tow-cloth,* Ecclus. 40:4). The refuse of flax or *tow* is called in Heb. tr#qem *mesoreth* (<0709>Judges 16:9; Isaiah 31). (See, generally, Celsius, *Hierobot.* 2:28 sq. See FLAX.

2. BUTS (/WB, from a root signifying *whiteness)* occurs in 1Ch 4:21; 15:27; 2Ch 2:14; 3:14; 5:12; Es 1:6; 8:15; Eze 27:16, in all which passages the A.V. renders it "fine linen," except in 2Ch 5:12, where it translates "white linen." The word is of Aramean origin, being found in substantially the same form in all the cognate dialects. It is spoken of the finest and most precious stuffs, as worn by kings (1Ch 15:27), by priests (2Ch 5:12), and by other persons of high rank or honor (Es 1:6, 8,15). It is used of the Syrian *byssus* (Eze 27:16), which seems there to be distinguished from the Egyptian *byssus* or vvç*shesh* (verse 7). Elsewhere it seems not to differ from this last, and is often put for it in late Hebrew (e.g. 1Ch 4:21; 2Ch 3:14; comp. Ex 26:31; so the Syr. and Chald. equivalents of *buts* occur in the O. and N.T. for the Heb. vvçand Gr. βύσσος*)*. That the Heb. garments made of this material were *white may* not only be certainly concluded from the etymology (which that of vvçconfirms), but from the express language of Re 19:4, where the white and shining raiment of the saints is emblematical of their purity. Yet we should not rashly reject the testimony of Pausanias (5:5), who states that the Hebrew *byssus* was *yellow,* for cotton of this color is found as well in Guinea and India *(Gossypium religiosum)* as in Greece at this day (comp. Vossius, *ad. Virg. Geo.* 2:220), although white was doubtless the prevailing color, as of linen with us. J.E. Faber (in Harmar, *Observ.* 2:382 sq.) suspects that the *buts* was a cotton-plant common in Syria, and different from the *shesh* or tree-cotton. It has long been disputed whether the cloths of *byssus* were of linen or cotton (see Celsius, *Hierobot.* 2:167 sq.; Forster, *De bysso antiquor.* London, 1776), and recent microscopic experiments upon the mummy-cloths brought to London from Egypt have been claimed as determining the controversy by discovering that the threads of these are linen (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 3:115). But this is not decisive, as there may have existed religious reasons for employing linen for this particular purpose, and the cloths used for bandaging the bodies are not clearly stated to have been of *byssus.* On the contrary, the characteristics ascribed to this latter are such as much better agree with the qualities of cotton (see Forster, *De bysqo,* ut sup.). "The corresponding Greek word βύσσος occurs in Lu 16:19, where the rich man is described as being clothed in purple and fine *linen,* and also in Re 18:12, 16, and 19:8, 14, among the merchandise the loss of which would be mourned for by the merchants trading with the mystical

Babylon. But it is by many authors still considered uncertain whether this byssus was of *fax* or *cotton;* for, as Rosenmüller says, 'The Heb. word *shesh,* which occurs thirty times in the two first books of the Pentateuch (see Celsius, 2:259), is in these places, as well as in (Proverbs 31:22), by the Greek Alexandrian translators interpreted *byssus,* which denotes Egyptian cotton, and also the cotton cloth made from it. In the later writings of the O.T., as, for example, in the Chronicles, the book of Esther, and Ezekiel, *buts* is commonly used instead of *shesh* as *an* expression for cotton cloth.' This, however, seems to be inferred rather than proved, and it is just as likely that improved civilization may have introduced a substance, such as cotton, which was unknown at the times when *shesh* was spoken of and employed, in the same manner as we know that in Europe woolen, hempen, linen, and cotton clothes have at one period of society been more extensively worn than at another."

Cotton is the product of a plant apparently cultivated in the earliest ages not only in India, Cyprus, and other well-known localities, but also in Egypt (Pliny, 19:2; comp. *Descript. de l'Egypte,* 17:104 sq.), and even in Syria (Ezekiel 27:16) and Palestine (1 Chronicles 4:21; Pausan. 5:5, 2; Pococke, *East,* 2:88; Arvieux, 1:306). Two kinds of cotton are usually distinguished, the *plant (Gossypium herbaceum)* and the *tree (Gossyp. arboreum),* although the latest investigations appear to make them essentially one. The former, which in Western Asia is found growing in fields (Olearius, *Travels,* page 297; Korte, *Reis.* page 437), is an annual shrub two or three feet high, but when cultivated (Olivier, *Trav.* 2:461) it becomes a bush from three to five feet in height. The stalks are reddish at the bottom, the branches short, furry, and speckled with black spots; the leaves are dark green, large, five-lobed, and weak. The flowers spring from the junction of the leaves with the stem; they are bell-shaped, pale yellow, but purplish beneath. They are succeeded by oval capsules of the size of a hazel-nut, which swell to the size of a walnut, and (in October) burst spontaneously. They contain a little ball of white filaments, which in warm situations attains the size of an apple. Imbedded in this are seven little egg-shaped, woolly seeds, of a brown or black-gray color, which contain an oily kernel. The *Gossypium arboreunr (*δένδρον ἐπιοφόριον of Theophrastus) was anciently (see Theoph. *Plant.* 4:9, page 144, ed. Schneider), and still is indigenous in Asia (i.e., India), and attains a height of about twelve feet, but differs very little as to the leaves, blossoms, or fruit from the herbaceous cotton. See generally Belon, in Paulus's *Samml.*

1:214 sq.; Kurrer, in the *Hall. Encykl.* 8:209 sq., Oken, *Lehrb. d. Neaturgesch.* II, 2:1262 sq.; Ainslie, *Mater. Ind.* page 282 sq.; Ritter, *Erdk.* 7:1058 sq.

Cotton

(שֵׁשׁ *shesh*, according to Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, 1:175; comp. Tuch, *Genesis* page 520 sq.; later בּוּץ, *buts*, see Faber, in Harmar, 2:383; comp. Gesenius, *Thesaur.* page 190) was not only manufactured in Egypt into state apparel (<01442>Genesis 41:42; comp. Pliny, 19:2), and in Persia into cords (<17006>Esther 1:6), but the Israelites even made use of *byssus* cloth (<12601>Exodus 26:1; 27:9) and clothing (<12839>Exodus 28:39), and the Hebrew women were accustomed to similar fabrics (<21803>Proverbs 31:32). It has also been regarded as the sumptuous apparel which only the rich were able to afford (<42169>Luke 16:19; on the *byssus* of the Greeks and Romans, see Celsius, 2:170,177, and Wetstein, 2:767). Nevertheless, the Hebrew *shesh* does not designate exclusively cotton, but also stands sometimes, like the Gr. *byssus* often (as the product of a tree, Philostr. *Apoll.* 2:20; comp. Pollux, *Onom.* 7:17; Strabo, 15:693; Arrian, *Indic.* 7), for the finest (Egyptian) white linen (certainly in <12918>Exodus 39:28; comp. 28:42; <03604>Leviticus 16:4; see Pliny, 19:2, 3), which in softness compared with cotton (Hartmann, *Hebr.* 3:37 sq.). Indeed, the Jewish tradition of the use of linen for sacred purposes (Bahr, *Symbol.* 1:264) is based altogether upon the custom of the Egyptians, whose priests were exclusively clothed in linen (Pliny, 19:1, 2; comp. Philostr. *Apoll.* 2:20), which it has likewise been contended was the ancient *byssus* (Rosellini, *Mon.* 104:1, 341; comp. Becker, *Chariik.* 333 sq.). In fine, the Orientals often employed a single term to designate both cotton and linen, but Celsius was wrong when he insisted *(Hierobot.* 2:259 sq., 167 sq.) that *shesh* stands only for (fine) linen (see Faber, in Harmar, 2:380 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebr.* 3:34 sq.). The same ambiguity that thus applies to βύσσος is also found in the use of רִשְׁ *(chur*, <17006>Esther 1:6; 8:15; Sept. βύσσος*)*, by which perhaps cotton is, after all, intended. See generally J.R. Forster, *De bysso antiquor.* (Lond. 1776); Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Byssus; *Egypt. Antiq.* in the *Lib. of Entertaining Knowl.* 2:182192; *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. Cotton, Gossypium. *SEE COTTON*.

3. BAD (דַּבְּ perhaps from its *separation* for sacred uses) occurs <12842>Exodus 28:42; 39:28; <03650>Leviticus 6:10; 16:4, 23, 32; <09218>1 Samuel

2:18; 32:18; <100614>2 Samuel 6:14; <131527>1 Chronicles 15:27, <261902>Ezekiel 9:2, 3, 11; 10:2, 6, 7; <270105>Daniel 10:5; 12:6, 7, in all which passages it is rendered "linen" in the Auth. Vers. It is uniformly applied to the sacred vestments (e.g. drawers, mitre, ephod, etc.) of the priests, or (in the passages in Ezekiel and Daniel) of an angel (comp. <432012>John 20:12; <440120>Acts 1:20). In these last instances it is in the plural, µyDB; *baddim'*, in the concrete sense of *clothes* of this material, Sept. in the Pent. invariably λίνεος, but in 1 Chronicles βύσσινος. It is well known that the official garments of the Egyptian (as of the Brahmin) priests were always of linen (Rosenmüller. *Bot. of the Bible*, page 175), and hence the custom among the Hebrews (compare <263417>Ezekiel 44:17, where the sacred apparel is expressly described as the product of flax, µyTæPe). Celsius, however, is of opinion *(Hierobot.* 2:509) that *bad* does not signify the common linen, as some have imagined, but the finest and best *Egyptian* linen; and he quotes (page 510) Aben-Ezra as asserting that *bad* is the same as *buts*, namely, a species of linen in Egypt. With this view Gesenius concurs *(Thesaur. Heb.* page 179). The Talmudists appear to have been of the same opinion, from their fanciful etymology of the term *bad* as of a plant with a single stem springing upright from the earth from one seed (Braun, *De vest. sacerd.* page 101). This interpretation is finally confirmed by the Arabic versions, which have a term equivalent to *byssus.* See No. 1 above. Perhaps, however, the requirement of the material in question for priestly garments may only signify that no wool should be employed in them, and they may therefore have consisted indifferently of either linen or cotton, provided it was entirely *pure,* and thus be represented by the equivocal term *byssus.* See No. 2 above.

4. SHESH (vve, prob. from the Egyptian *sheush,* in ancient Egyptian *cheuti.* i.e., linen, Bunsen, *AEg.* 1:606, which the Hebrews appear to have imitated as if from vWv, to *be white;* Sept. everywhere βύσσος*)* occurs <014142>Genesis 41:42; <022504>Exodus 25:4; 26:1, 31, 36; 27:9, 16,18; 28:5, 6, 8,15, 39; 35:6, 23, 25, 35; 36:8, 35, 37; 38:9, 16, 18, 23; 39:2, 3, 5, 8, 27, 28, 29; <203122>Proverbs 31:22; <261610>Ezekiel 16:10, 13; 27:7; in all which passages it is rendered "fine linen" in the Auth. Vers. (except <203122>Proverbs 31:22, where it is rendered "silk;" in <170106>Esther 1:6; <220515>Song of Solomon 5:15, the same term occurs, but is rendered, as it there signifies, "*marble");* once SHESHI (yvæ, from the same), <261613>Ezekiel 16:13, text, "fine linen." This word appears to designate Egyptian linen of peculiar whiteness and

fineness, and as such it is stated to have been imported from Egypt by way of Tyre (<26270>Ezekiel 27:7), in distinction from the Syrian linen or *buts* (/WB, verse 16). In the Pentateuch it is several times applied to *byssus,* of which, both as material spontaneously offered (<02504>Exodus 25:4; 35:6, 23) and as woven fabrics (<02535>Exodus 35:25, 35; 38:23), were made both the curtains and veils of the sacred tabernacle (<02601>Exodus 26:1, 31, 36; 27:9,16,18; 36:8, 35, 37; 38:9, 16, 18), and the priestly garments, especially the high-priest's ephod or shoulder-piece (<02805>Exodus 28:5, 6, 8, 15, 39; 29:2, 5, 8, 27, 28, 29). Raiment of this description is stated to have been worn by noble persons besides priests, e.g. by Joseph as prefect of Egypt (<01442>Genesis 41:42), and women of eminence (<20322>Proverbs 31:22). But that *shesh* is also spoken of *linen* articles is apparent from <02918>Exodus 39:28, where the "linen breeches" *(*dB;hiysEkimæ) are said to have been made "of fine-twined linen" (rz;vim;vv), as well as from the fact that µyTiæP;, *pishtim,* linen garments, are sometimes (e.g. <23817>Isaiah 43:17; <26418>Ezekiel 44:18) rendered by the Chaldee interpreter by /WB, *buts.* It thus appears that *shesh* is equivalent in general to *byssus.* See No. 2 above. See generally Celsius, *Hierobot.* 2:259; J.R. Forster, *Liber singularis de bysso antiquorum* (London, 1776); J.E. Faber, *Observat. 2:*282 sq.; Hartmann, *Hebrierin,* 3:34 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterth.* IV, 1:175 sq.

5. CHÛR (rWj, from its *whiteness)* occurs <17006>Esther 1:6; 8:15, where the Auth. Version renders "white," Sept. βύσσος, besides other passages where it signifies a "hole" (<23108>Isaiah 11:8; 42:22, etc.); once rwøj, *chor,* plural poet. yrIwøj, <23909>Isaiah 19:9 (Auth. Vers. "net-works." Sept. βύσσος, Vulg. *subtilia,* Kimchi *white garments).* This term likewise appears to designate fine and white *linen,* or in general *byssus,* although Saadias and other interpreters understand *silk* (see Schroder, *De Vest. Mul. Heb.* pages 40, 245). See No. 2 above.

6. ETUN' (ˆWfæ, from an obsolete root perhaps signifying to *bind,* referring to the use of the material for ropes) occurs only in <20716>Proverbs 7:16, as a product of Egypt, "I have decked my bed with coverings of tapestry, with carved works, with fine *linen* of Egypt." As Egypt was from very early times celebrated for its cultivation of flax and manufactures of linen, there can be little doubt that *etun* is correctly rendered, though some have thought that it may signify rope or string of Egypt, "funis AEgyptius," "funis salignus v. intubaceus;" a sense that it bears in Chaldee, for the

Targums employ ˆWfa in the sense of *rope* for the Heb. lbj, and rtyme (<060215>Joshua 2:15; <040432>Numbers 4:*32;* <112232>1 Kings 20:32; <170106>Esther 1:6, etc.). But, following the suggestion of Alb. Schultens, Celsius *(Hierobot.* 2, page 89) observes that *etun* designates not a rope, but flax and linen, as even the Greek ὀθόνη and ὀθόνιον, derived from it, sufficiently demonstrate. "So Mr. Yates, in his *Textrinzun Antiquorum,* page 265, says of ὀθόνη that 'it was in all probability an Egyptian word, adopted by the Greeks to denote the commodity to which the Egyptians themselves applied it.' For ˆWfae put into Greek letters and with Greek terminations, becomes ὀθόνη and ὀθόνιον. Hesychius states, no doubt correctly, 'that ὀθόνη was applied by the Greeks to any fine and thin cloth, though not of linen.' Mr. Yates further adduces from ancient scholia that ὀθόναι were made both of flax and of wool, and also that the silks of India are called ὀθόναι σηρικαί by the author of the *Perijplus of the Erythrcean Sea.* It also appears that the name ὀθόνιον was applied to cloths exported from Cutch, Ougein, and Baroach, and which must have been made of cotton. Mr. Yates moreover observes that, though ὀθόνη, lile σινδών, originally denoted linen, yet we find them both applied to cotton cloth. As the manufacture of linen extended itself into other countries, and as the exports of India became added to those of Egypt, all varieties, either of linen or cotton cloth, wherever woven, came to be designated by the originally Egyptian names Ὀθόνη asnd Σινδών." Forster *(De bysso antiquor.* page 75) endeavors to trace the Egyptian form of the word. and Ludolf *(Comment. ad hist. AEthiop.* page 204) renders it by the Ethiopic term for *franskincense.* But these efforts, as Gesenius remarks *(Thesaur. Heb.* page 77), are wide of the mark. Among the Hebrews the term "thread of Egypt" (µyaeix]mâ ˆWfae) may properly have designated a linen or even cotton material, similar to silk or *byssus* in fineness, such as we know was manufactured in Egypt (<231909>Isaiah 19:9; <262707>Ezekiel 27:7; Barhebr. page 218), q.d. *Egyptian yarn,* not less famous among the ancients than "Turkish yarn" has been among moderns. Kimchi, the Venetian Greek, and others *understand funiculum,* and apply it to cords hanging from the side of a bed, or something of that sort; rabbi Parchon, a *girdle* woven in Egypt — evidently mere conjectures.

"In the N.T. the word ὀθόνιον occurs in <431940>John 19:40: 'Then took they the body of Jesus and wound it in *linen clothes' (*ὀθονίοις*);* in the parallel passage (<402759>Matthew 27:59) the term used is σινδόνι, as also in <411546>Mark 15:46, and in <422353>Luke 23:53. We meet with it again in <432005>John 20:5, 'and

he, stooping down, saw the *linen clothes* lying.' It is generally used in the plural to denote 'linen bandages.' Ὀθόνη, its primitive, occurs in <44101>Acts 10:11, 'and (Peter) saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great *sheet* knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth.' and also in 11:5, where this passage is repeated." In Homer it signifies either the natriae *(Odys.* 7:107), or wrought veils and under-garments for women (11. 3:141; 18:195); in later writers linen cloths (Lucilius, *Dial. Mort.* 3:2), especially for sails (Mel. 80; Anth. 10:5; Luc. Jup. *Tramg.* 46). From the preceding observations it is evident that ὀθόνιον, whether answering to the Heb. *etun* or not, may signify cloth made either of linen or cotton, but most probably the former, as it was more common than cotton in Syria and Egypt. In classical writers the word signifies linen bandages (Luc. *Philops.* 34), espec. lint for wounds (Hipp. page 772, etc.; Ar. *Ach.* 1176); also sail-cloth (Polybus, 5:89, 2; Dem. 1145, 6). *SEE COTTON*; also Nos. 7 and 10 below.

7. SADIN' (ˆydæ; from an obsolete root signifying to *loosen* or let down a garment, as a *veil)* occurs in <07142>Judges 14:12, 13 (where the Auth. Vers. has "sheets," margin "shirts"), and <20124>Proverbs 31:24; <23023>Isaiah 3:23 (A. Vers. "fine linen"). From these passages it appears to have been an ample garment, probably of linen, worn under the other clothing in the manner of a shirt by men (<07142>Judges 14:12,13), or as a thin chemise by women (<23023>Isaiah 3:23). The Talmud describes it as made of the finest linen ("the *sindon* is suitable for summer," *Menach.* 41:1). The Targums similarly explain <19442>Psalm 104:2; <25120>Lamentations 2:20. The corresponding Syriac is employed in the Peshito for σουδάριον, <42910>Luke 19:20; λέντιον, <43004>John 13:4. The Sept. has σινδών, Vulgate *sindo;* but in <23023>Isaiah 3:23 the Sept. appears to have a paraphrase τὴν βύσσον σὺνχρυσίῳ καὶ ὑακίνθῳ συγκαθυφασμένην. The passage in Proverbs seems to refer to the manufacture of the *cloth* or material, probably linen, but possibly sometimes of cotton; in Judges *shirts* or male under-apparel are evidently referred to; and in Isaiah we may infer that female under-clothing is in like manner alluded to.

From this Heb. term many have thought is derived the Greek word σινδών, which occurs of linen or muslin cloth, e.g. a loose garment worn at night instead of the day-clothes, q.d. night-gown (<41451>Mark 14:51, 52, "linen cloth"); used also for wrapping around dead bodies, q.d. grave-clothes, cerements ("fine linen," <41546>Mark 15:46; "linen cloth," <40759>Matthew 27:59; "linen," <41546>Mark 15:46; <42253>Luke 23:53). This appears to have been

a fine fabric (probably usually, but not necessarily of linen), either the Egyptian (Pollux, 7:16, 72) or Indian; called in Egypt *senter* (Peyron, page 299), the Sanscrit *sindhu* (Jablonski, *Opusc.* 1:297 sq.). Others trace a connection with Ἰνδός, *Sind* (Passow, *Lex.* s.v.); some *(as Etymol. Mag.)* from the city *Sidon,* etc. It appears to have specially denoted a fine cotton cloth from India (Herod. 1:200; 2:95; 3:86; 7:181) ; also generally a linen cloth, used as a signal (Polyb. 2:66, 10), for surgeons' bandages (Herod. 7:181), for mummy-cloth (Herod. 2:86), or other purposes (Sophocles, *Ant.* 1222; Thuc. 2:49). This word is therefore not decisive as to the material. See Schroder, *De Vest. Mul.* page 339; Michaelis, *Suppl.* 1720; Wetstein, *N.T.* 1:631. — Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* s.v.

8. KARPAS´ (כַּרְפַּס; Sept. καρπάσινος, *Vulg. carbassinus)* "occurs in the book of Esther (1:6), in the description of the hangings 'in the court of the garden of the king's palace,' at the time of the great feast given in the city Shushan, or Susan, by Ahasuerus, who 'reigned from India even unto Ethiopia.' We are told that there were white, *green,* and blue hangings fastened with cords of fine linen and purple to silver rings and pillars of marble. *Karpas* is translated *green* in our version, on the authority, it is said, 'of the Chaldee paraphrase,' where it is interpreted *leek-green.* Rosenmüller and others derive the Hebrew word from the Arabic *kurufs,* which signifies 'garden parsley,' *Apium petroselinum,* as if it alluded to the green color of this plant; at the same time arguing that as 'the word *karpas* is placed before two other words which undoubtedly denote colors, viz. the *white* and the *purple-blue,* it probably also does the same.' But if two of the words denote colors, it would appear a good reason why the third should refer to the substance which was colored. This, there is little doubt, is what was intended. If we consider that the occurrences related took place at the Persian court at a time when it held sway as far as India, and that the account is by some supposed to have been originally written in the ancient language of Persia, we may suppose that some foreign words may have been introduced to indicate even an already well-known substance; but more especially so if the substance itself was then first made known to the Hebrews. The Hebrew *karpas* is very similar to the Sanscrit *kaspasum, karpasa,* or *karpase,* signifying the cotton-plant, whence the Armen. *kierbas,* and the Greek κυρβασία, κυρβάσις, etc. *(Asiat. Researches,* 4:231, Calcutta). Celsius *(Hierobot.* 1:159) states that the Arabs and Persians have *kallphas* and *kirbas* as names for cotton. These must no doubt be derived from the Sanscrit, while the word *karpas* is now applied

throughout India to cotton with the seed, and may even be seen in English prices-current. Κάρπασος occurs in the *Periplus* of Arrian, who states (page 165) that the region about the Gulf of Barygaze, in India, was productive of *carpasus,* and of the fine Indian muslins made of it. The word is no doubt derived from the Sanscrit *karpasa,* and, though it has been translated *fine muslin* by Dr. Vincent, it may mean cotton cloths, or calico in general. Mr. Yates, in his recently published and valuable work, *Textrinun Antiquorum,* states that the earliest notice of this Oriental name in any classical author which he has met with is the line *'Catrbasina,* molochina, ampelina' of Caecilius Statius, who died B.C. 169. Mr. Yates infers that as this poet translated from the Greek, so the Greeks must have made use of muslins or calicoes, etc., which were brought from India as early as 200 years B.C. See his work, as well as that of Celsius, for numerous quotations from classical authors, where *carbasus* occurs; proving that not only the word, but the substance which it indicated, was known to the ancients subsequent to this period. It might, indeed must, have been known long before to the Persians, as constant communication took place by caravans between the north of India and Persia, as has been clearly shown by Haeren. Cotton was known to Ctesias. who lived so long at the Persian court. Pliny describes it as a Spanish article *(Nat. H.* 19:1), but other ancient writers call it a product of India and the East (Strabo, 14:719; Curtius, 8:9). Nothing can be more suitable than cotton, white and blue, in the above passage of Esther, as J.F. Royle long since (1837) remarked in a note in his *Essay on the Antiquity of Hindoo Medicine,* page 145: 'Hanging curtains made with calico, usually in stripes of different colors and padded with cotton, called purdahs, are employed throughout India as a substitute for doors.' They may be seen used for the very purposes mentioned in the text in the court of the king of Delhi's palace, where, on a paved mosaic terrace, rows of slender pillars support a light roof, from which hang by rings immense padded and striped curtains, which may be rolled up or removed at pleasure. These either increase light or ventilation, and form, in fact, a kind of movable wall to the building, which is used as one of the halls of audience. This kind of structure was probably introduced by the Persian conquerors of India, and therefore may serve to explain the object of the colonnade in front of the palace in the ruins of Persepolis." See Abulplarag. *Hist. dynast.* page 433; Salmasius, *Homonym.* c. 81; Celsius, *Hierobot.* 2:157; Schroder, *De. Vest. Mul.* page 108 sq. *SEE COTTON*.

9. SHAATNEZ´ *(*znéÞ][iv), a kind of garments woven of two sorts of thread, linen and wool, like the Greek ὕφασμα ἀμφίμιτον, Eng. *linsey-woolsey,* which the Hebrews were forbidden to use, as appears from the two passages in the Mosaic law where the word occurs: <3Leviticus 19:19, "Neither shall a garment mingled of *linen and woolen* come upon thee;" <5Deuteronomy 22:11," Thou shalt not wear a garment of *divers sorts,* as of linen and woolen together." In the former of these passages the term *Shaatnez* is interpreted by µyaælÞKælgB, a *garment of two different kinds,* i.e. of heterogeneous materials; and in the latter by the explicit definition, µyTæpßwer mx,ˆyD;jÞy, *of wool and flax* threads *together.* The Sept. renders κίβδηλον, i.e., adulterated; Aquila, ἀντιδιακείμενον, i.e., various, of different sorts; the Peshito and Samaritan, *variegated.* Other ancient interpreters have either retained the original word, as Onkelos, or have entirely neglected it, as the Vulg., usually introducing the interpretation from Deuteronomy into Levit., as the Venetian Greek (ἐριόλινον), Saadias, the Armenian, Erpenius, and the Persic. The derivation is uncertain. The early etymologists have sought in vain a Samar. origin for the word, as Bochart *(Hieroz.* 1:545). The Talmud gives only fanciful derivations (Mishna, *Kilain,* 9:8; comp. *Nidda,* 61 b; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talin.* s.v.; Abr. Geiger. *Lehrbuch d. Mischnah,* 2:75); and the Targums are little better (see Pseudojon. *in Deuteronomy* ad loc.). Ernest Meyer proposes the signification *gradually formed,* from a transposition of the letters and comparison with the Arabic and Ethiopic *(Lex rad. Heb.* page 686). The word is prob. of Egyptian origin, although Forster *(De bysso antiquorurm,* page 95) and Jablonski *(Opusc.* 1:294 sq.) have not fully succeeded in tracing its original in the Coptic, which language, however, furnishes the nearest etvmolu (see Peyron, *Lexicon,* s.v. κίβδηλος). *SEE WOOLLEN.*

10. MIKVESH' *(*hwqÞmæa *collection,* as often) occurs only in connection with this subject in <111028>1 Kings 10:28, "And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt, and *linen yarn;* the king's merchants received the *linen yarn* at a price;" also <14116>2 Chronicles 1:16, where the same language occurs. In these passages it evidently signifies a *company* of horses, i.e., a drove or string, as brought from Egypt at a fixed valuation. The Sept. in most copies renders ἐκ θεκουέ or ἐξ Ἐκουέ, otherwise ἔξοδος, as in 2 Chronicles; the Vulg. has *Coa* in both places, as a proper name, referring. as some have thought, to *Michoe* (Pliny, 6:29), the country of the Troglodytes (see Calmet, *Dict.* s.v. Coa). Others have sought less direct elucidations (see

Bochart, *lsieroz.* 1:171, 172; Lud. de Dieu, ad loc.; Clericus and Dathe *On Kings,* ad loc.; Becke, *Paraphr. Chald. ad Chron.,* ad loc., page 7; Michaelis, *Supplenm.* 1271, and *In Jure Mosaico.* 3:332; Bottcher, *Specim.* page 170). But of these far-fetched explanations there is no occasion; the passages simply refer to a *caravan* of horse-merchants carrying on the commerce of Solomon with Egypt (see Taylor, *Fragments,* No. 190).

Linga

(a Sanscrit word which literally means a *sign* or *symbol)* denotes, in the sectarian worship of the Hindus, the *phallus,* as an emblem of the male or generative power of nature. The Linga-worship prevails with the Saivas, or adorers of Siva. *SEE HINUISMI.* Originally of an ideal and mystical nature, it has degenerated into practices of the grossest description, thus taking the same course as the similar worship of the Chaldeans, Greeks, and other nations of the East and West. The accounts how Linga became a representative of Siva vary greatly, but coincide in the main in that Siva, having scandalized the penitent saints by his amour with Parwati, was cursed by them to be changed into what occupied so much his being, and to lose his genitals, by which he had given offense; later, when finding the punishment not in proportion to the result, they resolved to hold that very sign in reverence. It is most probable that the organ of generation was here considered in the same light as Phallos and Priapus in Egypt and Greece. The manner in which the Linga is represented is generally inoffensive — the pistil of a flower, a pillar of stone, or other erect and cylindrical objects being held as appropriate symbols of the generative power of Siva. Its counterpart is *Yoni,* or the symbol of female nature as fructified and productive. The Siva-Purana names twelve Lingas which seem to have been the chief objects of this worship in India. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Vollmer, *Mythol. Worterb.* s.v.

Lingard, John, D.D., LL.D.

a Roman Catholic priest, and one of the most eminent. of modern historians, was born at Winchester, England, February 5, 1771. He studied at the Roman Catholic College of Douai, France, and remained there until obliged by the horrors of the French Revolution to return to England. The college was finally settled at Ushaw, near the city of Durham. and Mr. Lingard there performed the duties of some of its offices. He revisited

France for a short time during the dangerous period of the Revolution, and on one occasion barely escaped being mobbed as a priest. In 1805 he wrote for the *Newcastle Courant* a series of letters, which were collected and published under the title of *Catholic Loyalty vindicated* (12mo). He afterwards wrote several controversial pamphlets, which in 1813 were published in a volume having the title of *Tracts on several Subjects connected with the Civil and Religious Principles of the Catholics* (reprinted by F. Lucas, Jr., at Baltimore, 1823, 12mo, and often). Dr. Lingard's great work, however, is hi *is History of England from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of William and Mary in* 1688 (Londaon, 181925, 6 volumes, 4to; 2d edit. 1823-31, 14 volumes, 8vo; 4th edit. 1837, 13 volumes, 12mo; 5th ed. 1849-50, 10 volumes, 8vo; 6th ed. 1854-55, 10 volumes, 8vo; American editions, published by Dunigan, N.Y., 13 volumes, 12mo; by Sampson & Co., of Boston, 1853-54, 13 volumes, 12mo, of which the last is the best). It is a work of great research, founded on ancient writers and original documents, displaying much erudition and acuteness, and opening fields of inquiry previously unexplored. The narrative is clear, the dates are accurately given, and the authorities referred to distinctly. The style is perspicuous, terse, and unostentatious. The work, perhaps, exhibits too exclusively the great facts and circumstances, military, civil, and ecclesiastical, and enters less than might be desirable into the manners, customs, arts, and condition of the people. In all matters connected with the Romish Church the work is, as might have been expected, colored by the very decided religious opinions of the author, but these are not offensively set forth. Dr. Lingard, after the completion of his "History of England," paid a visit to Rome, where pope Leo XII offered to make him cardinal, but he refused the dignity, partly because he did not feel qualified for the office, and partly because it would have interfered with his favorite studies. He spent the last forty years of his life in the small preferment belonging to the Roman Catholic church at the village of Hornby, near Lancaster, enjoying the esteem and friendship of all, both Protestants and Roman Catholics. He died July 13, 1851, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Cuthbert's College, at Ushaw, to which institution he bequeathed his library. Lingard was also the author of *Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrines and Worship of the Catholic Church* (2d edit. Lond. 1840, 12mo; 3d edit. 1844, 18mo): — *A Review of certain Anti-Catholic Publications* (Lond. 1813, 8vo): — *Examination of certain Opinions advanced by Bishop Burgess* (anon.) (Manchester, 1813, 8vo): — *Scriptures on Dr. Marsh's Comparative View of the Churches of*

England and Rome (Lond. 1815, 8vo): — *Observations on the Laws and Ordinances which exist in Foreign States relative to the Religious Concerns of their Roman Catholic Subjects* (anon.) (Lond. 1817. 8vo): — *Documents to ascertain the Sentinments of British Catholics in former Ages respecting the Power of the Popes* (Lond. 1819, 8vo): — *The History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (Lond. 1806; 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo; Philippians 1841, 12mo). In 1836 he published anonymously an English translation of the N.T., which is said to be accurate and faithful in several passages where the Douai translation is faulty. See *Engl. Cycl.* . 5; the London *Times* (July 25, 1851); *Gentleman's Magazine* (September 1851, page 323 sq.); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* volume 8, s.v.; Lowndes, *Brit. Lib.* page 1096 sq.; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1844, page 374 sq.; and the excellent article in Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1102-1105. (J.H.W.)

Lingendes, Claude de

a noted French pulpit orator of the Jesuits, was born at Moulins in 1591. He entered the order, and soon rose to high distinction. He was entrusted with several important missions. He died at Paris, where he was superior of his order, April 12, 1660. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biograph. Generale*, 31:278.

Lingendes, Jean de

a French pulpit orator, a relative of the preceding, was born at Moulins in 1595. As chaplain to Louis XIII, he became quite eminent for his great talents in the pulpit. He was made bishop of Macon in 1650. He died in 1665. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gezer.* 31:278.

Link, Johann Wolfgang Conrad

a German theologian, was born at Pirmasens April 23, 1753. In 1771 he entered the University of Giessen, and in 1774 was graduated A.M. In 1775 he obtained the chair of philosophy at that university as professor extraordinary, and in 1778 he became pastor at Bischofsheim, near Darmstadt. He died suddenly December 23, 1788. In addition to his theological researches, his extensive knowledge of modern languages enabled him to translate English works into German and German productions into English, the latter for the "Universal English Library." Of his own compositions we mention *Ueber das hebrische Sprachstudieum*

(Giess. 1777, 8vo): — *Diss. de Schilo a Jacobo predicto Genes.* 49, 10 (ibid, 1774, 4to). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* volume 2, s.v.

Link, Wenceslaus

a German theologian, noted for his efforts in behalf of Martin Luther and the cause of the reformatory movement, was born at Colditz, near Meissen, Saxony, about 1483. He was an Augustinian monk of the convent Waldheim when he went to the Wittenberg University to pursue theological studies, and, after attaining to the distinction of doctor of theology, became successively prior of the convents at Wittenberg, Munich, Nuremberg, etc. He enjoyed great notoriety and popularity when the Reformation was first assuming shape, but his leaning towards it made him unpopular with Romanists, and he gradually went over to the new cause. In 1523 he married, and two years later appeared as Protestant preacher at Nuremberg. He died there March 11, 1547. His works are not of any special merit. A list of them is given in Jocher, *Gelehrten Lexikon,* 2:2442 sq.

Linn, John Blair

D.D., son of the succeeding, a Presbyterian minister, was born at Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, March 14, 1777, and graduated in 1795 at Columbia College, where he distinguished himself by his proficiency in polite literature. Having abandoned the study of law, he removed to Schenectady, where he studied theology, and was licensed in 1798. He was ordained in 1799, and installed in the First Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, where he continued until his sudden death, August 30,1804. Linn was quite a poet, and most of his publications are of a poetical nature. His best works are, *Pieces in Prose and Poetry: — A Sermon on the Death of Dr. Ewing* (1802): — *A Poem on the Influence of Christianity:* — a narrative poem, entitled *Valerian,* with a sketch of his life by Charles Brockden Brown (1805, 8vo); and two tracts against the doctrine of Dr. Priestley. See Sprague, *Annals,* 4:210; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors,* volume 2, s.v.

Linn, William

D.D., a Reformed (Dutch) minister, was born near Shippensburg, Pennsylvania, February 27, 1752. He graduated from Princeton College in 1772 with honor, studied divinity with Reverend Dr. Robert Cooper, of

Middle Spring, Pennsylvania, and in 1775 was licensed to preach by Donegal Presbytery. Fired with the patriotism of the Revolution, he became a chaplain in Genesis Thompson's regiment, and was ordained to the ministry at this period. His regiment being soon ordered to Canada, for domestic reasons he resigned his chaplaincy. After a brief settlement at Big Spring, he taught an academy in Somerset County, Maryland, with success, until in 1786 he became pastor of a Presbyterian church at Elizabethtown, N.J., from whence he removed to New York in the same year as one of the pastors of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church. He was full of genius and power. His sermons were written, and committed to memory. His delivery was graceful, natural, animated, and accompanied by that electric power which thrills and sways an audience. His imagination was vivid, his language choice and classical, and his pictorial ability remarkable. He was celebrated for his missionary and charitable discourses. "Earnest, pathetic, persuasive, and alarming in his addresses, he peculiarly excelled in awakening sinners and urging them to the refuge of the Gospel. On special occasions he shone with conspicuous luster, ad rose above himself." In consequence of the failure of his health, he retired from the active ministry in 1805, and died at Albany January 8, 1808. Among his published addresses are some of his celebrated missionary and charity sermons, historical discourses, controversial sermons, a eulogy on Washington, delivered before the New York State Society of the Cincinnati, and a sermon preached in 1776 to a regiment of soldiers who were about to join the army. — Sprague, *Annals,* volume 9; Dr. De Witt's *Historical Discourse;* Dr. Bradford's *Funeral Sermon,* etc. (W.J.R.T.)

Lintel

(prop. ãwqvjmi *mashkoph',* lit. a projecting *cover;* <012222>Exodus 12:22, 33; "upper door-post," ver. 7; also rTpKi *kaphtor', a chaplet,* i.e., capital of a column, <300901>Amos 9:1; <360214>Zephaniah 2:14; elsewhere a "knop" of the candelabrum; and lyai *a'yil,* a "*ram,*" as often; hence a *pilaster* or pillar in a wall, <110631>1 Kings 6:31, elsewhere "post"), the head-piece of a door, or the horizontal beam covering the side-posts or jambs. *SEE POST*. This the Israelites were commanded to mark with the blood of the paschal lamb on the memorable occasion when the Passover was instituted. *SEE PASSOVER*.

Li'nus

(usually Λῖνος, but prop. Λίνος, the name originally of a mythological and musical personage, perhaps from λίνον, *linen),* one of the Christians at Rome whose salutations Paul sent to Timothy (2 Timothy 4:21). A.D. 64. He is said to have been the first bishop of Rome after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul (Irenseus, *Adv. Haeres. 3:*3; Eusebius. *Hist. Eccles.* 3:2, 4, 13, 14, 31; 5:6; comp. Jerome, *De Viris. Illust.* 15; Augustine, *Epist.* 53:2; Theodoret, *ad 2 Tim.* 4:21), but there is some discrepancy in the early statement respecting his date (see Heinichen *a d Euseb.* 3:187; Burton, *Hist. of the Christ. Church;* Lardner, *Works,* 2:31, 32, 176,187). "Eusebius and Theodoret, followed by Baronius and Tillemont *(Hist. Eccles.* 2:165, 591), state that he became bishop of Rome after the death of St. Peter. On the other hand, the words of Ireneus, '[Peter and Paul] when they founded and built up the Church [of Rome], committed the office of its episcopate to Linus,' certainly admit, or rather imply the meaning that he held that office before the death of St. Peter; as if the two great apostles, having, in the discharge of their own peculiar office, completed the organization of the Church at Rome, left it under the government of Linus, and passed on to preach and teach in some new region. This proceeding would be in accordance with the practice of the apostles in other places. The earlier appointment of Linus is asserted as a fact by Ruffinus *(Praecf. isn Clem. Recosgn.),* and by the author of chapter 46, book 7 of the *Apostolic Constitutions.* It is accepted as the true statement of the case by bishop Pearson *(De Serie et Successione Priorum Roman Episcoporum,* 2:5, § 1) and by Fleury *(Hist. Eccl.* 2:26). Some persons have objected that the undistinguished mention of the name of Linus between the names of two other Roman Christians in 2 Timothy 4:21 is a proof that he was not at that time bishop of Rome. But even Tillemont admits that such a way of introducing the bishop's name is in accordance with the simplicity of that early age. No lofty pre-eminence was attributed to the episcopal office in the apostolic times."

According to the Roman Breviary, Linus was born at Volterra, but an old papal catalogue represents him as an Etrurian. According to tradition, he went to Rome when 22 years of age, made there the acquaintance of Peter, and was sent by him to Besanqon, in France, to preach the Gospel. After his return to Rome Peter appointed him his coadjutor; but, according to the Breviary, he was the one *who prinus post Petrum gubernavit ecclesiam.* He is said to have enacted, on his accession to the bishopric, that, in

accordance with 1 Corinthians 11:5, women should never enter the church with their heads uncovered.

The duration of his episcopate is given by Eusebius (whose *It. E.* 3:16, and *Chronicon* give inconsistent evidence) as A.D. 68-80; by Tillemont, who, however, reproaches Pearson with departing from the chronology of Eusebius, as 66-78; by Baronius as 67-78; and by Pearson as 55-67. Pearson, in the treatise already quoted (1:10), gives weighty reasons for distrusting the chronology of Eusebius as regards the years of the early bishops of Rome, and he derives his own opinion from certain very ancient (but interpolated) lists of those bishops (see 1:13, and 2:5). This point has been subsequently considered by Baraterius *(De Successione Antiquissima Eisc. Rome.* 1740), who gives A.D. 56-67 as the date of the episcopate of Linus.

"The statement of Ruffinus, that Linus and Cletus were bishops in Rome while St. Peter was alive, has been quoted in support of a theory which sprang up in the 17th century, received the sanction even of Hammond in his controversy with Blondel (*Works,* ed. 1684, 4:825; *Episcopatus Jura,* 5:1, § 11), was held with some slight modification by Baraterius, and has recently been revived. It is supposed that Linus was bishop in Rome only of the Christians of Gentile origin, while at the same time another bishop exercised the same authority over the Jewish Christians there. 'Tertullian's assertion *(De Prescr. Haeret.* § 32) that Clement [the third bishop] of Rome was consecrated by St. Peter has been quoted also as corroborating this theory, but it does not follow from the words of Tertullian that Clement's consecration took place immediately before he became bishop of Rome; and the statement of Ruffinns, so far as it lends any support to the above-named theory, is shown to be without foundation by Pearson (2:3, 4). Tilemont's observations (page 590) in reply to Pearson only show that the establishment of two contemporary bishops in one city was contemplated in ancient times as a possible provisional arrangement to meet certain temporary difficulties. The actual limitation of the authority of Linus to a section of the Church in Rome remains to be proved. Ruffinus's statement ought, doubtless, to be interpreted in accordance with that of his contemporary Epiphanius *(Adv. Haer.* 27:6, page 107), to the effect that Linus and Cletus were bishops of Rome in succession, not contemporaneously. The facts were, however, differently viewed, (1) by an interpolator of the *Gesta Pontificum Damasi,* quoted by J. Voss in his second epistle to A. Rivet (App. to Pearson's *Vindiciae Ignatiane);* (2) by

Bede (*Vita S. Benedlicti*, § 7, page 146, edit. Stevenson), when he was seeking a precedent for two colltemporaneous abbots presiding in one monastery and (3) by Rabanus Malrtns *(De Chorepiscopis,* in *Opp. e*d. Migne, 4:1197), who ingeniously claims primitive authority for the institution of chorepiscopi on the suppossition that Linus and Cietus were never bishops with full powers, but were contemporaneous chorepiscopi employed by St. Peter in his absence from Rome, and at his request, to ordain clergymen for the Church at Rome."

Linus is reckoned by Pseudo-Hippolytus, and in the Greek *Menaea,* among the seventy disciples. According to the Breviary, he cured the possessed, raised the dead, and was beheaded at the instigation of the consul Saturninus, although he had restored the latter's daughter from a dangerous illness. He was buried in the Vatican, by the side of St. Peter. Various days are stated by different authorities in the Western Church, and by the Eastern Church, as the day of his death. According to the most generally received tradition, he died on September 23. A narrative of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (Paris, 1644, volume 8), and certain pontifical decrees, are incorrectly ascribed to Linus, but he is generally considered as the author of a history of Peter's dispute with Simon Magus. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:421; Lipsius, *Die Papst Kataloge des Eusebius* (Kiel, 1868, 8vo).

Linz Or Lintz, The Peace Of,

so named after the place where it was concluded, December 13, 1645, between Rakoczy, prince of Transylvania, and the emperor Ferdinand III, as king of Hungary, was an event of great importance for the legal existence of the Evangelical Church in Hungary. Rakoczy, who aimed at the crown of that country, and relied on the Protestant party for support, had concluded in April 1643, with Sweden and France, a defensive and offensive alliance against Ferdinand. In an address to the Hungarians, in which he enumerated their various grievances, he laid great stress on the oppression of the evangelical party. He succeeded in assembling an army, and in obtaining John Kemenyi, an experienced general, to command it. Sweden sent him soldiers under the renowned Dugloss, and France furnished him with large amounts of money. His troops obtained some unimportant advantages over those of Frederick, and the Swedish soldiers succeeded in driving the Imperialists out of several towns. This, however, did not continue, and in October 1, 1644, Rakoczy began negotiations for

peace with Ferdinand. The advantages he asked, namely, the absolute religious liberty of Hungary, etc., were approved at Vienna August 8, 1645, and the peace finally signed as above. The most important feature of the treaty is the grant of religious liberty to the Hungarians. It gave permission to all to attend whatever Church they might choose; ministers and preachers of all the different confessions were to be left undisturbed, and such as had previously been persecuted and driven away on account of their religious principles were allowed to return, or to be recalled by their congregations. The churches and Church property taken from the evangelical party were restored to their previous owners. The eighth article of the sixth decree of king Wladislaus VI was re-enacted against those who infringed these regulations, and made them subject to a trial and punishment at the next session of the Diet. These regulations, however, so favorable to the Protestants met with great opposition at the Diet of Presburg in 1647, and were most violently opposed by the Jesuits. The Roman Catholics refused to surrender to the Protestants the churches they had taken from them, and the evangelical party finally agreed to accept, instead of some 400 churches which had been taken from it, the small number of 90, which had been assured to it by a royal edict, under date of February 10, 1647. See Steph. Katona, *Historia critica regum Hungaricorum,* 22:332 sq.; Dumont, *Corps universel diplomatique du droit des gens,* 6:1 sq.; J.A. Fessler, *Die Gesch. d. Ungarn,* etc., 9:25 sq.; Johann Mailath, *D. Religionswirren in Ungarn* (Regensb. 1845), part 1, page 30 sq.; *Gesch. d. Evangelischen Kirche in Ungarn* (Berlin, 1854), page 199 sq.; *History of the Protestant Church in Hungary,* transl. by J. Craig (Boston and New York, 1856, 12mo). *SEE HUNGARY*.

Lion

Picture for Lion 1

(prop. יִרְאֵה *ai,* or הֵיאֵל *aryeeh';* Sept. and N.T. λέων), the most powerful, daring, and impressive of all carnivorous animals, the most magnificent in aspect and awful in voice. Being very common in Syria in early times, the lion naturally supplied many forcible images to the poetical language of Scripture,, and not a few historical incidents in its narratives. This is shown by the great number of passages where this animal, in all the stages of existence-as the whelp, the young adult, the fully mature, the lioness-occurs under different names, exhibiting that multiplicity of

denominations which always results when some great image is constantly present to the popular mind. Thus we have,

1. rwG, *gor*, or rWG, *gur* (a *suckling)*, a lion's "whelp," a very young lion (<01409>Genesis 49:9; <05330>Deuteronomy 33:20; <24538>Jeremiah 51:38; <26912>Ezekiel 19:2, 3, 5; <34211>Nahum 2:11, 12).

2. rypK, *kephir'* (the *shaggy)*, a " young lion," when first leaving the protection of the old pair to hunt independently (<26912>Ezekiel 19:2, 3, 5, 6; 41:19; <19113>Psalm 91:13; <20912>Proverbs 19:12; 20:2; 28:1; <23104>Isaiah 31:4; <24408>Jeremiah 41:38; <28514>Hosea 5:14; <34211>Nahum 2:11; <38108>Zechariah 11:3), old enough to roar (<07405>Judges 14:5; <19421>Psalm 104:21; <20912>Proverbs 19:12; <24225>Jeremiah 2:15; <30304>Amos 3:4); beginning to seek prey for itself (<18040>Job 4:10; 38:39; <23529>Isaiah 5:29; <24538>Jeremiah 25:38; <26903>Ezekiel 19:3; <33508>Micah 5:8); and ferocious and blood-thirsty in his youthful strength (<19172>Psalm 17:12; 91:13; <23106>Isaiah 11:6). This term is also used tropically for cruel and blood-thirsty enemies (<19410>Psalm 34:10; 35:17; 58:6; <24225>Jeremiah 2:15); Pharaoh, king of Egypt, is called a "young lion of the nations," i.e., an enemy prowling among them (<26902>Ezekiel 32:2); it is also used of the young princes or warriors of a state (<26803>Ezekiel 38:13; <34123>Nahum 2:13).

3. yrAK, *cari'* (the *pulleer* in pieces, plur. masc. in <11020>1 Kings 10:20, elsewhere fem.), or hyerAK, *aryueh'* (the same with h paragogic, also Chald.), an adult and vigorous lion, a lion having paired, vigilant and enterprising in search of prey (<34212>Nahum 2:12; <10710>2 Samuel 17:10; <04234>Numbers 23:24, etc.). This is the common name of the animal.

4. lJiv, *sha'chal* (the *roarer)*, a mature lion in full strength (<18040>Job 4:10; 10:16; 28:8; <19113>Psalm 91:13; <21663>Proverbs 26:13; <28514>Hosea 5:14; 13:7). Bochart *(Hieroz.* 1:717) understands the *swarthy* lion of Syria (Pliny, *Il. N.* 8:17), deriving the name from rjv, *black*, by an interchange of liquids. This denomination may very possibly refer to a distinct variety of lion, and not to a black species or race. because neither black nor white lions are recorded, excepting in Oppian *(De Venat.* 3:43); but the term may be safely referred to the color of the skin, not of the fur; for some lions have the former fair, and even rosy, while in other races it is perfectly black. An Asiatic lioness, formerly at Exeter Change, had the naked part of the nose, the roof of the mouth, and the bare soles of all the feet pure black, though the fur itself was very pale buff. Yet albinism and melanism are not

uncommon in the felina; the former occurs in tigers, and the latter is frequent in leopards, panthers, and jaguars.

5. vyaiy; *la'yish* (the *strong),* a fierce lion, one in a state of fury, or rather, perhaps, a poetical term for a lion that has reached the utmost growth and effectiveness (<18411>Job 4:11; <20030>Proverbs 30:30; <23106>Isaiah 30:6).

6. aybal; lebia', or ybal; *lebi' (lowcin/g, roaring),* hence a *lion, lioness* (<04049>Numbers 24:9, <28138>Hosea 13:8; <29016>Joel 1:6; <05380>Deuteronomy 33:20; <19504>Psalm 57:4; <23529>Isaiah 5:29). Bochart *(Hieroz.* 1:719) supposes this word not to denote the male *lion,* but the *lioness;* and Gesenius *(Thes.* page 738) says this rests on good grounds, as it is coupled with other nouns denoting a lion, where it can hardly be a mere synonyme (<01409>Genesis 49:9; <04049>Numbers 24:9; <23106>Isaiah 30:6; <34211>Nahum 2:11); and the passages in <18411>Job 4:11; 38:39; <26902>Ezekiel 19:2, accord much better with a *lioness* than with a lion.

7. In <18808>Job 28:8, the Heb. words a /jiviynB; *beney sha'chats,* are rendered *"the lion's whelss."* "The terms properly signify *"sons of pride,"* and are applied to the larger beasts of prey, as the *lion, leviathan,* so called from their proud gait, boldness, and courage. The lion is often spoken of as "the king of the forest." or "the king of beasts;" and in a similar sense, in <18434>Job 41:34, the leviathan or crocodile is called the "king over all the *children of pride,"* that is, the head of the animal creation (see Bochart, *Heroz.* 1:718). *SEE WHELP*.

Picture for Lion 2

As "king of beasts," "the lion is the largest and most formidably armed of all carnassier animals, the Indian tiger alone claiming to be his equal. One full grown, of Asiatic race, weighs above 450 pounds, and those of Africa often above 500 pounds. The fall of a fore-paw in striking has been estimated to be equal to twenty-five pounds' weight. and this, with the grasp of the claws, cutting four inches in depth, is sufficiently powerful to break the vertebra of an ox. The huge laniary teeth and jagged molars, worked by powerful jaws, and the tongue entirely covered with horny papilla, hard as a rasp, so as to crush the frame of the victim and clean its bones of the flesh, are all subservient to an otherwise immensely strong, muscular structure, capable of prodigious exertion, and minister to the self-confidence which these means of attack inspire. In Asia the lion rarely

measures more than nine feet and a half from the nose to the end of the tail, though a tiger-skin has been known of the dimensions but a trifle less than thirteen feet. In Africa they are considerably larger, and supplied with a much greater quantity of mane. Both lion and tiger are furnished with a small horny apex to the tail-a fact noted by the ancients, but only verified of late years (see the *Proceedings of the Council of the Zoological Society of London,* 1832, page 146), because this object lies concealed in the hair of the tip, and is very liable to drop off." Yet this singular circumstance has not escaped the attention of the Assyrians, and it is foiund represented on the ruined inscriptions of Nineveh (Bonomi's *Nineveh,* pages 245, 246).

Picture for Lion 3

"All the varieties of the lion are spotted when whelps, but they become gradually buff or pale. One African variety, very large in size, perhaps a distinct species, has a peculiar and most ferocious physiognomy, a dense black mane extending half way down the back, and a black fringe along the abdomen and tip of the tail, while those of Southern Persia and the Dekkan are nearly destitute of that defensive ornament. The roaring voice of the species is notorious to a proverb, but the warning cry of attack is short, snappish, and sharp" (Kitto). This is always excited by opposition, and upon those occasions when the lion summons up all its terrors for the combat, nothing can be more formidable. It then lashes its sides with its long tail, its mane seems to rise and stand like bristles round its head, the skin and muscles of its face are all in agitation, its huge eyebrows half cover its glaring eyeballs, it discovers its formidable teeth and tongue, and extends its powerful claws. When it is thus prepared for war. even the boldest of the human kind are daunted at its approach, and there are few animals that will venture singly to engage it. Like all the felinae, it is more or less nocturnal, and seldom goes abroad to pursue its prey till after sunset. When not pressed by hunger it is naturally indolent, and, from its habits of uncontrolled superiority, perhaps capricious, but often less sanguinary and vindictive than is expected. In those regions where it has not experienced the dangerous arts and combinations of man it has no apprehensions from his power. It boldly faces him, and seems to brave e the force of his arms. Wounds rather serve to provoke its rage than to repress its ardor. Nor is it daunted by the opposition of numbers; a single lion of the desert often attacks an entire caravan, and after an obstinate combat, when it finds itself overpowered, instead of flying, it still continues to combat, retreating and still facing the enemy until it dies.

Picture for Lion 4

"Lions are monogamous, the male living constantly with the lioness, both hunting together, or for each other when there is a litter of whelps, and the mutual affection and care for their offspring which they display are remarkable in animals doomed by nature to live by blood and slaughter. It is while seeking prey for their young that they are most dangerous; at other times they bear abstinence, and when pressed by hunger will sometimes feed on carcasses found dead. They live to more than fifty years; consequently, having annual litters of from three to five cubs, they multiply rapidly when not seriously opposed. Zoologists consider Africa the primitive abode of lions, their progress towards the north and west having at one time extended to the forests of Macedonia and Greece, but in Asia never to the south of the Nerbundda nor east of the Lower Ganfges. Since the invention of gunpowder, and even since the havoc which the ostentatious barbarism of Roman grandees made among them, they have diminished in number exceedingly, although at the present day individuals are not unfrequently seen in Barbary, within a short distance of Ceuta" (Kitto). "At present lions do not exist in Palestine, though they are said to be found in the desert on the road to Egypt (Schwarz, *Desc. of Pal.;* see <23016>Isaiah 30:6). They abound on the banks of the Euphrates, between Bussorah and Bagdad (Rassell, *Aleppo,* page 61), and in the marshes and jungles near the rivers of Babylonia (Layard,*Nineveh and Babylon,* p. 566). This species, according to Layard, is without the dark and shaggy mane of the African lion *(ibid.* 487), though he adds in a note that he had seen lions on the River Karûn with a long black mane. But, though lions have now disappeared from Palestine, they must in ancient times have been numerous. The names Lebaoth (<06152>Joshua 15:32), Beth-Lebaoth (<06906>Joshua 19:6), Arieh (<12525>2 Kings 15:25), and Laish (<07007>Judges 18:7; <09244>1 Samuel 25:44) were probably derived from the presence of, or connection with lions, and point to the fact that they were at one time common. They had their lairs in the forests which have vanished with them (<24506>Jeremiah 5:6; 12:8; <30304>Amos 3:4), in the tangled brushwood (<24007>Jeremiah 4:7; 25:38; <18840>Job 38:40), and in the caves of the mountains (<22408>Song of Solomon 4:8 <26919>Ezekiel 19:9; <34222>Nahum 2:12). The canebrake on the banks of the Jordan, the 'pride' of the river, was their favorite haunt (<24919>Jeremiah 49:19; 1, 44; <38103>Zechariah 11:3), and in this reedy covert (<25310>Lamentations 3:10) they were to be found at a comparatively recent period, as we learn from a passage of Johannes

Phocas, who traveled in Palestine towards the end of the 12th century (Reland, *Pal.* 1:274). They abounded in the jungles which skirt the rivers of Mesopotamia (Ammian. Marc. 18:7, 5), and in the time of Xenophon *(De Venat.* 11) were found in Nysa."

Picture for Lion 5

"Naturalists are disposed to consider the lion as a genus, consisting of some three or four species. Two of these are found in Asia, the one called, from the scantiness of its mane, the maneless lion *(Leo Goozeratensis),* found only in Western India, and the other furnished with that appendage in its ordinary profusion *(L.* A *siaticus),* which is spread over Bengal, Persia, the Euphratean Valley, and some parts of Arabia. This is smaller, and more slightly built than the African lions, with a fur of a lighter yellow. It is doubtful, however, whether it is really more than variety."

Picture for Lion 6

"The lion of Palestine was in all probability the Asiatic variety, described by Aristotle *(II. A.* 9:44) and Pliny (8:18) as distinguished by its short curly mane, and by being shorter and rounder in shape, like the sculptured lion found at Arban (Layard *Nineveh and Babbylon,* page 278). It was less daring than the longermaned species, but when driven by hunger it not only ventured to attack the flocks in the desert in presence of the shepherd (<23104>Isaiah 31:4; <091734>1 Samuel 17:34), but laid waste towns and villages (<122725>2 Kings 17:25, 26; <202213>Proverbs 22:13; 26:13), and devoured men (<111324>1 Kings 13:24; 20:36; <122725>2 Kings 17:25; <261903>Ezekiel 19:3, 6). The shepherds sometimes ventured to encounter the lion single-handed (<091734>1 Samuel 17:34), and the vivid figure employed by Amos (<300312>Amos 3:12), the herdsman of Tekoa, was but the transcript o a scene which he must have often witnessed. At other times they pursued the animal in large bands, raising loud shouts to intimidate him (<23104>Isaiah 31:4) and drive him into the net or pit they had prepared to catch him (<261904>Ezekiel 19:4, 8). This method of capturing wild beasts is described by Xenophon *(De Ven.* 11:4) and by Shaw, who says, 'The Arabs dig a pit where they are observed to enter, and, covering it over lightly with reeds or small branches of trees, they frequently decoy and catch them' *(Travels,* 2d ed. page 172). Benaiah, one of David's heroic bodyguard, had distinguished himself by slaying a lion in his den (<102320>2 Samuel 23:20). The kings of Persia had a menagerie of lions (bGpgob, <270607>Daniel 6:7, etc.). When captured alive they were put in a

cage (<2609>Ezekiel 19:9), but it does not appear that they were tamed. In the hunting scenes at Beni-Hassan tame lions are represented as used in hunting (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 3:17). On the bas-reliefs at Kouyunjik a lion led by a chain is among the presents brought by the conquered to their victors (Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, page 138)." Wilkinson says: "The worship of the lion was particularly regarded in the city of Leontopolis, and other cities adored this animal as the emblem of more than one deity." It was the symbol of strength, and therefore typical of the Egyptian Hercules (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* 5:169). In Babylon it appears to have been the custom to throw offenders to be devoured by lions kept in dens for that purpose (<2706>Daniel 6:7-28). This is thought to be confirmed by the evidence of several ancient monuments, brought to light by the researches of recent travelers, on the sites of Babylon and Susa, which represent lions destroying and preying upon human beings. *SEE DEN*. The Assyrian monuments abound in illustrations of lionhunting, which appears to have been a favorite pastime, especially with royalty (Layard, *Nineveh,* 1:120). *SEE HUNTING*.

Picture for Lion 7

"The terrible roar of the lion is expressed in Hebrew by four different words, between which the following distinction appears to be maintained: gaiv; *shâag'* (<0714>Judges 14:5; <1922>Psalm 22:13; 104:21; <3104>Amos 3:4), also used of the thunder (<1804>Job 37:4), denotes the roar of the lion while seeking his prey; µhn; *nâham'* (<2529>Isaiah 5:29), expresses the cry which he utters when he seizes his victim; hGh; *hâgâh,'* (<2304>Isaiah 31:4), the growl with which he defies any attempt to snatch the prey from his teeth; while r[n; *nâ'ar'* (<2638>Jeremiah 51:38), which in Syriac is applied to the braying of the ass and camel, is descriptive of the cry of the young lions. If this distinction be correct, the meaning attached to *nâham* will give force to <2012>Proverbs 19:12. The terms which describe the movements of the animal are equally distinct: /bir; *râbats' (*<0409>*Genesis* 49:9; <2602>Ezekiel 19:2), is applied to the crouching of the lion, as well as of any wild beast, in his lair; hjy; *shâchâh',* bvy; *yâshab'* (<1840>Job 38:40), and bra; *arab'* (<1009>Psalm 10:9), to his lying in wait in his den, the two former denoting the position of the animal, and the latter the secrecy of the act; cmr; *râmas'* (<1940>Psalm 104:20), is used of the stealthy creeping of the lion after his prey; and qNæ *zinnêk'* (<5322>Deuteronomy 33:22), of the leap with which he hurls himself

upon it" (Smith). "The Scriptures present many striking pictures of lions, touched with wonderful force and fidelity; even where the animal is a direct instrument of the Almighty, while true to his mission, he still remains so to his nature. Thus nothing can be more graphic than the record of the man of God (<11138>1 Kings 13:28), disobedient to his charge, struck down from his ass, and lying dead, while the lion stands by him, without touching the lifeless body or attacking the living animal, usually a favorite prey. (See also <01409>Genesis 49:9; <18940>Job 4:10, 11; <34211>Nahum 2:11,12.) Samson's adventure also with the young lion (<07145>Judges 14:5, 6), and the picture of the young lion coming up from the underwood cover on the banks of the Jordan, all attest a perfect knowledge of the animal and its habits. Finally, the lions in the den with Daniel, miraculously leaving him unmolested, still retain, in all other respects, the real characteristics of their nature."

"The strength (<07148>Judges 14:18, <20330>Proverbs 30:30; <10123>2 Samuel 1:23), courage (<10710>2 Samuel 17:10; <20281>Proverbs 28:1; <23104>Isaiah 31:4; <34211>Nahum 2:11), and ferocity (<01409>Genesis 49:9; <04249>Numbers 24:9) of the lion were proverbial. The 'lion-faced' warriors of Gad were among David's most valiant troops (<13128>1 Chronicles 12:8) and the hero Judas Maccabaeus is described as 'like a lion, and like a lion's whelp roaring for his prey' (1 Macc. 3:4)." Hence the lion, as an emblem of power, was symbolical of the tribe of Judah (<01409>Genesis 49:9). Grotius thinks the passage in <26192>Ezekiel 19:2, 3, alludes to this fact that Judaea was among the nations like a lioness among the beasts of the forest; she had strength and sovereignty. The same type of sovereignty recurs in the prophetical visions, and the figure of this animal was among the few which the Hebrews admitted in sculpture or in cast metal, as exemplified in the throne of Solomon (<11109>1 Kings 10:19, 20) and the brazen sea (<11072>1 Kings 7:29, 36). The heathen assumed the lion as an emblem of the sun, of the god of war, of Ares, Ariel, Arioth, Re, the Indian Siva, of dominion in general, of valor, etc.; and it occurs in the names and standards of many nations. This illustrated <27004>Daniel 7:4, "The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings." The Chaldaean or Babylonian empire is here represented (see <24007>Jeremiah 4:7). Its progress to what was then deemed universal empire was rapid, and therefore it has the wings of an eagle (see <24840>Jeremiah 48:40, and <26708>Ezekiel 17:3). It is said by Megasthenes and Strabo that this power advanced as far as Spain. When its wings were plucked or torn out, that is, when it was checked in its progress by frequent defeats, it became more peaceable and humane, agreeably to that idea of <19920>Psalm 9:20. A remarkable coincidence between

the symbolical figure of Daniel's vision and the creations of ancient Assyrian art has lately been brought to light by the researches of Lavard and Botta on the sites of Babylon and Nineveh. *SEE CHERUB*. In <2291>Isaiah 29:1, "Woe to the lion of God, the city where David dwelt," Jerusalem is denoted, and the terms used appear to signify the strength of the place, by which it was enabled to resist and overcome all its enemies. *SEE ARIEL*. The apostle Paul says (<5047>2 Timothy 4:17), "I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." The general opinion is that Nero is here meant, or, rather, his prefect AElius Cesarianus, to whom Nero committed the government of the city of Rome during his absence, with power to put to death whomsoever he pleased. *SEE PAUL*. So, when Tiberius died, Marsyas said to Agrippa, "The lion is dead." So likewise speaks Esther of Artaxerxes, in the apocryphal chapters of that book (ch. 14:13), "Put a word into my mouth before the lion." There are some commentators who regard the apostle's expression as a proverbial one for a deliverance from any great or imminent danger, but others conclude that he had been actually delivered from a lion let loose against him in the amphitheater. That the same symbol should sometimes be applied to opposite characters is not at all surprising or inconsistent, since different qualities may reside in the symbol, of which the good may be referred to the one, the bad to another. Thus in the lion reside courage and victory over antagonists. In these respects it may be and is employed as a symbol of Christ, called the Lion of the tribe of Judah (<6605>Revelation 5:5), as being the illustrious descendant of that tribe, whose emblem was the lion. In the lion also reside fierceness and rapacity. In this point of view it is used as a fit emblem of Satan: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (<6058>1 Peter 5:8). On the subject generally, see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:1 sq.; Rosenmüller, *Alterlft.* IV, 2:111 sq.; Wemyss, *Clavis Symbolica*, s.v.; *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Wood, *Bible Animals*, page 18 sq.; Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, page 115 sq.

Lioness

SEE LION.

Lip

(hpc; *saphah'*, usually in the dual; Gr. χεῖλος), besides its literal sense (e.g. <2329>Isaiah 37:29; <2203>Song of Solomon 4:3, 11; 5:13; <2403>Proverbs

24:28), and (in the original) metaphorically for an *edge* or border, as of a cup (<110726>1 Kings 7:26), of a garment (<022708>Exodus 27:32), of a curtain (<022604>Exodus 26:4; 36:11), of the sea (<012217>Genesis 22:17; <021013>Exodus 2:3; <581112>Hebrews 11:12), of the Jordan (<120213>2 Kings 2:13; <070722>Judges 7:22), is often put as an organ of speech, e.g. to "open the lips," 1. to begin to speak (<181105>Job 11:5; 32:20), also to "open the lips" of another, i.e. ecause him to speak (<195117>Psalm 51:17), and to "refrain the lips," i.e. to keep silence (<194010>Psalm 40:10; <201019>Proverbs 10:19). So speech or discourse is said to be "upon the lips" (<201610>Proverbs 16:10; <191604>Psalm 16:4), once "under the lips" (<191404>Psalm 140:4; <450313>Romans 3:13; comp. <263603>Ezekiel 36:3), and likewise "sinning with lips" (<182010>Job 2:10; 12:20; <194503>Psalm 45:3), and "uncircumcised of lips," i.e., not of ready speech (<020612>Exodus 6:12), also "fruit of the lips," i.e., praise (<581315>Hebrews 13:15; <600305>1 Peter 3:5), and, by a bolder figure, "the calves of the lips," i.e., thank-offering (<281402>Hosea 14:2); finally, the motion of the lips in speaking (<401508>Matthew 15:8; <410706>Mark 7:6; from <232913>Isaiah 29:13). By metonomy, "lip" stands in Scripture for a manner of speech, e.g. in nations, a *dialect* (<011101>Genesis 11:1, 6, 7, 9; <231918>Isaiah 19:18; <260305>Ezekiel 3:5, 6; <461421>1 Corinthians 14:21, alluding to <232811>Isaiah 28:11), or, in individuals, the moral quality of language, as "lying lips," etc., i.e., *falsehood* (<201018>Proverbs 10:18; comp. 17:4, 7) or *wickedness* (<191202>Psalm 120:2), *truth* (<201219>Proverbs 12:19); "burning lips," i.e., ardent professions (<201623>Proverbs 26:23); "sweetness of lips," i.e., pleasant discourse (<201622>Proverbs 16:22; so <360309>Zephaniah 3:9; <230605>Isaiah 6:5; <191203>Psalm 12:3, 4). To "shoot out the lip" at any one, i.q. to *make mouths,* has always been an expression of the utmost scorn and defiance (<192208>Psalm 22:8). In like manner, "unclean lips" are put as a represelntation of unfitness to impart or receive the divine communications (<230605>Isaiah 6:5, 7). Also the "word of one's lips," i.e. communication, e.g. Jehovah's precepts (<191704>Psalm 17:4; comp. <202316>Proverbs 23:16: spoken of as something before unknown, <198106>Psalm 81:6); elsewhere in a bad sense, i.q. lip-talk, i.e., vain and empty words (<233605>Isaiah 36:5; <201423>Proverbs 14:23), and so of the person uttering them, e.g. a man of talk, i.e., an idle talker (<181102>Job 11:2), a prating fool (<201008>Proverbs 10:8; comp. <031304>Leviticus 5:4; <19A633>Psalm 106:33). *SEE TONGUE*.

The "upper lip" (μρς; *saphats'*, a derivative of the above), which the leper was required to cover (Leviticus 42:45), refers to the lip-beard or *mustachios,* as the Venet. Greek *(*μύσταξ*)* there and the Sept. in <101924>2 Samuel 19:24, render it, being the beard (in the latter passage), which

Mephibosheth neglected to trim during David's absence in token of grief. The same practice of "covering the lip" with a corner of one's garment, as if polluted((comp. "unclean lips"), as a sign of mourning, is allluded to in (2647)Ezekiel 24:17, 22; (3007)Micah 3:7, where the Sept. has στόμα, χείλη. *SEE MOUTH*

Lipmann, Jomtob

(of Mühlhausen), also called *Tab-Jomi* (ymwybf = bwf µwy), a Jewish writer and rabbi of the Middle Ages, was born, according to some, at Cracow, Poland, but most authorities are now agreed that he flourished at Prague about the middle of the 14th century. While a resident of the Bohemian capital he brought forward his *Nitsachon* (ˆwjxn, Victory), an important polemical work. It consists of seven parts, divided, he tells us himself in his preface, "according to the seven days of the week," and of 354 sections, "'according to the number of days in the lunar year, which is the Jewish mode of calculation to indicate that every Israelite is bound to study his religion every day of his life, and to remove every obstruction from the boundaries of his faith." In his treatment of the subject, the denial of the authenticity of the Christian religion, Lipmann does not adopt any systematic plan, but discusses and explains every passage of the Hebrew Bible which is either adduced by Christians as a Messianic prophecy referring to Christ, or is used by skeptics and blasphemers to support their skepticism and contempt for revelations, or is appealed to by rationalistic Jews to corroborate their rejection of the doctrine of creation out of nothing, the resurrection of the body, etc., beginning with Genesis and ending with Chronicles, according to the order of the books in the Hebrew Bible, so that any passage in dispute might easily be found. The work, which, as we have seen from its divisions, partook both of the character of a Jewish polemic and an O.-T. apologetic, was, until near the middle of the 16th century, entirely controlled by Jews. They largely transcribed and circulated it in MS. form among their people throughout the world; and in the numerous attacks which they had to sustain both from Christians and rationalists during the time of the Reformation, this book constituted their chief arsenal, supplying them with weapons to defend themselves. About 1642 the learned Hascapan, then professor in the Bavarian University at Altdorf, was engaged in a controversy on the questions at issue between Judaism and Christianity with a neighboring rabbi residing in Schneitach, who in his dissertations frequently referred to this *Nitsachon* (a MS. copy

made in 1589), which Hascapan asked the privilege to examine. Refused again and again, he at last called with three of his students on the rabbi, when he pressed him in such a manner to produce the MS. that he could not refuse. He pretended to examine it, and when the students had fairly surrounded the rabbi, the professor made his way to the door, got into a conveyance which was waiting for him, had the MS. speedily transcribed, and only returned it to the rabbi after much earnest solicitation. The professor enriched it by valuable notes and an index and then presented the work procured in such a dastardly manner to the Christian world (Altdorf, 1644). It was rapidly reprinted, translated into Latin, corrected and refuted by Blendinger, *Lipmanni Nizzacahon in Christianos,* etc., *Latine conversum?* (Altdorf, 1645); Wagenseil, *Tela ignea Saltane* (Altdorf, 1681) ; *Sofa, Liber Mischnicus de Uxore Adulterii Suspecta* (Altdorf. 1674), Appendix, and others (see Wolf, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:347 sq.). Lipmann's personal history is to our day very obscure. Jewish historians represent him as having been among the prisoners arrested at Prague (August 3, 1399) for irreverent mention, etc., of the name of Jesus. What punishment he suffered is not known; certain it is that he was not one of the seventy-seven Jews who were executed on the day of the dethronement of kingWenceslaus (August 22, 1400), for he mentions the fact himself in the *Nitsachon.* See Gritz, *Gesch. der Juden,* 8:76 sq.; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica,* 2:403 sq.; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana,* col. 1410-1414; Geiger, *Proben Jüd. Velrtheidigung gegen Christliche Angriffe im Mittelalter in Liebermanzn's Deutscher VolksKalender* (Brieg, 1854), page 9 sq., 47 sq.; Kitto, *Cycl. Bibl. Lit.* volume 2, s.v.

Lippe

sometimes also (but less properly) LIPPEDETMOLD, a small principality of Northern Germany, surrounded on the W. and S. by Westphalia, and on the E. and N. by Hanover, Brunswick, Waldeck, and a detached portion of Hesse-Cassel, extends over an area of 438 square miles, and has a population (1885) of 123,250, mainly belonging to the Reformed Church. The earliest inhabitants were the Cherusci; subsequently it was a part of the country of the Saxons. The first establishment of Christianity in that province dates back to Charlemagne. In the very beginning of his war against the Saxons, in 772, he took the *castrum AEresburgum* (probably Radtberg, on the Diemel, near the southern frontier of the principality), and there destroyed the statue of the idol Irmansaul. In 776 he went to Lippspringe, and the following year to Padrabrun (Paderborn), both on the

southern frontier of the province, obliging whole tribes of the conquered Saxons to receive baptism. In 783 Charlemagne again vanquished the Saxons in the great battle of Theotmelli (Detmold), in the very heart of the present principality. The Saxon army was entirely destroyed, and Charlemagne, in commemoration of this event, erected a church which is still in existence. The next Christmas he spent at Skidroburg-supra-Ambram, now Schieder, on the Emmer, where it is said he also erected a church. But his most important measure for Christianizing the country was his establishment of the bishopric of Paderborn, embracing the district of Lippe within its diocese, for which the house of the princes of Lippe furnished many a bishop.

The Reformation early found strong supporters in Lippe. The first city of the province to adopt it was Lemgo, moved to such a course by Luther's theses against indulgences. By 1524 the Reformation was further advanced in this part of Germany by the adherents it had gained in the town of Herford, adjoining Lemgo, where the works of Luther and Melancthon had been circulated freely. Foremost among Luther's supporters there were his colleagues the Augustine monks. One of them, Dr. John Drever, a native of Lemgo and a personal friend of Luther, distinguished for his learning and eloquence, was the first to preach the Gospel in Herford. In spite of the priests, the people introduced the singing of the German hymns of Luther into their churches, and all attempts to put an end to this by violence gave way before the unanimous will of the people. The first to take the decided step of separation was Moriz Piderit, a priest, and formerly one of the most determined adversaries of the evangelical doctrines, and by his influence the city was carried for Luther's doctrines. Lippstadt embraced them nearly at the same time. The monks of the Augustine convent in that city, who had sent two of their number to Wittemberg to be instructed by Luther, on their return preached the Gospel with great success to the people of Lippe and of neighboring places; and they so quickly advanced the cause of the Reformers, that when an inquisitor was sent to Lippe from Cologne in 1526 to stay the heresy, he found the evangelical party so strong that he gave up all attempts to control it, and returned to his home. In 1533 the town was besieged by the dukes of Cleves and Juliers, and the count of Lippe forced to surrender. The evangelical ministers were of course driven away, but it was not long before permission was granted for the preaching by Lutheran ministers again. After the death of the zealous Roman Catholic count Simon V, in 1536, the Reformation made more rapid progress in the

province. The landgrave Philip of Hessia and count Jobst von Hoya, two determined partisans of the Reformation, became guardians of the children of the deceased count, and caused them to be diligently instructed in the Protestant doctrines; and when, in 1538, both the nobility and the people loudly demanded a reform in the Church of the count de Hoya, John Timann, surnamed Amstelrodamus, and Adrian Buxschoten, both of Bremen, were called and sent to Lippe to frame a plan of evangelical church organization, which was submitted to the States and to Luther, and, upon approval (1538), it was promulgated throughout the principality, and Protestant ministers were everywhere appointed. Under John von Eyter, of Wittemberg, then general superintendent of Lippe, a new church organization was drawn up and printed in 1571, with the authorization of the authorities, and it is still in our day in force among the Lutheran communities of the country.

In 1600, during the reign of count Simon VI (ruled 1583-1613), who had imbibed Calvinistic views at the court of Cassel, Calvinism found an entrance in Lippe. It commenced by the appointment of a Calvinistic minister to preach at Horn in 1602. This preacher at once forbade the use of the Lutheran Catechism in the schools, administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in strict Calvinistic form, and established the Reformed mode of worship in spite of the local authorities and of the pope. In 1605 the same step was taken at Detmold, and was supported by the government, notwithstanding the opposition of the people and city authorities. In this manner Calvinism was established throughout the country, the nobility alone and the city of Lemgo remaining Lutheran. It was not, however, until 1684 that Calvinism was sanctioned as the state religion. In that year count Simon Henrich promulgated the Reformed ecclesiastical organization, which recognizes as its formula of confession the Catechism of Heidelberg, and is in force in our day. The city of Lemgo resisted these measures, and succeeded in obtaining in 1717 an edict assuring its inhabitants the fullest religious liberty, the right of appointing their own ministers, etc. But as Rationalism had obtained full control of the Reformed Church of Lippe in the 18th century, upon reaction towards the middle of the 19th century the whole country, including Lemgo, was subjected to the Reformed consistory, which, however, by the admission of one Lutheran member, became a mixed consistory. As an outline of doctrine, the Heidelberg Catechism was introduced.

In 1885 the principality numbered about 2700 Roman Catholics, 6500 Lutherans, 1150 Israelites; the remainder belonged to the Reformed Church. The latter is divided into three classes, at the head of each of which is a superintendent; at the head of the whole clergy is a superintendent general at Detmold. The supreme ecclesiastical board for both Reformed and Lutherans is the consistory at Detmold. The principality has 43 Reformed, 5 Lutheran, and 6 Catholic parishes; the Catholics belong to the diocese of Paderborn, in Westlphalia. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* 8:423; Falkmann und Preuss, *Lippesche Regesten* (Lemgo, 1860-63, 2 volumes, 8vo); Falkmann, *Beitrage zur Gesch. der Furstenth.* (ibid. 1847-56); and his *Graf Simon VI zur Lippe* (Detm. 1869, volume 1). (A.J.S.)

Lippomani, Aloysius

(or *Ludovicus),* born in Venice in 1500, was alike renowned for his historical and linguistic learning and for the purity of his life. He was in turn bishop of Modena, Verona, and Bergamo. He was active in securing the pope's assent to the transfer of the Tridentine Council to Bologna; was for two years after the interruption of the council papal nuncio in Germany, and in 1549 one of the three presidents of the council. In Poland the Reformation had made great advances through the influence of the tHussites and of the Bohemian Brethren, as also through the Socinian movement. At the national Diet of Petrikau in 1550, 1551, and especially 1555, the prerogatives of the Catholic bishops were, through special influence of the the king, Sigismund II, greatly diminished, and the Protestant theologians — such as Calvin, Melancthon, Beza — were recognized as important authorities in matters of faith. The Confession of Hosius, adopted in a provincial synod at Petrikau, obtained great acceptance with the people. Lippomani was specially commissioned by pope Paul IV, in 1556, as nuncio in Poland, to exert, himself against this rapid progress of resifrm. His efforts made him peculiarly obnoxious to the adherents of Protestantism, but were without marked success. He died as bishop of Bergamo in August 1559. He wrote commentaries on Genesis, Exodus, and the Psalms, but they are of no special value to the exegetist of today. See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexicon,* s.v.; Krasinski, *Hist. Sketch of the Reformation in Poland.* volume 1, chapter 6. (E.B.O.)

Lipscomb, Philip D.,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Georgetown, D.C., in October 1798. He was converted probably in early life, and joined the Baltimore Conference in 1822. Among his brethren in Conference assembled he was pleasant, attentive to business, safe in council. He was many years one of the stewards of the Conference. He was also for a time treasurer of the Preachers' Fund Society. A number of the years of his ministry were given to the service of the American Colonization Society, and from that work he retired in 1863 to a place on the superannuated list. A minister of this Conference, who knew him long and intimately, says, "His life was beautiful in its consistency." He died in January, 1870. — *Conf. Minutes,* 1871.

Lipsius

Justus, a Roman Catholic, renowned as a scholar in the 16th century, was born near Brussels in 1547. His talent was precocious, and he edited his *Variae lectiones* at the age of 19. He was secretary to cardinal Granville about this time (1572-74). Later, as professor of history at Jena, lie became a Protestant, and remained such for 13 years while professor of ancient languages at Leyden, but subsequently he returned to the Roman Catholic Church, and was made professor at Louvain (1602). He died March 23, 1606, holding at that time the appointment of historiographer to the king of Spain. His scholarship was honored by the pope and at several European courts. He distinguished himself especially by his commentary upon Tacitus, whose works he could repeat word for word, and by his enthusiastic regard for the stoical philosophy. He wrote *De Constantia manuductia ad philosophiam Stoicam*: — *Physiologiae Stoicorum libri tres* (new edit. Antv. 1605, fol.): — also *De una religione,* etc. His works were collected under the title *Opera Omnia* (Antv. 1585; 2d edit. 1637). See Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon,* volume 2, s.v.; *Theol. Univ. Lex.* (Elberf. 1869), volume 1, s.v.

Liptines Or Lestines, Synod Of

(Conciliumi Liptinense). This synod was held at Liptina or Lestines, near the convent of Laubes, in Henegau, in 743, by order of Carloman, Bonifacits presiding. Four canons were published. The bishops, earls, and governors promised in this council to observe the decrees of the Council of Germany (A.D. 742). All the clergy, moreover, promised obedience to the

ancient canons; the abbots and monks received the order of St. Benedict, and a part of the revenue of the Church was assigned for a time to the prince, to enable him to carry on the wars then raging. (J.N.P.)

Liquor

([mD, *de'ma, a tear,* fig. of the juice of olives and grapes, Exodus 22:29; gzm, *me'zeg, mixed,* i.e., highly flavored wine, Song of Solomon 7:3; h r ,y] ma, *mishrah', maceration,* i.e., drink prepared by steeping grapes, Numbers 6:3). *SEE WINE*.

Lismanini, Francis,

a Socinian theologian, was born at Corfu in the beginning of the 16th century. He studied in Italy, joined the Franciscans, and a few years after became doctor of theology; removed to Poland, and was appointed by queen Bona, wife of Sigismund I, her preacher and confessor. He became also superior of the Franciscans of Poland, director of all the convents of the nuns of St. Clara, etc. The society of Andrew Fricesio and the reading of Ochin's works led him to question the authority of the Roman Church, yet he was not displaced on account of it, but continued in favor with the queen, and was sent by her to Rome, in 1549, to congratulate Julius III on his election as pope. On his return to Poland in 1551, Lismanini became acquainted with Socinius, and it is this association that no doubt gave rise to the mission with which he was entrusted by the king of Poland, ostensibly for the purpose of collecting works for the royal library, but in reality to study the position of the Reformation, and to report concerning it. Lismanini accordingly visited Padua, Milan, and Switzerland, where he finally left his order, embraced the Helvetic confession, and married. The king, fearing to be compromised by this overt act, broke all connection with him, ceased to supply him with funds, and Calvin, Bullinger, and Gesner in vain sought to obtain for Lismanini leave to return to Poland. It was not until 1556 that he was permitted to return, but the king's favor he never regained, notwithstanding the efforts of a large number of the Polish nobility in his behalf. His Socinian views on the doctrine of the Trinity served still more to bring him into discredit. As he attempted to make converts he was exiled from Poland. He retired to Konigsberg, where he became counselor of duke Albrecht. About 1563 he became distracted on account of family difficulties, and committed suicide by drowning. His chief production is *Brevis Explicatio doctrinae de sanctissima Trinitate, quam*

Stancaro et aliis quibusdam opposuit (1565, 8vo). See *Bibl. antitrinitariorum,* page 34; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.;* Friese, *Beiträge z. Ref.-Gesch. in Polen,* 2:1, page 247 sq.; Fock, *Der Socinianismus,* 1:145; Herzoog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* 10:426; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 31:356. (J.H.W.)

List, Carl Benjamin

a German theologian, was born at Mannheim, in the grand-duchy of Baden, February 5, 1725. He attended the universities of Jena and Strasburg, and afterwards spent some time in Neufchatel to acquire French. About 1749 he was appointed court dean, in 1753 third pastor of his native city, and in 1756 first pastor of the Evangelical-Lutheran Church, together with the dignity of counselor of the Consistory. He died January 16, 1801. He possessed a pure, liberal, and reforming character, and to him is due the honor of having abrogated the custom of paving for confession in the Evangelical-Lutheran Church. His productions, mostly of a corrective character in liturgy and hymns, were of great service to the Church to which he belonged. We mention *Die Geschichte der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinde zu Mannheim* (Mannheim, 1767, 8vo): — *Neue Liturgie für die Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche in der Churpfalz* (ibid. 1783, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol, Deutschlands,* volume 2, s.v.

Litany

*(*λιτανεία*, entreaty),* a word the specific meaning of which has varied considerably at different times, is used in the liturgical services of some churches to designate a solemn act of supplication addressed with the object of averting the divine anger, and especially on occasions of public calamity. Hooker, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity* (book 5, page 265), has the following: "As things invented for one purpose are by use easily converted to more, it grew that supplications with this solemnity for the appeasing of (God's wrath and the averting of public evils were of the Greek Church termed *litanies;* rogations, of the Latins."

The term litany for a supplicatory form of worship among the pagans was early adopted by Christian writers. In the fourth century we find such occasions as litanies connected with processions, the clergy and people in solemn procession using certain forms of supplication and making special entreaty for deliverance. Whether anything of this kind would have been ventured before Christianity became a "religio licia" (A.D. 270) may be

doubted. The predominance of a Christian population, however, in certain localities, and the intervals of repose between persecutions, admit of their possibility at an earlier period. In these earliest developments, moreover, of the processional litany, whether before or during the fourth century, they rested, doubtless, upon an earlier Christian habit and custom — that of special seasons of prayer and supplication. These, in some cases, would be by the assembled body of believers in their houses or places of assembling; in others, for purposes of safety from the fury of their enemies, in their individual homes and places of abode. Certainly the Church was not wanting in such occasions during the first centuries of her existence, when the course pursued by the disciples at Jerusalem (Acts 12:5), and for similar reasons would need to be repeated. Occasions of this particular kind would of course pass away with the passing away of persecution. But others of a different character would take their place. As early, indeed, as the times of Tertullian and Cyprian we find allusions to Christian prayers, and fastings, and supplications for the removal of drought, the repelling of enemies, the moderation of calamities; and later, in the fourth and fifth centuries, we find the same thing, on a larger scale and in a more formal manner. Theodosius, preliminary to a battle, spent the whole night in fasting and prayer, and in sackcloth went with the priests and people to make supplication in all the churches. So, again, in the reign of one of his successors, a solemn litany or supplication on account of a great earthquake was made at Constantinople. In these last cases, the element, to which allusion has been made, that of the procession, was undoubtedly present, and so continued until the time of the Reformation; the name litany, indeed, being sometimes used simply to describe this part of it. as where seven litanies are directed by Gregory the Great to proceed from seven different churches (see below). The processions of the Arians in the times of Chrysostom, and the counter movement, on his part, by more splendid and imposing ones, to detract from any popularity which the Arians may have attained in this way, are described by Socrates. It is not at all improbable that in somewhat the same manner the hymns of Arius became circulated in Alexandria in the early part of the fourth century, and found lodgment in the minds of the populace.

The prevalence of litanies in the Western Church may be recognized after the beginning of the fifth century; and during the time of Charlemagne we find allusion to large numbers of them, to be attended to as a matter of special appointment. The Council of Orleans, A.D. 511, expressly

recognizes litanies as peculiarly solemn supplications, and enjoins their use preparatory to the celebration of a high festival. In the Spanish Church, in like manner, they were observed in the week after Pentecost. Other councils subsequently appointed them at a variety of other seasons, till, in the seventeenth Council of Toledo, A.D. 694, it was decreed that they should be used once in each month. By degrees they were extended to two days in each week, and Wednesday and Friday, being the ancient *stationary* days, were set apart for the purpose. Gregory the Great instituted a service at Rome for the 25th of April, which was named *Litacia Septiformis,* because a procession was formed in it of seven different classes. This service is distinguished as *Litania Major,* from its extraordinary solemnity. The *Litaniae Minores,* on the other hand, are supposed by Bingham to consist only of a repetition of Κύριε ἐλέησον, the customary response in the larger supplications. "It was a short form of supplication, used one way or other in all churches, and that as a part of all their daily offices, whence it borrowed the name of the Lesser Litany, in opposition to the greater litanies, which were distinct, complete, and solemn services, adapted to particular times or extraordinary occasions. I must note, further, that the greater litanies are sometimes termed '*exomologeses' — confessions — because* fasting, and weeping, and mourning, and confession of sins were usually enjoined with supplication, to avert God's wrath, and reconcile him to a sinful people." Du Cange cites a passage from the acts of the *Colc. Cloveshoviense,* A.D. 747, confirming the identity of *litania* and *royatio,* but showing that originally there was a distinction between *litania* and *exomologesis.* Johannes de Janua terms litany, properly, a service for the dead. But Du Cange, by the authorities he cites for the early litanies, hazards the assertion that they differ but little from those in modern usage. In the Western litanies two features are to be found not prevalent in the Eastern — the invocation of saints, and the appointment of stated annual seasons for their use, as the rogation days of the Romish, and the tri-weekly usage of the English Church. There is, indeed, mention made of an annual litany in commemoration of the great earthquake in the reign of Justinian. But the general and present habit of the patriarchate of Constantinople has been and is to confine such services to their original purpose-extraordinary occasions.

Freeman *(Principles of Divine Service,* 2:325) insists that in its origin the litany is distinctly a "eucharistic feature," a series of intercessions closely associated with the eucharistic sacrifice. So we find in the East, and so it

was originally in the West also, one most notable feature being the pleading of the work of Christ in behalf of his Church. In a Syriac form given by Renaudot, the priest, taking the paten and cup in his right and left hand, commemorates

(1) the annunciation;
(2) the nativity;
(3) the baptism;
(4) the passion;
(5) the lifting up on the cross;
(6) the life-giving death;
(7) the burial;
(8) the resurrection;
(9) the session.

Then follows the remembrance of the departed, and then supplication for all, both living and departed, ending with three kyries and the Lord's Prayer. This extended eucharistic intercession St. Ephraem the Syrian rendered into a very solemn hymn (comp. Blunt, *Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theol.* page 417).

As to the peculiar structure of litanies, which are prayers, certain features may be mentioned that distinguish them from other prayers (the collects and the so-called common prayers), for in the litany the priest or minister does not pray alone, the people responding after each separate petition. It is even not absolutely necessary that the minister should lead, as the whole may be divided between two choirs; for we must also notice that the litany, occupying a medium position between prayer and singing, may be sung or spoken, according to the custom of the place where it is used. Some compositors even — Mozart, for instance — sometimes treated it in the same manner as the usual Church chants (the *Stabat Mater, Requiemn,* etc.); but in this case, by losing the distinction between petitions and responses, the litany entirely changed its character. In the next place, it must be noticed that in all litanies preceding the Reformation there is great uniformity. They all begin alike — *Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison,* and end alike — Ag*nus Dei, qui tollis,* etc. In this respect they resemble the mass. A form of supplication somewhat resembling a litany exists in the Apostolical Constitutions; as the deacon named the subjects of petition, the people answered to each, *Lord, have mercy.* That of the Church of England begins with an invocation of the persons of the Trinity, but uses

the old invocations in its progress and close. In their original purpose litanies were connected with fasting and humiliation, and were therefore inappropriate to the festal character of the Sunday service. In this respect their usage has been changed, and they are now part of divine service not only on Sundays, but on the most joyous seasons of Christian commemoration, such as Easter and Christmas day. One of the last efforts, indeed, in this kind of composition is the litany of Zinzendorf for Easter morning. The ordinary arrangement of litany material may be described as, first, the invocations, where we find the greatest difference between Romish and Protestant litanies; these are followed by the deprecations, from which this kind of service originally took its predominant character; next come intercessions for various classes and conditions of men, the whole closing with supplications for divine audience, and blessing upon the worshippers. The litany of the Church of Rome is that of Gregory, with subsequent additions, especially in the material of invocation to the body of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and all the saints. There was an earlier form, bearing the name of Ambrose, agreeing in many respects with the Lutheran and English (see below). There was another, put in shape by Mamertius, bishop of Vienna, about the year 460, which was used by Sidonius of Arranque soon after, in connection with an invasion of the Goths, the annual usage of which the Council of Orleans enjoined. That of Gregory, however, composed during the next century, became the prevailing one, or rather the typical form of others in subsequent use.

The three different forms now in use in the Romish churches are called the "litany of the saints" (which is the most ancient), the "litany of the name of Jesus," and the " litany of Our Lady of Loretto." Of these the first alone has a place in the public service-books of the Church, on the rogation days, in the ordination service, the service for the consecration of churches, the consecration of cemeteries, and many other offices. The one called by the name of *litany of the saints* bears its name from the prayers it contains to the saints for their help and intercession in behalf of the worshippers. Almost every saint in the calendar of the Romish Church has his particular form in the litany. The people's response in the prayer is *Orca pro nobis,* "Pray for us." The *litany of Jesus* consists of a number of addresses to Christ under his various relations to men, in connection with the several details of his passion, and of a djurations of him through the memory of what he has done and suffered for the salvation of mankind. The date of this form of prayer is uncertain, but it is referred, with much probability, to

the time of St. Bernardino of Siena, in the 15th century. The *litany of Loretto SEE LORETTO* resembles both the above-named litanies in its opening addresses to the Holy Trinity and in its closing petitions to the "Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world;" but the main body of the petitions are addressed to the Virgin Mary under various titles, some taken from the Scriptures, some from the language of the fathers, some from the mystical writers of the mediaeval Church. Neither this litany nor that of Jesus has ever formed part of any of the ritual or liturgical offices of the Catholic Church, but there can be no doubt that both have in various ways received the sanction of the highest authorities of the Romish Church. Those of the Lutheran and English churches, which are very much alike, are derived from the same source, being shorter in that these invocations are expunged.

In the Church of England it was originally a distinct service, and seems to have been used at a different time of day from the ordinary morning service, and only on certain occasions. In 1544 it was given to the people in a revised form by Henry VIII. Upon its insertion in the Prayer-book published by Edward VI, A.D. 1549, the litany was placed between the communion office and the office of baptism, under the title "'The Litany and Suffrages," without any rubric for its use; but at the end of the communion office occurred the following rubric: “Upon Wednesdays and Fridays the English litany shall be said or sung in all places, after such form as is appointed by his majesty's injunctions, or as it shall be otherwise appointed by his highness." In the revision of the Common Prayer in 1552, the litany was placed where it now stands, and the rubric was added to "be used on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and at other times when it shall be commanded by the ordinary." So late as the last revision in 1661, the litany continued a distinct service by itself, used sometimes after the morning prayer (then read at a very early hour) was concluded, the people returning home between them. The rubric which inserts the litany after the third collect in morning prayer is formed from a similar rubric in the Scotch *Common Prayerbook,* with this difference, that the English rubric enjoins the omission of certain of the ordinary intercessional prayers; the Scotch rubric, on the other hand, states expressly, "without the omission of any part of the other daily service of the Church on those days."

The litany of the German and Danish Lutherans closely resembles that of the Church of England and that of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, and needs, therefore, no special mention here.

The processional feature is still retained in the Greek and Roman litanies on special occasions, but is not their special accompaniment. Efforts towards its restoration in the English and American Episcopal Church have for the past ten years been in progress. Judging from the prevalent sentiment of the episcopate in both countries, and the tone of the last General Convention in this, the prospects of success are not very favorable. See Procter, *Book of Common Prrayer,* page 246 sq.; Palmer, *Origines Liturgices,* 1:264 sq.; Wheatly, *Common Prayer,* page 163 sq.; Dean Stanley in *Good Words* for 1868 (June); Coleman, *Manual of Prelacy and Ritualism,* page 392 sq.; *Christian Antiq.* page 661; Blunt, *Dict. Doct. and Hist. Theol.* s.v.; Eacdie, *Ecclesiastical Dictionary,* s.v.; Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology,* page 353. *SEE LITURGY.*

Literae Encyclicae

a term used in the Roman Catholic Church to denote letters addressed by the pope to the whole Church, but primarily to the clergy at large, as representatives of the Church. They are to be distinguished from apostolical briefs and bulls as never being applicable to local or individual cases only. They relate to some general need or tendency of a moral or doctrinal kind within the Church, or to any supposed dangers from without, and contain the pope's views on the matters alluded to, with exhortations to cooperation on the part of the clergy and the Church at large in the course of conduct advised. *SEE ENCYCLICA.*

Literae Formâtae

or simply FORMATAE, are the epistles of bishops and churches to others of like character, and are so called because they are framed after certain prescribed canonical rules. There have been needless discussions over the fitness of the expression *formata,* and some would have it to *be formalis* (Suetonius, *Domitian,* 13); others will derive it *forma,* τύπος, seal (hence *formata,* τετυπωμένη, equivalent to *sigillata),* etc. Originally they were termed τετυπωμμένη, *canonicae,* but afterwards *formatae.* The adoption of a particular form was early necessary, in order to prevent the alteration of and tampering with letters, of which Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (t c.a. 167), complained, according to Eusebius *(Hist. Eccl.* lib. 4, cap. 23), as also Cyprian *(Epist.* 3). From the earliest times the brotherly union of the churches was cultivated by means of a regular correspondence, of which Optatus of Mileve says in the middle of the fourth century: "Totus orbis

commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat." The holy Scriptures themselves, namely, the epistles of the apostles, served as the first models. Letters of introduction and recommendation of brethren to the different churches were in the infancy of the Church the chief subject of this correspondence; these were called by the apostles συστατικαὶ ἐπιστολαί (2 Corinthians 3:1), *literae commendatitiae.* They are mentioned by Tertullian *(Adversus haereses,* cap. 20), Gregory of Nazianzum *(Oratio,* 3), and Sozomen *(Hist. Eccl.* lib. 5, cap. 16), etc. The demand for such letters of recommendation became so numerous that it was necessary to frame regulations determining who was and who was not entitled to them, and in what form they should be written. The Council of Elvira, a. 305 (? 310), c. 25, that of Aries, a. 314, c. 9, etc., decided that bishops alone should be authorized to write them. Every traveler, whether laic or clerical, was to provide himself with one. It is said, cap. 32 (al. 34): "Nullus episcopus peregrinorum aut presbyterorum aut diaconorum sine commendatitiis recipiatur epistolis; et cum scripta detulerint, discutiantur attentius, et ita suscipiantur, si praedicatores pietatis extiterint; sin minus, haec quae sunt necessaria subministrantur eis, et ad communionem nullatenus admittantur, quia per subreptionem multa proveniunt" (see *Conc. Antioch.* a. 341 [? 332], c. 7, in c. 9, dist. 71; *African.* 1, a. 506, 100:2 [100:21, dist. 1], 100:5). The defense of the right of these members of the clergy to officiate was often withdrawn, as by the *Conc. Chalcedon.* a. 451, c. 13, in c. 7, dist. 71, etc. The form of the writings was taken from the apostolic models. Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, stated in the Council of Chalcedon, 451, that there was a formula established by the Council of Niceca, 325: "Nicaes.... constitutum, ut epistola formatae hanc calculationis sen supputationis habeant rationem, id est, ut assumantur in supputationem prima Graeca elementa Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, hoc est π. υ. α. quae elementa octogenarium, et quadringentesimum, et primum significant numerum. Petri quoque apostoli prima litera, id est π... : ejus quoque, qui scribit, episcopi prima litera; cui scribitur secunda litera; accipientis tertia litera; civitatis quoque, de qua scribitur, quarta: et indictionis, quecunque est illius temporis, numerus assumatur. Atque ita his omnibus Graecis literis.... in unum ductis, unam, quaecunque fuerit collecta, summam epistola teneat, hanc qui suscipit omni cum cautela requirat expresse. Addat praeterea separatim in epistola etiam nonagenarium et nonunm numerum, qui secundum Graeca elementa significat ἀμήν." From these letters of recommendation must be distinguished the εἰρηνικαὶ ἐπιστολαί, *literae pacificae,* a kind of

letters of dismission (hence also called ἀπολυτικαί), stating that the giver was privy to the bearer's intention of traveling (c. 7, 8, *Conc. Antioch.* a. 382, c. 11; *Conc. Chaelced.* 451; *Conc. Trullan.* a. 672, c. 17, etc.). *Formatae* also contained the communications of one community to another, such as the information concerning the election of bishops, etc. (γράμματα ἐνθρονιστικά. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 7, cap. 30; Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. 4, cap. 4); notices of festivals, particularly Easter, etc. (γράμματαἑορταστικά, πασχάλια, *epistolae festales, paschales,* etc.; *Conc. Arelat.* 1, a. 314, c. 1; *Carthag.* 5, a. 401, c. 7; *Bracar.* 2, a. 572, c. 7; *Gratista.* c. 24-26. dist. 3, "de consecr."). The publication of ordinations was also made by *formate* as circulars, ἐγκύκλια, ἐπιστολαί, *circulares, tractorice.* See.Du Fresne, *Glossar. Lat.;* Suicer, *Thesaur. eccl.* s.v. εἰρηνικός; F.B. Ferrarii, *De antiquo epistolarum ecclesiasticarum genere* (Meliol. 1613; and edit. (Th. Meier, Helmstadt, 1678, 4to); Philippians Priorii, *De literiis canonicis diss. cum appendiae de tractoriis et synodicis* (Paris, 1675); J.R. Kiesling, *De stabli primitivae ecclesiae ope literarum communicatoriarum connubio* (Lipsiae. 1745, 4to); Gonzalez Tellez, *Kommentar z. d. Decretalen* (lib. 2, tit. 22, *"De clericis peregrinis,"* cap. 3); Rheinwald, *Kirchliche Archäologie* (Berlin, 1830). — Herzog, *Real-Encykolop.* s.v.

Lith, Johann Wilhelm Von,

a German theologian, was born at Anspach, in Bavaria, February 4, 1678. In 1693 he entered the University of Jena, and became in 1694 A.M. In the following year he went to the University of Altdorf to continue his studies; in 1697 he studied at the University of Halle, and in 1698 he was admitted to the philosophical faculty of that university. His health failing, he was obliged to leave for his native city. In 1707 he became dean at Wassertrüdingen. In 1710 he accepted a call to his native city as preacher of a foundation and counsellor of the Consistory; in addition to this, he became in 1714 city pastor. He died March 13, 1743. Von Lith repeatedly declined calls to far higher dignities abroad. His polemics against Catholicism prove him to have been a man of wide knowledge and great acuteness; and his repeatedly reprinted sermons, and his valuable contributions to the history of the Reformation, give evidence of his success as a great preacher and historian. We mention *Erläuterung der Reformationshistorie von* 1524-28 (Schwabach, 1733, 8vo; 2d edit. ibid. 1739, 8vo): — *Disquisitio de adoratione puntris consecrati,* etc.

(Suabmzi. 1754, 8vo). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands,* volume 2, s.v.

Lithuania

a grand-duchy in Eastern Europe, which formerly constituted a part of the kingdom of Poland, and which at the partition of the kingdom was partly united with Russia (the governments of Vilna, Grodno, Mohilev, Minsk, and Vitebsk), partly with Prussia (the administrative district of Gombinnen). The area of Lithuania is about 105,000 square miles. In the earliest historic times the country of the Lithuanians was subject to the neighboring tribes, in particular to the Russians of Polocz. As an independent state it appears for the first time about 1217 under Ercziwil, who threw off the yoke of Polock, and conquered Podlesia, Grodno, and Brzesk. Eberwand, about 1220, began to expel the Tartars from Lithuania, and Ringold, about 1235, was the first independent grand-duke. His son Mindore, who had to cede Podlesia, Samogitia, and Courland to the prince of Halicz Novgorod and to the Teutonic Order, was in 1245 baptized by the archbishop of Riga and crowned as king; but in 1261 he apostatized from Christianity, and in 1263 he was slain by Svintorog, the governor of Samogitia, who in 1268 obtained control of the country. In 1281 Podlesia was reunited with Lithuania. In 1282 Witen became ruler of Lithuania, after murdering his predecessor. His son Gedinim (1315-1328) conquered Samogitia and a portion of Russia, inclusive of Kiev, and founded the towns of Vilna and Troki. The son of Gedinim, Olgerd, wholly expelled the Tartars from Podolia, and conquered the prince Demetrius of Russia at Moscow, in 1333 at Mosaisk. His son Jagello was baptized on February 14, 1386, at Cracow, and on this occasion received the name of Vladislav. The marriage of Jagello with the princess Hedwig of Poland led to the union of Lithuania with Poland, and made the latter country the greatest power of Eastern Europe. In 1401, and again in 1413, it was stipulated that the princes of Poland and Lithuania should only be elected with the consent of both nations. Under Witold, who in 1413 conquered Smolensk, Lithuania was a powerful state, which embraced, besides Lithuania proper, the larger portion of White and Red Russia, Samogitia, and other districts. After a brief separation from Poland in the 15th century, Lithuania and Poland were reunitedi in 1501, and after this time the union was not again interrupted. In 1569 even the administrative union with Poland was carried through, and the history of Lithuania fully coincides with that of Poland. For an account of the Reformation, and the subsequent conflicts of the

Roman Catholic hierarchy with the Russian government, *SEE POLAND* and *SEE RUSSIA*. The Lithuanians, who still number about 1,340,000 inhabitants, are divided into three branches: 1, the Lithuanians proper, about 717,000, in the Russian government; 2, the Samogitians or Shamaites, of whom about 308,000 live in the district of Samogitia, which in 1795 was incorporated with Russia, and belongs to the government of Vilna, and 184,000 in the former government of Augustovo of Poland; 3, the Prussian Lithuanians, about 137,000. Before the partition of Poland, nearly the entire population of Lithuania, which embraced Lithuanians, Poles, and Little Russians or Ruthenians, belonged to the Catholic Church: the Lithuanians and Poles to the Latin rite, and the Little Russians or Ruthenians to the Greek rite. The united Greek bishops were in 1839 prevailed upon to sever their connection with the pope and unite with the orthodox Greek Church, whereupon the Russian government officially regarded the entire population of their dioceses as being part of the Greek Church. The Catholics now constitute a majority only in the government of Vilna; they have within the boundaries of the ancient Lithuania the archdiocese of Mohilev, and the dioceses of Vilna, Samogitia, and Minsk. The Protestants belong mostly to the Reformed Church, which is divided into four districts, each of which has a superintendent and vice-superintendent at its head. It has about 30 ministers, and annually holds a synod which often lasts three or four weeks, and which has to be attended by all the lay members, and by those ministers in whose district the synod assembles. Every district must be represented either by the president or by the vice-president. The meeting of the synod takes place every year in a different district and parish, the clergyman of the latter receiving a compensation for entertaining the members of the synod. The synod rules the Reformed Church under the superintendence of the ministry of St. Petersburg. It pays the salaries of the clergymen, attends to the repairs of the churches, and has also the care of all schools and poor-houses. It has from dotations an annual revenue of 22,000 silver rubles. The Lutheran congregations of Lithuania, which are less numerous, belong to the diocese of Courland. The orthodox Greek Church has within the limits of Lithuania the archbishop of White Russia and Lithuania, the bishop of Mohilev, the bishop of Vilna, and the bishop of Vitebsk. The dioceses of the two former belong to the eparchies of the second, those of the two latter to the eparchies of the third and fourth class. The following table of the five governments formerly belonging to Lithuania exhibits the total population,

the Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Israelites; the remainder belong chiefly to the orthodox Greek Church:

Picture for Lithuania

See Krause, *Lithauen u. dessen Bewohner* (Halle, 1834); Glagau, *Lithauen und Lithauer, gesammelte Skizzen* (Tilsit, 1869). (A.J.S.)

Litter

Picture for Litter 1

Picture for Litter 2

Picture for Litter 3

Picture for Litter 4

occurs in the Auth. Vers. as a translation of bxi *(tsab,* from bbx; to *move* slowly), in <2360>Isaiah 66:20, (Sept. λαμπήνη*),* where a *sedan* or palanquin for the conveyance of a princely personage, borne by hand or upon the shoulders, or perhaps on the backs of animals, is evidently referred to. The original term occurs elsewhere only in <0403>Numbers 6:3, in the phrase tlgl[, bxi *(egloth' tsab, carts* of the *litter* kind, A.V. "*covered* wagons"), where it is used of the large and commodious vehicles employed for the transportation of the materials and furniture of the tabernacle, being drawn by oxen. The term therefore signifies properly a hand-litter, and secondarily a wain or wheel-carriage. Litters or palanquins were, as we know, in use among the ancient Egyptians. They were borne upon the shoulders of men, and appear to have been used for carrying persons of consideration short distances on visits, like the sedan chairs of a former day in England (see Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 1:73). In <2209>Song of Solomon 3:9, we find the word ^/yrPæi *appiryon'* (perhaps a foreign [Egyptian] word), Sept. φορεῖον, *Vulg. ferculum,* which occurs nowhere else in Scripture, and is applied to a vehicle used by king Solomon. In the immediate context it is described as consisting of a framework of cedar-wood, in which were set silver stanchions supporting a gold railing. with a purple-covered seat, and an embroidered rug, the last a present from the Jewish ladies. This word is rendered "chariot" in our Authorized Version, although unlike any other word so rendered in that version. It literally means a *moving couch,* and is usually conceived to denote a kind of sedan, litter, or rather palanquin, in

which great personages and women were borne from place to place. "The name as well as the object immediately suggests that it may have been nearly the same thing as the *takht-ravan*, the *moving throne or seat* of the Persians. It consists of a light frame fixed on two strong poles, like those of our sedan chair. This frame is generally covered with cloth, and has a door, sometimes of lattice-work, at each side. It is carried by two mules, one between the poles before, the other behind. These conveyances are used by great persons when disposed for retirement or ease during a journey, or when sick or feeble through age; but they are chiefly used by ladies of consideration in their journeys" (Kitto). Some readers may remember the "litter of red cloth, adorned with pearls and jewels," together with ten mules (to bear it by turns), which king Zahr-Shah prepared for the journey of his daughter (Lane's *Arabian Nights* 1, 1:528). This was doubtless of the kind which is borne by four mules, two behind and two before. In Arabia. or in countries where Arabian usages prevail, two camels are usually employed to bear the takhtravan, and sometimes two horses. When borne by camels, the head of the hindmost of the animals is bent painfully down under the vehicle. This is the most comfortable kind of litter, and two light persons may travel in it. "The *shibrieyeh* is another kind of camel-litter, resembling the Indian *howdah*, by which name (or rather *hodaj)* it is sometimes called. It is composed of a small square platform with a canopy or arched covering. It accommodates but one person. and is placed upon the back of a camel, and rests upon two square carmel-chests, one on each side of the animal." *SEE CART*; *SEE CAMEL*.

Little Christians

is the name of a new sect, composed of members lately (1868) seceded from the Russo-Greek Church at Atkarsk, in the province of Saratof, and diocese of the bishop of Tsaritzin. The seceders from the orthodox Church, or founders of this new sect, were only sixteen persons in number. "They set up a new religion, and began to preach a gospel of their own devising." They condemned saints and altarpieces as idolatrous, and abandoned the use of bread and wine in the sacrament. Before they founded the new Church, which, they claim, Christ commanded them to do, they were immersed, and also fasted and changed their names. "They have no priests, and hardly any form of prayer. They keep no images, use no wafers, and make no sacred oil. Instead of the consecrated bread, they bake a cake, which they afterwards worship, as a special gift from God. This cake is like a penny bun in shape and size, but in the minds of these *Little Christians* it

possesses a potent virtue and a mystic charm" (Dixon, *Free Russia,* page 143, 144). The name they bear they gave themselves. Persecuted by the government, they have increased and are daily increasing in numbers. *SEE RUSSIA*. (J.H.W.)

Little Horn

SEE ANTICHRIST; *SEE DANIEL*.

Littlejohn, John

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Penrith, Cumberland County, England, December 7, 1756; emigrated to Maryland about 1767; received a respectable education; was converted in 1774; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1776; located on account of poor health in 1778; removed to Kentucky in 1818; re-entered the Baltimore Conference in 1831, and was the same year transferred to the Kentucky Conference as a superannuate, and died May 13,1836. He possessed considerable mental power and much eloquence. His piety was deep and fruitful, and his ministrations were weighty and very useful. — *Minutes of Conferences,* 2:486. (G.L.T.)

Littleton, Adam

D.D., a learned English divine, was born November 8, 1627, at Hales Owen, Shropshire, and was educated first at Westminster School, and later (1647) at Christ-church, Oxford, where he was ejected by the Parliamentary visitors in 1648. He was afterward usher, and taught as second master at Westminster School (1658). He became rector of Chelsea in 1674, and the same year was made prebendary of Westminster, and received a grant to succeed Dr. Busby in the mastership of that school. He had for some years been the king's chaplain, and in 1670 received his degree in divinity, which was conferred upon him without taking any in arts, on account of his extraordinary merit. He was for some time subdean of Westminster, and in 1687 was transferred to the church of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, London, which he held four years. He died June 30, 1694. He was an excellent philologist and grammarian, learned in the Oriental languages and Rabbinical lore. He was the author of a *Latin Dictionary,* long popular, but finally superseded by Ainsworth's. He also published many sermons and other works. — Thomas, *Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* s.v.

Littleton, Edward

LL.D., an English divine, was born about the opening of the last century, and was educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge, entering the latter in 1716. He early turned his attention to poetry, but he also studied philosophy. In 1720 Mr. Littleton was recalled to Eton as an assistant in the school, and in 1727 was elected a fellow, and presented to the living of Maple Derham in Oxfordshire. He was appointed June 9, 1730, chaplain in ordinary to the king, and died in 1734. He published poems and several discourses. He was an admired preacher and excellent scholar. — *General Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Liturgy

(Greek λειτουργία*)*, a function, service, or duty of a public character. These public services or duties among the (reeks were frequently, if not always, connected with religious ideas or ceremonies of some kind, even when the duties themselves were of a secular character — those, for instance, which had reference to the supervision of theatrical exhibitions or the presiding in the public assemblies. The religious meaning of the word in such case was not necessarily involved. In Isaiah 7:30 (Sept.), the idea of religious service predominates; in Romans 13:6, that of the secular, as under God; and again, ins. Luke 1:23, and in Hebrews 10:11, it refers to the priestly function. At a later period we find it used by Eusebius *(Life of Constantine,* 4:47) in speaking of the work of the Christian ministry. By a very natural process, the word, which thus designated the public function or service performed by the ministry, became restricted in its meaning to the form itself — the form of words in which such service was rendered, and thus, certainly before the middle of the fifth century, we find in the Church, in the present sense of the word liturgies, forms for the conducting of public worship and the administration of sacraments.

I. *Jewish Liturgies.* — This subject has, of course, its connection with the question of a similar state of things under the Jewish dispensation. Were there liturgical forms among the Jews, and, if so, to what extent? We find among the Greeks and Romans certain set forms in connection with their sacrifices, passing, it would seem, from mouth to mouth of successive priestly generations, and a usual form of prayer for the civil magistrate (Döllinger's *Heathenism and Judaisnm,* 1:221-225); among the sacred books of India, hymns and prayers to be used on stated occasions (Müller's

Chips from a German Workshop, 1:297); and in the Roman and in the Mohammedan worship, formula of a similar character (Lane's *Mod. Egypt.* 1:120 sq.). How was it in this matter with the Jews? There was, of course, a ritual of form; but was there with it also a form of words? The reading of the law, although enjoined, could hardly be said to meet this demand. There are, however, special forms in the Pentateuch which are liturgical in the stricter sense of that expression. Some of these have reference to possible contingencies, and would therefore be only occasional in their employment. Instances of this class may be found in the formula (<05219>Deuteronomy 21:19), where complaint should be made to the elders by parents against a rebellious and incorrigible son. Of similar character is the formula (<05258>Deuteronomy 25:8, 9) connected with the refusal to take the widow of a deceased brother or nearest kinsman, and so perpetuate his name in Israel. Another, again, of the same class, was that appointed to be used by the elders and priests (<05201>Deuteronomy 21:1-9) of any locality in which the body of a murdered person should be found; and still another, and more of the nature of a stated religious service, was the prescribed declaration and mode of proceeding connected with the going out to battle (<05001>Deuteronomy 20:1-8). These were occasional and contingent. For some of them there might never be the actual usage, as was probably the case with the first — that of the complaint against and the execution of a rebellious son. But there were others of a more stated character, having reference to regularly occurring seasons and ceremonies when they were required to be used. The priestly benediction, repeated, it would seem, upon every special gathering of the people (<04623>Numbers 6:23-27), is an instance of this class. The form of offering of the first-fruits (<05601>Deuteronomy 26:1-15) is another: in this latter the person making the offering uses the formula, the priest receiving the offering; and still another is the appointed formula of commination by the tribes at Ebal and Gerizim, the Levites repeating the curse, the whole people following with the solemn amen. Distinct, moreover, from these were certain transactions, in which. without any specified form, the official was required to use certain words. The confession by the high-priest of the sins of the people over the head of the scape-goat is one of these; in any such case, a set form, passing from priestly father to son, not improbably came into use. The liturgical use of the Psalms in the Temple worship was, of course, a matter of much later arrangement. The fiftieth chapter of Ecclesiasticus describes an exceptional service, and is, moreover, too indefinite in its language to justify any conclusion as to its liturgical character. During, this period, however,

between the captivity and the times of the New Testament, there comes to view another ecclesiastical development of Judaism which has its connection with this subject — that of the worship of the synagogue. This, which in all probability originated during the captivity, and in the effort to supply the want occasioned by the loss of the worship of the Temple, would in many respects be like that Temple worship; in others, and from the necessity of the case, it would be very different. The greatest of these diversities would be in the fact of the necessary presence of the sacrificial and priestly element in the service of the Temple, their absence in that of the synagogue. In the Temple the Levites sang psalms of praise before the altar, and the priests blessed the people. In the synagogue there were prayers connected with the reading of certain specific passages of Scripture, of which are distinctly discernible two "chief groups, around which, as time wore on, an enormous mass of liturgical poetry clustered-the one, the *Shelma* ('Hear, Israel,' etc.), being a collection of the three Biblical pieces (<05D604>Deuteronomy 6:4-9; 11:1321; <041537>Numbers 15:37-41), expressive of the unity of God and the memory of his government over Israel, strung together without any extraneous addition; the second, the *Tephilla,* or Prayer, by way of eminence (adopted in the Koran as *Salavat,* Sur. 2:40; comp. 5:15), consisting of a certain number of supplications, with a hymnal introduction and conclusion, and followed by the priestly blessing. The single portions of this prayer gradually increased to eighteen, and the prayer itself received the name *Shemeonezah Esreh* (eighteen; afterwards, however, increased to nineteen: the additional one is now twelfth in the prayer, and is against apostates [to Christianity] and heretics [all who refused the Talmud], including consequently the Karaites). The first addition to the Sheest formed the introductory thanksgiving for the renewed (lay (in accordance with the ordinance that every supplication must be preceded by a prayer of thanks) called *lozer* (Creator of Light, etc.), to which were joined *the three Holies (Ophan),* and the supplication for spiritual enlightening in the divine law *(Ahabah).* Between the Shema and the Tephillah was inserted the *Geulahl* (Liberation), or praise for the miraculous deliverance from Egypt and the constant watchings of providence. A *Kaddish* (Sanctification or Benediction) and certain psalms seem to have concluded the service of that period. This was the order of the *Shaharith,* or morning prayer, and very similar to this was the *Maarsib,* or evening prayer; while in the *Minchalh,* or afternoon prayer, the Shema was omitted. On new moons, Sabbath and feast days, the general order was the same as on week days; but since the festive joy was to overrule all

individual sorrow and supplication, the intermediate portion of the Tephillah was changed according to the special significance and the memories of the day of the solemnity, and additional prayers were introduced for these extraordinary occasions, corresponding to the additional sacrifice in the Temple, and varying according to the special solemnity of the day *(lMusssah, Neilath,* etc.)" (Chambers). Compare Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literatures,* page 367 sq.; Prideaux, 2:160-170. It is likewise to be noted that in the Temple worship there were occasions and opportunities in which the individual worshipper might confess the plague of his own heart, make individual supplication, or offer individual thanksgiving. Thus it was at the time of the coming of Christ. The Jewish liturgies since then, under the influence of Rabbinism, and in view of the fact that the synagogue, so far as possible, supplies the absence of the Temple, have been very much enlarged, and extend to numberless particularities. It may, in fact, be said that the whole life of the modern Jew is regulated by Rabbinic forms, that there is a rubric for every moment and movement of social as of individual existence. "The first compilation of a liturgy is recorded of Amram Gaon (A.D. 870-880); the first that has survived is that of Saadja Gaon (d. A.D. 942). These early collections of prayers generally contained also compositions from the hand of the compiler, and minor additions, such as ethical tracts, almanacs, etc., and were called *Silddurimn* (Orders, Rituals), embracing the whole calendar year, week-days and new moons, fasts and festivals. Later, the term was restricted to the week-day ritual, that for the festivals being called *Machzor* (Cycle). Besides these, we find the *Selichoth,* or Penitential Prayers; *Kinoth,* or Elegies; *Hoshanahs,* or Hosannahs (for the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles); and *Bakashoth,* or Special Supplications, chiefly for private devotion. The Karaites (q.v.), being harshly treated in these liturgies, especially by Saadja, have distinct compilations. The first of these was made by David ben-Hassan about A.D. 960 (compare Rule, *Karaites,* page 88, 104 sq., 118, 135 sq., 173 note). The public prayers were for a long time only said by the public reader *(Chasan, Sheliach Zibbur),* the people joining in silent responses and amens. These readers by degrees — chiefly from the 10th century — introduced occasional prayers *(Piutim)* of their own, over and above those used of yore. The materials were taken from the Halachah as well as the Haggadah (q.v.); religious doctrine, history, saga, angelology, and mysticism, interspersed with Biblical verses, are thus found put together like a mosaic of the most original and fantastic, often grand and brilliant, and often obscure and feeble kind; and the pure

Hebrew in manyy eases made room for a corrupt Chaldee. We can only point out here the two chief groups of religious poetry viz. the Arabic on the one hand, and the French-German school on the other. The most eminent representative of the Pajtanic age (ending c. 1100) is Eleazar Biribi Kalir. Among the most celebrated poets in his manner are Meshulam b.-Kalonymos of Lucca, Solomon b.-Jehuda of Babylon, R. Gerson, Elia b.-Menahem of Mans, Benjamin b.-Serach, Jacob Zom Elem, Eliezer b.-Samuel, Kalonymos b.-Moses, Solomon Isaaki. Of exclusively Spanish poets of this period, the most brilliant are Jehuda Halevi Solomon b.-Gabirol, Josef ibn-Abitur, Isaac ibn-Giat, Abraham Abn-Esra, Moses ben-Nachman, etc. When, however, in the beginning of the 13th century, secret doctrine and philosophy, casuistry and dialectics, became the paramount study, the cultivation of the Pint became neglected, and but few, and for the most part insignificant, are the writers of liturgical pieces from this time downwards" (Chambers). Comp. Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*, page 59 sq. These liturgies, adopted by the Jews in different countries, were naturally subject to great variation, not only in their order, but also in their contents. Even in our day there exists the greatest variety imaginable in the synagogues of even one and the same country, due, in a measure, also to the influence of the reformatory movements. *SEE JUDAISM*. Particularly worthy of note are the rituals of Germany (Poland), of France, Spain, and Portugal (Sefardim), Italy (Rome), the Levant (Romagna), and even of some special towns, like Avignon, Carpentras, Montpellier. The rituals of Barbary (Algiers, Tripoli, Oran, Morocco, etc.) are of Spanish origin. The Judaeo-Chinese liturgy, it may be observed by the way, consists only of pieces from the Bible. Yet, in the main body of their principal prayers, all these liturgies agree. As illustrative of these unessential diversities, we give the prayer of the Shemonah Esreh, which has been added to the number since the destruction of the second Temple, but which now stands as the twelfth, and shows its manifest reference to the followers of the Nazarene: "Let there be no hope to those who apostatize from the true religion; and let heretics, how many soever they be, all perish as in a moment; and let the kingdom of pride be speedily rooted out and broken in our days. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who destroyest the wicked, and bringest down the proud" (Prideaux). "Let slanderers have no hope, and all presumptuous apostates perish as in a moment; and may thine enemies, and those who hate thee, be suddenly cut off; and all those who act wickedly be suddenly broken, consumed, and rooted out; and humble thou them speedily in our days. Blessed art thou, O

Lord, who destroyest the enemies and humblest the proud" (Spanish and Portuguese Jews' Prayer-book). That in the German and Polish Jews' Prayer-book is more brief, and less pointed in its application to apostates, i.e. Jews converted to Christianity. There are translations and commentaries on them in most of the modern languages. In the orthodox congregations, these forms of prayer, whether for the worship of the synagogue or for domestic and private use, are all appointed to be said in Hebrew. One of the best moves in this direction is the effort within the last century to remedy this evil by parallel translations. In this country the service-books in the synagogues are usually of this kind: either the Hebrew on one page and the English on the other, or both in parallel columns on the same page.

II. *Early Christian Litiurgies.* —

1. *Their Origin.* — So far as regards the primitive or apostolic age, the only trace of anything of that kind is the Lord's Prayer, and the Amen alluded to in <4646>1 Corinthians 14:16; this latter an undoubted importation from the synagogue. As, moreover, we find the Master, with the twelve, singing a hymn, one of the psalms probably, on the night of the last supper, it is not improbable that such portions of Old-Testament Scripture, with which the early believers had been already familiar in the synagogue, should have still found favor in the Church. Even in free prayer fragments and sentences of old devotional forms, almost spontaneous through earlier use and sacred association, would naturally find utterance. This, however, would be the exception. Christian prayer, for its own full and peculiar utterance, must find its own peculiar modes of expression; and it would baptize into a new life and meaning and of those familiar expressions, the fragments of an earlier devotion. That men, however, who had been accustomed to liturgical worship under the old system should gradually go into it under the new, is not at all surprising; and to this special inducements before very long were presented. The demand for some form of profession of faith, of a definition of the faith, as dissensions and heresies arose, would be one of these occasions. The form of prayer given by the Master, in its present usage, would become the nucleus of others. The fact, again, that the most solemn act of Christian communion, the Lord's Supper, involved in the distribution of the elements a form of action, and that this action, in its original institution, had been accompanied by words, would have a like influence. That every thing in this respect, if not purely extemporaneous, was exceedingly simple in the time of Justin

Martyr, is very manifest from his own writings. The same remark is applicable to the statement of Pliny *(Ep. ad Treaj.* in *Ep.* 10:97).

2. *Primitive Type.* — The earliest form in which liturgical arrangement, to any extent, is found, is that which presents itself in the Apostolical Constitutions. The following is the order of *daily service*, as given in these Constitutions: After the morning psalm (the sixty-third of our enumeration), prayers were offered for the several classes of catechumens, of persons possessed by evil spirits, and candidates for baptism, for penitents, and for the faithful or communicants, for the peace of the world, and for the whole state of Christ's Church. This was followed by a short bidding prayer for preservation in the ensuing day, and by the bishop's commendation or thanksgiving, and by his imposition of hands or benediction. The morning service was much frequented by people of all sorts. The evening service was much the same with that of the morning, except that Psalm 140 (Psalm 141 of the present enumeration) introduced the service, and that a special collect seems to have been used sometimes at the setting up of the lights. *SEE SERVICE*. This work, a fabrication by an unknown author, and taking its present form about the close of the third century contains internal evidence (see Schaff, *Church History,* 1:441) that much of its material belongs to an earlier date. It may be regarded as affording a type of the liturgical worship in use during the latter part of the anteNicene period. Bunsen *(Christianity and Mankind,* volume 2) has attempted to construct, out of fragments of this and other liturgies, the probable form of worship then prevailing. Krabbe, in his prize essay on this subject, regards the eighth book as of later date than the others. Kurtz, agreeing with Bunsen, substantially finds in this work the earliest extant form of liturgical arrangement, and the type of those of a later period. While, therefore, apocryphal as to its name and claims, yet in the character of its material, in its peculiarity of structure, in the estimation which it enjoyed, and in its influence upon later forms of devotion, it is of great historical significance. Taking it as it comes to our day, the eighth book contains an order of prayer, praise, reading, and sermon, followed by the dismissal successively of the catechumens, the penitents, and the possessed. After this comes the order of the Lord's Supper for the faithful, beginning with intercessory prayer, this followed by collects and responses, the fraternal kiss, warnings against unworthy reception of communion, with suitable hymns, prayers, and doxologies. Much of this material, as already hinted, is probably of a much earlier date than that of its unknown last

compiler. The hymn Gloria in Exselsis may have been the same of which Justin and Pliny speak, or an enlargement of it. This liturgy is remarkable, as contrasted with subsequent liturgies, in that it wants the Lord's Prayer. The general spirit and tone pervading all its forms afford grateful indication of the interior Christian life of that period.

3. *Classification.* — This brings us to the particular liturgies which found acceptance and usage in particular communities. One remark in connection with these needs to be made. Whatever may have been the liturgical influences of the synagogue in shaping the worship of the early Church, they had, by this time, been superseded by another of a much more objectionable character, that of the Temple. In other words, the sacerdotal idea of the Christian ministry, and the sacrificial idea of the Lord's Supper, were making themselves felt, not only in the substance, but in the minutia of form which the liturgies were assuming. Of these liturgies there is to be made the general division of Eastern and Western.

(a.) *Liturgies of the Eastern Churches.* — Chronologically those of the Oriental Church first demand examination.

(1.) The earliest, perhaps, is that of Jerusalem or Antioch, ascribed to the apostle James; the first word in it, ὁ ἱερεύς — a word never used by apostolic men in speaking of the Christian ministry — puts the seal of reprobation upon every such claim. The same may be said as to another anachronism, the word ὁμοούσιος applied to the third person of the Trinity. Putting aside, therefore, such claim, as also the stranger notion that the apostle in <4609>1 Corinthians 2:9, quotes from this liturgy. rather than that the liturgist quotes from him, we may still recognize in this early form of Christian-worship features of peculiar interest. It is still used on St. James' day in some of the islands of the Archipelago, and is the pattern of two others, those of Basil and Chrysostom. Portions of it may have existed at an earlier period, but in its present form it dates from the last half of the fourth century. For the distinction between the orthodox Greek and the Monophysite Syrian forms of this liturgy, see Palmer, *Origines Liturgicae*, volume 1. The latter, the Monophysite form, it is to be observed, is still in use, and in both are portions of the material to be found in that of the Apostolical Constitutions.

(2.) The second of these liturgies is that of the Alexandrian Church, called that of St. Mark, but, quite as clearly as that of St. James, betraying its later origin. In this, as in the other two, there may be materials previously

existing; but the probabilities indicate Cyril of Alexandria as the author of it in its present shape. The effort has been made to separate in it the apostolic from the later elements, as is also attempted by Neale with that of St. James. As the object of this effort seems to be to prove the sacerdotal character of apostolic Christianity, so all sacerdotal elements become proof of apostolic authorship. The conclusion is as false as the premise. 'The special historical interest of this liturgy of St. Mark is its relation to those of the Coptic and Ethiopic churches, of which it forms the main constituent. The remark of Palmer as to its claim to inspired authorship is well worthy of attention. "In my opinion," says he, "this appellation of St. Mark's liturgy began about the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, after Basil had composed his liturgy, which was the first that bore the name of any man. Other churches then gave their liturgies the names of their founders, and so the Alexandrians and Egyptians gave hr theirs the name of Mark, while they of Jerusalem and Antioch called theirs St. James's, and early in the fifth century it appears that Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, perfected and improved the liturgy of St. Mark, from whence this improved liturgy came to be called by the Monophysites St. Cyril's, and by the orthodox St. Mark's." The peculiarity of this last, in Neale's estimation, is the difference from other liturgies in the position of the great intercession for quick and dead. That such intercession found place in any of them is evidence of their post-apostolic origin.

(3.) The third and last of these liturgies is that of Caesarea or Byzantium, composed probably by Basil of Caesarea, and held to have been recast and enlarged by Chrysostom; but more properly, perhaps, both these are to be regarded as elaborations of that of St. James. They, moreover, have historical and moral significance in the fact that, through the Byzantine Church, they have been received into that of Russia, and are used in its patriarchates, each for special occasions, at the present time. Such additions, of course, have been made as have been rendered necessary through peculiarities of Greek worship, and accumulation of ritualistic minutiae coming into use since these liturgies in their original forms were introduced. They now contain expressions not to be found in the writings of Chrysostom: e.g. the appellation of in other of God, given to the Virgin Mary, which was not heard of until after the third General Council at Ephesus [A.D.431] — the body which condemned the doctrines of Nestorius — held 24 years after the death of Chrysostom.

From these Oriental liturgies have sprung others, variously modified to meet doctrinal and other exigencies. The largest number is from that of Jerusalem, the next from that of Basil. The most important is that of the Armenians, Monophysite, those of the Nestorians, and that of Malabar. For discussion as to the special origin of these subordinate forms, and the principles of classification, see Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae,* volume 1; Neale's *Primitive Liturgies;* Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* book 4, chapter 1, sec. 6.

(b.) *Liturgies of the Western Church.* — In the West liturgical development went on with less rapidity.

(1.) That of the Roman Church, under the influence of the sort of feeling alluded to above in the quotation from Palmer, after it came into use, received the name of Peter, and was traced to his authorship. In point of fact, it probably first assumed definite shape under Leo the Great during the first half of the fifth century, was added to by Gelasius during the latter half of the same century, elaborated again by Gregory the Great not very long after, and through his influence secured its reputation and position. "His Ordo et Canon Missae, making allowance for the unavoidable changes taking place in it during the centuries intervening, was settled under Pius V, 1570, as the Missale Romanortum. It was revised under Clement VII and Urban VIII, and forms at the present time the liturgical text of Romish worship" (Palmer, in Herzog). The *Liturgy of Milan* seems to have been very much the same as that of Rome prior to the alterations of the latter under Gregory. These differences, at the greatest, were not of an essential character. The question of the independence of the Milanese and the supremacy of the Romans was probably the great issue upon which these differences turned. As nothing less than apostolicity could enable the liturgy of Milan to sustain itself in such a conflict, its origin was traced to Barnabas, and miracles, it was believed, had been wrought for its preservation against the efforts of Gregory and Hadrian to bring it to the form of that of Rome. The severest point of this conflict was doubtless when Charlemagne abolished the Ambrosian Chant throughout the West by the establishment of singing-schools under Roman instructors to teach the Gregorian. The attachment of the people and clergy of Milan, however, to their liturgy could not be overcome, and it is still in their possession. Alexander VI established it expressly as the "Ritus Ambrosianus."

Of even greater interest than the Roman liturgy are the Gallican and the Mozarabic.

(2.) The former of these, the Gallican, claims, and it would seem justly, an antiquity greater than that of Rome. The connection of Gaulish Christianity with that of Asia, whether through the person of Irenaeus or by earlier missionaries, would lead to a liturgical development of an independent character. It was displaced by the Roman liturgy during the Carolingian sera, and for a long time was almost lost sight of and forgotten. It does not seem to have been used or appealed to in the various conflicts of prerogative between the French monarchs and the pope, and no allusion to its existence is made in the Pragmatic Sanction. Public attention was again called to it during the controversies of the 16th century. Interest both of a literary and doctrinal character has been exhibited in connection with this liturgy. But there seems to be but little probability of its restoration to use. While unlike in certain specialities, its differences from the Roman liturgy are, not essential. Like the others preceding, it has been traced to the hand of an apostle — to the Church at Lyons, through that of Ephesus, from the apostle John! The apex upon which this inverted historical pyramid rests is the single fact, which has been questioned, that Christianity was introduced into Gaul by missionaries from the Church at Ephesus.

(3.) The Mozarabic, that of the Spanish churches under Arabic dominion, has so many resemblances to the Gallic liturgy that it would seem probable they proceeded from the same source. It is described by Isidore Hispalensis in the 6th century. During the Middle Ages, and in the time of the cardinal Ximenes, it received an addition of several rites. As Spanish territory was reconquered from the Moors, and came more fully under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the papacy in other respects, the effort was made, and eventually succeeded, although at times warmly resisted by the people, to displace the Mozarabie, and introduce the Roman liturgy. In the beginning of the 16th century cardinal Ximenes endowed a college and chapel at Toledo for the celebration of the ancient rites, and this is now, perhaps, the only place in Spain where the primitive liturgy of that country and of Gaul is in some degree observed. The old British liturgy, which was displaced by the Gregorian after the decision of Oswy in 664, seems, like the Mozarabic, to have been essentially the same with the Gallican.

(4.) One other liturgical composition of some interest, dating from the close of the 4th century, is that of the Cathari, published by E. Kunitz

(Jena, 1852). It is of interest as giving a more favorable view of the community for which it was composed than had been previously entertained. It is to be remembered in connection with all these liturgies of the West, as already remarked of those of the East, that they are the names of many subordinate offshoots in use and prevalence in different portions of the Church. The discretionary power of the bishops, both at this and at earlier periods, to modify and adapt prevalent liturgies to peculiar exigencies of time and place, naturally produced after a time this kind of diversity. The ecclesiastical confusion of mediaeval times, and clerical ignorance and carelessness, would of course increase it. The traces, however, of the parent stock in any such case would not be difficult of recognition.

Picture for Liturgy 1

4. *Structure of Liturgies.* — The variations of detail which are found in the parent liturgies of the Christian world are all ingrafted on a structural arrangement which they possess in common, much as four buildings might differ in the style and form of their decorations, and yet agree in their plans and elevation, in the position of their several chambers, and in the number of their principal columns.

i. There is invariably a division of the liturgy into three portions — the office of the Prothesis, the Pro-Anaphora, and the Anaphora, the latter being the "Canon" of the Western Church, and the office of the Prothesis being a preparatory part of the service corresponding to the "Praeparatio" of the Western Liturgy, and not used at the altar itself. In the Pro-Anaphora the central features are two, viz.:

(1) the reading of holy Scripture, and
(2) the recitation of the Creed.

In the Anaphora they are four, viz.:

(1) the Triumphal Hymn, or TRISAGION;
(2) the formula of Consecration;
(3) the Lord's Prayer; and
(4) the Communion.

These four great acts of praise, benediction, intercession, and communion gather around our Lord's words of institution and his pattern prayer, which form, in reality, the integral germ of the Christian liturgies. They are also

associated with other prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings, by which each is expanded and developed, the whole blending into a comprehensive service, by means of which the worship of the Church ascends on the wings of the eucharistic service, and her strength descends in eucharistic grace. The order in which these different portions of the liturgy are combined in the four ancient parent forms is shown by the following table:

Picture for Liturgy 2

ii. There is also, in the second place, a substantial agreement among all the four great parent liturgies as to the formula of consecration (*SEE CONSECRATION*; and comp. Blunt, *Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theol.* page 425-426).

iii. Another point in which the four parent liturgies of the Church uniformly agree is in the well-defined sacerdotal character of their language. This is sufficiently illustrated by the preceding comparative view.

iv. The intercessory character of the primitive liturgies is also a very conspicuous feature common to them all. The holy Eucharist is uniformly set forth and used in them as a service offered up to God for the benefit of all classes of Christians, living and departed. "Then," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "after the spiritual sacrifice is perfected, the bloodless service upon that altar of propitiation, we entreat God for the common peace of the Church; for the tranquillity of the world; for kings; for soldiers and allies; for the sick; for the afflicted; and, in a word, for all who stand in need of succor we all supplicate and offer this sacrifice. Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us, first, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that at their prayers and intervention God would receive our petition. Afterward also on behalf of the holy fathers and bishops who have fallen asleep before us; and, in a word, of all who in past years have fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great advantage to the souls for whom the supplication is put up while that holy and most awful sacrifice is presented" *(Catech. Lect.* 23:9, 10). St. Cyril was speaking thus in Jerusalem, where the liturgy used was that of St. James, and in that liturgy we find a noble intercession exactly answering to the description there given (Neale's *Translation,* page 52; Blunt's *Annot. Book of Com. Prayer,* page 156). A similar intercession is to be found in the other liturgies, and it is evident that its use was one of the first principles of the Church of that day.

III. *Modern Greek and Eastern Liturgies.* — Three liturgies are in use in the modern Greek or Constantinopolitan Church, viz., those of Basil and of Chrysostom, and the liturgy of the Presanctified. The liturgy bearing the name of Basil is used by the Constantinopolitan Church ten times in the year, viz., on the eve of Christmas Day; on the festival of St. Basil; on the eve of the Feast of Lights, or the Epiphany; on the several Sundays in Lent, except the Sunday before Easter; on the festival of the Virgin Mary; and on Good Friday, and the following day, which is sometimes termed the great Sabbath. The liturgy ascribed to Chrysostom is read on all those days in the year on which the liturgies of Basil and of the Presanctified are not used. The liturgy of the Presanctified is an office for the celebration of the Lord's Supper on Wednesdays and Fridays during Lent, with the elements which had been consecrated on the preceding Sunday. The date of this liturgy is not known, some authors ascribing it to Gregory Thaumaturgus in the third century, while others ascribe it to Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, in the eighth century. These liturgies are used in all those Greek churches which are subject to the patriarch of Constantinople, and in those countries which were originally converted by Greeks, as in Russia, Georgia, Mingrelia, and by the Melchite patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem (King's *Rites of the Greek Church,* page 131-134; Richard et Giraud's *Bibliotheque Sacrae,* 15:222-224). The Coptic Jacobites, or Christians in Egypt, make use of the *Liturgy of Alexandria,* which formerly was called indifferently the *Liturgy of St. Mark,* the reputed founder of the Christian Church at Alexandria, or the *Liturgy of* St. *Cyril,* who caused it to be committed to writing. The Egyptians had twelve liturgies,which are still preserveds among the Abyssinians; but the patriarchs commanded that the Egyptian churches should use only three, viz., those of Basil, of Gregory the Theologian, and of Cyril. The earliest liturgies of the Church of Alexandria were written in Greek, which was the vernacular language, until the fourth and fifth centuries; since that time they have been translated into the Coptic and Arabic languages. The Abyssinians or Ethiopians receive the twelve liturgies which were formerly in use among the Coptic Jacobites: they are commonly found in the following order, viz.,

1. The liturgy of St. John the Evangelist.
2. That of the three hundred and eighteen fathers present at the Council of Nice.
3. That of Epiphanius.
4. That of St. James of Sarug or Syrug.

5. That of St. John Chrysostom.
6. That of Jesus Christ.
7. That of the Apostles.
8. That of St. Cyriac.
9. That of St. Gregory.
10. That of their patriarch Dioscurus.
11. That of St. Basil.
12. That of St. Cyril.

The Armenians who were converted to Christianity by Gregory, surnamed the Illuminator, have only one liturgy, which is supposed to be that of the Church of Casarea in Cappadocia, in which city Gregory received his instruction. This liturgy is used on every occasion, even at funerals. The Syrian Catholics and Jacobites have numerous liturgies, bearing the names of St. James, St. Peter, St. John the Evangelist, St. Mark, St. Dionysius, bishop of Athens, St. Xystus, bishop of Rome, of the Twelve Apostles, of St. Ignatius, of St. Julius, bishop of Rome, of St. Eustathius, of St. Chrysostom, of St. Maruthas, etc. Of these, the liturgy of St. James is most highly esteemed, and is the standard to which are referred all the others, which are chiefly used on the festivals of the saints whose names they bear. The Maronites, who inhabit Mount Lebanon, make use of a missal printed at Rome in 1594 in the Chaldeo-Syriac language: it contains thirteen liturgies under the names of St. Xystus, St. John Chrysostom, St. John the Evangelist, St. Peter, St. Dionysius, St. Cyril, St. Matthew, St. John the Patriarch, St. Eustathius, St. Maruthas, St. James the Apostle, St. Mark the Evangelist, and a second liturgy of St. Peter. The Nestorians have three liturgies — that of the Twelve Apostles, that of Theodorus, surnamed the Interpreter, and a third under the name of Nestorius. The Indian Christians of St. Thomas are said to make use of the Nestorian liturgies (Richard et Giraud, *Bibliothèque Sacree,* 15:221-227).

IV. *Liturgies of the Churchl of Rome*. — There are various liturgical books in use in the modern Church of Rome, the greater part of which are common and general to all the members in communion with that Church, while others are permitted to be used only in particular places or by particular monastic orders.

1. The *Breviary* (Latin *breviarium)* is the book containing the daily service of the Church of Rome. It is frequently, but erroneously, confounded with *Missal* and *Ritual.* The Breviary contains the matins, lauds, etc., with the

several variations to be made therein, according to the several days, canonical hours, and the like. It is general, and may be used in every place; but on the model of this have been formed various others, specially appropriated to different religious orders, such as those of the Benedictines, Carthusians, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, and other monastic orders. The difference between these books and that which is by way of eminence designated the *Roman Breviary,* consists chiefly in the number and order of the psalms, hymns, ave-marias, pater-nosters, misereres, etc., etc. Originally the Breviary contained only the Lord's Prayer and the Psalms which were used in the divine offices. To these were subsequently added lessons out of the Scriptures, according to the institutes of the monks, in order to diversify the service of the Church. In the progress of time the legendary lives of the saints, replete with ill-attested facts, were inserted, in compliance with the opinions and superstition of the times. This gave occasion to many revisions and reformations of the Roman Breviary by the councils, particularly of Trent and Cologne, and also by several popes, as Gregory IX, Nicholas III, Pius V, Clement VIII, and Urban VIII; as likewise by some cardinals, especially cardinal Quignon, by whom various extravagances were removed, and the work was brought nearer to the simplicity of the primitive offices. In its present state the Breviary of the Church of Rome consists of the services of matins, lauds, prime, third, sixth, nones, vespers, complines, or the *post-communion,* that is of seven hours, on account, of the saying of David, *Septies in die laudenz dixi* — "Seven times a day do I praise thee" (Psalm 119:164). The obligation of reading this service-book every day, which at first was universal, was by degrees reduced to the beneficiary clergy alone, who are bound to do it on pain of being guilty of mortal sin, and of refunding their revenues in proportion to their delinquencies in discharging this duty. The Roman Breviary is recited in the Latin language throughout the Romish Church, except among the Maronites in Syria, the Armenians, and some other Oriental Christians in communion with that Church, who rehearse it in their vernacular dialects.

2. The *Missal,* or volume employed in celebrating mass. According to a tradition generally believed by members of the Romish Church, this liturgy owes its origin to St. Peter. The canon of the mass was committed to writing about the middle of the fifth century. Various additions were subsequently made, especially by Gregory the Great, who reduced the

whole into better order. This Missal is in general use throughout the Romish Church. *SEE MASS*.

3. The *Ceremoniale* contains the various offices peculiar to the pope. It is divided into three books, the first of which treats of the election, consecration, benediction, and coronation of the pope, the canonization of saints, creation of cardinals, the form and manner of holding a council, and the funeral ceremonies on the death of a pope or of a cardinal, besides various public ceremonies to be performed by the pope as a sovereign prince. The second book prescribes what divine offices are to be celebrated by the pope, and on what days; and the third discusses the reverence which is to be shown to popes, cardinals, bishops, and other persons performing sacred duties; the vestments and ornaments of the popes and cardinals when celebrating divine service; the order in which they are severally to be seated in the papal chapel; incensing the altar, etc. The compiler of this liturgical work is not known.

4. The *Pontificale* describes the various functions which are peculiar to bishops in the Romish Church, such as the conferring of ecclesiastical orders; the pronouncing of benedictions on abbots, abbesses, and nuns; the coronation of sovereigns; the form and manner of consecrating churches, burial-grounds, and the various vessels used in divine service; the public expulsion of penitents from the Church, and reconciling them; the mode of holding a synod; suspending, reconciling, dispensing, deposing, and degrading priests, and of restoring them again to orders; the manner of excommunicating and absolving, etc., etc.

5. The *Rituale* treats of all those functions which are to be performed by simple priests or the inferior clergy, both in the public service of the Church, and also in the exercise of their private pastoral duties. The *Pastorale* corresponds with the *Rituale,* and seems to be only another name for the same book.

V. *Continental Reformed or Protestant Liturgies*. — At the time of the Reformation there were, of necessity, great changes in the matter of public worship. The liturgies in use at its commencement included the prevalent doctrinal system, especially as connected with the Lord's Supper; and very soon changes were made having in view the repudiation of Romish error, and the adaptation of reformed worship to the restored system of scriptural doctrine. The old forms, moreover, had there been no objection to them

doctrinally, were liable to the practical objection that they were locked up from popular use in a dead language. The Reformation, to a very great degree, had opened the ears of the people to the intelligent hearing and reception of Christian doctrine. Its task now was to open their mouths to the intelligent utterance of supplication — in other words, to provide forms of worship in the vernacular. This was done very largely by selection and translation from old forms, and, as was necessary, by the preparation of new material. With the English and Lutheran Reformers, the object seems to have been to make as few changes in existing forms as possible. Doubtful expressions, which admitted of a Protestant interpretation, but which, for their own merits, would never have been selected, were thus retained. It is to be said for the Reformers that they seem to have acted in view of the existing circumstances of the communities by which they were surrounded, and from one of them, the most eminent of all, Luther, we have the distinct disavowal of all wish and expectation that his work, in this respect, should be imposed upon other churches or continued in his own any longer than it was found for edification.

a. *Lutheran Liturgies*. — As first among the Reformers we notice these liturgical works of Luther. Different offices were prepared by him, as needed by the churches under his influence, the earliest in 1523, the latest in 1534. These were afterwards collected in a volume, and became a model for others. In his "Order of Service" provision is made for daily worship in a service for morning and evening, and a third might be held if desirable. These services consist of reading the Scriptures, preaching or expounding, with psalms and responsoria, with the addition, for Sundays, of mass or communion. He dwells earnestly, however, upon the idea, already mentioned, that these forms are not to be considered binding otherwise than in their appropriate times and localities. These views and this action of Luther were responded to by similar action on the part of the churches which through him had received the doctrines of the Reformation. These drew up liturgies for themselves, some of them bearing a close resemblance to that of Wittemberg, others differing from it widely; the differences, in one direction, being conditioned by the Zwinglian or Calvinistic element. in the opposite by the Romish. These, in particular localities, have been changed at different times as circumstances seemed to require. No one Lutheran form has ever been accepted as obligatory upon all Lutheran churches, as is the case with the liturgy of the Church of England in all its dependencies; although it is claimed that there is essential unity — an

essential unity of life and spirit in all these unessential diversities as to outward form of particular states and churches. The tendency of the Rationalism of the last century was to neglect, to depreciate, and to mutilate the old liturgies, and then to procure changes which would substitute others in their stead. From this, and in connection with another movement, has followed a healthful reaction. This reaction may be seen in its effects upon the two great classes into which Lutheran Germany is now divided. It has controlled to a very great degree the efforts of the Unionists, has given form to the Union liturgy, and it is leading those who are opposed to this movement to a more careful study and diligent use of the older liturgies. The object of this new liturgy, that of the king of Prussia, first published in 1822, revised once or twice since then, is to unite the worship of the members of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in the Prussian dominions. The excitement connected with this movement, in the way of attack and defense, has given a deeper and wider interest to all liturgical questions — an interest deeply felt by the Lutheran churches of this country. Here, where the use of such forms is optional, the number of congregations returning to such use is on the increase. *SEE LUTHERANISM*.

In Sweden, which, although Lutheran, retains the episcopate, and may seem to demand a more special notice, there was published in 1811 a new, revised edition of the Liturgy, prepared at the time of the Reformation. This is divided into chapters, and contains the usual parts of a Church service, with forms for baptism, marriage, etc. In Denmark there is also a regularly constituted liturgy, of Bugenhagen's, which, besides morning and evening service for Sundays, contains three services for each of the three great festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.

b. *Moravian Liturgy.* — The liturgy of the Moravians, as recipients, through their great leader, of the Augsburg Confession, is not without its interest in this connection. It was first published in 1632. That which has been adopted by the renewed Moravian Church is mainly the work of count Zinzendorf who compiled it chiefly from the services of the Greek and Latin churches, but who also availed himself of the valuable labors of Luther and of the English Reformers. The United Brethren at present make use of a Church litany, introduced into the morning service of every Sunday; a litany for the morning of Easter-day, containing a short but comprehensive confession of faith; two offices for the baptism of adults, and two for the baptism of children: two litanies at burials; and offices for

confirmation, the holy communion, and for ordination; the *Te Deum,* and doxologies adapted to various occasions. All these liturgical forms in use in England are comprised in the new and revised edition of the *Liturgy and Hymns for the Use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren* (London, 1849). Other services peculiar to this Church, which are called "liturgies," consist mainly of a choral, with musical responsoria as a litany. This litany is for Sundays. There is a short prayer of betrothal, a baptismal office, also a form on Easter, used in the church-yards, of expressing their confidence in regard to the brethren departed of the year preceding. The daily service, which is in the evening, is a simple prayer-meeting. In this, as in the Sunday service, the prayers and exhortations are extemporaneous.

c. *Calvinistic Liturgies.* — The liturgy of Calvin, which, like that of Luther, constitutes the type of a class, differs from this latter in two important respects the absence of responsive portions, and the discretion conferred upon the officiator in the performance of public worship. This discretion seems to have been limited, however, to the use of one form of prayer rather than another, given in the Directory. These prayers were read by the pastor from the pulpit. The service began with a general confession, was followed by a psalm, prayer again, sermon, prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and benediction. Two additional prayers were provided for occasions of communion, one coming before, the other after; also a very long one of deprecation in times of war, calamity, etc. For the administration of the Lord's Supper there is an exhortation as to its intent — "fencing the tables," as it is called in Scotland. This is followed by the distribution of the elements, with psalms and passages of Scripture appropriate to the occasion. The offices of baptism and marriage are simple, but not discretionary as to their form. In accordance with what seems to be the peculiar Genevan characteristic, they are not wanting in length.

The present liturgy of Geneva is a development of that of Calvin, with certain modifications. It has no responses. Several additional prayers have been added. A distinct service for each day in the week is provided, also for the principal festivals, and for certain special occasions. So also as to the churches in sympathy with the system of Calvin. They have liturgies similar to that of Geneva, although not identical. Such is the case with the churches of Holland and Neufchatel, and the Reformed churches of France. A new edition of the old French Liturgy of 1562 was published in 1826, with additional forms for special occasions. The liturgy of the Church of

Scotland is in some respects different. It was drawn up at Frankfort by Knox and others, after the model of Calvin's, and was first used by Knox in a congregation of English exiles at Geneva. It was afterwards introduced by him into Scotland; its use enjoined in 1564, and such usage was continued until after his death. An edition of this liturgy was published in 1841 by Dr. Cumming. It differs from that of Calvin in that it more clearly leaves to the minister officiating to decide whether he shall use any form of prayer given or one of his own compositions extemporaneously or otherwise. It begins with the confession, as in Calvin's, and with the same form. This is followed by a psalm, by prayer, the sermon, prayer, psalm, and benediction. The book contains various offices and alternate forms; among other things, an order of excommunication. and a treatise on fasting, with a form of prayer for private houses, and grace before and after meals. The new book of Scotland of 1644 may be regarded as a modification of those of Knox and Calvin. In the Directory of the Westminster Assembly the discretionary power is greatly enlarged. Scriptural lessons are to be read in regular course, the quantity at the discretion of the minister, with liberty, if he see fit, of expounding. Heads of prayer in that before the sermon are prescribed, and rules for the arrangement of the sermon. The Lord's Prayer is recommended as the most perfect form of devotion. Private and lay baptism are forbidden. The arrangement of the Lord's table is to be such that communicants may sit about it, and the dead are to be buried without prayer or religious ceremony.

d. Intermediate between these two great families of liturgies, the Lutheran and Calvinistic, are those of the other Reformed churches on the Continent. It may be said, in general, that the German-speaking portion of these churches approach and partake of the Lutheran spirit and forms, and the Swiss of the Calvinistic, though there are individual exceptions. In 1523, the same year with Luther's work already mentioned, Zwingle and Leo Judah published at Zurich offices for baptism, the Lord's Supper, marriage, common prayer, and burial. This was followed by a more complete work in 1525, and subsequently by others. Similar works were published at Berne, Schaffhausen, and Basle at a later period. The peculiarity of these, according to Ebrard, quoted in Herzog, "is the liturgical character in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in which they compare favorably with the Calvinistic liturgies; also the custom of announcing the dead, and the special prayers for the festivals." The

liturgical issues which during this century have agitated the Lutheran Church have extended to those of the Reformed, not, however, to the same extent, nor with results of such decided character.

VI. *Liturgies in the English Language*. — Previous to the introduction of the Reformation on Anglican ground, the public service of the English churches was, like that of other Western churches, performed in the Latin language. But, though the language was universally Latin, the liturgy itself varied greatly in the different parts of the kingdom. The dioceses of Bangor, Hereford, Lincoln, Sarum, York, and other churches, used liturgies which were commonly designated by the "Uses," and of these the most celebrated were the Breviary and Missal, etc., *secundum usum Sarum*, compiled by Osmund, bishop of Salisbury, about the year 1080, and reputed to be executed with such exactness according to the rules of the Romish Church that they were also employed in divine service in many churches on the Continent. They consisted of prayers and offices, some of which had been transmitted from very ancient times, and others were of later origin, accommodated to the Romish religion. Compare Maskell, *The* A*ncient Liturgy of the Church of England, according to the Uses of Sarusm, Bangaor York, Hereford, and the Modern Roman Liturgy* (London, 1844, 8vo). Also by the same, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglican; or, Occasional Offices of the Church of England, according to the Ancient Use of Salisbury; the Prymer in English, and other Prayers and Forms* (London, 1846, 3 volumes, 8vo).

The first attempt in England to introduce e the vernacular was made in 1536, when, in pursuance of Henry VIII's injunctions, the Bible, Paternoster, Creed, and Decalogue were set forth and placed in churches. to be read in English. In 1545 the *King's Primer* was published, containing a form of morning and evening prayer in English, besides the Lord's Prayer, Creed, and Ten Commandments, the Seven Penitential Psalms, Litany, and other devotions, and in 1547, on the accession of Edward VI, archbishop Cranmer, bishop Ridley, and eleven other eminent divines, martyrs, and confessors, were commissioned to draw up a liturgy in the English language "free from those unfounded doctrines and superstitious ceremonies which had disgraced the Latin liturgies;" and this was ratified by act of Parliament in 1548, and published in 1549. This liturgy is commonly known and cited as the *First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.* In the great body of their work Cranmer and his associates derived their materials from the earlier services which had been in use in England; " but in the

occasional offices they were indebted to the labors of Melancthon and Bucer, and through them to the older liturgy of Nuremberg, which those reformers were instructed to follow" (Dr. Cardwell's *Two Books of Common Prayer, set forth... in the reign of King Edward the Sixth, compared,* page 14, Oxford, 1838). In consequence, however, of exceptions being taken at some things in this book, which were thought to savor too much of superstition, it underwent another revision, and was further altered in 1551, when it was again confirmed by Parliament. This edition is usually cited as the *Second Prayer-book of Edward VI.* it is very nearly the same with that which is at present in use. *The two Liturgies,* A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552, *with other Documents, set forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI,* were very carefully edited for the Parker Society by the Rev. Joseph Ketley, M.A., at the Cambridge University Press, in 1844, in octavo. The two acts of Parliament (2 and 3 Edwiard VI, c. 1, and 5 and 6 Edward VI, c. 1) which had been passed for establishing uniformity of divine service were repealed in the first year of Queen Mary, who restored the Latin liturgies according to the popish forms of worship. On the accession of Elizabeth, however, the Prayer-book was restored, and has been in use ever since. For the later history of the subject, including liturgical books in England, Scotland, and America, *SEE COMMON PRAYER*.

Among the curiosities of the subject we notice the following:

(a.) *Liturgy of the Primitive Episcopal Church. — "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Primitives Episcopal Church, revived in England in the Year of our Redemption One thousand eight hundred and thirty-one, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David,"* though bearing the imprint of London, was printed at Liverpool, but was never published. It was edited by the Reverend George Montgomery West, M.A., a presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the state and diocese of Ohio, in North America. This volume is of great rarity, not more than five or six copies being found in the libraries of the curious in ecclesiastical matters. The liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is the basis of this edition, excepting two or three alterations in the office for the ministration of baptism, and a few verbal alterations to fit it for use in England and in Ireland. "The Primitive Episcopal Church, revived in England in 1831," had a short existence of little more than twelve months.

(b.) *Deistical Liturgy.* — In 1752 a liturgy was published in Liverpool by some of the Presbyterians, as Antitrinitarians are often called in England, but Christ's name is hardly mentioned in it, and the third part of the Godhead is not at all recognized in it. It is known also by the name of "Liverpool Liturgy." In 1776 was published "*A Liturgy on the universal Principles of Religion and Morality:"* it was compiled by David Williams, with the chimerical design of uniting all parties and persuasions in one. comprehensive form. This liturgy is composed in imitation of the *Book of Common Prayer,* with responses celebrating the divine perfections and works, with thanksgivings, confessions, and supplications. The principal part of three of the hymns for morning and evening service is selected from the works of Milton and Thomson, though considerable use is made of the language of the Scriptures (see Orton, *Letters,* 1:80 sq.; Bogue and Bennett, *Hist. of the Dissenters,* 3:342).

VII. *Literature.* — Of bibliographical treatises on the literature of liturgy we may name Zaccaria, *Bibliotheca Ritualis* (Rome, 1776-8, 4 volumes, 4to); Guranegera , *Institutions Liturgiiues* (Paris, 1840-51); Ksecher, *Bibliotheca Liturgica,* etc., pages 699-866; *Liturgies and other Documents of the Ante-Nicene Period* (Ante-Nicene Library, Edinb. 1872, 8vo). Special works of note on the subject of liturgy are: J. Goar, Εὐχολόγιον, *sive Rituacle Grecorum,* etc., Gr. and Lat. (Par. 1647; Venice, 1740); Jos. Aloys. Assemani (R.C.), *Codex Litur sicus ecclesiae universae.... in quo continentur libri rituales, missales, pontificales, officia, dypticha, etc., ecclesiarum Occidentis et Orientis* (published under the auspices of pope Boniface XIV, Rome, 1749-66, 13 volumes); Euseb. Renaudot (R.C.), *Liturgiarum Orientalium collectio* (Paris, 1716; reprinted in 1847, 2 volumes); L.A. Muratori (R.C.), *Liturgia Romana vetus* (Venet. 1748, 2 volumes), contains the three Roman sacramentaires of Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory I, also the Missale Gothicum, and a learned introductory dissertation *De rebus liturgicis;* W. Palmer (Anglican), *Origines Liturgicae* (Lond. 1832 and 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo) [with special reference to the Anglican liturgy]; Thos. Brett, *Collection of the Principal Liturgies used in the Christian Church in the celebration of the Eucharist, particularly the anccient* (translated into English), *with a Dissertation upon them* (London, 1838); W. Trollope (Anglican), *The Greek Liturgy of St. James* (Edinb. 1848); Daniel (Lutheran, the most learned German liturgist), *Codex Liturgicus ecclesiae universae in epitomem redactus* (Lips. 1847 sq., 4 volumes; volume 1 contains the Roman, volume 4 the

Oriental liturgies); Fr. J. Mone (I.C.), *Lateinische u. Griechische Messen aus dem 2ten bis 6ten Jahrhundert* (Frankf. a. M. 1850), contains valuable treatises on the Gallican, African, and Roman Mass; J.M. Neale (Anglican, the most learned English ritualist and liturgist), *Tetralogia liturgica; sive St. Chrysostom, St. Jacobi, St. Marci divina missae: quibus accedit ordo Mozarabicus* (Lond. 1849); the same, *The Liturgies of St. Mark, St. James, St. Clement, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, or according to the Use of the Churches of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Constantinople* (Lond. 1859, folio, in the Greek original; and the same liturgies in an English translation, with an introduction and appendices, also at London, 1859); the same, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Ch.* (Lond. 1850-72, 5 volumes, 8vo; Gen.Introd. volume 2); the same, *Essays on Liturgioloqgy and Ch. History* (Lond. 1863) [this work, dedicated to the metropolitan Philaret of Moscow, is a collection of various learned treatises of the author from the *Christian Remembracer*, on the Roman and Gallican Breviary, the Church Collects, the Mozarabic and Ambrosian liturgies, liturgical quotations, etc.]; Binterim, *Denkwurdigkeiten d. Christ.-Kathol. Kirche,* Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service* (Oxf. 1855, 8vo, enlarged in 1863); Mabillon, *De Liturgia Gallicana,* etc. (1865), Etheridge, *Syrian Ch.* Page 188 sq.; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity Exemplified,* page 284 sq.; and his *Manual of Prelacy and Ritualismn* (Phila. 1869, 12mo), page 275 sq.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities,* page 396 sq., 602 sq.; Siegel, *Handb. d. Christl. Kirchl. Alterthümer,* 3:202 sq., Augusti, *Handb. d. Christl. Archaeol.* 1:191 sq.; 2:537 sq.; 3:704 sq., 714 sq.; Blunt, *Dict. of Hist. and Doctr. Theol.* s.v., and Eadie, *Eccles. Diet.* s.v.; Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind* (Lond. 1854), volume 7, which contains *Reliquiae Liturgicae* (the Irvingite work); *Readings upon the Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Clurch* (London, 1848-54); Hofling, *Liturgisches Urkundenbuch* (Leipz. 1854); Hefele (C. Jos.), *Beitr. zu Kirchengesch. Archaeol. u. Litursgi* (Tub. 1864), volume 2; Dollinger, *Heathenism and Judaism;* Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2, § 100; *Edinb. Review,* 1852 (April): *The Round Table,* 1867 (August 10); *New Englander,* 1861 (July), art. 6; *Mercersburg Review,* 1871 (January). art. 5; *Brit. and For. Miss. Rev.* 1857 (July). (C.W.)

Liutprand

SEE LUITPRAND.

Liver

(dbK; *akbesd'*, so called as being the *heaviest* of the viscera) occurs in <29013>Exodus 29:13, 22; <03004>Leviticus 3:4, 10, 15; 4:9; 7:4; 8:16, 25; 9:10, 19; <20723>Proverbs 7:23; <25211>Lamentations 2:11; <26121>Ezekiel 21:21. In the Pentateuch it forms part of the phrase translated in the Authorized Version "the caul that is above the liver," but which Gesenius *(Thesaur. Heb.* pages 645, 646), reasoning from the root, understands to be the great lobe of the liver itself rather than the caul over it, which latter, he observes, is inconsiderable in size, and has but little fat. Jahn thinks the smaller lobe to be meant. The phrase is also rendered in the Sept. "the lobe or lower pendent of the liver," the chief object of attention in the art of hepatoscopy, or divination by the liver, among the ancients. (Jerome gives "the net of the liver," "the suet," and "the fat;" see Bochart. *Hieroz.* 1:498.) *SEE CAUL*. It appears from the same passages that it was burnt upon the altar, and not eaten as sacrificial food (Jahn, *Bibl. Archaeol. §* 378, n. 7). The liver was supposed by the ancient Greeks and Romans to be the seat of the passions pride, love, etc. (see Anacreon, *Ode* 3, fin.; Theocritus, *Idyll.* 11:16; Horace, *Carri.* 1:13, 4; 25, 15; 4:1, 12; and the Notes of the Delphin edition. Comp. also Persius, *Sat.* v. 129; Juvenal, *Sat.* 5:647). Some have argued that the same symbol prevailed among the Jews (rendering ydbK] in <01406>Genesis 49:6, "my *liver,"* instead of "my honor," Sept. τὰ ἥπατακ; compare the Hebrew of <19609>Psalm 16:9; 57:9; 108:2), but Gesenius *(Hebr. Lex.* s.v. d/bK) denies this signification in those passages. Wounds in the liver were supposed to be mortal; thus the expression in <20723>Proverbs 7:23, "a dart through his liver," and <25211>Lamentations 2:11, "my liver is poured out upon the earth," are each of them a periphrasis for death itself. tEschylus uses a similar phrase to describe a mortal wound *(Agamemnon,* 1:442). *SEE HEART*.

The passage in <26121>Ezekiel 21:21 contains an interesting reference to the most ancient of all modes of divination, by the inspection of the viscera of animals, and even of mankind, sacrificially slaughtered for the purpose. It is there said that the king of Babylon, among other modes of divination referred to in the same verse, "looked upon the liver." The liver was always considered the most important organ in the ancient art of *Extispicium,* or divination by the entrails. Philostratus felicitously describes it as "the prophesying tripod of all divination" *(Life of Apollonius,* 8:7, 5). The rules by which the Greeks and Romans judged of it are amply detailed in

Adams's *Romuan Antiquities,* page 261 sq. (Lond. 1834), and in Potter's *Archaologia Graeca,* 1:316 (Lond. 1775). Vitruvius suggests a plausible theory of the first rise of *hepatoscopy.* He says the ancients inspected the livers of those animals which frequented the places where they wished to settle, and if they found the liver, to which they chiefly ascribed the process of sangnification, was injured, they concluded that the water and nourishment collected in such localities were unwholesome (1:4). But divination is coeval and coextensive with a belief in the divinity. Cicero ascribes divination by this and other means to what he calls "the heroic ages," by which term we know he means a period antecedent to all historical documents *(De Dirinationze).* Prometheus, in the play of that title (1:474 sq.), lays claim to having taught mankind the different kinds of divination, and that of *extispicy* among the rest; and Prometheus, according to Servius *(ad Virg. Ecl.* 6:42), instructed the Assyrians; and we know from sacred record that Assyria was one, of the countries first peopled. It is further important to remark that the first recorded instance of divination is that of the teraphim of Laban, a native of Padan-Aram, a district bordering on that country (<scripRef type="bible">1 Samuel 19:13, 16</scripRef>), but by which teraphim both the Sept. and Josephus understood "the *liver* of goats" *(Ant.* 6:11, 4). *SEE TERAPEISM.* See generally Whiston's *Josephus,* page 169, note (Edinb. 1828); Bochart, 1:41, *De Caprarum Nominibus; Encyclopaedia Metropolitanal ,* s.v. Divination; Rosenmüller's *Scholia* on the several passages referred to; Perizonius, *ad AElian.* 2:31; Peucer, *De Praecipuis Divinationum Generibus,* etc. (Wittemberg, 1560). *SEE DIVINATION.*

Liverpool Liturgy

SEE LITURGY.

Living Creatures

These, as presented in Ezekiel 1-10, and Revelation 4 sq., are identical with the cherubim. Besides the general resemblance in form, position, and service, we have, <scripRef type="bible">Ezekiel 10:20</scripRef>: "I knew that they were the cherubim." Ezekiel, being a priest, was familiar with these symbolical forms. The *living ones* present some variations from the cherubim, but not greater than appear in the cherubim themselves. The discussion of their forms and probable uses has already been given, and is not here resumed. *SEE CHERUB.* They are taken up here to give a more careful attention to their *symbolical* utility. The importance of these symbols is manifest, 1, in the

very minute description of them; 2, in the fact that they do in some way pervade the entire period of grace, from the expulsion of Adam till, in the apocalyptic vision, we arrive at the gates of the city, having a right to the tree of life in the midst of the paradise of God — such a right as man in innocence never attained. They were placed first at the front of the garden of Eden; renewed in the tabernacle; extended in the Temple; resumed in the visions of Ezekiel; incorporated in the book of Psalms; and in the prospective history of Revelation they are left with us till the end of the world. The seraphim of Isaiah (ch. 6) appear in all respects to be the same; though differing in name and in position, they perform the same service. Even the idolatrous images, the teraphim, were probably an unwarranted and superstitious imitation of the figures at the east of Eden. True, there are periods when they are under a cloud, e.g. from the Deluge till the erecting of the tabernacle; still, we dare not say they were extinct, for before the tabernacle was built in the wilderness we read of another, called the tabernacle of the congregation (<02337>Exodus 33:7-11). There is much mystery about them, and many mistakes occur among expositors in relation to them.

1. They are not angels, nor do they represent the peculiar ministry of angels.

(a) The Scriptures know no such orders as angels, archangels, cherubim, and seraphim; the orders of angelic nature are described as thrones, dominions, principalities, powers (<51016>Colossians 1:16).

(b) Angelic power would have been a very ineffectual agency for offsetting the sword of flame, and was not needed to wield that sword which turns on its own axis.

(c) The living ones are distinguished from angels in <66507>Revelation 15:7.

(d) They join the elders in the new song, "Hast redeemed *uts* to God by thy blood," etc. (<66509>Revelation 5:9).

(e) Angels take but a small part in the direct administration of grace; they rather point the inquirer, and furnish assistance to the administrator (<44003>Acts 10:3; <66001>Revelation 1:1; <132118>1 Chronicles 21:18; <44207>Acts 12:7).

2. Nothing vindictive or judicial belongs to them.

(a) There is no need of such power; the sword and the fire embody the whole power of justice.

(b) We never find them *executing judgment*, though they concur in it when executed.

(c) They warn of danger from divine justice (<2606>Isaiah 6:3-5).

(d) They call attention to justice (<6601>Revelation 6:1, 3, 5, 7).

(e) They deliver the commission to those who execute it (<2602>Ezekiel 10:2, 7; <6607>Revelation 15:7).

(f) They join in celebrating the triumph over the victims of judgment (<6604>Revelation 19:4). Very different is their function in the administration of grace; there they make application of the remedy to the very spot (<2606>Isaiah 6:6, 7).

3. They are not devoid of human sympathy.

(a) They have the face of a man.

(b) They have the hands of a man under their wings (<2608>Ezekiel 1:8).

(c) When the prophet was alarmed ("undone"), one of them brought him instant relief-just such relief as he felt in need of.

(d) The throne which they bear has a man above upon it (<2626>Ezekiel 1:26).

(e) In <6406>Revelation 4:6, we find them in the midst of the same throne, and round about it.

(f) They associate with the elders in sympathy with the one hundred and forty-four thousand who sing the new song (<6403>Revelation 14:3), and with the Church in celebrating the overthrow of her enemies (<6604>Revelation 19:4). They thus abound in the sympathies of a redeemed humanity.

(I.) In general terms they represent *mercy*, as contradistinguished from justice.

1. They are distinct from the sword, as already shown. If, in <2606>Ezekiel 1:6, they seem to be evolved out of the fire, this is no more than we have

already in the first promise, where the death of death is our life; and in <19136>Psalm 135:10 sq.

2. They were united to the ἱλαστήριον, the mercy-seat itself.

3. They belong to the holy of holies, both the larger figures of olive-tree, and the smaller of pure gold; but this chamber was a type of heaven (<580924>Hebrews 9:24).

4. Other cherubic emblems were wrought on the inner curtains of the tabernacle, and inner walls of the Temple, both Solomon's and Ezekiel's (<111629>1 Kings 6:29; <264118>Ezekiel 41:18-20). All is mercy inside of the Temple.

5. The like figures were made on the washstands of the Temple, interspersed with lions and oxen (<111729>1 Kings 7:29; "lions and palm-trees," verse 36; comp. <490526>Ephesians 5:26; <560305>Titus 3:5).

6. The firmament over their heads, with its throne and man upon it (<262601>Ezekiel 1:26, 27, combines <022410>Exodus 24:10 with <660115>Revelation 1:15).

7. The *iris* surrounding all this glory of the Lord puts on the finish to that institution where mercy rejoices against judgment (<262801>Ezekiel 1:28).

(II.) They seem to represent mercy in its *dispensation,* so to speak — in its instrumentalities, with all their interesting and happy varieties. While the *sword* — the whole power of justice, deters man from entering the earthly paradise; drives men away in their wickedness; awakes against the Shepherd; torments enemies in the second death; on the contrary, the *living ones* represent the entire administration of mercy (<260112>Ezekiel 1:12: "Whither the spirit was to go, they went;" verse 20: "Thither was their spirit to go"). Whether an organized Church, an open Bible, an altar, or a temple; whether patriarchs or prophets, priests or presbyters; apostles, John the Baptist, or Christ himself; evangelists, pastors, or teachers; whether angelic messengers, or little children, be the instrumentalities in dispensing the grace of God, the qualities of cherubim are, and ought to be, the characteristics with which they are imbued: the courage and power of the lion; the patience and perseverance of the ox; the sublimity, rapidity, and penetration of the eagle; with the sympathetic love and prudent forecast of our own humanity; each one full of eyes, within and without (<490416>Ephesians 4:16). In this view they do, as it were, bring God near to men.

(III.) The cherubim, in this dispensation of mercy, bring out prominently the idea of the *throne* of God the throne of grace (<26126>Ezekiel 1:26: "Likeness of a throne"). In <19901>Psalm 99:1, "The Lord reigneth" is parallel with "inhabiting the cherubim." Both in the tabernacle and Temple the Shekinah was between the two cherubim, which seemed to constitute, with the lid of the ark, the very throne itself, according to <02522>Exodus 25:22, and <26407>Ezekiel 43:7. In the versions of Ezekiel, the chertubim seem to support the throne; in <23602>Isaiah 6:2, and <66406>Revelation 4:6-9, they appear as attendants. To the English reader the seraphim might seem to be above the *throne*, but the original places them above the *Temple*, in which position they may still be below the throne, for the skirts of his robe flow down and fill the holy house.

(IV.) The idea of carrying the throne, or bearing royalty in his throne from one place to another, brings us to the acme of the whole cherubic system — "the *chariot of the Lord."* The key-note of this is given in <13818>1 Chronicles 28:18: " Gold for the pattern of the chariot.... the cherubim that spread out their wings and covered the ark of the covenant of the Lord;" compare <19810>Psalm 18:10: "He rode upon a cherub;" and <35808>Habakkuk 3:8, 13,15. These figures constituted a "moving throne." *SEE CREATURE*.

Livingston, Gilbert Robert

D.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, a descendant of the celebrated Rev. John Livingston (q.v.), was born at Stamford, Connecticut, October 8, 1786, and graduated at Union College in 1805. He studied theology under Reverend Dr. Perkins, of Great Hartford, Connecticut, and Reverend Dr. John Henry Livingston (q.v.). In 1811 he became pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church in Coxsackie, N.Y., where about six hundred persons were the fruits of his ministry of fifteen years. In 1826 he removed to Philadelphia as pastor of the First (Dutch) Reformed (or Crown Street) Church. Here again his ministry was greatly blessed, three hundred and twenty persons being added to the Church, and over one hundred in a single year. He died March 9, 1834. He was a man of large physical frame, benevolent countenance, and amiable temper. His preaching was practical, and addressed more to the understanding and conscience of the people than to their feelings. His pastoral labors were incessant and successful. At one period of his life lie embraced what were generally known as "New Measures," but he lived to abandon them in his later ministry. A single sermon and a tract are all that he is known to have published. — Sprague,

Annals; Corwin's *Manual Ref. Church; Funeral Sermon* by C.C. Cuvler, D.D.; *Historical Discourse* by W.J.R. Taylor, D.D. (W.J.R.T.)

Livingston, Henry Gilbert

son of the preceding, was born at Coxsackie, N.Y., February 3, 1821, graduated at Williams College in 1840, was principal of Clinton Academy (now Hamilton College) for two years, studied theology in Union Theological Seminary, N.Y., where he graduated in 1844, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Long Island in the following autumn. He became pastor of the Presbyterian church of Carmel, N.Y., in 1844, but removed in 1849 as pastor of the Third Reformed Dutch Church of Philadelphia. Resigning in 1854 on account of feeble health, he returned to Carmel, and became principal of the Raymond Institute, and also supplied the vacant church of which he was formerly pastor. He died suddenly, January 25, 1855. "No doubts, no fears, no darkness" beclouded his dying hours. Mr. Livingston was a man of noble mold, tall, massive, intellectual, modest, amiable, dignified in manners, somewhat reserved, diffident, and self-distrustful. His character was finely balanced. True manliness, transparent simplicity, moral purity, generosity, and the most delicate sensibility, were blended with deep piety and beautiful consistency of life, with a holy ministry and a full use of all his talents. Only two of his discourses were published. See *Memorial Sermon* by W.J.R. Taylor, D.D., and Sprague's *Annals*, volume 9; (W.J.R.T.)

Livingston, John

a noted Scottish Presbyterian divine, was born in 1603, and was educated at Glasgow, where he took the degree of A.M. in 1621. He entered the ministry, and soon distinguished himself as an able preacher. A zealous Covenanter, he opposed the episcopal government of the Church after the Restoration, and on this account suffered many inconveneniences. Very remarkable in his life was the result which followed his preaching on a special fast-day appointed by the "Kirk of Shotts," June 21, 1630. He was at this time domestic chaplain to the countess of Wigton. Later he became minister at Aneram. He was twice suspended from his pastoral office, but, his opposition to the government continuing, he was banished the kingdom in 1663. He retired to Holland, and became minister of a Scottish church at Rotterdam. There he died in 1672. He wrote his *Autobiography* (Glasgow, 1754, 12mo); also *Lives of Eminent Scottish Divines* (1754, 8vo). See

Chambers, *Biog. Dict. of eminent Scotsmen,* s.v.; A. Gunsn, *Memoirs of John Lisvingston* (N.Y. 1829); Gorton, *Biog. Dict.* volume 2, s.v.

Livingston, John Henry

D.D., S.T.P., the "father of the Reformed Dutch Church in this country," and in many respects its most celebrated representative, was born at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., May 30, 1746, son of Henry Livingston, and a lineal descendant in the fourth generation from the Reverend John Livingston, of Scotland. He graduated at Yale College in 1762, and then studied law for two years, when his health gave way under his close application, and he was obliged to discontinue it. About this time he was converted, and then directed his attention to the Christian ministry. By advice of Dr. Laidlie, of New York, he went to Europe to complete his theological studies at the University of Utrecht, in Holland, where he remained four years, and was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Classis of Amsterdam. Having received a call to become pastor and second preacher in English of the Church of New York, he passed examination at the university for the degree of doctor of divinity, returned to New York September 3, 1770, and at once began his labors as pastor of the Church. Here he soon established his great reputation as a pulpit orator and as a learned theologian; but his grand ecclesiastical achievement was the settlement of the old and bitter controversy between the "Coetus" and "Conferentie" parties of the Reformed Dutch Church, and the consummation in about two years of the union, which has never since been broken. His pastoral relation to the Church in New York continued forty years 1770 to 1810 — although during the Revolutionary War he was obliged to leave the city, and upon his return in 1783 he found himself the sole pastor, and so remained for three years. The next year he was appointed professor of theology, and retained this office, with his pastorate, until 1810, when he removed to New Brunswick, N.J., at the request of the synod, and opened the theological seminary in that city, occupying, in connection with it, the presidency of Queens, now Rutgers College. These two offices he held until his death in 1825. It is difficult, in this brief notice, even to sum up the services and character of this eminent man. More than four hundred souls were received into the Church on profession of their faith during the three years of his sole pastorate after the war. Nearly two hundred young men were trained by him for the ministry of the Church. To him, more than to any other man, is due the credit of the separate organization of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in this country. He principally shaped its

Constitution; he prepared its first psalm and hymn book. His theological lectures still form the basis of didactic and polemic instruction in the theological seminary of which he was the founder and father. The whole denomination is reaping today the fruits of the sacrifices which he made for it. His influence in the Church was like that of Washington in the nation. his grand and eloquent sermon, preached before the New York Missionary Society in 1804, from <66146>Revelation 14:6, 7, was one of the leading influences in that revival of the missionary spirit which gave Samuel J. Mills and his young friends to the work, and which resulted in the subsequent organization of the "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions" in 1813. Several of Dr. Livingston's occasional productions were published by himself, and a posthumous volume, containing a syllabus of his theological lectures, was issued by the Reverend Jesse Fonda, one of his pupils. His death, at his residence in New Brunswick, January 19, 1825, was like a translation, without pain or complaint, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." His wife, Sarah Livingston, whom he married in October 1775, was the daughter of Philip Livingston, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. Like him, Dr. Livingston was an ardent and fearless patriot, and during all of the Revolutionary struggle he earnestly sustained the cause of freedom. In person Dr. Livingston was tall, commanding, dignified, and imposing. His features were regular and handsome. His manners were refined and studiously polite. He was the model of the Christian gentleman. In his later years his appearance was truly patriarchal. His piety was all-pervading. As a preacher, he possessed eminent abilities. His oratory was peculiar to himself, and very effective. It was full of action, variety, and power. As a theological teacher, he was clear, concise, learned, systematic, and practical. His influence over his students was wonderful. His great aim was to make them experimental ministers of Christ, and they loved and reverenced him almost as an apostle. Whatever faults he had were more than covered, to the eyes of his friends, by his majestic bearing, his admirable character, his pious life, and fruitful ministry, and by his services to the Church of Christ. See Dr. (Gunn's *Life*, etc., abridged by Dr. T.W. Chambers; also Sprague, *Annals.* volume 9, an admirable portraiture; also several funeral discourses, etc. (W.J.R.T.)

Livonia

the largest of the Baltic provinces of Russia; area 18,158 sq. m.; pop. in 1882,1,173,951. The Germans, who chiefly live in the towns, number

about 64,000 inhabitants; the remainder are mostly either Letts (a branch of the Slavi. kindred to the Lithuanians) or Esthonians, who are of Finnish descent. Christianity was first introduced at Riga about 1180 by merchants from Bremen. The great missionary was the Augustinian monk Meinhard, who in 1186 established the first church at Wexkiill, on the Duna, and in 1191 was consecrated bishop of Livonia. His successor, abbot Berthold, of Loccum, endeavored to accelerate the conversion of the Livonians by force of arms, and in 1198 fell in a victorious battle of the Crusaders. Bishop Albert, of Apeldern, in 1202 founded the Order of the Knights of the Sword, and gradually overcame the persistent opposition of the Livonians to the enforcement of Christianity. After his death (in 1229) the see of Riga was separated from the ecclesiastical province of Bremen, and in 1246 made an independent archbishopric. The union of the Order of the Sword with the Teutonic Knight secured the subjection and Christianization of Livonia, but involved the bishops in long-protracted conflicts with the order, which hastened the decay of the Church. The army-master, Walter of Plettenberg (1494-1531), adopted the doctrines of the Reformation, and converted Livonia into a secular duchy under Polish sovereignty. The center of the reformatory movement was in Riga, where the Hussite Nicolaus Russ, of Rostock, had, from 1511 to 1516, prepared the way for a religious reformation. Among the first promoters of the Lutheran Reformation were Andreas Knipken, a Lutheran schoolteacher from Treptow, in Pomerania, who arrived in Riga in 1521, and Sylvester Tagetmeier, from Hamburg, who arrived in the following year. Both were appointed preachers by the town council, in spite of the remonstrances of the archbishop. In Wolmar and Dorpat, Melchior Hoffminnn labored so violently in behalf of the Reformation that he created dissatisfaction even among the friends of the movement. and had to leave Livonia. Luther's epistle of congratulation and exhortation (1523) to the congregatons of Riga, Revel, and Dorpat shows that at that time the Reformation had made considerable progress. In 1524, the archbishop, Caspar Linde, of Riga, died, deeply mortified at the utter failure of his zealous efforts for saving the Catholic Church. His successor, John VII Blankenfeld, previously bishop of Dorpat and Revel, was no longer recognized by the town council of liga as sovereign, and in 1525 he was even made a prisoner. Under the archbishop Wilhelm, margrave of Brandenburg, who in 1539 succeeded Thomas Schonnig, the Reformation spread throughout Livonia; the archbishop himself became favorable to the new doctrine, and at the time of his death the Catholic Church in Livonia had almost ceased to exist.

Johann Briesmann (1527-31), who was called from Knoigsberg to Riga, drew up in 1530 the first agenda. The liturgy for Revel appeared in 1561, but had in 1572 to yield to that of Courland. The Esthonian catechism and the Livonian hymn-book of Mathias Knopken were likewise published in 1561. In the same year the army-master Ketteler concluded a treaty with Poland, by virtue of which Livonia was placed under the sovereignty of Poland; it was stipulated, however, that the Lutheran Church of Livonia should not be interfered with. In violation of this treaty, the Jesuits at once began their agitation for the restoration of the Catholic Church, but the Swedish rule again secured the predominance of Protestantism, and greatly strengthened it by establishing the University of Dorpat. A new liturgy was introduced in 1632, a new agenda in 1633; at the same time, a Lettish and Esthonian translation of the Bible was published. In the 18th century the religious life of the province suffered greatly from the fact that most of the preachers, being called from Germany, were unable to preach in the native languages. The spiritual destitution of many country districts attracted the Moravians, who continued their zealous labors even when, in 1743, their meetings had been forbidden. For a long time they confined themselves to the Lutheran Church; but the large attendance at their meetings led them (since 1817) to separate from the Lutheran Church.

The latter therefore began, in 1843, to engage in a vigorous contest with the Moravians, invoking the stipulations of the peace of Nystadt (1721), in which Sweden had ceded Livonia to Russia, while the latter confirmed the privileges of the Lutheran Church. The Russian government supported the Lutherans against the Moravians, but, on the other hand, began (1841) to make great efforts to prevail upon the Lettish peasants to join the Greek Church. Several thousands of Letts and Livonians succumbed to the pressure brought upon them by the government, and, after having once joined the orthodox Greek Church, they were forbidden (as many soon desired) to return to the Lutheran Church. All the children born of mixed marriages (Lutheran and Greek) must be educated in the Greek religion. In 1863, the Lutheran bishop Walter, who vigorously stood up for the defense of the rights of his Church, had to yield to an intrigue, and not until 1868 was the rigor of the Russian government against the Lutheran Church somewhat relaxed. These conflicts have awakened a general interest in the religious community, to which the re-establishment of the University of Dorpat (1802) has been greatly instrumental. The number of Roman

Catholics is about 5000, that of Greek Catholics is estimated at 143,000; the remainder are Lutherans. (A.J.S.)

Lizard

appears in the Auth. Vers. in but one passage (Leviticus 11:30) as the rendering of ha;f;l] *letaah';* but different species of the animal seem to be designated by several Hebrew terms, variously rendered in the English translation. In the East numerous varieties of these reptiles are met with in great abundance, several of which are regarded as venomous (Hasselquist, *Trav.* pages 241, 344 sq.). Others, again, are used by the modern Arabs for food (comp. also Arrian, *Matr. Eryth.* page 17, ed. Hudson), whereas the Mosaic law (Leviticus 11) classes them among unclean animals.

(1.) KO´ÄCH (j Kø*strength,* Leviticus 11:30; Sept. χαμαιλέων, Auth. Vers. "chameleon"), prob. the *Lacerta stellio,* an olive-brown lizard, with black and white spots, and a tail about a span long, while the body itself is scarcely of this length (Hasselquist, *Trav.* page 352; figure in Ruppel, *Atlas,* tab. 2). Bochart *(Hieroz.* 2:493 sq.) understands this term to refer to the species called *El-w-aral,* which exhibits its great strength (hence its name) in combat with the crocodile and serpents, is disgusting in appearance. and said to be poisonous (Leon. Afric. *Descript. Afric.* 9:53). But Michaelis (Suppl. 2221) and Rosenmüller have long since remarked that the derivation of the name *koach* is perhaps from a different root. According to the Arabic interpreters, it is the *land crocodile,* or a species of it, perhaps the *Waran el-hard* or *skink (Lacerta scincus),* which sometimes attains a length of six feet or more. *SEE CHAMELEON*.

(2.) LETAAH´ (ha;f;l] perh. so called from its *hiding;* Leviticus 11:30; Sept. χαλαβώτης, Vulg. *stellio,* Auth. Vers. "lizard"), perhaps the species called in Egypt *Shechalit,* described by Forskal *(Descr.* page 13) as a delicate little animal, about a span in length and of the thickness of the thumb, found in the neighborhood of houses. Bochart *(Hieroz.* 2:497 sq.) maintains that it is the *wagrat* of the Arabs, a kind of lizard that clings close to the ground (hence his derivation from an Arabic root, signifying to *stick to the earth),* to which also the Sept. alludes (comp. Oken, *Naturgesch.* III, 2:203). Geddes regards it as identical with the *Lacerta gecko.*

(3.) CHO´MET (תֹמֶשׂ, so called from *lying* close to the ground; ⁰³¹³⁰Leviticus 11:30; Sept. σαύρα, Auth.Vers. "snail") has been supposed by Bochart (2:500 sq.) to mean the *Galkan,* a species of lizard that burrows in the sand (on the precarious interpretation of the Talmud). The interpretation *snail* rests on no better foundation. Both the Arabic interpreters understand the *chameleon.* The I species intended is uncertain. (See Fuller, *Miscell.* 6:9.)

(4.) ANAKAH' (אֲנָקָה, a *shriek;* ⁰³¹³⁰Leviticus 11:30; Sept. and Vulg. *shrewmouse,* Auth.Vers. "ferret") is regarded by the Arab. Erpen. as the *Waral,* considered by some as identical with the *Lacerta Nilotica* (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 361 sq.), but which last Forskal *(Descrit. Animal.* page 13) calls *Waranz* (comp. Robinson, 2:253). The *Waral* is described by those who have personally seen it (see Leo Afric. *Descr.* 9:51) as having a length of three or four feet, a scaly, very strong, grayish-yellow skin, and is regarded as poisonous in every part. (See Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, 2:256 sq.; Gesen. *Thesaur.* page 128.)

(5.) TSAB (צָב; prob. from its *sluggishness;* ⁰³¹²⁹Leviticus 11:29; Sept. and Vulg. the *crocodile,* Auth.Vers. "tortoise") is doubtless the species of lizard still called by the Arabs *Dhab* (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:463 sq.), a stupid creature tenanting rocky waters. According to Leo Afric. (9:52), it is about a yard long, without poisonous qualities, and incapable of drinking. They are caught and eaten in the desert. Forskal *(Descript. Aninmal.* page 13) and Hasselquist (Trasv. page 353 sq.) appear to have described it under the name *of Lacertat, Egyptiaca* (comp. Paulus, *Samml.* 2:263). According to Burckhardt (2:863 sq.), it has a scaly skin of a yellow color, and sometimes attains a length of eighteen inches.

(6.) TINSHE´METH (תִּנְשֶׁמֶת, the hard *breather;* Sept., Vulgate, and Auth. Vers. *mole;* ⁰³¹³⁰Leviticus 11:30; being the same Heb. word used in ⁰³¹¹⁸Leviticus 11:18; ⁰⁵⁵¹⁶Deuteronomy 14:16, to describe a bird, rendered "swan") is (according to Saadias) a species of lizard, probably the *Gecko* (Hasselquist, *Trav.* page 356 sq.), a kind described as having a round tail of moderate length, and tufted feet, lamellated lengthwise on the bottom, said to be peculiar for exuding poison from the divisions of its toes, eagerly seeking spots imbued with salt, which it leaves infected with a virus that engenders leprosy (see also Forskal, page 13). Bochart (2:503 sq.) understands the *chameleon,* deriving the etymology from the ancient belief

that this creature lived upon the air (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 8:33, 51), a notion probably derived from its long endurance of hunger. (See Hasselquist, *Trav.* page 348 sq.; Sonnini, *Trav.* 1:87; Oken, *Naturgesch.* III, 2:306 sq.; Russel, *Aleppo,* 2:128 sq.) *SEE CHAMELEON*.

(7.) SEMAMITH´ (tymAmc], prob. as being held *poisonous;* <2012>Proverbs 30:28; Sept. καλαβώτης,Vulg. *stellio,* Auth. Vers. "spider") is mentioned as a small creature of active instincts; prob. the Arabic *saum,* a poisonous lizard with leopard-like spots (Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:1084). Comp. Rosenmüller, *Alterth.* IV, 2:268. *SEE SPIDER*.

(8.) TANNIN' (ˆynAT) or TANNIM' (µynAT), otherwise TAN (ˆT), seems occasionally to signify a huge land serpent or saurian. *SEE DRAGON*.

(9.) LIVYATHAN' (ˆtyy]lI) sometimes stands for the largest of the lizard tribe, the *crocodile. SEE LEIVIATHAN*.

Picture for Lizard 1

Under the denomination of *lizard* the modern zoologist places all the cold-blooded animals that have the conformation of serpents with the addition of four feet. Thus viewed as one great family, they constitute the Saurians, Lacertinae, and Lacertinae and Lacertidae of authors, embracing numerous generical divisions, which commence with the largest, that is, the crocodile group, and pass through sundry others, a variety of species, formidable, disgusting, or pleasing in appearance — some equally frequenting the land and water, others absolutely confined to the earth and to the most and deserts; and, though in general harmless, there are a few with disputed properties, some being held to poison or corrode by means of the exudation of an ichor, and others extolled as aphrodisiacs, or of medical use in pharmacy; but these properties in most, if not in all, are undetermined or illusory. One of the best known of these is the common chameleon *(Chamaeleo vulgaris). SEE CHAMELEON*. When it is considered that the regions of Syria, Arabia, and Egypt are overrun with animals of this family, there is every reason to expect allusion to more than one genus in the Scriptures, where so many observations and similes are derived from the natural objects which were familiar to the various writers. Among the names enumerated above, Bochart refers bx; *tsub* (<3135>Leviticus 11:29), to one of the group of Monitors or Varanus, the Nilotic lizard, *Lacerta Nilotica, Varanus Niloticus,* or *Waran* of the Arabs.

Like the others of this form, it is possessed of a tail double the length of the body, but is not so well known in Palestine, where there is only one real river (Jordan), and that not tenanted by this species. It appears that the true crocodile frequented the shores and marshes of the coast down to a comparatively late period, and therefore it may well have had a more specific name than leviathan — a word apparently best suited to the dignified and lofty diction of the prophets, and clearly of more general signification than the more colloquial designation. Jerome was of this opinion; and it is thus likely that *tsab* was applied to both, as *Waran* is now considered only a variety of, or a young, crocodile. There is a second of the same group, *Lacerta scincus* of Merrem *(Vatranus arenarius), Waran el-hard,* also reaching to six feet in length; and a third, not as yet clearly described, which appears to be larger than either, growing to nine feet, and covered with bright cupreous scales. This last prefers rocky and stony situations. One of the last mentioned pursues its prey on land with a rapid bounding action, feeds on the larger insects, and is said to attack game in a body, sometimes destroying even sheep. The Arabs, in agreement with the ancients, assert that this species will do fierce and victorious battle with serpents. Considerations like these induce us to assign the Hebrew name jKo *koach* (a designation of strength) to the species of the desert; and if the Nilotic watranz be the *tsab,* then the Arabian *dhab,* as Bruce asserts, will be *Varanus arenarius,* or *watran el-hard* of the present familiar language, and *chardaun* the larger copper-colored species above noticed. But it is evident from the Arabic authorities quoted by Bochart, and from his own conclusions, that there is not only confusion among the species of lizard, but that the ichneumon of Egypt *(Horpestes Pharaonis)* is mixed up with the history of these saurians.

We come next to the group of lizards more properly so called, which Hebrew commentators take to be the ha;f;l] *letaah,* a name having some allusion to poison and adhesiveness. The word occurs only once (<3113>Leviticus 11:30), where saurians alone appear to be indicated. If the Heb. root were to guide the decision, *letaah* would be another name for the *gecko or anakah,* for there is but one species which can be deemed venomous; and with regard to the quality of adhesiveness, though the *geckos* possess it most, numerous common lizards run up and down perpendicular walls with great facility. We therefore take fm/j , *chomet,* or the sand lizard of Bochart, to be the true lizard, several (probably many) species existing in myriads on the rocks in sandy places, and in ruins in

every part of Palestine and the adjacent countries. There is one species particularly abundant and small, well known in Arabia by the name of *Sarabandi*. We now come to the *Stelliones*, which have been confounded with the noxious *geckos* and others from the time of Aldrovandus, and thence have been a source of inextricable trouble to commentators. They are best known by the bundles of starlike spines on the body. Among these *Lacerta stellio, Stellio Orientalis,* the κροκόδειλος of the Greeks, and *hardun* of the Arabs, is abundant in the East, and a great frequenter of ruinous walls. The genus *Uromastix* offers *Stellio spinipes* of Daudin or *Urspinipes*, two or three feet long, of a fine green, and is the species which is believed to strike with the tail; hence formerly denominated *Caudae verbera.* It is frequent in the deserts around Egypt, and is probably the *Guamril* of the Arabs. Another subgenus, named *Trapelus* by Cuvier, is exemplified in the *Tr. AEgyptiacus* of Geoff., with a spinous swelled body, but remarkable for the faculty of changing color more rapidly than the chameleon. Next we place the *Geckotians,* among which comes hqnA} *anakath,* in our versions *denominated ferret,* but which is with more propriety transferred to the noisy and venomous *abu-burs* of the Arabs. There is no reason for admitting the verb qnA; *anak, to groan, to cry out,* as radical for the name of the ferret, an animal totally unconnected with the preceding and succeeding species in Leviticus 11:29, 30, and originally found, so far as we know, only in Western Africa, and thence conveyed to Spain, prowling noiselessly, and beaten to death without a groan, though capable of a feeble, short scream when at play, or when suddenly wounded. Taking the interpretation “to cry out," so little applicable to ferrets, in conjunction with the whole verse, we find the *gecko,* like all the species of this group of lizards, remarkable for the loud grating noise which it is apt to utter in the roofs and walls of houses all the night through; one, indeed, is sufficient to dispel the sleep of a whole family. The particular species most probably meant is the *Lacerta gecko* of Hasselquist, the *Gecko lobatus* of Geoffroy, distinguished by having the soles of the feet dilated and striated like open fans, from which a poisonous ichor is said to exude, inflaming the human skin, and infecting food that may have been trod upon by the animal. *SEE FERRET*. Hence the Arabic name of *abusbirs,* or "father of leprosy," at Cairo. The species extends northwards in Syria, but it may be doubted whether the *Gecko fascicularuis,* or *tarentola* of South-eastern Europe, be not also an inhabitant of Palestine; and in that case the tymAmc] *semamith* of Bochart, would find an appropriate location. To

these we add the *Chameleons* proper; and then follows the *Scincus* (in antiquity the name of *Varanus arenarius),* among which *Lacerta scincus,* Linn., or *Scincus officinalis,* is the *El-adda* of the Arabs, figured by Bruce, and well known in the old pharmacy of Europe. S. *Cyprius,* or *Lacerta Cyprius scincoides,* a large greenish species, marked with a pale line on each flank, occurs also; and a third, *Scincus variegatus* or *ocillatus,* often noticed on account of its round black spots, each marked with a pale streak, and commonly having likewise a stripe on each flank, of a pale color. Of the species of *Seps,* that is, viviparous serpent-lizards, having the body of snakes, with four weak limbs, a species with only three toes on each foot, the *Lacerta chalcides* of Linn, appears to extend to Syria. See further details in the *Penny Cyclopaedia,* s.v. Varanidae; Wood, *Bible Animals,* page 534 sq.

Picture for Lizard 2

From this examination, it appears probable that the generic name for the lizard among the Hebrews (being the only one thus rendered in the Auth. Version) is the ha;f;l] *letaah,* which, although an unclean animal, does not usually designate a poisonous species. Among the various kinds with which the East abounds, the *Lacerta stellio,* or starry lizard, may be selected as probably affording the best type of the scriptural terms, or at least of *letaah* in general, as it is the most common in Egypt and Palestine. It is covered with tubercles, and is of a gray color. It lives in the holes of walls, and under stones, and covers itself with dirt. Belon states that it sometimes attains the size of a weasel. This is said to be the lizard which infests the Pyramids, and in other countries where it is found, harbors in the crevices and between the stones of old walls, feeding on flies and other winged insects. This may be the species intended by Bruce when he says, "The number I saw one day, in the great court of the Temple of the Sun at Baalbek, amounted to many thousands; the ground, the walls, the stones of the ruined buildings, were covered with them; and the various colors of which they consisted made a very extraordinary appearance, glittering under the sun, sin which they lay sleeping and basking." Lord Lindsay also describes the ruins at Jerash (the ancient Gerasa) as "absolutely alive with lizards." Near Suez, he speaks of "a species of gray lizard;" and on the ascent towards Mount Sinai, "hundreds of little lizards of the color of the sand, and called by the natives *sarabandi,* were darting about." In the Syrian desert, Major Skinner says, "The ground is teeming with lizards; the

sun seems to draw them from the earth, for sometimes, when I have fixed my eye upon one spot, I have fancied that the sands were getting into life, so many of these creatures at once crept from their holes." Wilkinson says, “In Egypt, of the lizard tribe, none but the crocodile seems to have been sacred. Those which occur in the hieroglyphics are not emblematical of the gods, nor connected with religion." *SEE SNAIL*.

Lizel, Georg

a German theologian, was born at Ulm, in Wurtemberg, November 23, 1691; attended successively the universities of Strasburg, Leipsic, Jena, Halle, Wittenberg, Altdorf, and Tubingen, and in 1735 became vicar at Weidenstetten, and soon after pastor at Steinen Kirch; but in 1736, on account of false charges against his character, he lost his situation. In 1737 he was appointed subrector at the Gymnasium of Ulm, afterwards inspector of the alumni and imperial poet laureate. The Prussian Royal Society of Duisburg, and the German Society of Jena, elected him a member of their respective bodies. He died March 22,1761. His life was spent in the investigation of science, and in the cause of religion and education. While at the universities he explored numerous antique libraries, and the results he gave to the public in more than twenty volumes. As a theologian Lizel was faithful to his Church, and confronted and challenged Romanism. For a list of his works, see Doring, *Gielehrte Theol. Deutschl.* volume 2, s.v.

Llorente, Don Juan Antonio,

the noted author of a history of the *Inquisition*, etc., was born at Rincon del Soto, near Calahorra, Spain, March 30, 1756. He studied at Tarascone with great success, and received the tonsure when but fourteen years of age. In 1779 he was ordained priest, and took his degree in canon law. At this time the liberal ideas prevailing in France were beginning to make their way into Spain, and Llorente became interested in them. In 1781 he was named advocate of the Council of Castile, and in the year following was made general vicar of the bishopric of Calahorra. While in this position he appears to have connected himself with the Freemasons, and, although this rumor seems to have been generally credited, he was nevertheless appointed commissary of the Inquisition in 1785, and general secretary in 1789. After the downfall of the grand inquisitor he attached himself to the Liberal minister Jovellanos, who contemplated a religious and political

regeneration of Spain. The minister fell, and Llorente was involved in his fall, the more surely as he openly expressed his sympathy for him. Suspected by his superiors, he was closely watched. He was subjected to innumerable petty annoyances, his letters were opened, and, without any reason being given for the measure, was deposed from his situation, and imprisoned in a convent for one month. In 1805 he was again received into favor as the reward of a literary service of a very questionable character which he rendered to the minister Godoy. The latter purposed abolishing the ancient privileges of the Basque Provinces, and carrying out in Spain a thorough system of centralization; to accomplish this, he deemed it advantageous to prepare the way by means of a historical essay, disproving the ancient liberties of those provinces. The mission was given to Llorente, who wrote *Noticias historicas sobre has tres provincias Bascongadas* (Madrid, 1806-8, 3 volumes, 8vo), a work not in any way remarkable for historical truthfulnessp Llorente was now again favored with several high offices. His tendency towards the French ideas, centralization among others, led him perhaps to accept offers which he would otherwise have rejected. Upon the intrusion of the French (1807), Llorente found himself placed between the national government which opposed all progress, and that of a foreign sovereign which offered both political and religious liberty. Unable to serve at once the cause of the hereditary monarch and that of progress, Llorente and the Josephinos chose the latter; but the accusation preferred against them of having sold themselves to France (Hefele, in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:557 sq.) is unsupported by proof, and unlikely; they simply chose a foreign master rather than religious and political slavery. In 1809 the Spanish Inquisition was abolished in Spain, and Llorente was commissioned to search its records for the purpose of writing a history of that tribunal. He had already, as early as 1789, began to collect materials for this purpose, yet two more years were spent, with the aid of several assistants, in compiling the voluminous records. When the convents were abolished he was given the direction of the proceedings, and the charge of the sequestered goods, as also the administration of the national properties, an ungrateful and not very creditable task, for these properties were the result of sequestration; yet he claimed afterwards to have introduced many favorable changes in the administration, such, for instance, as that of leaving the management of the property belonging to parties put under the ban to the members of their family, and the many distinguished persons of Spain to whom he appealed in corroboration of his assertion have never denied its truth. He was,

however, accused of embezzlement to the amount of 11,000,000 reals, and lost his position; but the accusation not being substantiated, he was indemnified by another situation. In the mean time he continued to advocate the cause of Joseph Bonaparte both by his pen and in public addresses, and when the celebrated Constitution of the Cortes of Cadiz was proclaimed he was one of its most zealous opponents. When Joseph lost the Spanish throne (1814) Llorente was obliged to quit the country in haste. After his flight, banishment was pronounced against him, and his property, and his library of 8000 volumes, some of which were rare and costly manuscripts, were sequestered. After stopping a short time in London, Llorente settled in Paris, where he completed the work of which he had published a sketch in Spain: *Histoire critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne* (4 volumes, 8vo). It was written in Spanish, but was immediately translated into French by Alexis Pellier, under Llorente's own supervision (Par. 1817-18). Translations into most of the languages of Europe were made shortly afterwards. One of the best English editions was published in London in 1826. (For a review, see *British Critic,* 1:119.) Llorente was now the outspoken enemy of the Church, and he was forbidden to officiate as priest in Paris, and thus deprived of his regular means of support. He next attempted to earn a living by teaching Spanish, but the University of Paris forbade him teaching in public, and he became altogether dependent on his literary labors and the assistance of his masonic brethren for a support. To what straits he found himself reduced is seen in the fact that lie translated Faublas into Spanish. In 1822 he published his *Portraits politiques des Papes,* which still increased the animosity of the clergy against him, and in this instance it must be granted that he recklessly provoked this enmity by accepting as undoubted facts such legends as that of the popess Joanna, etc., while his friends were obliged to admit that the nature, tendencies, and even the tone of the work were not becoming the character of a priest. In December of the same year (1822) he received orders to leave France within three days. Exiled from the land of his adoption, he returned to that of his birth, but died shortly after (February 5, 1823) at Madrid, in consequence of the hardships he had undergone during his journey.

Llorente's character and writings have been the object of as extravagant praise by some as of extravagant censure by others. He lived in a time of great fermentation, and in a country where the struggle between progress and conservatism gave rise to innumerable parties: under these

circumstances he remained true to progress, and if he did not remain true also to any of the divers political parties, it was because he could not maintain his fidelity to both. When writing the history of the Inquisition, he was yet a fervent Roman Catholic; and in attacking an institution which he considered and proved to have been more political than religious, he undeservedly received the censure of a large proportion of the Roman Catholic world; he did not mean to attack the Romish Church, but, on the contrary, to vindicate it from the imputation of having been solidly concerned in the transaction of that fell tribunal. If in his subsequent works he went further, and attacked the Roman Catholic Church itself, the reason is to be found in the persecutions he endured at the hands of that Church. Llorente is not to be considered as a historian; neither his literary talents, nor his historical knowledge, nor the gift of correctly combining and connecting events, gave him any title to that appellation. His greatest production, the *Critical History of the Inquisition,* such Protestant historians as Prescott and Ranke judge to be of but little value, because of its partisan character, and the exaggerations in which it abounds, and, as the readers of this Cyclopeadia must have noticed, in the article INQUISITION *SEE INQUISITION*, he has rarely been quoted. His only credit in the work is that he brought together much material before inaccessible. We might say Llorente was a good and diligent compiler, but too ardent a partisan to be aught of a historian. See his autobiography entitled *Noticias biographica o Memorias para la Historiat de su Vida* (1818); Mahul, *Notice biographique sur Don J.* II *Lorente* (1823); Prescott, *Hist. of Ferdinand and Isabella,* 1, part 1; Rlanke, *Hist. of the Papacy,* 1:142, 272; 2:293; *Monthly Review,* 91 (1820), Append.; *Revue Encyclopedique* (1823). (J.H.W.)

Lloyd, Charles Hooker

a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Haven, Connecticut, February 21, 1833. His early life was spent in mercantile pursuits in New York City. In 1856, however, purposing to become a missionary to the heathen, he entered New York University; later he studied divinity in the theological seminary at Princeton, N.J., and graduated in 1862. He was licensed and ordained as an evangelist by the New York Presbytery April 29, 1862, and appointed (June 21, 1862) by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to South Africa. He did not, however, do much effective mission work, as he died February 10, 1865. Mr. Lloyd, as a preacher, was eminently wise to win souls. He was gifted with a strong passion for music,

and wrote and arranged many chants and hymns for the African converts. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, page 169.

Lloyd, Thomas

a noted Quaker preacher, was born in North Wales in 1649. While a student at Oxford University, he visited, during a vacation, his brother Charles, who had been imprisoned for Quakerism at Welch-Pool, and by the latter's influence became himself a convert to the religion of the Friends. He immediately left Oxford, suffered with the Quakers in their persecutions, and became an "instructor" on their "Firstdays." On account of persecution, reproach, and loss of property for his religion's sake, lie emigrated to Pennsylvania soon after the first settlement of that province. He died July 10, 1694. As president of the council, and subsequently as deputy governor of Pennsylvania, he exercised a most salutary influence upon the interests and progress of the colony.. See Janney's *History of Friends;* 2, chapter 17; 3, chapter 2.

Lloyd, William

a noted English prelate, was born in Berkshire in 1627, and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. In 1640 he removed to Jesus College, where he became fellow in 1646. He took deacon's orders from Dr. Skinner at the time of Charles's execution. In 1656 he was ordained priest, and acted as tutor of John Backhouse, son of Sir Wm. Backhouse, at Wadham College, Oxford. In 1660 he became master of arts at Cambridge, and was also made a prebendary of Ripon, in Yorkshire. In 1666 he was appointed king's chaplain, and in 1667 was collated to a prebend of Salisbury, and proceeded doctor of divinity at Oxford. In 1668 he was presented to the vicarage of St. Mary's, in Reading, and also installed archdeacon of Merioneth, in the church of Bangor, of which he became deacon in 1672, besides being made prebend in St. Paul's Church, London. In 1674 he was made residentiary of Salisbury, and in 1676 promoted to the see of Exeter, the vicarage of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Westminster. In 1680 he was appointed bishop of St. Asaph, was translated to Lichfield in 1692, and to Worcester in 1699-1700. He took an active part in the troubles between the Romanists and Protestants in 1678. He preached the funeral sermon of Sir Edmondbury Godfrey, believed to have been murdered in carrying out what is known as the popish plot for overthrowing Protestantism in England. In 1688, with six other bishops, he signed, and, as spokesman,

presented to the king, a memorial against the publication of his declaration of indulgence to Romanists and Dissenters. He was one of the six bishops who, together with archbishop Sancroft, composing the illustrious seven bishops, for their refusal to publish the king's declaration, were shortly after imprisoned by James II in the Tower, and, after trial, acquitted, to the great joy of all England. He became almoner to William III, and later also to queen Anne. He died at Hartlebury Castle August 30, 1717. Lloyd furnished valuable materials to Burnet's *History of his Own Times*, and wrote *Considerations touching the true Way to supress Popery in this Kingdom*, etc. (Lond. 1684, 8vo, 2d edit.) [a work which was attacked by MacKenzie *(Defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland*, etc.), and was defended by bishop Stillingfleet *(Origines Brit.)*, who reprinted it, with Notes by T.P. Panton (Oxford, 1842, 2 volumes, 8vo)]: — *History of the Government of the Church of Great Britain*: — *A Dissertation on Daniel's Seventy Weeks:* — *A Systenm of Chronology* (1712): — *Harmony of the Gospels*, etc., etc. See Allibone, Dict. *of Brit. and Am. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. (Restoration)*, 1:500; 2:5, 28, 141 sq., 146; Strickland, *Lives of the Seven Bishops*.

Loaf

Picture for Loaf 1

Picture for Loaf 2

(properly rKKkikkar', *a circle*, in the phrase µj,l, rKKkkikkar *a round of bread*, i.e., circular cake, being the form of Oriental bread, or rather biscuit, <022923>Exodus 29:23, <070805>Judges 8:5, <091003>1 Samuel 10:3; <130916>1 Chronicles 16:3; rendered "piece" or "morsel" of bread in <201626>Proverbs 6:26; <243721>Jeremiah 37:21, <090226>1 Samuel 2:26; sometimes simply µj,l, *le'chem, bread*, <032317>Leviticus 23:17; <091717>1 Samuel 17:17; 25:18; <111403>1 Kings 14:3; <120442>2 Kings 4:42; and so likewise the Greek ἄρτος, *bread*, espec. in the plural, <400414>Matthew 14:17, 19, 15:34, 36; 16:9, 10; <410638>Mark 6:38, 41, 44, 52; 8:5, 6,14, 19; <420913>Luke 9:13,16; 11:5; <430609>John 6:9, 11, 13, 26), a round cake, the usual form of bread among the ancients. *SEE SHEW-BREAD*. The bread of the Jews was either in small loaves, or else in broad and thick cakes, as is the present custom in the East. Bread was always broken into such portions as were required, and distributed by the master of the family. *SEE BREAD*.

The word hL;j; *challah'*, "cake" (<10619>2 Samuel 6:19), often refers to a cake of oblation (<02923>Exodus 29:23; <03836>Leviticus 8:26; <04755>Numbers 6:15; etc.), from the root l l ij ; *chalal*, to pierce through, because they were pricked, as among the Arabians and Jews of the present day. We also find, on the paintings in the monuments of Egypt, representations of offerings of cakes pricked. *SEE CAKE*.

The two wave loaves mentioned in <03217>Leviticus 23:17 are called in Hebrew hp;WnT]µj ,l , *le'chem temphah'*, signifying the act of waving or moving to and fro before Jehovah, a ceremony observed in the consecration of offerings; hence applied as a name to anything consecrated in this manner. *SEE OFFERING*.

Lo-am'mi

(Heb. *Lo-Ammi'*, yMæi a l o *not my people*, as it is explained in the context, <28109>Hosea 1:9; Sept. Οὐ λαός μου, Vulg. *Non populus mzeus;* in the parallel passage, <28223>Hosea 2:23, yMæi Aa l o Sept. οὐ λαῷ μου, Vulg. *non populo mseo*, Auth. Vers. "not my people"), a symbolical name given by the prophet Hosea at the divine instance to his second son, in token of Jehovah's rejection and subsequent restoration of his people, alluding to the Babylonian captivity (<28109>Hosea 1:9; 2:23; comp. 2:1). B.C. cir. 725. *SEE HOSEA*.

Loan

(hl ;aew] *sheelah';* <09120>1 Samuel 2:20, a *petition* or request, as elsewhere rendered). The law of Moses did not contemplate any raising of loans for the purpose of obtaining capital, a condition perhaps alluded to in the arables of the "pearl" and "hidden treasure" (<40144>Matthew 13:44, 45; Michaelis, *Comm. on Laws of Moses*, art. 147, 2:297, edit. Smith). *SEE COMMERCE*. Such persons as bankers and sureties, in the commercial sense (<20226>Proverbs 22:26; <16503>Nehemiah 5:3), were unknown to the earlier ages of the Hebrew commonwealth. The Mosaic laws which relate to the subject of borrowing, lending, and repaying are in substance as follows: If an Israelite became poor, what he desired to borrow was to be freely lent to him, and no interest, either of money or produce, could be exacted from him; interest might be taken of a foreigner, but not of an Israelite by another Israelite (<02220>Exodus 22:20; <05319>Deuteronomy 23:19, 20; <03525>Leviticus 25:35-38). At the end of every seven years a remission of

debts was ordained; every creditor was to remit what he had lent: of a foreigner the loan might be exacted, but not of a brother. If an Israelite wished to borrow, he was not to be refused because the year of remission was at hand (<5501>Deuteronomy 15:1-11). Pledges might be taken, but not as such the mill or the upper millstone, for that would be to take a man's life in pledge. If the pledge was raiment, it was to be given back before sunset, as being needful for a covering at night. The widow's garment could not be taken in pledge (<2226>Exodus 22:26, 27; <5246>Deuteronomy 24:6, 17). The law thus strictly forbade any interest to be taken for a loan to any poor person, either in the shape of money or of produce, and at first, as it seems, even in the case of a foreigner; but this prohibition was afterwards limited to Hebrews only, from whom, of whatever rank. not only was no usury on any pretense to be exacted, but relief to the poor by way of loan was enjoined, and excuses for evading this duty were forbidden (<2225>Exodus 22:25; <3536>Leviticus 25:35, 37 <5503>Deuteronomy 15:3, 7-10; 23:19, 20). The instances of extorio onu metioate conduct mentioned with disapprobation in the book of Job probably represent a state of things previous to the law, and such as the law was intended to remedy (<1806>Job 22:6; 24:3, 7). As commerce increased, the practice of usury, and so also of suretyship, grew up; but the exaction of it from a Hebrew appears to have been regarded to a late period as discreditable (<2001>Proverbs 6:1, 4; 11:15; 17:18; 20:16; 22:26; <1505>Psalm 15:5; 27:13; <2450>Jeremiah 15:10; <2613>Ezekiel 18:13; 22:12). Systematic breach of the law in this respect was corrected by Nehemiah after the return from captivity (<1601>Nehemiah 5:1 3; see Michaelis, *ibid.* arts. 148, 151). In later times the practice of borrowing money appears to have prevailed without limitation of race, and to have been carried on upon systematic principles, though the original spirit of the law was approved by our Lord (<4042>Matthew 5:42; 25:27; <4065>Luke 6:35; 19:23). The money-changers' *(*κερματισταί and κολλυβισταί*)*, who had seats and tables in the Temple, were traders whose profits arose chiefly from the exchange of money with those who came to pay their annual half shekel (Pollux, 3:84; 7:170; Schleusner, *LexL. N.T.* s.v.; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* at <4012>Matthew 21:12). The documents relating to loans of money appear to have been deposited in public offices in Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, 2:17, 6).

In making loans no prohibition is pronounced in the law against taking a pledge of the borrower, but certain limitations are prescribed in favor of the poor.

1. The outer garment, which formed the poor man's principal covering by night as well as by day, if taken in pledge, was to be returned before sunset. A bedstead, however, might be taken (<2226>Exodus 22:26, 27, <5412>Deuteronomy 24:12, 13; comp. <1826>Job 22:6; <2227>Proverbs 22:27; Shaw, *Trav.* page 224; Burckhardt, *Notes on Bed.* 1:47, 231; Niebuhr, *Descr. de 1'Ar.* page 56; Lane, *Mod. Eg.* 1:57, 58; Gesen. *Thessaur.* page 403; Michaelis, *Laws of Moses,* arts. 143 and 150).

2. The prohibition was absolute in the case of (the widow's garment (<5417>Deuteronomy 24:17), and (b) a millstone of either kind (<5406>Deuteronomy 24:6). Michaelis (art. 150, 2:321) supposes also all indispensable animals and utensils of agriculture; see also Mishna, *Maautser Sheri.* 1

3. A creditor was forbidden to enter a house to reclaim a pledge, but was to stand outside till the borrower should come forth to return it (<5410>Deuteronomy 24:10, 11).

4. The original Roman law of debt permitted the debtor to be enslaved by his creditor until the debt was discharged (Livy, 2:23; Appian, *Ital.* page 40); and he might even be put to death by him, though this extremity does not appear to have been ever practiced (Gell. 20:1, 45, 52; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Bonorum Cessio, Nexum). In Athens also the creditor had a claim to the person of the debtor (Plutarch, *Vit. Sol.* 15). The Jewish law, as it did not forbid temporary bondage in the case of debtors, yet forbade a Hebrew debtor to be detained as a bondsman longer than the seventh year, or at furthest the year of jubilee (<2102>Exodus 21:2; <3539>Leviticus 25:39, 42; <5509>Deuteronomy 15:9). If a Hebrew was sold in this way to a foreign sojourner, he might be redeemed at a valuation at any time previous to the jubilee year, and in that year was, under any circumstances, to be released. Foreign sojourners, however, were not entitled to release at that time (<3544>Leviticus 25:44, 46, 47, 54; <1202>2 Kings 4:2; <2301>Isaiah 1:1; 52:3). Land sold on account of debt was redeemable either by the seller himself, or by a kinsman in case of his inability to repurchase. Houses in walled towns, except such as belonged to Levites, if not redeemed within one year after sale, were alienated forever. Michaelis doubts whether all debt was extinguished by the jubilee; but Josephus's account is very precise (*Ant.* 3:12, 3; comp. <3523>Leviticus 25:23, 34; <0804>Ruth 4:4, 10; see Michaelis, § 158, 2:360). In later times the sabbatical or jubilee release was superseded by a law, probably introduced by the

Romans, by which the debtor was liable to be detained in prison until the full discharge of his debt (40:5:26Matthew 5:26). Michaelis thinks this doubtful. The case imagined in the parable of the unmerciful servant belongs rather to despotic Oriental than Jewish manners (40:18:34Matthew 18:34, Michaelis, *ibids.* art. 149; Trench, *Parables*, page 141). Subsequent Jewish opinions on loans and usury may be seen in the Mishna, *Buabal Meziah.* c. 3:10. *SEE JUBILEE*.

These laws relating to loans may wear a strange and somewhat unreasonable aspect to the mere modern reader, and cannot be understood, either in their bearing or their sanctions, unless considered from the Biblical point of view. The land of Canaan (as the entire world) belonged to its Creator, but was given of God to the descendants of Abraham under certain conditions, of which this liberality to the needy was one. The power of getting loans, therefore, was a part of the poor man's inheritance. It was a lien on the land (the source of all property with agricultural people), which was as valid as the tenure of any given portion by the tribe or family to whose lot it had fallen. This is the light in which the Mosaic polity represents the matter, and in this light, so long as that polity retained its force, would it, as a matter of course, be regarded by the owners of property. Thus the execution of this particular law was secured by the entire force with which the constitution itself was recommended and sustained. But as human selfishness might in time endanger this particular set of laws, so Moses applied special support to the possibly weak part. Hence the emphasis with which he enjoins the duty of lending to the needy. Of this emphasis the real essence is the sanction supplied by that special providence which lay at the very basis of the Mosaic commonwealth, so that lending to the destitute came to be enforced with all the power derivable from the express will of God. Nor are there wanting arguments sufficient to vindicate these enactments in the light of sound political economy, at least in the case of the Jewish people. Had the Hebrews enjoyed a free intercourse with other nations, the permission to take usury of foreigners might have had the effect of impoverishing Palestine by affording a strong inducement for employing capital abroad; but, under the actual restrictions of the Mosaic law, this evil was impossible. Some not inconsiderable advantages must have ensued from the observance of these laws. The entire alienation and loss of the lent property were prevented by that peculiar institution which restored to every man his property at the great year of release. In the interval between the jubilees the system under

consideration would tend to prevent those inequalities of social condition which always arise rapidly, and which have not seldom brought disaster and ruin on states. He affluently were required to part with a portion of their affluence to supply the wants of the needy, without exacting that recompense which would only make the rich more wealthy and the poor more needy, thus superinducing a state of things scarcely more injurious to the one than to the other of these two parties. There was also in this system a strongly conservative influence. Agriculture was the foundation of the constitution. Had money-lending been a trade, money-making would also have been eagerly pursued. Capital would be withdrawn from the land; the agriculturist would pass into the usurer; huge inequalities would arise, commerce would assume predominance, and the entire commonwealth be overturned — changes and evils which were prevented, or, if not so, certainly retarded and abated by the code of laws regarding loans. As it was, the gradually increasing wealth of the country was in the main laid out on the soil, so as to augment its productiveness and distribute its bounties. The same regulations, moreover, prevented those undue expansions of credit and those sudden fluctuations in the relative value of money and staple comnmodities which have so often brought on financial collapses and prostration in modern communities. While, however, the benign tendency of the laws in question is admitted, and special objects may be adduced as attainable by them, may it not be questioned whether they were strictly just? Such a doubt could arise only in a mind which viewed the subject from the position of our actual society. A modern might plead that he had a right to do what he pleased with his own; that his property of every kind —land, food, money — was his own; and that he was justified to turn all and each part to account for his own benefit. Apart from religious considerations, this position is impregnable. But such a view of property finds no support in the Mosaic institutions. In them property has a divine origin and its use is entrusted to man on certain conditions, which conditions are as valid as is the tenure of property itself. In one sense, indeed, the entire land — all property — was a great loan, a loan lent of God to the people of Israel, who might well, therefore, acquiesce in any arrangement which required a portion — a small portion — of this loan to be under certain circumstances accessible to the destitute. This view receives confirmation from the fact that interest might be taken of persons who were not Hebrews, and therefore lay beyond the sphere embraced by this special arrangement. It would open too wide a field did we proceed to consider how far the Mosaic system might be applicable in the world at

large; but this is very clear to our mind, that the theory of property on which it rests — that is, making property to be divine in its origin, and therefore tenable only on the fulfillment of such conditions as the great laws of religion and morality enforce — is more true and more philosophical (except in a college of atheists) than the narrow and baneful ideas which ordinarily prevail.

These views may prepare the reader for considering the doctrine of "the Great Teacher" on the subject of loans. It is found forcibly expressed in Luke's Gospel (<4134>Luke 6:34,35): "If ye lend to them of when ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again; but love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest; for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil." The meaning of the passage is distinct and full, unmistakable, and not to be evaded. He commands men to lend, not as Jews to Jews, but even to enemies, without asking or receiving any return, after the manner of the Great Benefactor of the universe, who sends down his rains and bids his sun to shine on the fields of the unjust as well as of the just. To attempt to view this command in the light of reason and experience would require space which cannot here be given; but we must add, that any attempt to explain the injunction away is most unworthy on the part of professed disciples of Christ; and that, not impossibly at least, fidelity to the behests of him whom we call Lord and Master would of itself answer all doubts and remove all misgivings by practically showing that this, as every other doctrine that fell from his lips, is indeed of God (<4817>John 7:17). Yet, while we must maintain the paramount obligation of our Savior's precept, corroborative — and, indeed, expansive — as it is, of the essential principle of the Mosaic economy, namely, the inculcation of universal brotherly love, nevertheless common sense, no less than sound morality, dictates at least the following coordinate considerations, which should likewise be taken into the account in the exercise of Christian liberality, in loans as well as in gifts:

1. Due inquiry should be instituted, so as to satisfy the lender of the moral worthiness of the creditor, lest the loan, instead of being a benefaction, should really be but a stimulus to vice, or, at least, an encouragement to idleness.

2. The wants of one's own family and nearer dependents must not be sacrificed by ill-judged and untimely generosity.

3. Funds held in trust should be carefully discriminated from one's own personal property, and a greater degree of caution exercised in their administration.

4. We have no right to loan what is already due for our own debts — "We must be just before we are generous."

5. In fine, the great fact that we are but stewards of God's bounty should be the ruling thought in all our benefactions, whether in the form of loans or gifts, and we should therefore dispense funds so as to contribute most to the divine glory and the highest good of the recipients. This principle alone is the true corrective of all selfishness, whether parsimony on the one hand, or prodigality on the other. *SEE BORROW*; *SEE LIED*, etc.

Loaysa, Gracia De

an eloquent Dominican preacher and Spanish cardinal, was born in 1479 at Talavera, Castile; entered the Dominican Order at St. Paul de Pennefiel in 1495, and was made successively professor of philosophy, next of theology, director of studies, rector at St. Gregory, prior of the convent of Avila and of Vallad(olid. provincial of Spain (1518), and finally general of his order. In 1532 he was chosen confessor to Charles V, of whom he had previously been a teacher. In the following year Charles V made him bishop of Osma. He admitted him into his private council, and very soon made him president of the Royal Council of the Indies, and president of the Crusade. Loavsa strongly opposed the release, without ransom or condition, of Francis I, king of France, made prisoner by Charles at Pavia. Succeeding events proved his counsel good. In 1530 Charles V obtained a cardinalship for him from pope Clement VII, and also the title St, Suzanne. In the same year he named him bishop of Siguenza, and also archbishop of Seville. Loaysa finally became grand inquisitor of Spain. He was frequently ambassador for Charles V, and kept up a private correspondence with him, some of the letters of which (from 1530 to 1532), embracing Charles's stay in Germany, the most important period in the history of the Reformation, are published by G. Heine from the archives of Simancas. These letters prove Loaysa very bitter against the "heretics." Loaysa (died April 21, 1546, at Madrid. See Antonio, *Biblioth. Hispana Nova*, 3:514; Richard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 2:39; Le P. Touron, *Hommes illustres*

de l'Ordre de Saint-Dominique, 4:93; *Table du Journ. des Savans*, volume 6; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, volume 31, s.v.; Vehse, *Memoirs of the Court of Austria*, 1:158 sq.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Lobbes

a celebrated convent in Hennegau, near Liege, in Belgium, founded by St. Laudelin, is noted particularly because it educated, and at one time had as its abbot, the celebrated monk Heriger, who flourished towards the close of the 10th century. His whole history is so thoroughly entangled in mythical narratives that it is well-nigh impossible to tell when Heriger first came to Lobbes. Vogel, in Herzog *(Real-Encyklopadie*, 5:753), thinks it probable that Heriger entered Lobbes in 960, and that he could not, because of the low condition of the inmates of that monastery previous to this date, have been educated there. Heriger wrote *Vita St. Ursmari:* — *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium et Leodiensium* (about A.D. 979): — *Vita St. Laudoaldi* (about 980), etc. He died October 31,1007.

Löber, Gottiilf Friedemann

a German theologian, was born at Bonneburg, in the duchy of Sachsen-Altenburg, October 22, 1722. In 1738 he entered the University of Jena, where, in 1741, he lectured on linguistics of the Old and New Testament and later on philosophy. Notwithstanding his splendid prospects in this sphere, he gave up academical life in 1743, and removed to Altenburg as assistant court preacher (his aged father was then chief court preacher). In 1745 he became assessor of the Consistory; in 1747, archdeacon: in 1751, preacher of a foundation and councillor of the Consistory; in 1768, superintendent general; in 1792, privy councillor of the Consistory; in the following year he celebrated his jubilee of fifty years of office. He died August 22, 1799. By reason of his extensive learning, profound linguistic attainments, accurate knowledge of all the branches of theology, and great piety, he is considered one of the greatest Lutheran theologians of the 18th century. Of his productions, we mention *Observationes ad historiam vitae et mortis Jesu Christi in ipsa cetatis fore obitae spectantes* (Altenburg, 1767, 8vo). — Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s.v.

Lobethan, Johann Konrad

a German theologian, was born at Hebel, near Homburg, September 29, 1688. In 1705 he entered the University of Marburg; later, he spent three

years in Cassel, and in 1711 went to Bremen to continue his studies. In 1714 he accepted a call to Weimar as court preacher of the duchess dowager Charlotte Dorothea Sophie; in 1720, to Chthen, as chief minister and superintendent, with the dignity of a councilor of the Consistory. Subsequently he was, for several years, the first minister and councilor of the Consistory of the German Reformed Church at Magdeburg. The latter portion of his life he spent at Cothen, where he died November 29, 1735. Lobethan was noted as an eminent preacher; the earnest and warm mode of his delivery always captivated the attention of his audience. Of his productions, mostly of an ascetical character, we mention *Dissert. de magisterio gratiae sub Novo Testam.* (Bremae, 1711, 4to). — Doring, *Gelehrte Th. Deutschl.* s.v.

Lobo, Jeronimo

a noted Portuguese missionary of the Order of the Jesuits, was born at Lisbon in 1593. He was at first a professor in the Jesuits' College at Coimbra, whence he was ordered to the missions in India, and removed to Goa in 1622. In 1623 he volunteered for the mission to Abyssinia to Christianize that country, whose sovereign, by Lobo called sultan Segued, had turned Roman Catholic through the instrumentality of father Paez. who in 1603 had gone to Abyssinia (q.v.). Lobo sailed from Goa in 1624, and landed at Pate, on the coast of Mombaza, thinking to reach Abyssinia by land. He proceeded some distance from Pate to the northward among the Gallas, of whom he gives an account, but, finding it impracticable to penetrate into Abyssinia by that way, he retraced his steps to the coast, and embarked for India. In 1625 he started out again, this time in company with Mendez, the newly-appointed patriarch of Ethiopia, and other missionaries. After sailing up the Red Sea they landed at Belur, or Belal Bay (13° 14' N. lat.), on the Dancali coast, whose sheik was tributary to Abyssinia, and thence, crossing the salt plain, Lobo entered Tigre by a mountain pass, and arrived at Fremona, near Duan, where the missionary settlement was. Here he spent several years as superintendent of the missions in that kingdom. A revolt of the viceroy of Tigre, Tecla Georgis, put Lobo in great danger, for the rebels were joined by the Abyssinian priests, who hated the Roman Catholic missionaries, and indeed represented the protection given to them by the emperor Segued as the greatest cause of complaint against him. The viceroy, however, was defeated, arrested, and hanged; and Lobo, having repaired to the emperor's court, was afterwards sent by his superiors to the kingdom of Damot.

From Damot, Lobo, after some time, returned again to Tigre, where the persecution raised by the son and successor of Segued overtook him. All the Portuguese, to the number of 400, with the patriarch, a bishop, and eighteen Jesuits, were compelled to leave the country in 1634. Lobo now sailed for Europe, but on his way was shipwrecked on the coast of Natal, and some time elapsed before he arrived in Portugal, where he sought to enlist the government in behalf of his scheme, the reclamation of Abyssinia to the Romish Church. Neither here nor at the court of Rome did his plan find favor, and he left in 1640 for India, and became provincial of the Jesuits in Goa. In 1656 he returned to Lisbon, and published the narrative of his journey to Abyssinia, entitled *History of Ethiopias* (1659), which was afterwards translated into French by the abbe Legrand, who added a continuation of the history of the Roman Catholic missions in Abyssinia after Lobo's departure, and also an account of the expedition of Poncet, a French surgeon, who reached that country from Egypt, and a subsequent attempt made by Du Roule, who bore a sort of diplomatic character from the French court, but was murdered on his way, at Sennaar, in 1705. This is followed by several dissertations on the history, religion, government, etc., of Abyssinia. The whole was translated into English by Dr. Johnson in 1735. Lobo died at Lisbon in 1678.

Lobstein, Johan Michael

a German theologian, was born at Lampertheim, near Strasburg, May 1740. In 1755 he entered the university of his native place, went to Paris in 1767, and at the expiration of nearly two years returned to Strasburg, and became pastor of the French Nicolai Church. In addition to this he became, after a few years, preacher of the German Peter's Church, and assistant at the Gymnasium. In 1764 he obtained a position as assistant of the philosophical faculty of the university of the same place. In 1775 he accepted a call to the University of Giessen as prof. ord. of divinity and assessor of the Consistory; in 1777 he received the degree of doctor of divinity, and was appointed inspector and first preacher at Butzbach. In 1790 he again returned to Strasburg as professor and preacher, and there died, June 29, 1794. Lobstein's above-mentioned stay in Paris not only offered him the opportunity of hearing some of the best Orientalists of the day (a fact which chiefly contributed to his extensive and accurate knowledge of the Oriental languages), but also made him acquainted with many great men of that city. Of his scholarly productions was only mention *Diss. de divina animi pace, sanctae comite* (Argentorati. 1766, 4to): —

Conmmentatio historico-philologica de montibus Ebal et Garizim (ibid. 1770, 4to): — *Observationes criticae in loca Pentateuchi illustria* (Gissae et Francof. 1787, 8vo). He published also the Samaritan Codex, after the MSS. of the Royal Library at Paris. — Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutsch.* s.v.

Lobwasser, Ambrosius

a German Protestant poet, was born at Schneeburg, in Saxoney, April 4, 1515. He studied law, and became chancellor of Misnia, which position he resigned in 1563, to assume the duties of a professorship at the University of Konigsberg. He died November 25, 1585. Lobwasser exerted great influence over the religious concerns of the duchy of Prussia, which, being at first exclusively Lutheran, finally came to be about equally divided among Lutherans and Calvinists. His reputation chiefly rests, however, on his German version of the Psalms (based upon the French translation of Clement Marot and Theodore Beza), publishsed under the title *Die Psalmen Davids nach franz. Melodey in deutsche Reymen gebracht* (Lpz. 1573, 8vo; Heidelb. 1574; Lpz. 1579; Strasb. 1597, Amsterd. 1704). The translation was so symmetrical that the music made for the French by Claude Gondimel was exactly adapted to the German. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that it is entirely devoid of poetical merit, as might naturally be expected, for a translation from a translation can seldom have any of the original spirit, These Psalms were nevertheless used in the German Reformedi churches until the middle of the 18th century, on account of the people's aversion against singing any but sacred productions. Lobwasser wrote also *Summarien aller Kapitel d. heiligen Schrift, in deutschen Reimen* (Lpz. 1584, 8vo). See Jocher, *Gelehrien Lexikon;* Koch, *Gesch. d. Kirche;* Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 10:447; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* ◁0342▷*Genesis* 31:428. (J.N.P.)

Local Preachers

The term "local," as applied to preachers in Methodist churches, is used in contradistinction to the term "itinerant" or "traveling," which designates members of Annual Conferences. Local preachers are *lay* preachers. They are not subject to appointment by bishops or stationing committees, as are itinerant ministers. Nevertheless, they are formally licensed, and subject to the direction and friendly requisitions of the pastoral authority in the charge in which they reside. By special arrangement, and by authority of the

presiding elder, a local preacher is sometimes appointed preacher in charge or pastor for a longer or shorter period.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church the following is the process of the appointment of any person as a local preacher.

1. He must be recommended by the leaders' meeting of the Church to which he belongs. He must be elected by a Quarterly Conference before which he has been examined on the subject of doctrines and discipline.

2. An election by the Quarterly Conference at this stage appoints a candidate to the office of a local preacher. In proof of his appointment, he is furnished with a license signed by the president of the Conference. The license is given for one year only, and, in order to validity, must be renewed every year thereafter.

3. Subject to the following prerequisites, a local preacher may be ordained:

(1.) He must have held a local preacher's license for four consecutive years before his ordination.

(2.) He must have been examined in the Quarterly Conference on the subject of doctrines and discipline.

(3.) He must have received a "testimonial" from the Quarterly Conference, signed by the president and countersigned by the secretary. This testimonial must recommend the applicant as a suitable person to receive ministerial orders.

(4.) He must pass an examination as to character and acquirements before the Annual Conference, and obtain its approbation and election to orders.

Local preachers are amenable to the Quarterly Conferences of which they are members. An ordained local preacher is not required to have his credentials renewed annually, although his character must be approved each year by the Quarterly Conference. No person is eligible to admission on trial in an Annual Conference who is not a local preacher, and specially recommended by the Quarterly Conference as a suitable candidate for the "traveling connection." Thus the local or lay preacher's office is made preparatory to the itinerant or fully-constituted ministry. Local preachers are subject to all the moral and religious obligations of the regular ministry. Although expected to devise and execute plans for doing good to the

extent of their individual ability, they are nevertheless required to act under the direction of their pastors or presiding elders, who are on their part required by the Discipline of the Church to give local preachers regular and systematic employment on the Sabbath.

On large circuits, and on stations embracing missionary work, and where the number of local preachers is considerable, it is customary to arrange and print a *Plan* covering all the appointments of a quarter, and designating the time and place of each individual's services. In the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Great Britain the insertion of a local preacher's name on the current plan of the charge is deemed a sufficient license and public authentication for his office. In his measures for training and employing lay workers in the Congregational Church, Reverend T. Dewitt Talmage, of Brooklyn, has adopted the system of mapping out the work of his lay preachers in a printed plan, after the manner above alluded to.

According to official statistics. the number of local preachers in the Methodist Episcopal Church at the close of 1889 was 13,558, a number less by but 1537 than that of the itinerant ministers of the same Church. The number of local preachers in the eight other Methodist bodies of the United States is supposed to be about 10,000. In all but a few exceptional cases, the individuals forming this great body of evangelical workers render their services to churches and people without fee or reward. Many of them faithfully and zealously obey the commands of the great Teacher: "Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind;" also, "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled." While preaching laboriously on the Sabbath, they support themselves by diligence in business during the week.

Within a few years past a spirited effort has been made among the local preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church for mutual improvement, and the general increase of the intellectual and spiritual power of the body. A National Local Preachers' Association has been formed, which has held public sessions in various parts of the United States. "At these annual gatherings representatives from all parts of the world come together for counsel, and for the comparison of personal experience, and observations, and methods of labor; also to discuss questions bearing upon their work generally." This association also encourages the organization of branch associations in different sections of the country. The National Association

referred to memorialized the General Conference of 1872, requesting the following legislation, viz.:

(1.) To organize in each presiding elder's district a District Conference, to be composed of all the traveling and local preachers in the district, and to be presided over by the presiding elder, and meet semi-annually.

(2.) To give this District Conference authority to receive, license, try, and expel local preachers, and also to recommend suitable persons to the Annual Conference to be received into the traveling connection, and for ordination as local deacons and elders.

(3.) To authorize the District Conference to assign each local preacher to a field of labor for the quarter, and to hold him strictly responsible for an efficient performance of his work.

This scheme of District Conferences being analogous to that long practiced by the Wesleyans of Great Britain,was, with sundry additions and modifications, adopted, but, nevertheless, made subject to the option of a majority of the Quarterly Conferences in any given district. The local preacher's office may be considered a feature of Methodist churches, in all their branches and in all parts of the world. By means of it lay preaching is not only sanctioned, but regulated and made auxiliary to regular Church and missionary movements. In England a monthly magazine is published, entitled *The Local Preacher's Magazine,* to furnish lay preachers material for study, etc., since 1851. See also J.H. Carr, *The Local Ministry, its Character, Vocation, and Position* (Lond. 1851); G. Smith, *Wesleyan Local Preacher's Manual* (Lond. 1861); Mills, *Local or Lay Ministry* (Lond. 1851). (D.P.K.)

Lochman, John George, D.D.

a Lutheran minister, widely and favorably known, was born in Philadelphia December 2, 1773. After the proper preparation, he entered the University of Pennsylvania, at which he was graduated in 1789, and from which institution he subsequently received the doctorate. He studied theology under the direction of Dr. Helmuth, and was licensed to preach the Gospel in 1794. Soon after, he accepted a call to Lebanon, Penn., where he remained twenty-one years, laboring with great fidelity and the most satisfactory results. In 1815 he was elected pastor of the Lutheran Church at Harrisburg, Penn. His successful labors here were terminated by death

July 10, 1826. Dr. Lochman was an able and popular preacher. He was held in high estimation by the Church, and exercised an unbounded influence. See Sprague, *Annals Am. Pulpit,* 9:110 sq. (M.L.S.)

Loci Communes Theologici

is the name given to expositions of evangelical dogmatics in the early times of the Reformation. It originated with Melancthon, and was retained by many as late as the 17th century. Melancthon was led to adopt it in consequence of its classical signification, the word *loci* being then used to denote the fundamental principles of any system or science, and he considered it desirable that the *loci* of theology should also be regularly established and defined: "Equibus rerum summa pendeat, ut quorsum dirigenda sint studia intelligatur" *(Loci communes s. hypotyposes theologiae,* 1521); "Prodest in doctrina Christ ordine colligere praecipuos locos ut intelligi possit; quid in summa profiteatur doctrina Christiana, quid ad eam portineat, quid non pertineat" *(Loci communes,* 1533, init.). But, as the very first principle of the Reformation was the Bible as a source of saving truth, it is evident the *Loci communes theologici* could be nothing else than the Scriptures themselves. In the first edition of his *Loci* Melancthon confined himself almost exclusively to the Epistle to the Romans, in the exposition of which he collected the *Communissimi rerum theologicarum loci;* in his second work (1533) he extended his field, following the historical order, and this plan has been generally adopted since. The most striking progress accomplished by this method, compared with the former scholastic treatment of dogmatics, is, as Melancthon himself pointed out, a return to the Bible on all points, instead of to the sentences of Peter Lombard, "Qui ita recitat dogmata ut nec muniat lectorem Scripturae testimoniis nec de summit Scripturae disputet." As the Reformation restored the Bible to the people, it was natural that the *Loci theol.* also should be less scientific and learned works than such as could help the people to a clearer understanding of the Scriptures. Hence they were published in German by Spalatin (1521). afterwards by J. Jonas (1536), and finally by Melancthon himself (1542), and designated by them as the chief articles and principal point of Scripture *(Hauptartikel u. fürnehmste Punkte d. ganzen heil. Schrift),* or of Christian doctrine *(Hauptartikel christlicher Lehre).* Melancthon, however, in the third part of his *Loci* (1543-59), gradually withdrew from this position, and adopted a manner of treating the subject more akin to scholasticism. This was subsequently the case with the *Loci theologici* of Abdias Praetorius

(Schulze) (Wittemberg, 1569) and Strigel (ed. Pezel, Neust. 1581), who held the same views, as well as with those of Martin Chemnitz (ed. P. Lyser, Francf. a. M. 1591) and Hafenreffer (Tüb. 1600), who differed from him; also of Leonard Hutter (Wittemb. 1619), who went on an entirely different principle, which John Gerhard tried to soften down in his renowned *Loci theol.* (Jena, 1610), while A. Calov, in his *Systema locor. theol.* (Wittemb. 1655), carried it to its full extreme. After this time the expression *Loci theologici* ceased to be used in Lutheran dogmatics. In the Reformed Church it was used by Hyperius (Basle, 1566), W. Musculus (Berne, 1561), Peter Martyr (Basle, 1580), J. Maccov (Franeker, 1639), and D. Chamier (Geneva, 1653). See Gass, *Gesch. d. prot. Dogmatik* (1854, volume 1); Heppe, *Dogmatik des deutsch. Protestantismus,* etc. (1857, volume 1); C. Schwarz, *Studien u. Kritiken* (1855, 1, and 1857, 2). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* 8:449. (J.N.P.)

Lock

Picture for Lock

(לָנָא; *naal',* to *bar* up a door, <07023>Judges 3:23, 24; rendered "bolt," <10137>2 Samuel 13:17, 18, "inclose," "shut up," in <22412>Song of Solomon 4:12; hence מְנוּעִל; *manul',* the *bolt* or fastening of a door, <16303>Nehemiah 3:3, 6, 13, 14, 15, <22505>Song of Solomon 5:5). The doors of the ancient Hebrews were secured by bars of wood or iron, though the latter were almost entirely appropriated to the entrance of fortresses, prisons, and towns (comp. <23702>Isaiah 45:2). Thus we find it mentioned in <11043>1 Kings 4:13 as something remarkable concerning Bashan that "there were threescore great cities, having walls and brazen bars." These were almost the only locks known in early times, and they were furnished with a large and clumsy key, which was applied to the bar through an orifice on the outside, by means of which the bolt or bar was slipped forward as in modern locks (<07024>Judges 3:24). There were smaller contrivances for inner doors, and probably projecting pieces by which to shove the bolt with the hand (<22505>Song of Solomon 5:5). *SEE KEY*. Lane thus describes a modern Egyptian lock: "Every door is furnished with a wooden lock, called *dabbeh,* the mechanism of which is shown by a sketch here inserted. No. 1 is a front view of the lock, with the bolt drawn back, Nos. 2, 3, and 4 are back views of the separate parts and the key. A number of small iron pins (four, five, or more) drop into corresponding holes in the sliding bolt as soon as the latter is pushed into the hole or staple of the door-post. The key also has

small pins, made to correspond with the holes, into which they are introduced to open the lock, the former pins being thus pushed up, the bolt may be drawn back. The wooden lock of a street door commonly has a sliding bolt about fourteen inches long; those of the doors of apartments, cupboards, etc., are about seven, eight, or nine inches. The locks of the gates of quarters, public buildings, etc., are of the same kind, and mostly two feet in length, or more. It is not difficult to pick this kind of lock" *(Mod. Egyptians,* 1:25). Hence they were sometimes, as an additional security, covered with clay (q.v.), and on this a seal (q.v.) impressed (comp. <1814>Job 28:14). (See Rauwollff, *Trav.* in Ray, 2:17; Russell, *Aleppo,* 1:22; Volney, *Trav.* 2:438; Chardin, *Voy.* 4:123; Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.*, abridgment, 1:15, 16.) *SEE DOOR.*

The other terms rendered "lock" in the Auth. Vers. refer to the hair of the head, etc.; they are the following: tjlpm; *machlaphoth', braids* or plaits, e.g. of the long hair of Samson (<0716>Judges 16:13, 19); tyxyx; *tsitsith',* the *forelock* of the head (<2803>Ezekiel 8:3; also a "fringe" or *tassel,* <0458>Numbers 15:38, 39; comp. <4023>Matthew 23:5); rP, *pe'rla,* the *locks* of hair, as being shorn (<0605>Numbers 6:5; <2640>Ezekiel 44:20; and tXwq; *kevutstsoth', the forelocks* or *sidelocks* of a man's or woman's hair (<2212>Song of Solomon 5:2, 12; comp. Schultens, *Op. min.* page 246); but hMx; *tsammah',* is a *veil* or female covering for the head and face, usual in the East (<2404>Song of Solomon 4:1, 3; 6:7; <2302>Isaiah 47:2). *SEE HAIR.*

Locke, George

a Methodist preacher, was born in Cannonstown, Pennsylvania, June 8, 1797, and reared in Kentucky. His early educational advantages were few, but he improved all opportunities to secure knowledge. His parents were Presbyterians, but George was made a Methodist through the preaching of Edward Talbot when a saddler's apprentice. In 1817 he was licensed to exhort, and soon began to preach. In 1819 he entered Tennessee Conference, and was successively appointed to Little River Circuit, to Powell's Valley, and to Bowling Green Circuit, Kentucky. In 1822 he located in Shelbyville, and engaged in secular business. His conscience forced him to re-enter the ministry, and he successively preached on Jefferson Circuit and Hartford Circuit (Kentucky Conference). In 1826 he was transferred to Corydon Circuit, Illinois Conference. In 1828 he labored on Charleston Circuit, and was the means of one of the greatest revivals

that Southern Indiana ever witnessed. The same year he was appointed presiding elder of Wabash District, which embraced an area of territory in Indiana and Illinois of at least 100 miles from east to west, by 200 miles from north to south, on either side of the Wabash River. While on this district he contracted the consumption, and was obliged to become supernumerary. He died in New Albany, Indiana, in July, 1834. See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit,* 7:608.

Locke, John

the most notable of modern English philosophers, who has exercised the greatest influence on all subsequent speculation, in both psychology and politics, and whose doctrines, under various modifications or exaggerations, still contribute largely to mold the opinions of the civilized world. He has in great measure determined the complexion of British psychology. As the most strenuous antagonist of Cartesianism; as the precursor and teacher alike of the French encyclopedists and of the Scotch school; as the oracle of the freethinkers, the target of Leibnitz, and the stimulator of Hartley, Berkeley, and Hume, Locke must always attract the earnest consideration of the student of metaphysics. For nearly two centuries his name has been a battlecry, and his dogmas have been fought over by the shadowy hosts of warring *ideologues* with the zeal and the fury with which the Greeks and the Trojans contended over the body of Patroclus. His labors in the department of mental philosophy constitute only a part of his claims to enduring regard. His inquiries have been scarcely less fruitful in political philosophy and political economy. In the former he is the *avant-courier* of Rousseau; in the latter science, of Adam Smith; and in each he has laid the foundations on which later theorists and later statesmen have been content to build.

Life. — John Locke was born August 29, 1632, at Wrington, Somersetshire, and was educated first at Westminster School, and later at Christ Church College, Oxford. Here he prosecuted the prescribed studies with diligence and success, but deviated from the beaten path by devoting himself to the discountenanced writings of Des Cartes, who had died a few years before. He obtained the baccalaureate in 1655, and the master's degree in 1658, and then applied himself to the study of medicine, rather for the sake of knowledge and of his sickly frame than with the purpose of practicing his profession.

In 1664 Locke accompanied the embassy to the elector of Brandenburg as secretary of legation, but he returned to Oxford within the year, and applied himself to experimental philosophy, then rising into favor. An accident now decided his course of life, and occasioned his acquaintance with lord Ashley — the celebrated earl of Shaftesbury — with whom he was persuaded to take up his abode the next year. By his skill and good luck he relieved his patron of an abcess which endangered his life, and was induced to confine his medical practice to a small circle of the lord's friends, and to give his chief attention to political speculation and questions of state. He thus became a man of the world before he became a philosopher. In 1668 Locke accompanied the earl and countess of Northumberland to France. The earl proceeded towards Rome, and died on the way. Locke returned with the countess to England, and again found a home with Ashley-chancellor of the exchequer after Clarendon's fall. The future sage was employed to superintend the education of Ashley's heir, a feeble boy of sixteen. He was afterwards commissioned to select a wife for him, and did so satisfactorily. In due course of time he took charge of the education of the eldest son of this marriage, the author of "the Characteristics." "To such strange uses may we come at last!"

Though residing with lord Ashley, Locke retained his connection with Oxford, which he frequently visited. On one of these visits, in 1670, the conversation of Dr. Thomas and other friends turned his thoughts to the difficult, still unsettled, and perhaps insoluble question of the nature and limits of human knowledge. This supplied the germ of the *Essay on the Human Understanding*, though nearly twenty years elapsed before the completion and publication of the work. In 1672, Ashley, the master-spirit in Charles II's "Cabal," was created earl of Shaftesbury, and soon after he was made lord high chancellor. Locke was appointed secretary of Plantations. Next summer Shaftesbury surrendered the great seal, and became president of the Board of Trade and Plantations. Locke was named secretary of the board. It was at this time that he produced for his noble friend and the other proprietors the Constitution of the Carolinas. In another year the Commission of Trade was dissolved, Locke lost his post, and he dreamt of making a livelihood by his profession. But his health was feeble, and he traveled in France, acquiring at Montpellier the intimacy of the earl of Pembroke, to whom he afterwards dedicated his "*Essay."*

On Shaftesbury's restoration to office as lord president of the council, 1679, he sent for Locke, but the minister was dismissed in October of the

same year. In two years more he was brought to trial for treason, but the grand jury ignored the indictment. Shaftesbury, however, was compelled to escape secretly to Holland, where he died, June 21, 1683. Locke had followed him, and wrote an affectionate tribute to his memory.

The hostile testimony of bishop Fell proves that Locke had held himself aloof from the intrigues in which Shaftesbury was involved. He did not avoid the malice which such an intimacy invited. He was deprived of his studentship at Christ Church, and vainly attempted to regain it at the Revolution. On the accession of James II his surrender was demanded from the states' general on the charge of complicity in Monmouth's insurrection. He was concealed by his Dutch friends. William Penn offered to procure his pardon, but the office was nobly declined. During this exile Locke composed his first *Letter on Toleration,* and produced his plan of "A Commonplace Book" — if it be his — a cumbrous and inadequate device, which admits of easy improvement. During this period towards the close of 1687 — he finished the *Essay concerning the Human Understanding.* The mode of its composition has left painful traces on the completed work, as was apprehended and acknowledged by its author.

The Revolution of 1688 restored Locke to his native land. He signalized his return by the publication of his great philosophical work. An attempt was made to prohibit its introduction into the University of Oxford. In 1690 he issued his two treatises *On Government.* They controverted the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and referred the origin of government to a social compact, which is equally disproved by theory and by history. They rendered a greater service by recognizing labor as the foundation of property, though the tenet was pressed too far.

Locke continued to decline diplomatic honors, but accepted the place of Commissioner of Appeals, with the modest salary of £200. He directed his regards in these years to the coinage of the realm, which was much debased; and published in 1691 his *Considerations on the Lowering of Interest and Raising the Value of Money,* which was followed in 1695 by *Further Considerations one Raising the Value of Money.* He was in frequent consultation with the earl of Pembroke on the subject of that restoration of the British coinage which was brought about by the concurrent action of lord Somers and Sir Isaac Newton.

In 1693 Locke withdrew from the dull, heavy atmosphere of London, and accepted a pleasant retreat for his increasing asthma and advancing age at

Oates. in Essex, the seat of Sir Francis Masham, who had married the accomplished daughter of Dr. Cudworth. It had been the fortune of Locke through life to live *"quadris alienis."* His last quarters were at Oates. This was his home till he found a quieter home in the grave, where he waited in *cold abstraction's apathy* for a miracle to reanimate his spirit, according to the dogma of *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (produced in 1695). This work sought the union of all Christian believers by advancing the doctrine that the only necessary article of Christian belief is comprised in *the acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah,* making all the requirements beyond this to consist *of practical duties,* of repentance for sin, and obedience to the moral precepts of the Gospel. It will be remembered that king William III, of England, entertained the design of uniting Conformists and Dissenters on some common ground, and to further this scheme Locke wrote *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (comp. *Quarterly Review*, Lond. 1864, July). About the time of his retirement from the city Locke published his third *Letter on Toleration,* and in the first year of his seclusion wrote his little tract on the *Education of Children.* The same year which brought out his exceedingly heterodox essay on Christianity was marked by his philosophical controversy with Dr. Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester.

Locke's circumstances were now rendered perfectly easy by his appointment as commissioner of Trade and Plantations, with emoluments amounting to £1000 per annum. Locke, however, had an aptitude for losing or dropping the gifts of the fairies. Increasing debility made him resign his comfortable sinecure in 1700, and, four years later, he died calmly at Oates, October 28, 1704. He was buried at the neighboring church of High Laver. Queen Caroline, one of those *femmes precieuses* who, like Christina of Sweden or Euler's princess, followed with her sympathies the studies she could not understand, placed Locke's bust with those of Bacon, Newton, and Clarke, in the mausoleum erected by her at Richmond Park to commemorate the glories of English philosophy.

Locke's health was always exceedingly feeble, and his existence was prolonged only by constant vigilance and care. This doubtless contributed to his abstinence from any energetic vocation, and probably influenced his theories as well as his character and conduct. It rendered his existence a career of tranquil and learned leisure, except so far as it was interrupted by the suspicions and malice which civil discord directs against every man of note. The self-regarding habits of a valetudinarian may have impelled the

thoughts of the philosopher to that continual introspection and that exaggeration of personal impressions which so strongly mark his philosophy. His love of ease and security showed itself in his general demeanor. He was cautious and retiring, affable and genial in his intercourse, kindly and affectionate in his nature, free from personal animosities, notwithstanding his transitory difference with Newton and his controversy with bishop Stillingfleet. He avoided the incumbrances of matrimony; and the deficient experiences of an old bachelor — the want of that most suggestive knowledge, the dawn of intelligence in infancy — may be noted in his whole psychology. His life was, however, worthy of his eminence, and was such as to make him a suitable compeer of *those fortunate nimium* — those happy philosophic dispositions which are represented by Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Berkeley, and Hume.

Philosophy. — The philosophy of Locke is very simple, if not very coherent, and very unsystematic in its treatment by himself. It consists rather of one prolific principle and its explanations than of any complete and orderly scheme. That principle furnishes a foundation for a distinctive method, which was only imperfectly and inconsistently developed by him. That method is psychological, and Locke has been too hastily regarded as its inventor, whereas he only applied it too exclusively and within too narrow limits. Locke's controversial works are naturally directed to the removal of the numerous objections and misapprehensions to which his fundamental tenet and its applications are obnoxious: but even the Essay itself is mainly employed in the discussion of topics which illustrate the dogma rather than establish a formal body of doctrine, and which belong to the preliminaries or prolegomena of philosophy much more than to philosophy proper.

An examination of the analysis usually prefixed to the "Essay" will show how small a portion of the work really belongs to the regular exposition of a metaphysical system; how much is occupied with the anticipation of objections, or the simplification of apprehended difficulties. The treatise is divided into four books. The first repudiates the Cartesian doctrine of innate ideas, and is therefore controversial and negative. It does not seem to have been very highly regarded by Locke himself. The second is an inquiry into the origin and limits of human knowledge, and is the characteristic portion of Locke's philosophy. The third is given to the consideration of words, and is in many respects the most valuable part of the book, affording useful suggestions for guarding against the

multitudinous seductions of the *Idola Fori.* It is dialectical rather than philosophical, though it affords frequent opportunities of confirming or expounding his cardinal tenet, and many of exhibiting its inadequacy. The fourth book is on the nature of knowledge in general, and does little more than apply the conclusion already reached to the determination of the degree, extent, and quality of human knowledge, which is reduced by him not merely to relativity, but to a beggarly and unsatisfactory relativity.

The circumstances which provoked the composition of Locke's celebrated treatise account in a most instructive manner for the character of his doctrine. His addiction to the writings of Des Cartes in his college days — his rejection of his postulates and conclusions — his fondness for the physical and natural sciences — his utter defect of poetic sensibility — his association with the great and with the *beau monde* — his political and practical proclivities, confined his attention to observed phenomena, cramped and discouraged the criticism of those phenomena, and withdrew his thoughts from what lay beyond, and was required for the intelligent observation and interpretation of the phenomena supposed to be observed. Hence he was led to ignore the spirit of human thought — to exaggerate the importance of the words which served for the counters of metaphysical speculation — to make much of his philosophy turn upon the precision and determinateness of terms, and to consider that a scrupulous recognition of their import in their acceptance and employment constituted the main part of philosophy. Hence, when he undertook "to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understandings were or were not fitted to deal with," the examination scarcely reached to that primary and essential problem of metaphysics, but revolved tediously and with needless prolixity around the limits of the meanings of words. He thus necessarily arrived at an excessive, though far from rigorous nominalism.

Locke's point of departure was that of all the philosophers of the latter part of the 17th and the first quarter of the 18th century — Cartesianism. The influence of the suspected doctrine was manifested at the outset of his labors by his proposition to substitute the phrase *determinate ideas* for *clear and distinct ideas* — though a mere change of name, and such a change, could effect little in producing a complete reform of system. It is a startling commentary on the insufficiency of this substitution that no writer has been more capricious and vacillating in his employment of terms than Locke himself, and that the very term *idea,* which he elaborately defines, is used by him without determinate meaning, and in almost every possible

sense except its true one. He, however, furnished neither the first nor the solitary example of the abuse of this fine Platonic invention. Locke's popularity may be due to the ease, and vigor, the vivacity, and homeliness of his style; but the style is rugged, ambiguous, conversational, and as far removed from philosophical propriety as it is from literary elegance.

The influence of Des Cartes, educing antagonism, tempted Locke to commence his investigations by an assault on the hypothesis of innate ideas, which unquestionably formed the latent substratum of the Cartesian delusions. Certainly the clear and distinct ideas of Des Cartes had no title to be accepted as innate. Locke had thus an easy task in refuting the Cartesian positions. He failed to recognize that the incriminated doctrine was not thereby refuted. The *"tabula rasa"* of Locke was just as much an assumption and as much a fallacy as the innate truths of his opponent — unless by the *tabula rasa* is understood, what Locke would not have understood, the sensitive and sympathetic tablet ready to restore in the sunlight of life all images presented to it. It is perfectly true that distinct conceptions and formulated maxims are not innate, or anterior to all excitation. This admission does not disprove the reality of congenital and constitutional preadaptations of the intellectual faculties for the acceptance of such conceptions and propositions when suitably presented to the mind and apprehended by it. Locke's doctrine on this point has consequently been surrendered, and the doctrine opposed by him has been accepted, under juster limitations, by many who continue to entertain the profoundest reverence for his general procedure. The Cartesian postulate compelled the assertion of a divine influx to explain the operations of the mind, and suggested Malebranche's celebrated thesis of "seeing all things in God." Locke, who had assailed the heresiarch, felt the necessity of controverting the hazardous modification proposed by the fervent acolyte. But the tenet to which Locke was himself driven by the compulsion of his own erroneous principles was equally hazardous and still more fallacious — that our idea of God is obtained by sensation and reflection.

Having got rid of innate ideas — tenues *sine corpore vitae* — the English philosopher proceeded to investigate the origin of human knowledge — the avowed object of his main inquiry. There was an inversion of logical order, as Morell has observed, in seeking the *ratio essendi* of the phenomena before ascertaining the phenomena themselves; but the accidental connection between the first and second pairs of the Essay is very intimate. If knowledge be not deduced *ab infra,* it might naturally

appear to be derived *ab extra.* Hence Locke concluded that all knowledge is obtained from sensation and reflection. This is his principle, and his principle is his philosophy — the curtain is the picture. The distinction between the sensation and its intellectual appreciation was unsuspected by him; nor did he observe that if sensation and reflection upon sensation are the exclusive sources of knowledge, the knowledge of reflection is derivative from and dependent upon sensation, and all knowledge springs from sensation alone. This oversight occasioned his very inadequate explanations of space, time, power, cause, good and evil, and God; it furnished Hume with his cardinal positions in regard to impressions and ideas; it rendered Locke a suitable patron for the French encyclopaedists and the materialists, and created the belief that he espoused the tenet "*Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu."* This tenet was held by neither Aristotle nor Locke, but Locke's development of his own principle often seems to assert and to rest upon that tenet, and both provoked and justified the celebrated response and refutation offered by Leibnitz in the proposed addition to the maxim of the words *"nisi infellectus ipse."* Locke might have accepted that addition, but it was not declared by his language, nor clearly indicated by his teachings; and its frank acceptance would have been fatal to his philosophical expositions; for, if reflection be considered as a source of knowledge distinct from sensation, it must be different from sensation, and must be a contribution of the mind itself to the intellectual product. Locke's original attitude was that of a polemic engaged in the refutation of Des Cartes; this attitude he never altogether abandoned; it determined his habits of speculation, and continually misled him. Locke was still further misled by the looseness, awkwardness, obscurity, and prolixity of his style, by its colloquial negligence of phrase, by that wavering of expression and impalpability of figurative illustration which have been noted by Sir William Hamilton, Maurice, and nearly every other student of his works. The equivocation of the terms employed by him escaped his recognition, while it perplexes his readers, and produced much the same effect upon his reasoning as was produced upon Hume's by a similar agency. With Locke there might be delusion; there was no sophistry; there was an open, manly spirit, a candor and honesty of investigation which often slighted or ignored consistency in the determined apprehension of what was felt instinctively to be right. His book accordingly exercises a most wholesome influence even when the developments of his doctrine are most aberrant, and its perversions most perilous. The practical character of his own disposition, the predilection for

the studies of observation, and the innocence and simplicity of his own nature, guarded him from the effects as well as from the perception of his errors, but at the same time rendered those errors less apparent and more seductive to others. They preserved his own piety, while his system became a *templum impietatis.*

This practical appetency of Locke's mind was so engrossing as to leave him utterly without imagination or poetic sensibility. Poetry he discountenanced from want of taste, but professedly for the more ignoble reason that "no gold was found at the roots of Parnassus." The absence of imagination was a very serious defect. It was not true in his case that *omne ignotum pro mirabili.* On the contrary, the wondrous domain of the unknown and the unapprehended was "undreamt of in his philosophy." These intellectual peculiarities became very manifest in his religious and political treatises sometimes inducing point, perspicuity, and popularity; sometimes generating prosaic assumptions for want of penetrating vision. Thus were probably occasioned the denial of the immortality of the soul in the *Reasonableness of Christianity* — the ascription of all value to labor originally expended in his economical speculations the allegation of a social contract and of a state of nature pure and untenable hypotheses — in his treatises *On Government,* and other less prominent vagaries. These points merit careful consideration, but they can be only noted here. We should not, however, omit to mention that Locke's amiable and tolerant disposition, the associations of his life, the tenor of his philosophy, his love of justice and freedom, rendered efficient service towards the extension of civil, political, and religious liberty at home and abroad, and entitle him to reverential regard as one of the chief benefactors of humanity.

Literature. — The literature illustrative of Locke's philosophy is endless. It includes the greater part of the metaphysical treatises written since the close of the 17th century. It must suffice, therefore, to mention here only the works of most direct importance, and most readily accessible. Of such is the following list composed. Locke, *Works* (London, 1824, 9 volumes, 8vo) ; Locke, *Philosophical Works,* by J.A. St. John (London, 1854, 2 volumes, 12mo); Leibnitz, *Nouveaux Esssais sur l'Entendement Humain;* Joannes Clericus, *Lockii Vita;* "Life of John Locke," in the *Biographica Britannica;* Lord King, *The Life of John Locke,* etc. (Lond. 1830, 2 volumes, 8vo); Forster, *Original Letters of John Locke,* etc. (London, 1847); Browne, "Life of John Locke," in the *Encyclop. Britannica;* Dugald Stewart, *Supplement to the Encyclop. Britannica;* Sir James Mackintosh,

On the philosophical Genius of Bacon and Locke; Henry Rogers, *Miscellanies* (Lond. 1855, 3 vols. 8vo); Ritter, *Gesch. d. Christl. Philos. 7:*449 sq.; V. Cousin, *Hist. de la Philosophie;* Lewes, *Biogrsaph. Hist. of Philosophy* (Lond. 1857, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:237 sq.; Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought,* page 124 sq.; Blakey, *Hist. Philosophy of Mind* (London, 1850, 4 volumes, 8vo); Morell, *Crit. History of Modern Philosophly* (Lond. 1847, 2 volumes, 8vo); *Brit. Quar. Rev.* 1847 (May); *North Brit. Rev.* 1864 (July), page 37 sq.; *Edincb. Rev.* 1864 (April), 1854; *Lond. Quar. Review,* 1864 (July), page 41 sq. (G.F.H.)

Locke, Nathaniel Clark

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born June 1, 1816, at Salem, N.J., graduated from Middlebury College, Vermont, in 1838; from Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1844; was immediately licensed by the New York Presbytery, and soon after entered upon the duties of his first charge at Eastville, Northampton County, Virginia; accepted a call to the Central Church, Brooklyn, in 1847; three years later took charge of the Church at Hempstead, Long Island, N.Y., and there labored until 1860, when failing health compelled him to seek for a dismission. Dr. Locke was a member of the General Assembly of 1860, which met in Rochester, N.Y. A number of his discourses were published, and he was also a large contributor to the religious press. He died July 21, 1862. He was gifted with a well-trained and well-stored mind. and was eminently genial and social as a pastor and friend, and earnest and eloquent as a preacher. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac,* 1863, page 188. (J.L.S.)

Locke, Samuel

D.D., a noted American divine and educator, was born at Woburn, Mass., Nov. 23, 1732, and was educated at Harvard University (class of 1755). He was ordained minister of the Gospel at Sherburne, Massachusetts, November 7, 1759, and remained in the ministry until 1769, when he was called to preside over his alma mater, and was inducted to the office March 21, 1770. Three years later he was honored by the college authorities with the doctorate of divinity, but some troubles must have arisen shortly after, for in December of this self-same year Locke resigned his position at Harvard, and spent the remainder of his life in retirement. He died at Sherburne, Massachusetts, January 15, 1788. An estimate of the man we find in two letters written by Dr. Andrew Eliot, of Boston, to Mr. Hollis,

of London, the distinguished benefactor of the college, about the time of Locke's election to the presidency of Harvard University, in which he is represented as "a clergyman of a small parish about twenty miles from Cambridge; of fine talents — a close thinker, having when at college the character of a first-rate scholar — of an excellent spirit, and generous, catholic sentiments — a friend to liberty — his greatest defect a want of knowledge of the world, having lived in retirement, and perhaps not a general acquaintance with books." The only production of Dr. Locke's that exists in print is the *Convention Sermon* preached in 1772. "His manner in the pulpit is said to have been marked by great dignity and impressiveness." See *The N.Y. Observer,* March 1865.

Locke, William E.

a minister and instructor, first in the Baptist, and later in the Presbyterian Church, was born in New York City, where he received a good education at the high school, in which he subsequently became an assistant teacher. In 1832 he took charge of the Mantua Manual Labor Institute in New York, and in 1833 was licensed to preach in the Baptist Church. He entered the junior class of Hamilton Institute (now Madison University); in 1835 he accepted his first call from the Church in Messina, N.Y., and was ordained August 18, 1836. He remained in the Baptist i connection until 1849, when his views concerning baptism led him to a change of his ecclesiastical relations. He was called in 1850 to the Presbyterian Church at Springfield, N.J., where, because of impaired health, he quit preaching. He subsequently took charge of the Female Collegiate Institute in Lancaster, Pa., and in August 1857, removed to Missouri, and took charge of the Van Rensselaer Presbyterial Academy. At the end of his first quarter in this new position he was taken ill, and died November 15, 1858. Mr. Locke's talents as a teacher were of a high order, and in the various places in which he labored he made many warm friends. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. A1.* 1860, page 73. (J.L.S.)

Lockyer, Nicholas

a Presbyterian divine and pious Nonconformist, was born in 1612. He studied at New Inn Hall, Oxford, and became provost of Eton College in 1658, but was ejected at the Restoration. He died in 1684. His writings show him to have been very zealous and affectionate, earnestly bent on the conversion of souls. Some of his most important works are the following:

Baulme for bleeding England and Ireland, or seasonable Instructions for persecuted Christians, delivered in several sermons [on Colossians 1:11, 12] (London, 1644): — *Christ's Communion with his Church militant* [on John 14:18] (5th ed. London, 1672, 12mo): — *England faithfully watcht with her Wounds, or Christ as a Father sitting up with his Children in their swooning State; which is the summe of several Lectures painfully preached upon Colossians 1* (Lond. 1646, 4to). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* s.v.

Locust

a well-known insect, which commits terrible devastation to vegetation in the countries which it visits. In the East it is especially prevalent, and at times commits such ravages as to produce famine and render the district almost uninhabitable.

I. There are ten Hebrew words which appear to signify *locust* in the Old Testament, while in the Greek the general term is ἀκρίς, which is employed in the New Testament. It has been supplosed that some of these words denote merely the different states through which the locust passes after leaving the egg, viz. the larva, the pupa, and the perfect insect — all which much resemble each other, except that the larva has no wings, and that the pupa possesses only the rudiments of those members, which are fully developed only in the adult locust (Michaelis, *Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr.* 2:667, 1080). But this supposition is manifestly wrong with regard to several of these terms, because, in Leviticus 11:22, the word /nymal;e "after his kind," or species, is added after each of them (compare verses 14, 15,16). It is most probable, therefore, that all the rest are also the names of species. But the problem is to ascertain the particular species intended by them respectively.

(1.) ARBEH' (hB,r;a], occurs in Exodus 10:4; Sept. ἀκρίδα πολλήν, a vast flight of locusts, or perhaps indicating that several species were employed, Vulg. *locustam;* and in verses 12, 13, 14, 19, ἀκρις and *locusta,* Eng. "locusts;" Leviticus 11:22, βροῦχον, *bruchus,* "locust;" Deuteronomy 28:38, ἀκρίς, *locustae,* "locust;" Judges 6:5; 7:12; ἀκρίς, *locustarum,* "grasshoppers;" 1 Kings 8:37, βροῦχος, *locssta,* "locust;" 2 Chronicles 6:28, ἀκρίς, *locusta,* "locusts;" Job 39:20, ἀκρίδες, *locustas,* "grasshopper;" Psalm 78:46, ἀκρίδι, Symm. σκώληκι, *locustae,* "locust;" Psalm 105:34, ἀκρίς, *locusta,* "locusts;"

(19A923)Psalm 109:23, ἀκρίδες, *locustae,* "locust;" (2B027)Proverbs 30:27, ἀκρίς, *locusta,* "locusts;" (24623)Jeremiah 46:23, ἀκρίδα, *locusta,* "grasshoppers;" (29104)Joel 1:4; 2:25, ἀκρίς, *locustar,* "locust;" (34B15)Nahum 3:15, βροῦχος, *bruchus,* "locusts;" verse 17, ἀττέλαβος**,** *locusts,* "locusts"). In almost every passage where *arbeh* occurs, reference is made to its terribly destructive powers.

It is the locust of the Egyptian plagues described in Exodus 10, where, as indeed everywhere else, it occurs in the singular number only, though it is there associated with verbs both in the singular and plural (verses 5, 6), as are the corresponding words in the Sept. and Vulgate. This it might be as a noun of multitude, but it will be rendered probable that four species were employed in the plague on Egypt, of which this is named first (19786)Psalm 78:46, 47; 105:34). These may all have been brought into Egypt from Ethiopia (which has ever been the cradle of all kinds of locusts), by what is called in Exodus " the east wind," since Bochart proves that the word which properly signifies "east" often means "soth" also. The word *arbeh* may be used in (03122)Leviticus 11:22 as the collective name for the locust, and be put first there as denoting also the most numerous species; but in (29104)Joel 1:4, and (19786)Psalm 78:46, it is distinguished from the other names of locusts, and is mentioned second, as if of a different species; just, perhaps, as we use the *word fly,* sometimes as a collective name, and at others for a particular species of insect, as when speaking of the hop, turnip, meat fly, etc. When the Hebrew word is used in reference to a particular species, it has been supposed, for reasons which will be given, to denote the *Gryllus gregarius* or *migratorius.* Moses, therefore, in Exodus, refers Pharaoh to the visitation of the locusts, as well known in Egypt; but the plague would seem to have consisted in bringing them into that country in unexampled numbers, consisting of various species never previously seen there (comp. (02105)Exodus 10:5, 6, 15).

It is one of the flying creeping creatures that were allowed as food by the law of Moses ((03121)Leviticus 11:21). In this passage it is clearly the representative of some species of winged *saltatorial orthoptera,* which must have possessed indications of form sufficient to distinguish the insect from the three other names which belong to the same division of orthoptera, and are mentioned in the same context. The opinion of Michaelis *(Suppl.* 667, 910), that the four words mentioned in (03122)Leviticus 11:22 denote the same insect in four different ages or stages of its growth, is quite untenable, for, whatever particular species are intended by these

words, it is quite clear from verse 21 that they must all be *winged ortholptera.* The Septulagint word βροῦχος there clearly shows that the translator uses it for a winged species of locust, contrary to the Latin fathers (as Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, etc.), who all define the *bruchus* to be the untledged young or larva of the locust, and who call it *attelabus* when its wings are partially developed, and *locusta* when able to fly; although both Sept. and Vulg. ascribe flight to the *bruchus* here, and in <34317>Nahum 3:17. The Greek fathers, on the other hand, uniformly ascribe to the βροῦχος both wings and flight, and therein agree with the descriptions of the ancient Greek naturalists. Thus Theophrastus, the pupil of Aristotle, who, with his preceptor, was probably contemporaneous with the Septuagint translators of the Pentateuch, plainly speaks of it as a distinct species, and not a mere state: "The ἀκρίδες (the best ascertained general Greek word for the locust) are injurious, the ἀττέλαβοι still more so, and those most of all which they call βροῦχοι *(De Aniin).* The Sept. seems to recognize the peculiar destructiveness of the βροῦχος in <110837>1 Kings 8:37 (but has merged it in the parallel passage, 2 Chronicles), and in <34315>Nahum 3:15, by adopting it for *arbeh.* In these passages the Sept. translators may have understood the *G. migratorius* or *greguarius* (Linn.), which is usually considered to be the most destructive species (from βρώσκω, *I devour).* Yet, in <29104>Joel 1:4; 2:2, they have applied it to the *yelek,* which, however, appears there as engaged in the work of destruction. Hesychius, in the 3d century, explains the βροῦχος as "a species of locust," though, he observes, applied in his time by different nations to different species of locusts, and by some to the ἀττελαβος. May not his testimony to this effect illustrate the various uses of the word by the Sept. in the minor prophets? Our translators have wrongly adopted the word "grasshopper" in Judges and <24623>Jeremiah 46:23, where "locusts" would certainly have better illustrated the idea of "innumerable multitudes;" and here, as elsewhere, have departed from their professed rule "not to vary from the sense of that which they had translated before, if the word signified the same in both places" (translators to the reader, ad finern).

The Hebrew word in question is usually derived from, hbr, "to multiply," or "be numerous," because the locust is remarkably prolific; which, as a general name, is certainly not inapplicable; and it is thence also inferred that it denotes the *G. migratorius,* because that species often appears in large numbers. However, the largest flight of locusts upon record, calculated to have extended over five hundred miles, and which darkened the air like an

eclipse, and was supposed to come from Arabia, did not consist of the *G. nigratorius,* but of a red species (Kirby and Spence, *Introd. to Entomology,* 1:210); and, according to Forskal, the species which now chiefly infests Arabia, and which he names *G. gregarius,* is distinct from the *G. migratorius* of Linn. *(Encyc. Brit.* art. Entomology, page 193). Others derive the word from bra; "to *lie hid"* or "in ambush," because the newly-hatched locust emerges from the ground, or because the locust besieges vegetables. Rosenmüller justly remarks upon such etymologies, and the inferences made from them *(Scholia in Joel.* 1:4), "How precarious truly the reasoning is, derived in this manner from the e mere etymology of the word, everybody may understand for himself. Nor is the principle otherwise in regard to the rest of the species." He also remarks that the references to the destructiveness of locusts, which are often derived from the roots, simply concur in this, that locusts consume and do mischief. Illustrations of the propriety of his remarks will abound as we proceed. Still, it by no means follows from a coincidence of the Hebrew roots, in this, or any other meaning, that the *learned* among the ancient Jews did not recognize different species in the different names of locusts. The English word fly, from the Saxon *fleon,* the Heb. ãwP, and its representative "fowl," in the English version (<010120>Genesis 1:20, etc.), all express both a general and specific idea. Even a modern entomologist might speak of "the flies" in a room, while aware that from fifty to one hundred different species annually visit our apartments. The Scriptures use popular language; hence "the multitude," "the devourer," or "the darkener," may have been the familiar appellations for certain species of locusts. The common Greek words for locusts and grasshoppers, etc., are of themselves equally indefinite, yet they also served for the names of species, as ἀκρίς, the locust generally, from the tops of vegetables, on which the locust feeds; but it is also used as the proper name of a particular species, as the grasshopper: τετραπτερυλλίς, "four-winged," is applied sometimes to the grasshopper; τρωξαλλίς, from τρώγω, "to chew," sometimes to the caterpillar. Yet the Greeks had also distinct names restricted to particular species, as ὄνος, μολουρίς, κερκώτη, etc. The Hebrew names may also have served similar purposes.

(2.) GEB (bGe<233304>Isaiah 33:4; Sept. ἀκρίδες, Vulgate omits, Engl. "locusts"), or GoB (b/G, <300701>Amos 7:1, ἐπιγονὴ ἀκρίδων*;* Aquila, βοράδον [voratrices], *locustae,* "grasshoppers;" <340317>Nahum 3:17, ἀττέλαβος, *locusts,* "grasshoppers"). Here the lexicographers, finding no

Hebrew root, resort to the Arabic, abç; "to *creep* out" (of the ground), as the locusts do in spring. But this applies to the young of all species of locusts, and Bochart's quotations from Aristotle and Pliny occur unfortunately in general descriptions of the locust. Castell gives another Arabic root, baç; "to *cut"* or "tear," but this is open to a similar objection. Parkhurst proposes bG; anything gibbous, curved, or arched, and gravely adds, "The locust in the *caterpillar* state, so called from its shape in general, or from its continually *hunching* out its back in moving." The Sept. word in Nahum, ἀττέλαβος, has already been shown to mean a perfect insect and species. Accordingly, Aristotle speaks of its parturition and eggs *(Hist. A*mim 5:29; so also Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.).* It seems, however, not unlikely that it means a wingless species of locust, genus *Podisma* of Latreille. Grasshoppers, which are of this kind, he includes under the genus *Tettix.* Hesychius defines the ἀττέλαβος as "a small locust," and Pliny mentions it as “the smallest of locusts, without wings" *(Histor. Nat.* 29:5). Accordingly, the Sept. ascribes only leaping to it. In Nahum we have the construction ybiw bwG, *locust of the locusts,* which the lexicons explain as a vast multitude of locusts. Archbishop Newcome suggests that "the phrase is either a double reading where the scribes had a doubt which was the true reading, or a mistaken repetition not expunged." He adds, that we may suppose ybiw the contracted plural for µybiw *(Improved Version of the Minor Prophets,* Pontefr. 1809, page 188). Henderson understands the reduplication to express "the largest and most formidable of that kind of insect" *(Comment. on the Minor Prophets,* ad loc.). Some writers, led by this passage, have believed that the *gob* represents the larva state of some of the large locusts; the habit of halting at night, however, and encamping under the hedges, as described by the prophet, in all probability belongs to the *winged* locust as well as to the *larvae;* see (2203)Exodus 10:13: "The Lord brought an east wind upon the land all that day and all that night; and when it was *morning,* the east wind brought the locusts." Mr. Barrow (1:257-8), speaking of some species of South African locusts, says that when the larvae, which are still more voracious than the parent insect, are on the march, it is impossible to make them turn out of the way, which is usually that of the wind. At sunset the troop halts and divides into separate groups, each occupying in bee-like clusters the neighboring eminences for the night. It is quite possible that the *gôb* may represent the *larva* or *nymnpha* state of the insect; nor is the passage from Nahum, "When the sun ariseth they flee away," any objection

to this supposition, for the last stages of the *larva* differ but slightly from the *nympha*, both which states may therefore be comprehended under one name; the *gob of* <3481>*Nahum* 3:17 may easily have been the *nymphae* (which in all the *Ametabola* continue to feed as in their larva condition) encamping at night under the hedges, and, obtaining their wings as the sun arose, are then represented as flying away (so too Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on <3481>Nahum 3:17). It certainly is improbable that the Jews should have had no name for the locust in its larva or nymphs state, for they must have been quite familiar with the sight of such devourers of every green thing, the larvae being even more destructive than the imago; perhaps some of the other nine names, all of which Bochart considers to be the names of so many species, denote the insect in one or other of these conditions. *SEE GRASSHOPPER*.

(3.) GAZAM' (μzG; <2904>Joel 1:4; 2:25; <3049>Amos 4:9; in all which the Sept. reads κάμπη, the Vulg. *eruca*, and the English "palmer-worm"). Bochart observes that the Jews derive the word from zWG;or zzG; "to *shear*" or "*clip*," though he prefers μzG; "to *cut*," because, he observes, the locust gnaws the tender branches of trees as well as the leaves. Gesenius urges that the Chaldee and Syriac explain it as the young unfledged *bruchus*, which he considers very suitable to the passage in Joel, where the *gazam* begins its ravages before the locusts; but Dr. Lee justly remarks that there is no dependence to be placed on this. Gesenius adds that the root μzG;in Arabic and the Talmud is kindred with μsK; "to *sher*" — a derivation which, however, applies to most species of locusts. Michaelis follows the Sept. and Vulgate, where the word in each most probably means the caterpillar, the larvae of the lepidopterous tribes of insects *(Supplema. ad Lex.* 290, compared with *Recueil de Quest.* page 63). We have, indeed, the authority of Columella, that the creatures which the Latins call *erucae* are by the Greeks called κάμπαι, or *caterpillars* (11:3), which he also describes as creeping upon vegetables and devouring them. Nevertheless, the depredations ascribed to the *gazam*, in Amos, better agree with the characteristics of the locust, as, according to Bochart, it was understood by the ancient versions. The English word *"palmer-worm,"* in our old authors, means properly a hairy caterpillar, which wanders like a palmer or pilgrim, and, from its being rough, called also "beareworm" (Mouffet, *Insectorum Theatrum*, page 186). *SEE PALMERWORM*.

(4.) CHAGAB' (bg;j ; <03122>Leviticus 11:22; <04133>Numbers 13:33; <23422>Isaiah 40:22; <21205>Ecclesiastes 12:5, and <14713>2 Chronicles 7:13, in all which the Sept. reads ἀκρίς, Vulg. *locusta*, and Engl. "grasshopper," except the last, where the Engl. has "locusts." The manifest impropriety of translating this word "grasshoppers" in <03122>Leviticus 11:22, according to the English acceptation of the word, appears from its description there as being winged and edible; in all the other instances it most probably denotes a species of locust. Our translators have, indeed, properly rendered it "locust" in 2 Chronicles; but in all the other places "grasshopper," probably with a view to heighten the contrast described in those passages, but with no real advantage. Oedman *(Vern. Samml.* 2:90) infers, from its being so often used for this purpose, that it denotes the smallest species of locust; but in the passage in Chronicles voracity seems its chief characteristic. An Arabic root, bgij ; signifying "to *hide,"* is usually adduced, because it is said that locusts fly in such crowds as to hide the sun; but others say, from their hiding the ground when they alight. Even Parkhurst demurs that "to veil the sun and darken the air is not peculiar to any kind of locust;" and with no better success proposes to understand the cucullated, or hoode, or veiled species of locust. Tychsen *(Conmment. de Locust.* page 76) supposes that *chadab* denotes the *Gryllus coronatus,* Linn.; but this is the *Acanthodis coronatus* of Aud. Serv., a South American species, and probably colnfined to that continent. Michaelis *(Supplem.* 668), who derives the word from an Arabic root signifying "to veil," conceives that *chagab* represents either a locust at the fourth stage of its growth, "ante quartas exuvias quod adhuc velata est," or else at the last stage of its growth, "post quartas exuvias, quod jam volans *solem coelumque obvelat."* To the first theory the passage in Leviticus 11 is opposed. The second theory is more reasonable, but *châgâb* is probably derived not from the Arabic, but the Hebrew. From what has been stated above, it will appear better to own our complete inability to say what species of locust *châgâb* denotes, than to hazard conjectures which must be grounded on no solid foundation. In the Talmud *châgâb* is a collective name for many of the locust tribe, no less than eight hundred kinds of *châgâbim* being supposed by the Talmud to exist! (Lewysohn, *Zoolog. des Talm.* § 384). Some kinds of locusts are beautifully marked, and were sought after by young Jewish children as playthings, just as butterflies and cockchafers are nowadays. M. Lewysohn says (§ 384) that a regular traffic used to be carried on with the *chagâbim,* which were caught in great numbers, and sold after wine had

been sprinkled over them; he adds that the Israelites were only allowed to buy them before the dealer had thus prepared them. *SEE GRASSHOPPER*.

(5.) CHANAMAL' (לַמְחָל occurs only in Psalm 78:47; Sept. πάχνη; Aq. ἐν κρύει; Vulg. *in pruina;* Eng. "frost"). Notwithstanding this concurrence of Sept, Vulg., and Aquila, it is objected that "frost" is nowhere mentioned as having been employed in the plagues of Egypt, to which the Psalmist evidently alludes; but that, if his words be compared with Exodus 10:5, 15, it will be seen that the *locusts* succeeded the hail. The Psalmist observes the same order, putting the devourer after the hail (comp. Malachi 3:11). Hence it is thought to be another term for the locust. If this inference be correct, and assuming that the Psalmist is describing facts, this would make a fourth species of locust employed against Egypt, two of the others, the *arbeh* and *chasil*, being mentioned in the preceding verse. Proposed derivation, חנל; *to set'le*, and לחם, *to cut off*, because where locusts settle they cut off leaves, etc., or as denoting some non-migrating locust which settles in a locality (see Bochart, *in voc.).* Michaelis *(Supplem.* 846) suggests the signification of *ants,* comparing the Arabic name for that insect, with ל prefixed. Gesenius regards it as a quadriliteral, and argues from the term דרב; *hail,* in the parallel member, that it denotes something peculiarly destructive to trees. See FROST.

(6.) CHASIL' (חִסיל; 1 Kings 8:37; 2 Chronicles 6:28; Psalm 78:46; Isaiah 23:4; Joel 1:4; 2:25; Septuag. ἀκρίς, but in 2 Chronicles βροῦχος; Vulg. *rubigqo, bruchus, cerugo;* Engl. always "caterpillar"). Gesenius derives it from the root חסל; *to eat off;* Deuteronomy 33:38. It thus points to the same generic idea of destructiveness prominent in all this genus. *SEE CATERPILLAR*.

(7.) CHARGOL' (חַרְגֹּל only in Leviticus 11:22; Septuag. ὀφιομάχης,*Vulg. ophionsmachus,* Auth. Vers. "beetle"), derived by Gesenius from the Arabic quadriliteral root חרגל; *to gallop,* as a horse, and applied by the Arabs to a flight of wingless locusts, but thought by him to indicate in Leviticus a winged and edible locust. Beckmann has arrived at the conclusion that some insect of the sphex or ichneumon kind was meant (apud Bochaxt, a Rosenmüller, 3:264). The genus of *locusts* called *Truxalis,* said to live upon insects, has been thought to answer the description. But is it a fact that the genus *Truxalis* is an exception to the rest of the *Acridites,* and is pre-eminently *insectivorous?* Serville *(Orthopt.*

p. 579) believes that in their manner of living the *Truxalides* resemble the rest of the *Acridites,* but seems to allow that further investigation is necessary. Fischer *(Orthop. Europ.* page 292) says that the nutriment of this family is *plants* of various kinds. It is some excuse for the English rendering "beetle" in this place, that Pliny classes one species of grylhsis, the house-cricket, *G. domesticus,* under the scarabaei *(Hist. Nat.* 11:8). The Jews interpret *chargôl* to mean a species of *grasshopper,* German *heuschrecke,* which M. Lewysohn identities with *Locusta viridissima,* adopting the etymology of Bochart and Gesenius. The Jewish women used to carry the eggs of the *chargol* in their ears to preserve them from the earache (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. et Rabbin.* s.v. Chargol). *SEE BEETLE.*

(8.) YE'LEK (qlyi, <19534>Psalm 105:34, βροῦχος, *bruchus,* "caterpillars;" <24514>Jeremiah 51:14, 27, ἀκρίς, *bruchus,* "caterpillars;" and in the latter passage the Vulgate reads *bruchus aculeatus,* and some copies *horripilantes;* <29104>Joel 1:4; 2:25, βροῦχος, *bruchus,* "canker-worm;" <34315>Nahum 3:15, 16, ἀκρίς and βροῦχος, "canker-worm"). Assuming that the Psalmist means to say that the *yelek* was really another species employed in the plague on Egypt, the English word caterpillar in the common acceptation cannot be correct, for we can hardly imagine that the larvae of the Papilionidae tribe of insects could be carried by "winds." Canker-worm means *any worm* that preys on fruit. Βροῦχοςcould hardly be understood by the Sept. translators of the minor prophets as an unfledged locust, for in <34316>Nahum 3:16 they give *the* βροῦχος *away.* As to the etymology, the Arabic qlyi; *to be white,* is offered; hence the white locust or the chafer-worm, which is white (Michaelis, *Recueil de Quest.* page 64; *Supp. ad Lex. Heb.* 1080). Others give qqil; *to lick* off; as Gesenius, who refers to <04204>Numbers 22:4, where this root is applied to the ox "licking" up his pasturage, and which, as descriptive of celerity in eating, is supposed to apply to the *yelek.* Others suggest the Arabic qliw; *to hasten,* alluding to the quick motions of locusts. The passage in <24527>Jeremiah 51:27 is the only instance where an epithet is applied to the locust, and there we find qly, rmsi; "rough caterpillars." As the noun derived from this descriptive term (rmsmi) means "nails," "sharp-pointed spikes," Michaelis refers it to the rough, sharp-pointed feet of some species of chafer *(ut supra).* Oedman takes it for the *G. cristatus* of Linn. Tychsen, with more probability, refers it to some rough or bristly species of locust, as the *G. haematopus* of Linn., whose thighs are ciliated with hairs. Many

grylli are furnished with spines and bristles; the whole species *Acheta,* also the *pupa* species of Linn., called by Degeer *Locusta pupa spinosa,* which is thus described: Thorax ciliated with spines, abdomen tuberculous and spinous, posterior thighs armed beneath with four spines or teeth; inhabits Ethiopia. The allusion in Jeremiah is to the ancient accoutrement of war-horses, bristling with sheaves of arrows. *SEE CANKER-WORM.*

(9.) SALAM' (μ[;lB), only in <03122>Leviticus 11:22, ἀττάκη, *attacus,* "the bald locust." A Chaldee quadriliteral root is given by Bochart, μ[ilB; *to devour.* Another has been proposed, [lB, *a rock* or *stone,* and hl;[; *to go up;* hence the locust, which climbs up stones or rocks; but, as Bochart observes, no locust is known answering to this characteristic. Others give [lB, *a stone,* and μmi[;*to hide under;* equally futile. Tychsen, arguing from what is said of the *salam* in the Talmud (Tract, *Cholin),* viz. that "this insect has a smooth head, and that the female is without the sword-shaped tail," conjectures that the species here intended is *Gryllus eversor* (Asso), a synonyme that it is difficult to identify with any recorded species. From the text where it is mentioned it only appears that it was some species of locust winged and edible.

(10.) TSELATSAL' (lxil;x] as the name of an insect only in <05802>Deuteronomy 28:42, ἐρυσίβη, *rubigo,* "locust"). The root commonly assigned is llx; *to sound* (whence its use for a *whizzing* of wings, <23301>Isaiah 18:1; for *cymbals,* <10605>2 Samuel 6:5; <19505>Psalm 150:5; or any ringing instrument, as a *harpoon,* <18407>Job 41:7); hence, says Gesenius, a species of locust that makes a shrill noise. Dr. Lee says a *tree-cricket* that does so. Tychsen suggests the *G. stridulus* of Linn. The song of the *gryllo-talpa* is sweet and loud. On similar principles we might conjecture, although with perhaps somewhat less certainty, a derivation from the Chald. alx] *to pray,* and thence infer the *Mantis religiosa,* or Prier Iieu, so called from its singular attitude, and which is found in Palestine (Kitto's *Physical History,* page 419). The words in the Septuag. and Vulgo properly mean the mildew on corn, etc., and are there applied *metaphorically* to the ravages of locusts. This mildew was anciently believed by the heathens to be a divine chastisement; hence their religious ceremony called Rubigalia (Pliny, *Hist. Na.* 18:29). The word is evidently onomatopoietic, and is here perhaps a synonyme for some one of the other names for locust. Michaelis *(Supplem.* 2094) believes the word is identical

with *chasil,* which he says denotes perhaps the molecricket, *Gryllus talpiformis,* from the stridulous sound it produces. Tychsen (pages 79, 80) identifies it with the *Gryllus stridulus,* Linneus (— *Edipoda stridula,* Aud. Serv.). The notion conveyed by the Hebrew word will, however, apply to almost any kind of locust, and, indeed, to many kinds of insects; a similar word, *tsalsalza,* was applied by the Ethiopians to a fly which the Arabs called *zimb,* apparently identical with the *tsetse* fly of Dr. Livingstone and other African travelers. In the passage in Deuteronomy, if an insect be meant at all, it may be assigned to some destructive species of grasshopper or locust.

(11.) The Greek term for the locust is ἀκρίς, which occurs in Revelation 9:3, 7, with undoubted allusion to the Oriental devastating insect, which is represented as ascending from the smoke of the infernal pit, as a type of the judgments of God upon the enemies of Christianity. They are also mentioned as forming part of the food of John the Baptist (Matthew 3:4; Mark 1:6), where it is not, as some have supposed, any plant that is intended, but the insect, which is still universally eaten by the poorer classes in the East, both in a cooked and raw state (Hackett's *Illustra. Of Script.* page 97).

Picture for Locust 1

II. Locusts belong to that order of insects known by the term *Orthoptera* (or *straight-winged).* This order is divided into two large groups or divisions, viz. *Cursoria* and *Saltatoria.* The first, as the name imports, includes only those families of *Orthoptera* which have legs formed for *creeping,* and which are considered unclean by the Jewish law. Under the second are comprised those whose two posterior legs, by their peculiar structure, enable them to move on the ground by *leaps.* This group contains, according to Serville's arrangement, three families, the *Gryllides, Locustariae,* and the *Acridites,* distinguished one from the other by some peculiar modifications of structure. The common housecricket *(Gryllus domesticus,* Oliv.) may be taken as an illustration of the *Gryllides;* the green grasshopper *(Locusta viridissima,* Fabr.), which the French call *Sauterelie verte,* will represent the family *Locustariae;* and the *Acridites* may be typified by the common migratory locust (*OEldipoda migratoria,* Aud. Serv.), which is an occasional visitor to Europe (see the *Gentleman's Magazine* July, 1748, pages 331-414; also *The Times,* October 4, 1845). Of the *Gryllides, G. cerisyi* has been found in Egypt, and *G. domesticus,*

on the authority of Dr. Kitto, in Palestine; but doubtless other species also occur in these countries. Of the *Locustariae, Phaneroptera falcata,* Serv. *(G. falc.* Scopoli), has also, according to Kitto, been found in Palestine, *Bradyporus dasypus* in Asia Minor, Turkey, etc., *Saga Natoliae* near Smyrna. Of the locusts proper, or *Acridites,* four species of the genus *Truxalis* are recorded as having been seen in Egypt, Syria, or Arabia, viz. *T. nasuta, T. variabilis, T. procera,* and *T. miniata.* The following kinds also occur: *Opsomala pisciformis,* in Egypt, and the oasis of Harrat; *Paekiloceros hieroglyphicus, P. bufonius, P. punctiventris, P. vulcanus,* in the deserts of Cairo; *Dericorys albidula* in Egypt and Mount Lebanon. Of the genus *Acridium, A. maestum,* the most formidable perhaps of all the *Acridites, A. lineola* (= *G. AEgypt.* Linn.), which is a species commonly sold for food in the markets of Bagdad (Serv. *Orthop.* 607), *A. semifasciatum, A. peregrinum,* one of the most destructive of the species, and *A. morbosum,* occur either in Egypt or Arabia. *Calliptamus serapis* and *Chrotogonus lugubris* are found in Egypt, and in the cultivated lands about Cairo; *Eremobia carinata,* in the rocky places about Sinai. E. *cisti, E. pulchripennis, (Edipoda octofasciata,* and *OEd. migratoria (=G. migrat.* Linn.), complete the list of the *Saltatorial Orthoptera* of the Bible lands. Of one species M. Olivier *(Voyage dans l'Empire Othoman,* 2:424) thus writes: "With the burning south winds (of Syria) there come from the interior of Arabia and from the most southern parts of Persia clouds of locusts *(Acridium peregrinum),* whose ravages to these countries are as grievous and nearly as sudden as those of the heaviest hail in Europe. We witnessed them twice. It is difficult to express the effect produced on us by the sight of the whole atmosphere filled on all sides and to a great height by an innumerable quantity of these insects, whose flight was slow and uniform, and whose noise resembled that of rain: the sky was darkened, and the light of the sun considerably weakened. In a moment the terraces of the houses, the streets, and all the fields were covered by these insects, and in two days they had nearly devoured all the leaves of the plants. Happily they lived but a short time, and seemed to have migrated only to reproduce themselves and die; in fact, nearly all those we saw the next day had paired, and the day following the fields were covered with their (lead bodies." This species is found in Arabia, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia. The ordinary Syrian locust greatly resembles the common grasshopper, but is larger and more destructive. It is usually about two inches and a half in length, and is chiefly of a green color, with dark spots. It is provided with a pair of antennae or "feelers" about an inch in length, projecting from the

head. The mandibles or jaws are black, and the wingcoverts are of a bright brown, spotted with black. It has an elevated ridge or crest upon the thorax, or that portion of the body to which the legs and wings are attached. The legs and thighs of these insects are so powerful that they can leap to a height of two hundred times the length of their bodies; when so raised they spread their wings, and fly so close together as to appear like one compact moving mass.

Picture for Locust 2

Locusts, like many other of the general provisions of nature, may occasion incidental and partial evil, but, upon the whole, they are an immense benefit to those portions of the world which they inhabit; and so connected is the chain of being that we may safely believe that the advantage is not confined to those regions. "They clear the way for the renovation of vegetable productions which are in danger of being destroyed by the exuberance of some particular species, and are thus fulfilling the law of the Creator, that of all which he has made should nothing be lost. A region which has been choked up by shrubs, and perennial plants, and hard, half-withered, impalatable grasses, after having been laid bare by these scourges, soon appears in a far more beautiful dress, with new herbs, superb lilies, fresh annual grasses, and young and juicy shrubs of perennial kinds, affording delicious herbage for the wild cattle and game" (Sparman's *Voyage,* 1:367). Meanwhile their excessive multiplication is repressed by numerous causes. Contrary to the order of nature with all other insects, the males are far more numerous than the females. It is believed that if they were equal in number they would in ten years annihilate the vegetable system. Besides all the creatures that feed upon them, rains are very destructive to their eggs, to the larvae, pupae, and perfect insect. When perfect they always fly with the winds, and are therefore constantly carried out to sea, and often ignorantly descend upon it as if' upon land. (See below, III.) Myriads are thus lost in the ocean every year, and become the food of fishes. On land they afford in all their several states sustenance to countless tribes of birds, beasts, reptiles, etc.; and if their office as the scavengers of nature, commissioned to remove all superfluous productions from the face of the earth, sometimes *incidentally* and as the operation of a general law, interferes with the labors of man, as do storms, tempests, etc., they have, from all antiquity to the present hour, afforded him an excellent supply till the land acquires the benefit of their visitations, by yielding him in the mean time an agreeable, wholesome, and nutritious aliment.

Picture for Locust 3

There are different ways of preparing locusts for food: sometimes they are ground and pounded, and then mixed with flour and water and made into cakes, or they are salted and then eaten; sometimes smoked; boiled or roasted; stewed, or fried in butter. Dr. Kitto *(Pict. Bible,* note on Leviticus 11:21), who tasted locusts, says they are more like shrimps than anything else; and an English clergyman, some years ago, cooked some of the green grasshoppers, *Locusta viridissima,* boiling them in water half an hour, throwing away the head, wings, and legs, and then sprinkling them with pepper and salt, and adding butter: he found them excellent. How strange, then, nay, "how idle," to quote the words of Kirby and Spence *(Entom.* 1:305), "was the controvey concerning the locusts which formed part of the sustenance of John the Baptist,... and how apt even learned men are to perplex a plain question from ignorance of the customs of other countries!" They are even an extensive article of commerce (Sparman's *Voyage,* 1:367, etc.). Diodorus Siculus mentions a people of Ethiopia who were so fond of eating them that they were called *Acridophagi,* "eaters of locusts" (24:3). Whole armies have been relieved by them when in danger of perishing (Porphyrius, *De Abstinentia Carnis).* We learn from Aristophanes and Aristotle that they were eaten by the inhabitants of Greece (Aristoph. *Acharnen.* 1116, 1117, edit. Dind.; Aristotle, *Hist. Anin.* 5:30, where he speaks of them as delicacies). (See below, III.) That they were eaten in a preserved state by the ancient Assyrians is evident from the monuments (Layard, *Bab. and Nin.* page 289).

Picture for Locust 4

Birds also eagerly devour them (Russell, *Natural History of Aleppo,* page 127; Volney, *Travels,* 1:237; Kitto's *Physical History of Pal.* page 410). The locust-bird referred to by travelers, and which the Arabs call *smurmur,* is no doubt, from Dr. Kitto's description, the "rose-colored starling," *Pastor roseus.* The Reverend H.B. Tristram saw one specimen in the orange-groves at Jaffa in the spring of 1858, but makes no allusion to its devouring locusts. Dr. Kitto in one place (page 410) says the locust-bird is about the size of a starling; in another place (page 420) he compares it in size to a swallow. The bird is about eight inches and a half in length. Yarrell *(British Birds,* 2:51, 2d ed.) says "it is held sacred at Aleppo because it feeds on the locust;" and Colossians Sykes bears testimony to

the immense flocks in which they fly. He says *(Catalogue of the Birds of Dakhan)* "they darken the air by their numbers... forty or fifty have been killed at a shot." But he says "they prove a calamity to the husbandman, as they are as destructive as locusts, and not much less numerous."

Picture for Locust 5

The great flights of locusts occur only every fourth or fifth season. Those locusts which come in the first instance only fix on trees, and do not destroy grain: it is the young, before they are able to fly, which are chiefly injurious to the crops. Nor do all the species feed upon vegetables; one, comprehending many varieties, the truxalis, according to some authorities, feeds upon insects. Latreille says the house-cricket will do so. "Locusts," remarks a very sensible tourist, "seem to devour not so much from a ravenous appetite as from a rage for destroying." Destruction, therefore, and not food, is the chief impulse of their devastations, and in this consists their utility; they are, in fact, omnivorous. The most poisonous plants are indifferent to them; they will prey even upon the crowfoot, whose causticity bursts the very hides of beasts. They simply consume *everything* without predilection, vegetable matter, linen, woolen, silk, leather, etc.; and Pliny does not exaggerate when he says, "Fores quoque tectorum," "and even the doors of houses" (11:29), for they have been known to consume the very varnish of furniture. They reduce everything indiscriminately to shreds, which become manure. It might serve to mitigate popular misapprehensions on the subject to consider what would have been the consequence if locusts had been carnivorous like wasps. All terrestrial beings, in such a case, not excluding man himself, would have become their victims. There are, no doubt, many things respecting them yet unknown to us which would still further justify the belief that this, like " every" other "work of God, is good" — benevolent upon the whole (see Dillon's *Trav. in Spain,* page 256, etc., London, 1780, 4to).

Picture for Locust 6

III. The general references to locusts in the Scriptures are well collected by Jahn *(Bibl. Archaeol. §* 23), while Wemyss gives many of the symbolical applications of this creature *(Clavis Symbolica,* s.v.). It is well known that locusts live in a republic like ants. Agur, the son of Jakeh, correctly says, "The locusts have no king." But Mr. Horne gives them one *(Introduction,* etc., 1839, 3:76), and Dr. Harris speaks of their having "a leader whose

motions they invariably observe" *(Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, London, 1825). See this notion refuted by Kirby and Spence (2:16), and even by Mouffet *(Theat. Insect.* page 122, Lond. 1634). It is also worthy of remark that no Hebrew root has ever been offered favoring this idea. Our translation (<34317>Nahum 3:17) represents locusts, "great grasshoppers," as "camping in the hedges in the cold day, but when the sun ariseth as fleeing away." Here the locust, *gob,* is undoubtedly spoken of as a perfect insect, able to fly, and as it is well known that at *evening* the locusts descend from their flights and form camps for the night, may not the cold day mean the cold portion of the day, i.e., the night, so remarkable for its coldness in the East, the word μωγ being used here, as it often is, in a comprehensive sense, like the Gr. ἡμέρα and Lat. *dies?* Gesenius suggests that twdg] "hedges," should here be understood like the Gr. αἰμασιά**,** shrubs, brushwood, etc. (See above, 1, 2.) With regard to the description in Joel (chapter 2), it is considered by many learned writers as a figurative representation of the ravages of an invading "army" of *human beings,* as in <660902>Revelation 9:2-12, rather than a literal account, since such a devastation would hardly, they think, have escaped notice in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Some have abandoned all attempt at a literal interpretation of <031122>Leviticus 11:22, and understand by the four species of locusts there mentioned, Shalmaneser, Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus, and the Romans. Theodoret explains them as the four Assyrian kings, Tiglathpileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar; and Abarbanel, of the four kingdoms inimical to the Jews, viz. the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Romans (Pococke's *Works,* 1:214, etc., Lond. 1740; Rosenmüller, *Scholia in Joel.* c. 1).

From the Scriptures it appears that Egypt, Palestine, and the adjacent countries were frequently laid waste by vast bodies of migrating locusts, which are especially represented as a scourge in the hand of divine Providence for the punishment of national sins; and the brief notices of the inspired writers as to the habits of the insects, their numbers, and the devastation they cause, are amply borne out by the more labored details of modern travelers.

1. Locusts occur in great numbers, and sometimes obscure the sun (<021015>Exodus 10:15; <242623>Jeremiah 46:23; <070605>Judges 6:5; 7:12; <290210>Joel 2:10; <343315>Nahum 3:15; compare Livy, 42:2: AElian, N.A. 3:12; Pliny, *N.H.*

11:29; Shaw, *Travels*, page 187 [fol. 2d ed.] ; Ludolf, *Hist. AEthiop.* 1:13, and *De Locustis*, 1:4; Volney, *Travels in Syria*, 1:236).

2. Their voracity is alluded to in (02002)Exodus 10:12,15; (29004)Joel 1:4, 7, 12, and 2:3; (05888)Deuteronomy 28:38; (19846)Psalm 78:46; 105:34; (23304)Isaiah 33:4 (comp. Shaw, *Travels*, page 187, and travelers in the East, passim).

3. They are compared to horses ((29204)Joel 2:4; (66097)Revelation 9:7. The Italians call the locust "Cavaletta;" and Ray says, "Caput oblongum, equi instar prona spectans." Compare also the Arab's description to Niebuhr, *Descr. die l'Arabie).*

4. They make a fearful noise in their flight ((29205)Joel 2:5; (66099)Revelation 9:9; comp. Forskal, *Descr.* page 81: "Transeuntes grylli super verticem nostrum sono magnae cataractae fervebant;" Volney, *Trav.* 1:235).

5. Their irresistible progress is referred to in (29208)Joel 2:8, 9 (comp. Shaw, *Trav.* page 187).

6. They enter dwellings, and devour even the wood-work of houses ((02006)Exodus 10:6; (29209)Joel 2:9, 10; comp. Pliny, *N.H.* 11:29).

7. They do not fly in the night ((34087)Nahum 3:17; comp. Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Arabie*, page 173).

8. The sea destroys the greater number ((02009)Exodus 10:19; (29020)Joel 2:20; compare Pliny, 11:35; Hasselquist, *Trav.* page 445 [Engl. transl. 1766]; also *Iliad*, 21:12).

9. Their dead bodies taint the air ((29020)Joel 2:20; comp. Hasselquist, *Trav.* page 445).

10. They are used as food ((03121)Leviticus 11:21, 22; (40304)Matthew 3:4; (41006)Mark 1:6; compare Pliny, *N.H.* 6:35; 11:35; Diod. Sic. 3:29; Aristoph. *Achar.* 1116; Ludolf, II. *AEtiol).* page 7 [Gent's transl.]; Jackson, *Marocco*, page 52; Niebuhr, *Descr. (de l'Arabie*, page 150; Sparman, *Trav.* 1:367, who savs the Hottentots are glad when the locusts come, for they fatten upon them; Hasselquist, *Travels*, pages 232, 419: Kirby and Spence, *Entom.* 1:305). There are people at this day who gravely assert that the locusts which formed part of the food of the Baptist were not the insect of that name, but the long, sweet pods of the locust-tree *(Ceratonia siliqua), Johannis brodt*, "St. John's bread," as the monks of Palestine call

it. For other equally erroneous explanations, or unauthorized alterations of ἀκρίδες, see Celsii *Hierob.* 1:74.

IV. The following are some of the works which treat of locusts: Ludolf, *Dissertatio de Locustis* (Francof. ad Moen. 1694) [this author believes that the *quails* which fed the Israelites in the wilderness were locusts (vid. his *Diatriba qua sententia nova de Selavis sive Locustis de enditur,* Francof. 1694), as do the Jewish Arabs to this day. So does Patrick, in his *Comment. on Numbers.* A more absurd opinion was that held by Norrelius, who maintained that the four names of <03122>Leviticus 11:22 were *birds* (see his *Schediassma de Avibus sacris, Arbeh, Chagab, Solam, et Chargol,* Upsal. 1746, and in the *Bibl. Barem,* 3:36)]; Faber, *De Locustis Biblicis, et sigillatim de Avibus Quadrupedibus, ex* <03120>*Leviticus* 11:20 (Wittenb. 1710-11); Asso, *Abhlandlung von den Heuschrecken* (Rostock, 1787; usually containing also Tychsen's *Comment. de Locustis);* Oedman, *Vermischte Sammlung,* volume 2, c. 7; Kirby and Spence, *Introduction to Entomology,* 1:305, etc.; Bochart, *Hierozoicon,* 3:251, etc., ed. Rosenmüller; Kitto, *Phys. History of Palestine,* pages 419, 420; Harris, *Natural Hist. of the Bible,* s.v. (1833); Harmer, *Observations* (Lond. 1797); Fabricius, *Entomol. System.* 2:46 sq.; Credner, *Joel,* page 261 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book,* 2:102 sq.; Tristram, Nat. *Hist. of the Bible,* page 306 sq.; Wood, *Bible Aninmals,* page 596 sq.; Hackett. *Illustra. of Script.* page 97; Serville, *Aonograph* in the *Suites a Blufon;* Fischer, Or*thoptera Europcea;* Suicer, *Thesaurus,* 1:169,179; Gutherr, *De Victu Johannis* (Franc. 1785); Rathleb, *Akridotheologie* (Hanover, 1748); Rawlinson, *Five Ancient Monarchies,* 2:299, 493; 3:144.

Lod

(<13812>1 Chronicles 8:12; <15122>Ezra 2:32; <16737>Nehemiah 7:37; 11:35). *SEE LYDDA*.

Lo-de'bar

(Heb. *Lo-Debar,* רבד]אפ, *no pasture,* <10727>2 Samuel 17:27, Sept. Λωδαβάρ*;* written רבד]ופ in <10904>2 Samuel 9:4, 5, Septuag. Λωδαβάρ*),* a town apparently in Gilead, not far from Mahanaim, the residence of Ammiel, whose son Machir entertained Mephibosheth. and afterwards sent refreshments to David (<10904>2 Samuel 9:4, 5; 17:27). It is probably the same with the place (see Reland, *Palest.* page 875) called DEBIR (or rather

Lidbir', רְבְדִל, [1636] Joshua 13:26; Sept. Λεβίρ, Vulg. *Dabir;* for thelis not a prefix, but a part of the name [see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.], which should probably be pointed רְבְדֹל *Lod-ebar'),* on the (north-eastern) border of Gad, but in which direction from Mahanaim is uncertain, perhaps north-west (in which general direction the associated names appear to proceed), and not far from *et-Taryibell.*

Lodenstein, Jodocus Von

a noted Dutch theologian, was born at Delft in 1620. He studied undel Voetius at Utrecht, and under Cocceius and Amesius at Franeker, and became preacher at Zoetemer in 1644; at Sluys, in Flanders, in 1650, and at Utrecht in 1652-in all of which places he used every exertion to revive the spirit of practical piety among his countrymen, whom great prosperity had rendered worldly-minded and indifferent. When, in 1672, the country was threatened by the invasion of the French under Louis XIV, he proclaimed it a judgment of the Lord, and called on them to repent. He found many followers. In 1665 he ceased to administer the Lord's Supper, from conscientious scruples. Laying great stress on purity of life and of heart, he feared lest he might administer it to some unworthy to receive this sacred ordinance. The number of his adherents gradually increased, and they spread over the whole Netherlands, but they never separated from the Reformed Church like the Labadists. The effect of Lodenstein's doctrines in Holland was like that following Spener's labors afterwards in Germany. He died pastor of Utrecht in 1677. He wrote *[Verfallenes Christenthum* (published after his delath by J. Hofmann), *Reformationsspiesel* (to be found also in Arnold's *Kirchen u. Ketzerhistorie),* a a number of hymns, etc. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 10:450. (J.N.P.)

Lodge

(properly some form of the verb לוּן, *lun,* or לִין, *lin,* to *stay over night,* αὐλίζομαι, etc.). See INN. In [2901] Isaiah 1:8, the "lodge in a garden" (הנוּלמ, *meelunah',* a *lodging-place,* rendered "cottage" in [2902] Isaiah 24:20) signifies a shed or lodge for the watchman in a garden; it also refers to a sort of hanging bed or hammock, which travelers in hot climates, or the watchmen of gardens or vineyards, hang on high trees to sleep in at night, probably from the fear of wild beasts ([2902] Isaiah 24:20). The lodge here referred to was a little temporary hut consisting of a low framework of poles, covered with boughs, straw, turf, or similar materials, for a

shelter from the heat by day and the cold and dews by night, for the watchmen that kept the garden, or vineyard, during the short season while the fruit was ripening (1278Job 27:18), and speedily removed when it had served that purpose. It is usually erected on a slight artificial mound of earth, with just space sufficient for one person, who, in this confined solitude, remains constantly watching the ripening crop, as the jackals during the vintage often destroy whole vineyards. and likewise commit great ravages in the gardens of cucumbers and melons. This protection is also necessary to prevent the depredations of thieves. To see one of these miserable sheds standing alone in the midst of a field or on the margin of it, occupied by its solitary watcher, often a decrepit or aged person, presents a striking image of dreariness and loneliness (Hackett's *Illustra. of Scripture,* page 162). *SEE COTTAGE*.

Lodge, Nathan

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in London County, Virginia, August 20, 1788; was converted in 1804, entered the Conference at Baltimore in 1810, and died November 27, 1815. He was a very zealous and useful minister, and many souls were converted through his preaching. He was greatly lamented by his people, among whom he was suddenly cut down. — *Minutes of Conferences,* 1:278.

Lodge, Robert

a member of the Society of Friends, was born at Masham, Yorkshire, about 1636. He was a religious youth, and became a Friend about 1660. He preached and suffered for the Quaker cause in Ireland. On July 15, 1690, he died, assuring his friends, Blessed be God, I have heavenly peace." See Janney, *Hist. of Friends,* 2:434.

Lodur

one of the three Norse divinities (Odin and Haner), who, walking at the sea-shore, created the first pair of men. *SEE LOKI*.

Löffler, Friedrich Simon

a German Protestant theologian, nephew of the celebrated philosopher Leibnitz, was born at Leipzic August 9, 1669, and was educated at the university of his native place. In 1689 he became magister of philosophy and bachelor of divinity. In 1695 he was appointed pastor at Probstheida,

and served his people until 1745, when, on account of age, he was mande emeritus preacher. He died in 1748. He wrote *Specimen exeges. s. de operarsiis in vinea: — Diss. de litteris Bellerophonteis;* etc.

Loffler, Josias Friedrich Christian

a noted German Protestant theologian, was born at Saalfeld January 18, 1752. Having lost his father in 1763, he was educated in the orphan asylum and at the University of Halle. In 1774 he went to Berlin, where he made the acquaintance of Teller, and in 1777 became minister of one of the churches of that city. He now made himself known as a writer by translating Souverail's renowned work on the Platonism of the fathers. In 1778 he went to Silesia as chaplain of a Prussian regiment, but returned at the end of a year to Berlin, where he resumed his office, devoting also part of his time to educational pursuits. In 1783 he became professor of theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and minister of the principal church of that city. Here his rationalistic views made him many enemies. In 1787 he was appointed general superintendent at Gotha, but entered on this office only in the following year. The University of Copenhagen conferred on him the degree of D.D. in 1792. He died February 4, 1816. Loffler published a number of separate sermons, dissertations, and tracts, and was after 1803 the editor of the continuation of Teller's *Magazia fur Predifer.* See Doring, *Die deutsch. Kanzelredner des* 18 *and* 19 *Jahrh.* page 223; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* 8:451.

Loft

(hY;l [;, *aliy ah'*, ὑπερῷον), the upper chamber, e.g. of a private house (<11179>1 Kings 17:19; <44009>Acts 20:9). Such rooms were either over the gate (<10901>2 Samuel 19:1) or built on the flat roof (<12312>2 Kings 23:12), and were especially used for prayer, conference, or public meetings. *SEE CHAMBER*; *SEE HOUSE*; *SEE ROOF*.

Loftus, Dudley Field

an Irish lawyer, noted as a learned Orientalist, was born at Rathfarnham, near Dublin, in 1618. He rose to the position of master in Chancery and a judge of the Prerogative Court. He translated the Ethiopic New Testament into Latin for Walton's Polyglot; also published translations from the Syriac into Latin and English. He died in 1695. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.;* Harris's edition of Ware's *Ireland;* Lodge's *Peerage of Ireland.*

Loftus, William Kennett

an English archaeologist, was born at Rye in 1820. He was a zealous traveler and discoverer, and explored the sites of several ancient cities on the Euphrates and Tigris. In 1857 he published a work entitled *Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susiana;* also an account of *Some Excavations at Warka, the Erech of Nimrod, and Shushan, the Palace of Esther, in* 1849-52. He died in 1858. To the Biblical student Loftus's work is of special importance. See Thomas's *Dict. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Log

(לֹג *log,* prob. a deep *cavity, basin;* Sept. κοτύλη, Vulg. *sextarius),* the smallest liquid measure (e.g. of oil) among the Hebrews (Leviticus 14:10, 12, 15, 21, 24), containing, according to the rabbins (see Carpzov. *Apparat.* p. 685), the twelfth part of a "HIN," or six eggs, i.e., nearly a pint. *SEE MEASURE*.

Logan, David Swift

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1834. His literary education was commenced in the academy of Beaver, and was continued in Jefferson College (class of 1854). In 1857 he entered the Western Theological Seminary, and, after completing the regular theological course, was licensed by the Presbytery of Alleghany City, and afterwards ordained as an evangelist by the Presbytery of Steubenville, and for two years preached in the churches of New Philadelphia and Urichville, Ohio. He next labored in the Presbyterian Church of Tiffin, Ohio, until ill health obliged his return to his home in Bridgewater, Pennsylvania, where he died, Sept. 15, 1864. Mr. Logan was endowed with a well-balanced nature; no single faculty was cultivated at the expense of the rest. He had method, promptness, assiduity, thoughtfulness; he was an earnest preacher and a faithful pastor. See Wilson, *Presbyterian Historical Almanac,* 1865, page 97. (J.L.S.)

Logan, John

a noted Scottish divine, was born at Fala, in the county of Edinburgh, in 1748. Though the son of a farmer, he was early destined to the clerical profession, and was educated in the University of Edinburgh. Upon graduation he became tutor to Sir John Sinclair. In 1773 he was licensed as

a preacher in the Established Church of Scotland, and was shortly after appointed minister at Leith, where he remained until 1785, when he removed to London, retaining by agreement a part of his clerical income, for the purpose of devoting himself altogether to literary labors. He had established quite a reputation as a sacred poet. Logan, if not a learned divine or a very profound thinker, was a man. of much eloquence, and a highly popular preacher. But his poetical endowments, strongly lyrical in their tendency, were the highest he possessed; and, unfortunately, he was tempted to apply these in a path where he was ill calculated to shine, and the adoption of which proved fatal not only to his professional usefulness, but to his happiness. In 1783 he printed and caused to be acted in Edinburgh a tragedy called *Runnamede,* which had been rehearsed at Covent Garden, but refused a license by the lord chamberlain. This publication brought on him the anger of his Presbyterian associates; and these and other annoyances, aggravated by a hereditary tendency to hypochondria, drove him to intoxication for relief. He died in London December 28, 1788. His friends, Doctors Blair, Robertson, and Hardy, published a volume of his sermons in 1790, and a second in 1791. These sermons long enjoyed very great popularity, and have been several times reprinted. They are among the most eloquent that the Scottish Church has produced. A third edition of his poems, with an account of his life, appeared in 1805; and the poems are included in Dr. Anderson's collection. Some of his hymns are annexed to the psalmody of the Scottish Church.

Logic.

This term, derived from the Greek λόγὶος, λογικη, has been the subject of numerous definitions. By different authors and schools it has been defined as the art of convincing, the art of thinking, the art of discovering truth, the right use of reason, the science and art of reasoning, the science of deductive thinking, the science of the laws of thought as thought, and the science of the laws of discursive thought. These specimen definitions indicate in some degree the diverse conceptions of the subject which have prevailed at different periods and in different circles. Aristotle, whom Sir William Hamilton extravagantly calls the author and finisher of the general science under consideration, had no single name for it. He treated of its principal parts as *analytic, apodeictic,* and *topic.* In the latter he included the *dialectic* of Plato and the *sophistic* of the Sophists. Notwithstanding the honor credited to Aristotle, he himself says that Zeno the Eleatic was the inventor of dialectics.

Thus we are taken back to the early Greek philosophers for the first formal discussions of what is now universally denominated Logic. They, in successive generations, developed with more or less clearness its principal elements. Socrates illustrated induction; Euclid, deduction. Plato treated of mental images as the results of sensation, of notions as the product of the understanding, and of ideas as the product of reason. Aristotle formulated syllogisms, and defined their principal laws. He taught analysis. He devised a system of categories. He enumerated the five predicables, genus, species, difference, property, and accident. In short, he reduced to a system the fragmentary discoveries in the philosophy of mind of those who had gone before him, and embodied them in works destined to exert a great influence upon after ages. Like many other great men, Aristotle was but indifferently appreciated by his contemporaries. Even after his death, his logical system produced but little influence upon his countrymen the Greeks. Several of the Christian fathers, however, give evidence of having profited by its study, and of desiring to use the knowledge they had thus acquired in propagating the truth of Christianity. Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Clement, and others, both used and defended such dialectics as they had learned in the Grecian schools. On the other hand, as the same style of dialectics had been closely identified with the pernicious vagaries of heathen philosophy, Tertullian, Irenaeus, Arnobius, and Lactantius considered its use as unfavorable to the interests of Christianity, and destructive of true science and wisdom. Augustine also wrote in the same spirit against the academicians.

Nevertheless, speculative studies held a relative prominence in the learning of Greece and Rome during the early Christian centuries; and when, owing to the barbarian irruptions, learning and civilization declined, dialectical science remained in more general cultivation than almost any other of the higher species of knowledge. Having its subject matter in the human mind, it was not dependent for perpetuity upon those external circumstances which influenced the conditions of general literature. Boethius, who has been called the last of the ancient philosophers, and the connecting link between the classical and the medieval age, made a translation of Aristotle's categories into Latin. His contemporaries of the 6th century, Cassiodorus, Capella, and Isidore of Seville, together with several Byzantine writers, e.g. George Pachymera, Theodorus Metachita, and Michael Psellus, formed meager compendiums of logic and rhetoric, without any clear distinction between the two. These manuals superseded

or rather substituted the use of the ancient authors on both these subjects, and, imperfect as they were, became the oracles of that long and dismal period in which the trivium (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and quadrivium (music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy) were the chief topics of study and instruction. The ignorance consequent upon such a condition of things continued for the long period of five centuries without material variation.

In the latter part of the 11th century commenced a period of literary awakening known to history as the first aera of scholasticism. *SEE SCHOLASTICISM*. This movement was characterized by attempts to construct systems of theology on the traditional basis with strict dialectical form and method. Paris was the chief seat of the movement. Anselm, an abbot at Bec in 1078, and late in life an archbishop of Canterbury, made the first vigorous attempt in harmony with logical forms, on the basis of *credo ut intelligam.* Abelard opposed him, on the principle that understanding should precede faith. Thisas the period of Nominalism and Realism, and also of the foundation of universities. Among the most prominent of the great names of this period is that of Roscelinus of Compeigne, who is celebrated as having been the first to revive the question of the reality of universal ideas, and William of Champeaux, who opened a school of logic in Paris in 1109. The fame of the latter was soon eclipsed by that of Peter Abelard, who was able to invest logical disputation with such fascinations as to make it the favorite occupation of the most intelligent minds for generations following.

The 13th century is counted as the second period of scholasticism, durinlg which the leading dialecticians were Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. During this period scholasticism reached its climax. The 14th century, as the third period of scholasticism, witnessed its sensible decline under the protracted but bitter wranglings of the Thomists (Realists) and Scotists (Nominalists).

Notwithstanding an attempt by the Medici of Florence to revive the Platonic philosophy in opposition to that of Aristotle, the latter prevailed in the chief universities of Europe, and the corruptions of it which had been countenanced by scholasticism began to pass away under the influence of more intelligent discussion. In the 16th century, after the invention of printing, the logical and philosophical works of the Stagirite were issued in

a purer text and more accurate versions, and largely engaged public criticism.

The authority of Aristotle had been so long supreme in the continental universities, and the union between what passed for his philosophy and the errors of the Church of Rome had been so long established, that it was only natural for Luther and Melancthon, at the beginning of the Reformation, to inveigh strongly against the Aristotelian logic and metaphysics. As time passed on, however, it became apparent that the work of the Reformers had largely to be done through the agency of that same Aristotelian logic. Melancthon was not slow to perceive this, and subsequently became an acknowledged follower of Aristotle as to dialectics, and even influenced Luther to retract some of his severer utterances. He introduced into the University of Wittenberg, to which Protestant Germany looked up, a scheme of dialectics and physics founded upon the Aristotelian theory. He also imitated the Stagirite philosopher by teaching logic with constant reference to rhetoric. The advocacy and influence of Melancthon secured the preponderance of the Aristotelian dialectics in the Protestant schools of Germany for more than a century.

About the middle of the 16th century a formidable opposition to the authority of Aristotle sprang up at the University of Paris, under the leadership of Peter Ramus, a scholar of great natural acuteness, and of an intrepid, though somewhat arrogant spirit. He published his *Institutiones Dialecticae* in 1543. His system, founded with much ingenuity on the writings of Plato, notwithstanding violent opposition, prevailed so far as to greatly weaken the influence of the Aristotelian philosophy. The heads of the university, alarmed at this innovation, made complaint against Ramus to Parliament. The king himself interfered, and appointed a public trial of the rival systems of logic. As might have been expected, a majority of the judges favored the established system. Ramus was consequently ordered to desist from teaching, and an order passed for the suppression of his book. That order was subsequently removed, and Ramus again became popular as a teacher. He treated logic as merely the art of arguing, and was very severe on the dry and tedious formalities of the schoolmen. His system embraced invention and proofs, and thus blended with rhetoric. In 1551, through the influence of the cardinal of Lorraine, Ramus became royal professor of rhetoric and philosophy, in which capacity he made many proselytes. Having adhered to the Huguenot party, he was killed in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. But he had already traveled and taught in

Germany, where his system found no little favor. In Italy it secured a few disciples. but many more in France, England, and Scotland. Andrew Melville introduced the logic of Ramus at Glasgosw, and it ultimately became popular in all the Scottish universities. The logical writings of the remainder of the 16th century, and somewhat later, were filled with the Ramist and anti-Ramist controversy, which, though of little permanent importance, doubtless prepared the way for a better comprehension of the true principles and processes of logic in later periods.

In the 17th century the writings of lord Bacon formed another epoch in the history of logic. *SEE BACON*. Logic, according to lord Bacon, comprised the sciences of invention, judging, retaining, and delivering the conceptions of the mind. We invent or discover new arts and arguments. We judge by induction or syllogism, and we may improve memory by artificial modes. The first book of the *Novuma Organum* developed his celebrated and peculiar division of fallacies, viz. *idola tribes, idola splecus, idola fori,* and *idola theatri.* The second book sought to apply the principles of induction to the interpretation of nature. Although, from a defective knowledge of natural phenomena incident to his times, the author's illustrations were far from perfect, and although many logicians have disputed the correctness of his principles, it cannot be questioned that the Baconian logic and method of study exerted a powerful influence upon his own and after times in stimulating thought and discovery. The remaining authors of the 17th century whose writings influenced the study and methods of logic were Des Cartes, Arnauld, author of *L'Art de Pense,* and Locke, of England. Probably the most influential treatise on the direct subject was Arnauld's *Art of Thinking,* commonly called the Port-Royal Logic. It attacked the Aristotelian system, and, being written in a modern language, had the advantage over the heavy Latinity of previous books. In this respect it became an example to subsequent writers, who, from the beginning of the 18th century, were numerous if not influential. But, with all that was written respecting it, the study of logic failed to command general attention. It had few attractions for the popular mind, and its special devotees were seldom able to place it in successful competition with philosophy, natural science, and general literature. Although prescribed in every system of academic study, and at once the agency and topic of ceaseless wrangling among professed scholars, yet its influence upon human life and public opinion was infinitesimally small.

The limits of this article do not admit of a detailed notice of all the logicians and logical systems of modern times, but only of allusion to a few of the most influential. In Germany, more than in all other countries, the study of logic has within the last hundred years assumed new phases and developed new doctrines, more especially in connection with the various systems of idealistic philosophy. Of that philosophy Immanuel Kant, *SEE KANT*, may be considered the inaugurator, and his first philosophical production commenced with the study of logic. As early as 1762 he published a treatise on the "False Subtlety of the Four Syllogistic Figures," in which he maintained that only the first is pure, and the others *ratiocinia hybrida.* From this point he went on developing his system, till in 1781 he published his *Kritik of Pure Reason,* to which in 1790 he added his *Kritik of the Judgment.* Kant claimed to have subjected the human mind to a new analysis, from which he determined the three comprehensive functions of sense, understanding, and reason. His general scheme is summed up as follows:

I. Doctrine of the transcendental elements of knowledge.

A. Transcendental aesthetics.
B. Transcendental logic.
a. Transcendental analytics.
b. Transcendental dialectics.

II. The transcendental mlethod.

Not to mention the numerous defenders and modifiers of the Kantian system, we pass to G.W.F. Hegel, *SEE HEGEL*, the publication of whose *Wissenschaft der Logik* in 1812 marks another epoch in German metaphysics. Hegel employed the term logic in a very extended sense. Not confining it to abstract forms of thought and the laws of ideas, he considered it the science of the self-sufficient and self-determining idea — the science of truth and reality. From his fundamental principle that thought and substance are identical, it followed that what is true of one is true also of the other, and that the laws of logic are ontological. His system claimed to develop the idea of the absolute by antagonisms through all its successive stadia. With him the primary element of logic consisted in the oneness of the subjective and objective. Instinctive knowledge only regards the object without considering itself. But consciousness, besides the former, contains a perception of itself, and embraces, as three stages of

progress, consciousness, self-consciousness, and reason. Pure logic, according to Hegel, is divided into,

1. The logic of being;
2. The logic of qualified nature;
3. The logic of the idea.

In 1825, Richard Whately, afterwards archbishop of Dublin, published an article in the *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana*, which, having been expanded and printed as his *Elements of Logic*, was soon after extensively adopted as a text-book both in England and America. This publication has justly been considered as constituting an Vera in the study of logic in English-speaking countries. The principles of Kant's *Kritik of Pure Reason* were not extensively introduced into Great Britain until after 1836, when Sir William Hamilton began his lectures in the University of Edinburgh. *SEE HAMILTON*. Although Hamilton took opposite ground to Whately in reference to the essential character of logic, yet both were admirers and exponents of the *Analytic* of Aristotle. Thus the reawakened taste for logical studies during the current century arose from a restoration, by different methods, of the old logic which had come down from the early ages, and survived all the opposition and ridicule of the modern centuries. It is worthy of especial note that none of the systems put forth by Ramus, Descartes, Locke, or Condillac, and their several modifiers, has been able to stand the test of time like that of the old philosophers and schoolmen. This fact may be accepted as proving that the syllogism indicates substantially the process which takes place in all minds in the act of reasoning. Notwithstanding this small demonstration, and a few other points of general concurrence, the science of logic, which has been the subject of human study for more than two thousand years, remains still incomplete. Many of its principles and processes are yet in continued and active dispute. Since Whately and Hamilton, Mr. John Stuart Mill has written an elaborate work in which he depreciates the syllogism and magnifies induction. But his theories in reference to both bear the stamp of Comte's empirical positivism.

The chief logical discussion of the present day revolves around the "New Analytic of Logical Forms," or the quantification of the predicate introduced by Sir William Hamilton. This new analytic, which is chiefly valuable for its enlargement of the hitherto narrow sphere of formal logical praxis, is an emanation from the metaphysics of Kant, being grounded

upon certain principles of the *Kritik of Pure Reason.* Its theory, although illustrated by an ingenious system of notation, was left in a somewhat crude state by Hamilton, but has been ably elaborated by Mansel and Thomson, of England, and Bowen and Mahan. of America. While these writers seem to think that they have attained the end of all logical perfection, Dr. M'Cosh, of Princeton, charges their whole system with fundamental error in presupposing "that there are forms in the mind which it imposes on objects as it contemplates them." To explode this error is the avowed object of M'Cosh's recent treatise, in which, while he falls back for confirmation upon the old logic, he claims to unfold laws which were not noticed by the old logicians. The characteristic of his work is a more elaborate treatment of the notion than has taken place since the publication of the Port-Royal Logic. Thus logic seems destined to pass down to coming centuries as it has descended from the past, a subject of endless debate, but one from which each successive generation derives its advantage in the very process of debate.

See Hallam's *Literature of Europe;* Blakey's *Historical Sketch of Logic;* Kant's *Kritik;* Hegel's *Wissenschaft der Logik;* Whately's *Elements of Logic;* Sir William Hamilton's *Lectures on Logic;* Mansel's *Prolegomena Logica;* Thomson's *Laws of Thought; Eleements of Logic,* by H.P. Tappan, by W.D. Wilson, by C.K. True, by H. Coppee, by J.R. Boyd, by H.N. Day, by A. Schuyler, by L.H. Atwater; *System of Logic,* by John Stuart Mill; *Science of Logic,* by Asa Mahan; *Formal Logic,* by James M'Cosh. (D.P.K.)

Logos

(Λόγος, a *word,* as usually rendered), a special term in Christology, in consequence of its use as such by the apostle John, especially in the opening verses of his Gospel. An excellent article on the subject may be found in the brief but lucid exposition given in Bengel's *Gnomon* (Amer. edit. by Profs. Lewis and Vincent, page 536 sq.). *SEE WORD*.

1. *Rendering.* — The general meaning of *Logos* in every such connection is THE WORD, said symbolically of the law-giving, creative, revealing activity of God. This is naturally suggested here by the obvious reference to <01001>Genesis 1:1, 3.

Many have seen in this term but a bold personification of the *wisdom* or *reason* of God. as in <20822>Proverbs 8:22. But this sense of *Logos* does not

occur in the New Test., and is excluded by the reference to the history of creation. Besides, the repeated "with God" (verses 1, 2) compels us to distinguish the Logos from God; the words " became flesh" (verse 14) cannot be said of an attribute of God; and the Baptist's testimony, verse 15, in direct connection with this introduction (compare also such sayings of Christ as in chapters 8:58; 17:5), show clearly that John attributes *personal pre-existence* to the *Logos.* Similarly, every attempt to explain away this profound sense *of Logos* is inadequate, and most are ungrammatical. *SEE WISDOM PERSONIFIED*.

Thus the fundamental thought of this introduction is, that *the original, all-creating, all-quickening, and all-enlightening Logos, or personal divine word,* became man in Jesus Christ. *SEE INCARNATION*.

2. *Origin and History of the Idea. —*

(1.) John uses the term *Logos* without explanation, assuming that his readers know it to bear this sense. Accordingly, we find this conception of it not new with him, but a chief element in the development of the Old-Testament theology. In the Mosaic account, God's revelation of himself in the creation was, in its nature, *spirit* (<010102>Genesis 1:2), in contrast with matter, and in its form, a *word* (<010104>Genesis 1:4), in contrast with every involuntary materialistic or pantheistic conception of the creative act. The real significance, under this representation, of the invisible God's revelation of himself by *speech* became the germ of the idea of the *Logos*. With this thought all Judaism was pervaded; that God does not manifest himself immediately, but mediately; not in his hidden, invisible essence, but through an appearance — an attribute, emanation, or being called the *angel of the Lord* (<022321>Exodus 23:21, etc.), or the *word of the Lord.* Indeed, to the latter are ascribed, as his work, all divine light and life in nature and history; the law, the promises, the prophecies, the guidance of the nation (compare <193306>Psalm 33:6, 9; 107:20; 147:18; 148:8; <230201>Isaiah 2:1, 3; <240104>Jeremiah 1:4, 11, 13, etc. Even such poetic personifications as <19E715>Psalm 147:15; <230401>Isaiah 4:11, contain the germ of the doctrinal personality of the Word). *SEE ANGEL*.

(2.) Another important element of Hebrew thought was the *wisdom* of God. The consideration of it became prominent only after the natural attributes of God — omnipotence, etc. — had long been acknowledged. The chief passages are <182812>Job 28:12 sq.; Proverbs 8 and 9. Even the latter is a poetic personification: but this is based on the thought that Wisdom is

not shut up at rest in God, but active and manifest in the world. It is viewed as the one guide to salvation, comprehending all revelations of God, and as an attribute embracing and combining all his other attributes. This view deeply influenced the development of the Hebrew idea of God. At that stage of religious knowledge and life, Wisdom, revealing to pious faith the harmony and unity of purpose in the world, appeared to be his most attractive and important attribute-the essence of his being. One higher step remained; but the Jew could not yet see that *God is love*.

(3.) In the apocryphal books of Sirach (chapters 1 and 24) and Baruch (3 and 4:1-4), this view of Wisdom is developed yet more clearly and fully. The book of Wisdom (written at least B.C. 100) praises wisdom as the highest good, the essence of right knowledge and virtue, and as given by God to the pious who pray for it (chapters 7 and 8); see especially 7:22 sq., where Wisdom has divine dignity and honors, as a holy spirit of light, proceeding from God, and penetrating all things. But this book seems rather to have viewed it as another name for the whole divine nature than as a person distinct from God. And nowhere does it connect this *Wisdom* with the idea *of Messiah*. It shows, however, the influence of both Greek and Oriental philosophy on Jewish theology, and marks a transition from the Old Test. view to that of Philo, etc. *SEE WISDOM, BOOK OF*.

(4.) In Egypt, from the time of Ptolemy I (B.C. 300), there were Jews in great numbers, their head-quarters being at Alexandria (Philo estimates them at a million in his time, A.D. 50), and there they gradually came under the influence of the Egyptian civilization of that age, a strange mixture of Greek and Oriental customs and doctrines. *SEE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOLS*. Aristobulus, about 150 B.C., seems to have endeavored to unite the ancient doctrines of Wisdom and the Word of God with a form of Greek philosophy. This effort, the leading feature of the Jewish-Alexandrian school, culminated in Philo, a contemporary of Christ, who strives to make Judaism, combined with and interpreted by the Platonic philosophy, do the work of the idea of Messiah, affording by the power of thought a complete substitute for it. This attempt to harmonize heathen and Jewish elements, while it led in him to a sort of anticipation of certain parts of Christian doctrine, explains how he himself vacillates between opposite and irreconcilable views. *SEE PLATONISM*.

(5.) Philo represents the absolute God as hidden and unknown, but surrounded by *his powers* as a king by his servants, and, through these, as

present and ruling in the world. (These powers, δυνάμεις, are, in Platonic language, *ideas;* in Jewish, *angels.)* These are different and innumerable; the original principles of things; the immaterial world, the type of which the material is an image. The two chief of these in dignity are the θείς, *God*, the creative power, and the Κύριος, *Lord*, or governing power of the Scriptures. But all these powers are essentially one, as God is one; and their unity, both as they exist in God and as they emanate from him, is called the *Logos*. Hence the Logos appears under two relations: as the reason of God, lying in him — the divine thought; and as the outspoken word, proceeding from him, and manifest in the world. The former is, in reality, one with God's hidden being; the latter comprehends all the workings and revelations of God in the world, affords from itself the ideas and energies by which the world was framed and is upheld, and, filling all things with divine light and life, rules them in wisdom, love, and righteousness. It is the beginning of creation; not unoriginated, like God, nor made, like the world, but the eldest son of the eternal Father (the world being the younger); God's image; the creator of the world; the mediator between God and it; the highest angel; the second God; the high-priest and reconciler.

(6.) Lücke concludes that, such being the development of the doctrine of the Logos when John wrote, although there is no evidence that he borrowed his views from Philo, yet it is impossible to doubt the direct historical connection of his doctrine with the Alexandrian. Meyer thinks that if we suppose John's doctrine entirely unconnected with the Jewish and Alexandrian philosophy, we destroy its historic meaning, and its intelligibleness for its readers. It must be admitted that the term *Logos* seems to be chosen as already associated in many minds with a class of ideas in some degree akin to the writer's, and as furnishing a common point of thought and interest with those speculative idealists who constantly used it while presenting them with new truth.

(7.) But any connection amounting to *doctrinal dependence* of John upon Philo is utterly contrary to the tenor of Philo's own teaching; for he even loses the crowning feature of Hebrew religion, the moral energy expressed in its view of Jehovah's holiness, and with it the moral necessity of a divine teacher and Savior. He becomes entangled in the physical lntions of the heathen, forgets the wide distinction between God and the world, and even denies the independent, absolute being of God, declaring that, were the universe to end, God would die of loneliness and inactivity. The very

universality of the conception, its immediate working on all things, would have excluded to Philo the belief that the whole *Logos,* not a mere part or effluence of his power, became incarnate in Christ. "Heaven and earth cannot contain me," cries his *Logos,* "*how much less a human being."* On the whole, it is extremely doubtful whether Philo ever meant formally to represent the *Logos* as a person distinct from God. All the titles he gives it may be explained by supposing it to mean the ideal world, on which the actual is modeled. At most, we can say that he goes beyond a mere poetic personification, and prepares the way for a distinction of persons in the Godhead. *SEE PHILO.*

(8.) John's connection with the doctrines of the later Jews, though less noticed, is at least as important as that with Philo. In the apocryphal books, as we have seen, the idea of the *Logos* was overshadowed by that of the divine *Wisdom;* but it reappears, prominently and definitely, in the Targums, especially that of Onkelos. These were written, indeed, after John's Gospel (Onkelos, the earliest, wrote not later than the 2d century A.D.), yet their distinguishing doctrines certainly rest upon ancient tradition. They represent the *Word of God,* the *Memrah,* hrmm, or *Dibur,* rwbd, as the personal self-revealed God, and one with the *Shekinah,* hnykç, which was to be manifested in Messiah. But it would be absurd to claim that John borrowed his idea of Messiah from the Jews, who in him looked for, not a spiritual revelation of God in clearer light, to save men from sin by suffering and love, but a national deliverer, to gratify their worldly and carnal desires of power; not even for the divine *Word become flesh,* and dwelling among men, but for an appearance, a vision, a mere display, or, at most, an unreal, *docetic* humanity.

(9.) The contrast between John's Logos and Philo's appears in several further particulars. The Logos here is the real personal God, the Word; who did not begin to be when Christ came, but *was* originally, before the creation, "with God, and was God." He made *all things* (verse 3). Philo held to the original independent existence of matter, the *stuff,* ὕλη, of the world, before it was framed. John's Logos is holy light, which shines in moral darkness, though rejected by it. Philo has no such height of mournful insight as this. This *Logos* became man in the person of Christ, the Son of God. Philo conceives of no incarnation. Thus John's lofty doctrine of the Messiah is not in any way derived from Jewish or Gnostic speculations, but rests partly on pure Old-Testament doctrine, and chiefly on what he

learned from Christ himself. His testimony to this forms the historical part of his Gospel. *SEE MEMRA*.

3. *Theological Bearing of the Term.* — The word "Logos" is therefore evidently "employed by the evangelist John to designate the mediatorial character of our Redeemer, with special reference to his revelation of the character and will of the Father. It appears to be used as an abstract for the concrete. just as we find the same writer employing *light* for *enlightener. life* for *life-giver*, etc.; so that it properly signifies the *speaker* or *interpreter*, than which nothing can more exactly accord with the statement made (John 1:18), 'No man hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, hath *declared* him,' i.e., communicated to us the true knowledge of his mind and character. That the term is merely expressive of a divine attribute, a position which has been long and variously maintained by Socinians, though abandoned as untenable by some of their best authorities, is in total repugnance to all the circumstances of the context, which distinctly and expressly require personal subsistence in the subject which it describes. He whom John styles the Logos has the creation of all things ascribed to him; is set forth as possessing the country and people of the Jews; as the only-begotten (Son) of the Father; as assuming the human nature, and displaying in it the attributes of grace and truth, etc. Such things could never, with the least degree of propriety, be said of any mere attribute or quality. Nor is the hypothesis of a personification to be reconciled with the universally admitted fact that the style of John is the most simply historical, and the furthest removed from that species of composition to which such a figure of speech properly belongs. To the Logos the apostle attributes eternal existence, distinct personality, and strict and proper Deity — characters which he also ascribes to him in his first epistle — besides the possession and exercise of perfections which absolutely exclude the idea of derived or created being." *SEE CHRISTOLOGY*.

4. *Literature.* — The following are the principal monographs on this subject: Sandius, *De* Λόγῳ (in his *Interp. Paradox*, Amsterd. 1670); Saubert, *De voce* Λόγος (Altdorf, 1687): Carpzov, *De* Λόγῳ, *Philonis* (Helmstadt, 1749); Bryant, *Philo's* Λόγος (1797); Upham, *Letters on the Logos* (Boston, 1828); Bucher, *Johann. Lehre evon Logos* (Schaffh. 1856). For others, see Danz, *Worterbuch*, s.v.; Darling, *Cyclopaedia*, col. 1059; Lange's *Commentary* (Am. ed., Introd. to John's Gospel). Comp. also the *Meth. Quar. Review*, July and October 1851; January 1858;

Christian Examiner, January 1863; *Am. Presb. Review,* January 1840; July, 1864; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, 3:672; 1833, 2:355; 1868, 2:299. *SEE JOHN, GOSPEL OF*.

Logotheta

(λογοθέτης, q.d. *chancellor)* is the title given in the Greek Church to the member of the ecclesiastical courts holding the imperial seal to be appended to their edicts. *SEE GREEK CHURCH*.

Loguo

is, in the mythology of the Caribbeans, the name of the first man, who descended from his celestial abode to the soft, shapeless mass of which the earth was formed by his creative power. He first imparted to it shape and motion; the sun rendered it dry and hard. Loguo, after his death, reascended to heaven. See Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterb.* s.v.

Lohdius, Carl Friedrich

a German theologian, was born at Grünberg, near Waldheim, December 13, 1748, and was educated at the University of Leipsic, where, in 1774, he obtained the degree of A.M. and the privilege of lecturing on theology. He became soon after morning preacher at the university. In 1780 he accepted a call to Grimma as dean, and in 1782 to Dresden. He died there August 4, 1809. Of his scholarly productions we only mention *Delineatur imago doctrinae de conditione animi post mortem eo, quo Christus et Apostoli vixerunt, saeculo,* diss. 1 et 2 (Lipsiae, 1790, 4to). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands,* s.v.

Löhe, Johann Konrad Wilhelm

a German Lutheran minister, was born at Fürth, in Bavaria, February 17, 1808, and was educated at the University of Erlangen, which he entered in 1826. After serving at various places as minister of Lutheran churches, he settled in 1837 at Neuendettelsau as pastor of a flourishing Church. Zealously devoted to the cause of his Master, he studied the ways and means of promoting the Christian religion among the masses of the German people, and in 1849 founded to this end a society for *Inner AIaissions* (q.v.), and in 1854, following the example of the immortal Fliedner (q.v.), of Kaiserswerth, established a Deaconesses' Institute, *SEE DEACONESS*, which in our day is known in nearly all the civilized world. Lohe labored

here faithfully and successfully until his death, January 28, 1872. He wrote *Der evangelische Geistliche* (2d edition, Stuttg. 1866, 2 volumes, 8vo): — *Lebenslauf der heilig. Magd Gottes aus dem Pfarrstande* (3d ed. Nuremb. 1869, 8vo): — *Geistlicher Tageslauf* (3d ed. Nuremb. 1870, 8vo): — *Aus der Geschichte d. Diakonissenanstalt Neuendettelsan* (Nuremb. 1870, 8vo); etc. See Schem, *Deutsch-Amerikan. Conv. Lexicon*, 6:589.

Lohesh

SEE HAL-LOHESH.

Loin

(usually in the dual, µyæl ;j } *chalatsa'yim*, as the seat of strength, spoken of as the place of the girdle, <183803>Job 38:3; 40:7; <235705>Isaiah 5:27 ["reins," 11:5]; 32:1; or as a part of the body generally, <183120>Job 31:20; <240616>Jeremiah 30:6 [so the Chald. plur. ˆyxæ}j ¡, <270706>Daniel 5:6]; by euphemism for the generative power, <013511>Genesis 35:11; <110819>1 Kings 8:19; <141609>2 Chronicles 6:9; also µyæt }n; *mothna'yin*, as the seat of strength, Gr. ὀσφύς, which are the other terms properly so rendered, and refer to that part of the body simply; but µy l æ{K] *kesalim'*, <191907>Psalm 38:7, means the *flanks*, as elsewhere rendered, prop. the internal muscles of the loins, near the kidneys, to which the fat adheres; while µyæir ¡[} put in (<014656>Genesis 46:26; <020105>Exodus 1:5; comp. <070830>Judges 8:30, by euphemism for the seat of generation, properly signifies the *thigh*, as elsewhere rendered, being plainly distinguished from the true loin in <022842>Exodus 28:42), the part of the back and side between the hip and the ribs, which, as being, as it were, the pivot of the body, is most sensibly affected by pain or terror (<053311>Deuteronomy 33:11; <184016>Job 40:16; <190707>Psalm 38:7; 69:23; <232103>Isaiah 21:3; <240306>Jeremiah 30:6; <262106>Ezekiel 21:6; 29:7; <270506>Daniel 5:6; <340210>Nahum 2:10). This part of the body was especially girt with sackcloth, in token of mourning (<013734>Genesis 37:34; <112031>1 Kings 20:31, 32; <196611>Psalm 66:11; <232002>Isaiah 20:2; 32:11; <244837>Jeremiah 48:37; <300810>Amos 8:10). The term is most frequently used with allusion to the girdle which encompassed this part of the body, i.q. the *waist;* especially in the phrase to "gird up the loins," i.e., prepare for vigorous effort, either literally (<111846>1 Kings 18:46; <120429>2 Kings 4:29; 9:1; <211717>Proverbs 31:17), or oftener as a metaphor borrowed from the loose and flowing dress of Orientals, which requires to be gathered closely at the waist, or even to have the skirts tucked up into the belt before engaging in any

exertion or enterprise (<18B038>Job 38:3; 40:7; <241701>Jeremiah 1:17; <421235>Luke 12:35; <600113>1 Peter 1:13). *SEE GIRDLE*.

Lo'is

*(*Λωΐς, perh. *agreeable)*, the grandmother of Timothy, not by the side of his father, who was a Greek, but by that of his mother. Hence the Syriac has “thy mother's mother." She is commended by the apostle Paul for her faith (<550105>2 Timothy 1:5); for, although she might not have known that the Christ had come, and that Jesus of Nazareth was he, she yet believed in the Messiah to come, and died in that faith. Ante A.D. 64. *SEE TIMOTHY*.

Loki Or Loke

in Scandinavian mythology, is the principle of evil, an impious, mischievous wretch, author of all intrigue, vice, and crime; father of the most abominable monsters, of the wolf Fenris, the midgard snake, and Hela (blue Hel), the goddess of death; the "spirit of evil," as it were, mingling freely with, yet essentially opposed to the other inhabitants of the Norse heaven, very much like the Satan of the book of Job. He is called the son of the giant Farbante, and is married to the giantess Angerbode. Sometimes he is called *Asa-Loki*, to distinguish him from Utgarda-Loki, a king of the giants, whose kingdom lies on the uttermost bounds of the earth; but these two are occasionally confounded. It is quite natural, considering the character of Loki, that at a later period he should have become identified with the devil of Christianity, who is called in Norway to the present day *Laake.* See Vollmer, *Mythol. Worterb.* s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Weinhold, *Die Sagen v. Loki* in Haupt, *Zeitschrift Jur deutsches Alterth.* volume 7; Thorpe, *North. Mythol.* volume 1 (see Index); and the excellent article in Thomas, *Biogr. and Alythol. Dict.* (Phila. 1872), s.v.

Lokmân

is represented in the Koran and by later Arabian tradition as a celebrated philosopher, contemporary with David and Solomon, with whom he is said to have frequently conversed. He was, we are told, an Arabian of the ancient tribe of Ad, or, according to another account, the king or chief of that tribe; and, when his tribe perished by the Seil el-Arim, he was preserved on account of his wisdom and piety. Other accounts, drawn mostly from Persian authorities, state that Lokman was an Abyssinian slave, and noted for his personal deformity and ugliness, as for his wit and

a peculiar talent for composing moral fictions and short apologues. He was considered to be the author of the well-known collection of fables, in Arabic, which still exist under his name. There is some reason to suppose that Lokman and AEsop were the same individual, and this view is of late gaining ground. See the excellent articles in the *English Cyclops.* s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclops.* s.v.; and Hammer-Purgstall, *Literaturgesch. der Araber,* 1:31 sq.