

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Lollards - Lyttleton, Sir George

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

Lollards Or Lol(l)hards

originally the name of a monastic society which arose at Antwerp about 1300, and the members of which devoted themselves to the care of the sick and dying with pestilential disorders, *SEE CELLITES*, was afterwards applied to those who, during the closing part of the 14th and a large part of the succeeding century, were credited with adhering to the religious views maintained by Wickliffe (q.v.).

Origins of the Name. — Great diversity of opinion exists among scholars on the origin of the name *Lollard*. Some have supposed that there existed a person of such a name in Germany, who, differing in many points from the Church of Rome, made converts to his peculiar doctrines, and thus originated an independent sect about 1315 (see *Genesis Biog. Dict.* art. Lollard, Walter), and for this heretical step was burned alive at Cologne in 1322. It is more than probable, however, that this leader received his name from the sect than gave a name to it, just as in the *Prognosticatio* of Johannes Lychtenberger (a work very popular in Germany towards the close of the 15th century) great weight is attached to the predictions of one Reynard Lollard (Reynhardus Lolhardus), who was, no doubt, so called from the sect to which he belonged. Others believe that it was applied to the Cellites because of their practice of singing dirges at funerals — the Low-German word *lollen* or *lullen* signifying to sing softly or slowly. Another derivation of the word is that which makes it an epithet of reproach. In papal bulls and other documents it is used as synonymous virtually with *lollia*, the tares commingled with the wheat of the Church. In this sense we meet with it (A.D. 1382) even before Wickliffe's death. Still another suggestion comes from a correspondent of "Notes and Queries" (March 27, 1852), who, quoting from a passage of Heda's history, cites a statement to the effect that bishop Florentius de Wevelichoven "caused the bones of a certain Matthew Lollaert to be burned, and his ashes to be dispersed," etc. The correspondent remarks that from a note on this passage, where reference is made to Prateolus and Walsingham, it is evident that Heda is speaking of the founder of the sect of the Lollards. The name Lollaert would, of course, indicate that the name of the English sect was derived from a Dutch heretic, buried at Utrecht, and well known in the neighboring region. With much more reason the origin of the word Lollard has been traced of late to the Latin *lollardus*, by a comparison of the later English *Lollard* with the old English *loller*, used by Chaucer and Langeland. Says Whitaker (in his edition of *Piers Plowman*, page 154 sq.):

"Any reader of early English knows that *Lollard* is the late English spelling of the Latin *lollardus*. *But* what is *lollardus*? It is a Latin spelling of the old English *loller*, used by Chaucer and Langeland. The real meaning of *loller* is one who *lolls* about, a vagabond; and it was equally applied, *at first*, to the Wickliffites and to the *begging friars*... . [Beghuins (q.v.)]. But, before long, *loller* was *purposely* confused with the Latin *lolium*, by a kind of pun. The derivation of *loller* from *loll* rests on no slight authority. It is most distinctly discussed and explained, and its etymology declared by no less a person than Langeland himself, who lived at the time it came into use."

English Lollards. — Whatever be the derivation of the word Lollard, certain it is that by this name alone the followers of John Wickliffe (q.v.) were always designated, who, in the early stage of the reformatory movements of the bold English churchman (about A.D. 1360), consisted of the "Poor Priests" (q.v.), a class called together by Wickliffe to carry the glad tidings of the Gospel into the remotest hamlets, and to counteract the influence of the *begging friars* (*SEE BEGHARDS*, who were then strolling over the country, preaching instead of the *Word* the legends of the saints and the history of the Trojan War (compare D'Aubigne, *Hist. of the Reformation*, 5:91 sq.). For some time. the mendicant orders, which had first entered England in the early part of the preceding century, had been the object of attack, both by the people and the clergy, for their rapacious and shameless conduct. Indeed, so much was the country disturbed by the violence and vices of swarms of these sanctimonious vagabonds that the ancient records often speak of their arrest. Wickliffe's opposition to such a class of persons could not but have secured him the general respect and commendation of the people. Not so, however, when, to counteract the influence of the mendicants, he instituted the "Poor Priests," who, not content with mere polemics, preached the great mystery of godliness, and became so greatly the favorites of the people that the clergy were threatened to be left without any attendants at their churches, preference being shown to the poor priests, preaching in the fields, in some church-yard, or in the market-places. It was not, however, until after Wickliffe's appointment to the University of Oxford that any of the doctrines which the Lollards as a sect afterwards maintained, and which caused his prosecution by the papists, were advocated and propagated. It is true, even as early as 1357, Wickliffe had published a work against the covetousness of Rome (*The last Age of the Church*), and in 1365 had vindicated Edward

III's resistance to the claim of Urban V of the arrears of the tribute granted to the papacy by king John, *SEE URBAN V*; *SEE ENGLAND*; but it was not until (in 1372) he had taken the degree of D.D., and entered upon his work at Oxford University by able and emphatic testimony against the abuses of the papacy, that he drew upon himself the enmity of the English prelates, and, in consequence, came to stand forth the advocate of reform and the leader of a movement for this purpose. Nor did the success of his course slacken in the least after his withdrawal from the university and his retirement to the small parish of Lutterworth. Everywhere those persons who had come sunder his influence or been converted by his writings were busily engaged in disseminating the doctrines which he taught. His followers were to be found among all classes of the population. Some, like the duke of Lancaster, lord Percy, and Clifford, may have been attached to Wickliffe's views mainly by their political sympathies, but the great mass of his adherents were such upon religious grounds. The examinations of those who, during the generation that followed his death (1384), were arrested or punished as heretics, indicate the common doctrinal position which they almost uniformly maintained. It was substantially identical with that taken by Wickliffe in his writings. The supreme authority of the Scriptures in religious matters. the rejection of transubstantiation, the futile nature of pilgrimages, auricular confession, etc., the impiety of image-worship, the identification of the papal hierarchy with Antichrist, the entire sufficiency of Christ as a Savior, without the need of priestly offices in the mass, or any elaborate ceremonial — such were the points upon which they were pronounced heretical, and, as such, persecuted and condemned.

Up to 1382, through the events of the time, the great schism of the papacy, the indignation excited in England by papal encroachments, the scandalous conduct of many among the prelates and clergy, Wickliffe, as well as his followers, had been left comparatively unmolested, and he himself even escaped altogether. Not so, however, his followers, who were, near the time of his death, rapidly augmenting all over England. The testimony of Knighton and Walsingham indicates the rapid spread of Wickliffe's opinions, though there may be some exaggeration in the remark of the former to the effect that "nearly every other man in England was a Lollard." In 1382, however, more decided action was taken on the part of the ecclesiastics, and resulted in the convening of a council by archbishop Courtney. By it ten of Wickliffe's articles were condemned as heretical, and twenty-four as erroneous. The archbishop issued his mandate, forbidding

any man, "of what estate or condition soever," to hold, teach, preach, or defend the aforesaid heresies and errors, or any of them, or even allow them to be preached or favored, publicly or privately. Each bishop and priest was exhorted to become an "inquisitor of heretical pravity," and the neglect of the mandate was threatened with the severest censures of excommunication. This measure took effect at Oxford, where the chancellor, Robert Rygge, was inclined to favor Wickliffe's opinions, and the proctors, John Huntman and Walter Dish, were in sympathy with him. A sermon by Philip Reppyngdon, which they had allowed, and in which Wickliffe's views were defended, subjected them to suspicion. They were summoned before the archbishop, and with some difficulty escaped on submission. The chancellor was required to put Wickliffe's adherents to a purgation or cause them to abjure, publishing before the university the condemnation of his conclusions. His reply was that he durst not do it for fear of death. "What!" exclaimed the archbishop, "is Oxford such a nestler and favorer of heresies that the catholic truth cannot be published?" At the same time, by the archbishop's authority, Nicholas Hereford, Philip Reppyngdon, John Ashton, and Lawrence Bedemen, whose names were associated with Wickliffe's, were denied the privilege of preaching before the university, and suspended from every scholastic act. The chancellor himself was addressed as "somewhat inclined and still inclining to the aforesaid conclusions so condemned," and, under pain of the greater excommunication, he was enjoined to permit no one in the university to teach or defend the obnoxious doctrines. The injunction of the archbishop was enforced by the command of the royal council.

In the early months of 1382 the king had favored the persecution of heretics. On the petition of the archbishop, he had allowed him and his suffragans "to arrest and imprison, either in their own prisons, or any other if they please, all and every such person and persons as shall either privily or openly preach or maintain" the condemned conclusions. The persons thus arrested might, moreover, be detained "till such time as they shall repent them and amend them of such erroneous and heretical pravities." The officers and subjects of the king were also required to obey and humbly attend the archbishop and his suffragans in the execution of their process. But the king declined to interfere. Even this, however, did not satisfy the archbishop. The excommunicated Hereford had escaped from prison, and the prelate, disappointed of his victim, asked the king to issue letters for his apprehension. On Ashton's trial in London, the citizens broke

open the doors of the conclave, forcing the archbishop to complete his process elsewhere. But popular sympathy was weak to resist the organized efforts of a powerful hierarchy, largely occupying the most responsible posts of government, and bold enough (Hannay's *Rep. Gov.*) to forge or interpolate parliamentary records, of which they had the control. Some of the accused, like Reppyngdon and Hereford, recanted, and became the most virulent persecutors of their former sympathizers. Others, according to Walden, who mentions William Swinderby, Walter Brute, William Thorpe, and others, whose names figure in Fox's "Martyrs," fled the realm. If Swinderby was one of the refugees, he soon returned. It is doubtful whether he or his associates went farther than to Wales or Scotland. In 1389 he was arraigned before the bishop of Lincoln, and charged with heresy. Forced to recant, he withdrew to the diocese of Hereford. Here he was again arrested as a "truly execrable offender of the new sect vulgarly called Lollards." The issue, so far as episcopal authority was concerned, could not remain doubtful. Swinderby was found guilty, pronounced a heretic, and to be shunned by all. From this sentence he appealed to the king and council.

We have no subsequent record of Swinderby. Foxe supposes him to have been burned in 1399. In 1393, Walter Brute, another Lollard, a layman, was arrested, and, after a tedious trial, was forced to recant. In 1395 the alarm of heresy was again sounded. There was an apprehension that Parliament would take some action in behalf of the persecuted Lollards. A bull of Boniface IX was issued, inciting the bishop of Hereford against the obnoxious sect, and urging him to stimulate the orthodox zeal of the king. The king was at the time absent in Ireland, but Tindale states that intelligence of what had transpired was sent him, and his immediate return, with a view to repress the boldness of the Lollards, was strenuously urged. Nor was the king backward in responding to the petitions of the archbishop and the exhortations of the pope. Reciting his former commission to the bishops and their suffragans, giving them authority to arrest and imprison, he extended this authority, by which the bishop of Hereford was allowed to arrest William Swinderby and Stephen Bell, who had fled to the borders of Wales; while several of the leading members of Parliament were directed to have it proclaimed, wherever they thought meet, that no man of any condition within the said diocese should, under pain of forfeiture of all he had, "make or levy any conventicles, assemblies, or confederacies by any color," and that, if any one should transgress this rule, he should be seized,

imprisoned, and safely kept till surrendered to the order of the king and council.

During this time, while special attention was drawn to the danger apprehended from Parliament, the Lollards were spreading their doctrines in other parts of the kingdom. At Leicester and its neighborhood they had made such progress that several of their leaders, eight of whom are mentioned by Foxe by name, were denounced to the archbishop on his visitation as heretics. They were summoned the next day to appear before him and answer to the charge. But they "hid themselves away and appeared not." They were therefore publicly denounced as excommunicate in several of the parish churches. Nor was this all. The whole town of Leicester, and all the churches in the same, were interdicted so long as any of the excommunicated should remain within the same, and "till all the Lollards of the town should return and amend from such heresies and errors, obtaining at the said archbishop's hands the benefit of absolution."

The compact between the leading representatives of the ecclesiastical and civil power which marked the accession of Henry IV to the throne was soon sealed by parliamentary legislation. To prevent the spread of the Lollards, and to suppress their meetings, which were described as confederacies to stir up sedition and insurrection (Crabb's *History of English Law*, page 334), it was ordained that if persons, sentimentally convict, refused to abjure their opinions, such persons were to be left to the secular arm. In such cases evidence was to be given to the diocesan or his commissary, and the sheriff, mayor, and bailiff were, after sentence promulgated, to receive them, and in a high place, before the people, to cause them to be burnt. "The law did not remain a dead letter. It was not long before a victim was found. The ecclesiastics were only too zealous for an example that might strike terror among the people, and especially the Londoners, who were "not right believers in God, nor in the traditions of their forefathers; sustainers of the Lollards, depravers of religious men, withholders of tythes," etc. The victim selected was "one William Sautre, a good man and a faithful priest, inflamed with zeal for true religion," who in the Parliament of 1401 required that he might be heard for the commodity of the whole realm. The suspicions of the bishops were excited, and he was summoned before the ecclesiastical court. His views were in substance those of the Lollards. He was at first induced to recant, but after his previous trial before the bishop of Norwich was known, as well as his submission and subsequent relapse, there was no disposition to show him

mercy. By the king's order, "in some public and open place within the liberties of the city" of London, he was "committed to the fire." So bold a measure, not frequent in English history, naturally terrified the Lollards. They kept themselves secret from the eyes of the bishops. To the king they could no longer look with confidence or the hope of relief. The son of Wickliffe's patron had become the tool of the bishops. His usurped power was sustained by their alliance. As the hopes of relief from the burdens of taxation which had been inspired by the promises made at his accession began to (lie out, his popularity waned. Complaints were heard from various quarters. The old partisans of Richard II began to murmur, and, to retain his throne in security, Henry IV was compelled to throw himself more and more into the arms of the Church, and concede everything which the prelates might demand. The "cruel constitution" of archbishop Arundel was the fitting ecclesiastical counterpart of the civil statute that legalized the burning of the Lollards. It forbade any one to preach, "whether within the Church or without, in English," except by episcopal sanction. Schoolmasters and teachers were to intermingle with their instructions nothing contrary to the determination of the Church. No book or treatise of Wickliffe was to be read in schools, halls, hospitals, or other places whatsoever. No man hereafter, by his own authority, should translate any text of the Scripture into English or any other tongue, by way of a book, tract, or treatise. No one should presume to dispute upon articles determined by the Church contained in the decrees, decretals, etc. Every warden, provost, or master of every college, or principal of every hall within the University of Oxford, was, at least once every month, to inquire diligently in the college with which he was connected whether any scholar or inhabitant thereof had proposed or defended anything contrary to the determinations of the Church, and the failure of duty in this respect was to be visited by deprivation, expulsion, and the greater excommunication.

But all the precautions of the bishops and the severity of persecuting laws were ineffectual to suppress the hated opinions. Fox narrates the examination of William Thorpe (1407) and the burning of John Badby (1409). The latter event seems to have created sympathy for the Lollards on the part of the Commons. In the eleventh year of Henry IV (1410) they prayed that persons arrested under the obnoxious statute might be bailed and make their purgation, and that they might be arrested by none but sheriffs and lay officers. This petition, however, did not secure the royal approval. The influence and support of the Church would doubtless have

been lost to the king if he had yielded to the wishes of the Commons. Other measures which they proposed, designed to set limits to ecclesiastical usurpation, while they gave unequivocal evidence of the unchanged spirit of the nation, met with little more success. In 1413 Henry IV was succeeded by his son, Henry V. The change, however, did not open any brighter prospect to the persecuted Lollards. The beginning of this reign was signalized by a new triumph of the Church. The king surrendered his friend, Sir John Oldcastle, lord Cobham, to the machinations of his persecutors. He was arrested, imprisoned, arraigned before the archbishop and his assessors, pronounced a heretic, and excommunicated. His offense was regarded as of the most aggravated character. He was not only himself heretically inclined, but he had employed his wealth and influence to support Lollard preachers, and transcribe and disperse heretical books. So powerful and bold was the organized conspiracy of the priesthood against him that the king did not venture to interfere in his behalf. He was abandoned to his fate, but by some means escaped from prison, and only some years later was arrested, and subjected to the tardy but sure vengeance of his persecutors. It was not only by his surrender of lord Cobham that the new monarch signalized his subservience to the interests of the hierarchy. In his first Parliament a law was enacted against the Lollards, who were considered as the principal disturbers of the peace not only of the Church, but of the whole kingdom, uniting, as the preamble of the act states, in confederacies to destroy the king and all other estates of the realm. Hence all magistrates, from the chancellor to the sheriffs of cities and towns, were required, on entering office, to take an oath that they would use their whole power and diligence to destroy all heresies and errors, commonly called lollardies, and assist the ordinaries and their commissaries as often as required by them. It was moreover enacted "that whatsoever they were that should read the Scriptures in the mother tongue (which was then called Wickliffe's learning) should forfeit land, cattle, body, life, and goods from their heirs forever, and so be condemned for heretics to God, enemies to the crown, and most arrant traitors to the land." No sanctuary or privileged ground within the realm, though permitted to thieves and murderers should shelter them. In case of relapse after pardon they should be hanged as traitors against the king, and then burned as heretics against God.

The terror inspired by such executions and enactments drove many into exile. They fled, says Fox, "into Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, and

into the wilds of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, working there many marvels against their false kingdom too long to write." It was, of course, the most distinguished members of the sect who had most to apprehend, and who were the first to flee. Those who remained behind belonged very largely to the middle or the lower class. From time to time we meet with the name of some more eminent offender, and, from the precautions taken by their persecutors, we may form some idea of the continued energy as well as existence of the Lollards. Lechler, in the *Zeitschrift für Hist. Theol.* (1853, volume 4), has traced the evidences of their presence and influence in England down to the date of the Lutheran Reformation. The precious legacy of the Lollard faith was transmitted, along with MS. translations of the Scriptures and Lollard books, from generation to generation; and among the English martyrs, just before as well as after the commencement of the Reformation, there were several who might most appropriately be denominated Lollards. The prevalence of their views as late as the middle of the 15th century is attested by the elaborate effort which Reginald Peacock, successively bishop of St. Asaph and of Chichester, made to refute them. His earlier years had been spent in London, in the work of instruction, and here he had become familiar with the work of the Lollards, and the arguments by which they were maintained. With great ingenuity, and with a commendable patience, he undertook their refutation, giving to this method the decided preference over chains, prison, and the stake. Convicted at length himself of holding heretical opinions, and removed from the episcopal office, he spent the last three years of his life in prison, and by some, although unwarrantably, was regarded as a Lollard. On some points his views, indeed, approximated to those of the hated sect, but his writings derive their historical value from the exhibition which they make of the doctrines maintained by the Lollards, or "Bible-men," as he sometimes calls them, and the evidence which they afford of their extensive acceptance. Here we see that for nearly two full generations the same doctrinal views which had been accepted by the immediate followers of Wickliffe were still retained by their successors, and during the two generations which followed they underwent no material change. Thus, when the English Reformation of the 16th century commenced, it derived a new impulse from the earlier Lollard movement which it was destined to absorb into itself. Nor is it a mere fancy which has led writers like Lechler to assert an important and vital connection between the Lollardism of the 15th and the Puritanism of the 16th century. (E.H.G.)

Scottish Lollards. — Lollardism was by no means confined to the southern portion of the British Islands. It penetrated also into Scotland, and in the real home of the *Culdees* (q.v.) — the land where a simple and primitive form of Christianity had been established, while among her southern neighbors Rome presented a vast accumulation of superstitions, and was arrayed in her well-known pomp — received the countenance of those whose position and influence were well calculated to aid in its dissemination among a people that had freely imbibed the spirit of religious reformation so prevalent among the English in the 14th century, especially in the reign of Richard II, at the time of the passage of the statute of *praemunire* (A.D. 1389). More particularly rapid was the spread of the reformatory spirit in Scotland in the western districts, those of Kyle, Carrick, and Cunningham, and hence the surname for the Scotch Lollards, *Lollards of Kyle*, as they were oftentimes called. The clergy, aware of the danger that threatened their state of profligacy and ease, at last, in the beginning of the 15th century, made open war upon these silent antagonists. The first to suffer from the persecution which they inaugurated was a certain John Resby an English priest who had fled northward from persecution, and in the land of refuge also was fast making converts to his cause. The leading authority and influence in the land was at this time the see of St. Andrews (compare Dean Stanley's *Lectures on the Eccles. History of Scotland*, page 45), over which bishop Henry Wardlaw was now presiding. By his interference Resby was tried before Dr. Laurence de Lindoris, afterwards professor of common law at St. Andrews, and on his refusal to retract his views about the supremacy of the pope, auricular confession, transubstantiation, etc., was burnt at Perth in 1405 or 1407. According to Pinkerton, such a scene was unknown before in Scotland. The burning of Resby is given in the twentieth chapter of the fifteenth book of the *Scotichronicon*. Still these opinions continued to extend, especially in the south and west of Scotland. The regent, Robert, duke of Albany, was known to be opposed to the Lollards; and though king James I was by no means blind to prevailing abuses in the Church, an act of Parliament was passed during his reign, in 1425 by which bishops were required to make inquisition in their dioceses for heretics, in order that they might undergo condign punishment. This act was soon to be put in force. In 1433 another victim for the stake was secured in the person of Paul Craw or Crawler, a physician of Prague, who had sought refuge from persecution in Scotland. As he made no secret of his Lollard or Hussite opinions, he was arraigned

before Lindoris and condemned to the flames. After this time we hear but little of Lollardism for quite a long period.

With the closing years of the century, however, to judge from the energy of the papists, it must have been apparent again in a more prominent manner, and from this period dates one of the severest of religious persecutions. In 1494, Robert Blacater, the first archbishop of Glasgow, sought to display his zeal for the Church by a wholesale attack on the pious followers of Lollardism. Accordingly, thirty suspected persons, both male and female, were summoned before the king (James IV) and the great council. Among them were Reid of Barskimming, Campbell of Cessnock, Campbell of Newmills, Shaw of Polkemmet, Helen Chalmers, lady Polkillie, and Isabel Chalmers, lady Stairs. According to Knox (*History of the Reformation*, page 2), their indictment contained thirty-four different articles, which he informs us are preserved in the Register of Glasgow. Among the chief of these were. that images, relics, and the Virgin are not proper objects of worship; that the bread and wine in the sacrament are not transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ; that no priest or pope can grant absolutions or indulgences; that masses cannot profit the (lead; that miracles have ceased; and that priests may lawfully marry. Providentially for the Lollards of Kyle, king James IV, "a monarch who, with all his faults, had vet too much of manliness and candor to permit his judgment to be greatly swayed by the malignity of the prelates," declined to be a persecutor of any of his people for such moderate reason, and dismissed the prisoners with an admonition to beware of new doctrines, and to content themselves with the faith of the Church. It is by many believed, however, that one particular reason why king James IV abstained from inflicting any punishment on these Lollards of Kyle was their influence and the wide spread of the doctrines they adhered to, and that "divers of them were his great familiars" (compare Lea, *Hist. Sacerdotal Celibacy*, page 508; Hetherington, *Hist. Ch. Of Scotland*, 1:34 sq.).

Literature. — Much information concerning the Lollards may be derived from the lives of Wickliffe by Lewis, Le Bas, and especially Vaughan. Fox, in his *Martyrology*, often presents very disconnected documents exceedingly valuable. Walsingham (*Chronica*), Knighton, and Walden have contributed important evidence. although by no means favorable, which subsequent writers have used. The fuller histories of England, as Rapin, for instance, present some leading facts concerning the Lollards in connection with contemporary political movements. The most satisfactory account of

the later Lollards is found in articles by Lechler in the *Histor. Zeitschrift* for 1853 and 1854. He has given citations from works hitherto unpublished, which he examined in the libraries of the English universities. See also Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britannicae* (London, 1737, 3); Turner, *History of England during the Middle Ages*; Weber, *Gesch. d. Kirchen Ref. in Grossbritannien* (1856), volume 1; Neander, *Ch. History*, 5:141 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, 7:404 sq.; Mosheim, *Eccles. Hist.* 13th cent. page 323; 14th cent. pages 381, 392, etc.; 15th cent. Page 438 sq.; Shoberly, *Persecutions of Popery*, 1:135 sq.; Ullmann, *Reform. before the Reformation*, 2:11, 14; Ebrard, *Kirchen und Dogmengesch.* 2:360, 450, 462 sq.; Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, 1:370 sq., 628, Index for Wickliffe; Punchard, *Hist. of Congregationalism* (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 12mo), 1:237 sq.; Butler (C.M.), *Eccles. Hist.* second series (Philadel. 1872, 8vo), page 365 sq., 378, 381 sq., 388; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, page 379 sq.; Reichel, *Hist. of the Roman See in the Middle Ages*, page 571 sq.; *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1845, 3:594 sq.; 1848, 1:169 sq.; *Chr. Rev.* volume 8; *Christ. Remem.* 1853 (October), page 415; *Ladies' Rewos.* 1870 (September), page 189 sq.

Lombard(us), Peter

a very noted scholastic theologian, derived his name from the province in which he was born, near Novara, in Lombardy, about the opening of the 12th century. He studied at Bologna, Rheims, and afterwards at Paris. Here he acquired a great reputation, was made first professor of theology in the university, and subsequently (in 1159) appointed bishop. He died in the French capital in 1164. Lombardus was considered one of the best scholars of his day, and a zealous priest. His principal work, *Sententiarum libri quatuor*, is a collection of passages from the fathers, of which he attempted to conciliate the apparent contradictions, somewhat in the manner in which Gratian attempted it in his *Decret.* He may be considered as the first author who collected theological doctrines into a complete system, and, whatever the faults of his work, it is the foundation of scholastic theology, and shows much care and system. It became *the* text-book in the schools of philosophy, obtained for him the title of "Master of Sentences" (*Magister Sententiarum*), and placed him at the head of the scholastic divines. The work was first published at Venice (1477, fol.) in four parts, each divided into different headings. After his death, one of the propositions contained in it ("Christus, secundum quod est homo, non est aliquid") was condemned by pope Alexander III. Thomas Aquinas and

others have written commentaries on the book. He also wrote *Commentaire sur les Psaumes* (Paris, 1541, fol.): — *Commentaire sur les Epitres de St. Paul* (1537, fol.). His complete works were published at Nuremberg in 1478, and at Basle in 1486. An able editor was found in Aleaume, who published Peter the Lombard's works at Louvain in 1546. The best edition of the *Sentences* is by Antoine Ghenart (Louvain, 1567, 4to). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Neander, *Hist. of Christian Dogmas* (Bohn's edit.), volume 2 (see Index); Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* 5:545, 639, 785; Reuter, *Alexander III*, volume 3; Dupin, *Nouv. Biblioth. des antiq. Ecclesiastiques*, 16:45 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:583 sq. (J.H.W.)

Lombards

SEE LONGOBARDI.

Lombardy

is the name given to that part of Northern Italy which formed the "nucleus" of the kingdom of the *Longobardi* (q.v.). Incorporated in 774 into the Carolingian possessions, it became an independent kingdom again in 843, though it was not entirely severed from the Frankish monarchy until 888. It now consisted of the whole of Italy north of the Peninsula, with the exception of Savoy and Venice. In 961 it was annexed to the German empire, and its territory thereafter gradually lessened by the formation of several small but independent duchies and republics. Throughout the Middle Ages the Lombards were compelled to league together with their neighbors to retain their independence from the German emperors. The assumptions of Frederick Barbarossa they successfully defeated in 1176, and so also those of Frederick II. But by internal dissensions they were gradually weakened, and in 1540 Spain finally took possession of Lombardy, and held it until about 1706, when it fell to Austria, and was designated "Austrian Lombardy." In 1796 it became part of the Cisalpine republic, but in 1815 it was restored to Austria, and annexed politically to the newly-acquired Venetian territory under the name of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. This union was dissolved in 1859 by the Italian War, Lombardy, with the exception of the Venetian territory (finally also given to Italy in 1866), falling to the new kingdom of Italy. "Here is now no political division called Lombardy, the country having been parceled out into the provinces of Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Cremona, Milan, Pavia,

and Sondrio. Its total area was 9086 English square miles, with a population, in 1885, of 3,460,824 souls, mostly Roman Catholics. *SEE ITALY.*

Lombroso, Jacob

a noted Jewish writer and rebbi of Spanish descent, flourished in Venice, Italy, in the first half of the 17th century. He published in 1639 a beautiful edition of the Old Test. in Hebrew, with valuable comments, and a Spanish translation of the most difficult passages, entitled *tj n āk al ym* (*a Handful of Quiet*). He also wrote a polemic against Christianity. See Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Sekten*, 3:227; Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, 2:254.

Lomenie, De Brienne, Etienne Charles De

a very celebrated French prelate, was born at Paris in 1727. He renounced his primogeniture and the rigors of military glory for the easy honors of the Church, and became a great and powerful opponent of the Protestants. Promoted in 1763 to the archbishopric of Toulouse, he aspired, it would seem, to the part of a Mazarin or a Richelieu in the state, without possessing either the ability or the unscrupulous daring necessary to it. Upon the coronation of Louis XVI in 1775, he took particular pains to strike against the Protestants, but it was not until 1787 that he gained prominence in state affairs. In this year, after figuring in a commission for the reform of the clergy, and coquetting with the philosophy of D'Alembert and the encyclopaedists, he became a member of the Assembly of Notables, and, having headed the party by whom the administration of Calonne was overthrown, he succeeded that unfortunate as minister, adopted his plans, and proved himself just as incapable of executing them. An excited contest arose between the king and Parliament, and resulted in the dismissal of the latter by force of arms. In 1788 he was made prime minister, and was also promoted to the rich archbishopric of Sens. In 1791 he was offered a cardinal's hat, but, knowing the opposition of the people against the clergy, he declined this distinction. In July, 1788, he was compelled by the dissatisfaction of the people to proceed to the Convocation of the states general for the month of May following, and on the 24th of August he retired to private life. He resided for a time at Nice, but the cardinal's hat which Pius VI bestowed on him he now gratefully accepted. He was one of those who took the oath as a constitutional bishop, on account of which he was deprived of the cardinal's hat. He was nevertheless arrested February

15, 1794, and died of apoplexy the same night. See *Heroes, Philosophers, and Courtiers of the Time of Louis XVI* (London, 1863, 2 volumes, 12mo); Lacroix's *Pressense, Religion and the Reign of Terror*, pages 43, 124; Droz, *Hist. due regne de Louis XVI*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 31:532 sq. (J.H.W.)

Lomus

in Hindû mythology, is the first created being, formed by Brahma when he commenced to exist. He immediately concluded to devote himself only to the contemplation of divine things, and, in order to be undisturbed, buried himself in the ground. This pleased the gods so much that they loaded him with favors, increased and fixed his power and piety, and assured him a duration of life surpassing even that of Brahma (q.v.). Lomus, said to be twenty miles long, and covered with hair all over, draws out a hair after the lapse of each cycle Brahma has gone through, and dies only after the last hair is drawn. See Vollmer, *Mythol. Wörterb.* s.v.

Lön, Johanna Michael

a German Protestant jurist and theologian, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1695. He studied jurisprudence at Marburg, became soon known as an essayist on questions of morals, philosophy, and theology, which he treated with great ease and brilliancy, although occasionally inaccurate in his statements, and was finally appointed president of the Council of Lingen and Tecklenburg. He died in 1776. He is especially known for his efforts to bring about a union of the different Christian churches, or, at least, of the evangelical denominations. He sought to unite them all into one, to carry out indifferentism towards dogmatics to its full extent. With this object in view, he wrote, under the name of Gottlob von Friedenheim, *Evangelischer Friedenstempel nach d. Art d. ersten Kirche* (1724): — *Von Vereinigung d. Protestanten* (1748): — *Die einzig wahre Religion* (1750). These works brought him into a long controversy with Hoffmann, Weickhmann, Brenner, etc., and his attempts at establishing a union proved fruitless. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:452; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon* 10:463. (J.N.P.)

London Missionary Society

SEE MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

Long, Jacques Le

SEE LE LONG.

Long, Roger

D.D., an English divine, noted as an astronomer, was born in Norfolkshire in 1680, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge University, and became M.A. in 1733. He was honored with the chair of astronomy by his alma mater in 1749; and shortly after secured the rectory of Bradwell. He died December 16, 1770. Besides his *Sermons* (1728 sq.), he published and is best known as the author of a *Treatise on Astronomy* (2 volumes, 4to; volume 1:1742; volume 2:1764). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and American Authors*, 2, s.v.; Thomas, *Biog. and Mythol. Dict.* s.v.

Long, Thomas

an English Nonconformist, was born at Exeter in 1621. He was educated at Exeter College, and about 1660 became prebendary of Exeter cathedral, from which he was ejected in 1688 for refusing to take the oath to William and Mary. He died in 1700. Mr. Long published a *Vindication of the Prinmitive Christians in Point of Obedience to their Prince* (1683): — *Answer to Locke's first Letter on Toleration* (1689): — *Vox Cleri on Alterations in the Liturgy* (1690); and a *Review of Dr. Walker's Account of the Author of Eikon Basilike*. See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Thomas, *Dictionary of Biography and Mythology*, s.v.

Long Brothers, The Four.

Among the leading men of the spiritualists, the four "Long Brothers" must not be overlooked: Dioscorus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, who were as distinguished by their influence as they were eminent in stature. The secret of their power was in their inflexible honesty, combined with hearty and unflinching faith in the system of their choice. See each name.

Longevity

The Biblical narrative plainly ascribes to many individuals in the earlier history of the race lives far longer than what is held to be the present extreme limit, and we must therefore carefully consider the evidence upon which the general correctness of the numbers rests, and any independent evidence as to the length of life at this time. The statements in the Bible

regarding longevity may be separated into two classes those given in genealogical lists, and those interspersed with the relation of events.

I. To the former class virtually belong all the statements relating to the longevity of the patriarchs before Abraham. These, as given by Moses in the Hebrew text, are as follows:

Picture for Longevity

Infidelity has not failed, in various ages, to attack revelation on the score of the supposed absurdity of assigning to any class of men this lengthened term of existence. In reference to this, Josephus (*Ant.* 1:3, 3) remarks: "Let no one, upon comparing the lives of the ancients with our lives, and with the few years which we now live, think that what we say of them is false, or make the shortness of our lives at present an argument that neither did they attain to so long a duration of life." When we consider the compensating process which is going on, the marvel is that the human frame should not last longer than it does. Some, however, have supposed that the years above named are *lunar*, consisting of about thirty days; but this supposition, with a view to reduce the lives of the antediluvians to our standard, is replete with difficulties. At this rate, the whole time from the creation of man to the flood would not be more than about 140 years; and Methuselah himself would not have attained to the age which many even now do, whilst many must have had children when mere infants! Moses must therefore have meant *solar*, not *lunar* years — averaging as long as ours, although the ancients generally reckoned twelve months, of thirty days each, to the year. "Nor is there," observes St. Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, 15:12), "any care to be given unto those who think that one of our ordinary years would make *ten* of the years of these times, being so short; and therefore, say they, 900 years of theirs are 90 of ours — their 10 is our 1, and their 100 our 10. Thus think they that Adam was but 20 years old when he begat Seth, and he but 201 when he begat Enos, whom the Scriptures call (the Sept. ver.) 205 years. For, as these men hold, the Scripture divided one year into ten parts, calling each part a year; and each part had a sixfold quadrate, because in six days God made the world. Now 6 times 6 is 36, which, multiplied by 10, makes 360 — i.e., twelve lunar months." Abarbanel, in his *Comment. on Genesis v*, states that some, professing Christianity, had fallen into the same mistake, viz. that Moses meant *lunar*, and not *solar* years. Ecclesiastical history does not inform us of this fact, except it be to it that Lactantius refers (2:12) when he speaks

of one Varro: "The life of man, though temporary, was yet extended to 1000 years; of this Varro is so ignorant that, though known to all from the sacred writings, he would argue that the 1000 years of Moses were, according to the Egyptian mode of calculation, only 1000 months!"

That the ancients computed time differently we learn from Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* 7), and also from Scaliger (*De Emend. Temporum*, 1); still this does not alter the case as above stated (see Heidegger, *De Anno Patriarcharum*, in his *Hist. Patr.* Amst. 1688, Zir. 1729).

But it is asked, if Moses meant solar years, how came it to pass that the patriarchs did not begin to beget children at an earlier period than they are reported to have done? Seth was 105 years old, on the lowest calculation, when he beget Enos, and Methuselah 187 when Lamech was born! St. Augustine (1:15) explains this difficulty in a twofold manner by supposing,

1. Either that the age of puberty was later in proportion as the lives of the antediluvians were longer than ours, or,
2. That Moses does not record the first-born sons but as the order of the genealogy required, his object being to trace the succession from Adam, through Seth, to Abraham.

While the Jews have never questioned the longevity assigned by Moses to the patriarchs, they have yet disputed, in many instances, as to whether it was common to all men who lived up to the period when human life was contracted. Maimonides (*More Nebochim*, 2:47) takes this view. With this opinion Abarbanel, on Genesis v, agrees; Nachmanides, however, rejects it, and shows that the life of the descendants of Cain must have been quite as long as that of the Sethites, though not noticed by Moses; for only seven individuals of the former filled up the space which intervened between the death of Abel and the flood, whereas ten of the latter are enumerated. We have reason, then, to conclude that longevity was not confined to any peculiar tribe of the ante or post diluvian fathers, but was vouchsafed, in general, to all. Irenaeus (*Adversus Haeret.* 5) informs us that some supposed that the fact of its being recorded that no one of the antediluvians named attained the age of 1000 years, was the fulfillment of the declaration (Genesis 3), "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" grounding the opinion, or rather conceit upon ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 90:4, namely, that God's day is 1000 years.

As to the probable reasons why God so prolonged the life of man in the earlier ages of the world, and as to the subordinate means by which this might have been accomplished, Josephus says (*Ant.* 1.c.): "For those ancients were beloved of God, and lately made by God himself; and because their food was then fitter for the prolongation of life, they might well live so great a number of years; and because God afforded them a longer time of life on account of their virtue and the good use they made of it in astronomical and geometrical discoveries, which would not have afforded the time for foretelling the periods of the stars unless they had lived 600 years; for the great year is completed in that interval." To this he adds the testimony of many celebrated profane historians, who affirm that the ancients lived 1000 years. In the above passage Josephus enumerates *four* causes of the longevity of the earlier patriarchs.

1. As to the first, viz., their being dearer to God than other men, it is plain that it cannot be maintained; for the profligate descendants of Cain were equally longlived, as mentioned above, with others.
2. Neither can we agree in the second reason he assigns; because we find that Noah and others, though born so long subsequently to the creation of Adam, yet lived to as great an age, some of them to a greater age than he did.
3. If, again, it were right to attribute longevity to the superior quality of the food of the antediluvians, then the seasons, on which this depends, must, about Moses's time — for it was *then* that the term of human existence was reduced to its present standard — have assumed a fixed character. But no change at that time took place in the revolution of the heavenly bodies, by which the seasons of heat, cold, etc., are regulated: hence we must not assume that it was the nature of the fruits they ate which caused longevity.
4. How far the antediluvians had advanced in scientific research generally, and in astronomical discovery particularly, we are not informed; nor can we place any dependence upon what Josephus says about the two inscribed pillars which remained from the old world (see *Ant.* 1:2, 9). We are not, therefore, able to determine, with any confidence, that God permitted the earlier generations of man to live so long in order that they might arrive at a high degree of mental excellence. From the *brief* notices which the Scriptures afford of the character and habits of the antediluvians, we should rather infer that they had not advanced very far in discoveries in natural and experimental philosophy. **SEE ANTEDILUVIANS.** We must

suppose that they did not reduce their language to alphabetical order; nor was it necessary to do so at a time when human life was so prolonged that the tradition of the creation passed through only two hands to Noah. It would seem that the book ascribed to Enoch is a work of postdiluvian origin (see Jurieu, *Crit. Hist.* 1:41). Possibly a want of mental employment, together with the labor they endured ere they were able to extract from the earth the necessaries of life, might have been some of the proximate causes of that degeneracy which led God in judgment to destroy the old world. If the antediluvians began to bear children at the age on an average of 100, and if they ceased to do so at 600 years (see Shuckford's *Connect.* 1:36), the world might then have been far more densely populated than it is now. Supposing, moreover, that the earth was no more productive antecedently than it was subsequently to the flood, and that the antediluvian fathers were ignorant of those mechanical arts which so much abridge human labor now, we can easily understand how difficult they must have found it to secure for themselves the common necessaries of life, and this the more so if animal food was not allowed them. The prolonged life, then, of the generations before the flood would seem to have been rather an *evil* than a blessing, leading as it did to the too rapid peopling of the earth. We can readily conceive how this might conduce to that awful state of things expressed in the words, "And the whole earth was filled with violence." In the absence of any well-regulated system of government, we can imagine what evils must have arisen: the unprincipled would oppress the weak, the crafty would outwit the unsuspecting, and, not having the fear of God before their eyes, destruction and misery would be in their ways. Still we must admire the providence of God in the longevity of man immediately after the creation and the flood. After the creation, when the world was to be peopled by one man and one woman, the age of the greatest part of those on record was 900 and upwards. But after the flood, when there were three couples to repeople the earth, none of the patriarchs except Shem reached the age of 500, and only the first three of his line, viz. Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber, came near that age, which was in the first century after the flood. In the second century we do not find that any attained the age of 240; and in the third century (about the latter end of which Abraham was born), none, except Terah, arrived at 200, by which time the world was so well peopled that they had built cities, and were formed into distinct nations under their respective kings (see Genesis 15; see also Usher and Petavius on the increase of mankind in the first three centuries after the flood).

II. The statements as to the length of the lives of Abraham and his nearer descendants, and some of his later, are so closely interwoven with the historical narrative, not alone in form, but in sense, that their general truth and its cannot be separated. Abraham's age at the birth of Isaac is a great fact in his history, equally attested in the Old Testament and in the New. Again, the longevity ascribed to Jacob is confirmed by the question of Pharaoh and the patriarch's remarkable answer, in which he makes his then age of 130 years less than the years of his ancestors (⁽¹⁴⁷⁾Genesis 47:9), a minute point of agreement with the other chronological statements to be especially noted. At a later time, the age of Moses is attested by various statements in the Pentateuch, and in the New Test. on St. Stephen's authority, though it is to be observed that the mention of his having retained his strength to the end of his 120 years (⁽¹⁵⁴⁾Deuteronomy 34:7) is, perhaps, indicative of an unusual longevity. In the earlier part of the period following we notice similar instances in the case of Joshua, and, inferentially, in that of Othniel. Nothing in the Bible could be cited against this evidence, except it be the common explanation of Psalm 90 (esp. verse 10), combined with its ascription to Moses (see title).

That the common age of man has been the same in all times since the world was generally re-peopled is manifest from profane as well as sacred history. Plato lived to the age of 81, and was accounted an old man; and those whom Pliny reckons up (7:48) as rare examples of long life may for the most part be equaled in modern times. It must be observed, however, that all the supposed famous modern instances of very great longevity, as those of Parr, Jackson, and the old countess of Desmond, have utterly broken down on examination, and that the registers of countries where records of such statistics have been kept *prove* no greater extreme than about 110 years. We may fortunately appeal to at least one contemporary instance. There is an Egyptian hieratic papyrus in the Bibliotheque at Paris bearing a moral discourse by one Ptah-hotp, apparently eldest son of Assa (B.C. cir. 1910-1860), the fifth king of the fifteenth dynasty, which was of shepherds. **SEE EGYPT.** At the conclusion, Ptah-hotp thus speaks of himself: "I have become an elder on the earth (or in the land); I have traversed a hundred and tell years of life by the gift of the king and the approval of the elders, fulfilling my duty towards the king in the place of favor (or blessing)" (*Facsimile d'un Papyrus Egyptien*, par E. Prisse d'Avennes, pl. 19, lines 7, 8). The natural inferences from this passage are, that Ptah-hotp wrote in the full possession of his mental faculties at the age of 110 years, and that

his father was still reigning at the time, and therefore had attained the age of about 130 years, or more. The reigns assigned by Mahetho to the shepherd-kings of this dynasty seem indicative of a greater age than that of the Egyptian sovereigns (Cory, *Ancient Fragments*, 2d ed., pages 114, 136). *SEE CHRONOLOGY.*

Longînus, Dionysius Cassius

a noted Greek philosopher and rhetorician, was born probably in Syria, and flourished in the 3d century of our aera. He was educated at Alexandria under Ammonius and Origen, and became an earnest disciple of Platonism. To expound this system and to teach rhetoric, he opened a school at Athens, and there soon acquired a great reputation. His knowledge was immense, and to him was first applied the phrases, often repeated since, "a living library" and "a walking museum." His taste and critical acuteness also were no less wonderful. He was probably the best critic of all antiquity. Flourishing in an age when Platonism was giving place to the semi-Oriental mysticism and dreams of Neo-Platonism, Longinus stands out conspicuously as a genuine disciple of the great master. Clear, calm, rational, yet lofty, he despised the fantastic speculations of Plotinus (q.v.). In the latter years of his life he accepted the invitation of Zenobia to undertake the education of her children at Palmyra; but, becoming also her prime political adviser, he was beheaded as a traitor, by command of the emperor Aurelian, A.D. 273. Longinus was a heathen, but generous and tolerant. Of his works, the only one extant (in parts only) is a treatise, *Περὶ Ὑψους* (On the Sublime). There are many editions of it; those by Morus (Leips. 1769), Toupius (Oxford, 1778; 2d edition, 1789; 3d edit., 1806), Weiske (Leipsic, 1809), and Egger (Paris, 1837) being among the best. Translations have been made of it into French by Boileau, into German by Schlosser, and into English by W. Smith. See Ruhnken, *Dissertatio de Vita et Scriptis Longini* (1776); Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.

Longley, Charles Thomas, D.D.

the last primate of all England, was born in Westmeathshire in 1794, and was educated at Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford, where he distinguished himself as a first-class scholar in classics. After graduating, he remained for some time connected with the university as college tutor, censor, and public examiner. He became perpetual curate of Cowley in

1823, and rector of West Tytherley in 1827, and head master of Harrow School in 1829. In 1836 he was appointed bishop of Ripon, and in 1856 was translated to Durham, in 1860 to the archbishopric of York, and in 1862 to that of Canterbury. Over this see, by virtue of which he was primate of the Church of England, and first of all the Anglican bishops of the world, he presided until his death, October 27, 1868. "Archbishop Longley belonged ecclesiastically to the old school of 'moderate' Establishment divines, but in the last three years of his administration his amiable temper, cooperating with his instinctive hyper-conservatism, led him to temporize with the reckless and audacious policy of bishop Wilberforce and the High-Anglicans, and he became a most inadequate standard-bearer for the English Church in her supreme hour. Incapable of bold and persistent action, the latter portion of his primacy was marked by a series of disastrous vacillations and blunders. He first gave his countenance to the bishop of Capetown in his revolutionary action in South Africa, and then withdrew that countenance. In an interval of reason he encouraged lord Shaftesbury to introduce his anti-ritualistic resolutions, and then he shiveringly withdrew his approval when they came up for action." The most important event during his administration was the so-called "Pan-Anglican" Synod, a meeting of all the bishops of the Church of England and the churches in communion with her, convened in 1867, a measure instigated, it is said, by bishop Wilberforce (q.v.), to stop the tide of ritualism, and to bring about, if possible, a union with the Greek Church (see Appleton's *Annually Cyclop.* 1867, page 42 sq.). In this synod the archbishop of Canterbury proved entirely untrustworthy. Himself inclining towards ritualism, he moderately rebuked the Ritualists in public, while privately he favored their promotion, and was instrumental in their appointment to colonial bishoprics. He was decidedly a High-Churchman, and, though in person amiable, devout, dignified, and courteous, he showed, in his disastrous primacy, how unfitted are mere moderation, and a desire simply for compromise and peace, to guide the Church in times when her foundations are assailed. We will only add that archbishop Longley died as he had lived, a man of profoundly pious feeling that fell a little too much into formula. He referred to words of Hooker's some three or four days before his death as containing the faith in which he "wished to die" — words expressive of his sense of guilt and his faith in Christ's blood to cleanse him from that guilt. See London Spectator, 1868, October 31, page 1272; NY. — Tribune, October 29, 1868. (J.H.W.)

Longobardi

(otherwise called LOMBARDS), a Teutonic people of the Suevic race, who maintained a dominion in Italy from A.D. 568 to 774.

The name *Lombards* is derived from the Latin *Longobardi* or *Langobardi*, a form in use since the 12th century, and generally supposed to have been given in reference to the long beards of this people; although some derive it rather from a word *paruta* or *barste*, which signifies a battle-axe.

The first historical notices present them as a people small in number, having their original seat on the west side of the Lower Elbe, in a territory extending some sixty miles southward from Hamburg. They advanced into Moravia and Hungary, the abode of the Rugi, before 500, and conquered the Heruli, and were invited by Justinian to the neighborhood of the Danube in the year 526. They afterwards crossed into Pannonia, where, though at first in alliance with the Gepide, they subsequently (A.D. 566 or 567) subdued the people, yielding in turn to the Avars, and in 569 crossed the Alps into Italy under Alboin, having been invited thither by Narses, as it is said, out of revenge against the province and the emperor. This was fourteen years after the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom, and the exhausted state of the country left Northern Italy an easy prey. The Goths were Arians, and religious differences with both the Roman and Greek churches went far to prevent the acceptance of their rule, and the establishment at that time of a united government in Italy, for the want of which the country has so many centuries suffered. The Lombards succeeded no better in securing entire dominion. They, however, extended their power, establishing the duchies of Frioul, Spoleto, and Benevento, until only the districts of Rome and Naples, the southern extremity of the peninsula, Venice, and the east coast from the Po to Ancona, with Ravenna as the city of the exarchs, remained sunder the power of the Greek emperor. The conduct of the Lombards as conquerors has been severely characterized on the authority of early writers of the Romish Church. Gregory the Great, in his epistles and dialogues, draws a frightful picture of their oppressions, as does Paulus Diaconus of the unquestionably lawless sway of the thirty-five dukes, who were the only rulers in the interregnum after the death of Cleph, till, by the threatening approach of the Franks, they were compelled to elect a king in the person of Autharis. Now for the first time (584-590) an orderly constitution was established. Paulus Diaconus speaks with great praise of the new state of things. "Wonderful

was the state of the Lombard kingdom: violence and treachery were alike unknown; no one was oppressed, no one plundered another; thefts and robberies were unheard of; the traveler went wherever he would in perfect security" (Paul. Diac. 3:16).

A general idea of their political constitution may be found in the edict of king Rothari (636-652), a kind of Bill of Rights, which was promulgated November 22, 643, and is memorable as having become the foundation of constitutional law in the Germanic kingdoms of the Middle Ages. It was revised and extended by subsequent Lombard kings, but subsisted in force for several centuries after the Lombard kingdom had passed away. The edict recognises, as among all German nations, three classes — the *free*, the *semi-free*, and *slave* or *vassal*. Among the free were the *nobiles*. The army secured the national unity, civil officers being regarded as rendering military service. The king was elective, and among the dukes he represented the nation. He was commander of the army, head of all police power, chief judge, and general ward. There were courtiers of various ranks. The dukes were also called judges, or *judices civitatis*. Under each *judex* were many local, judicial, police, and military authorities. The cities chosen by the dukes severally as their residences were centers of the Lombard government. There would seem to be but little room for the old Roman municipal constitutions. Concerning the relation of the Lombard rule to the continuance of the Roman law and the rights of the conquered people there are differences of opinion. Under the Goths the former laws and customs remained largely unaffected; but it has been maintained (as by Leo) that under the Lombards the personal liberty, right of property, and municipal constitutions of the conquered people were abolished. The subject was much discussed by the Italians in the last century; and in this century the historians Savigny, Leo, Bandi di Vesme, Fossati, Troya, Bethmann-Hollwseg, etc., present conflicting or somewhat varied views. The Lombard laws themselves give but little precise information on this point. The Romans at least lost all united nationality. Roman law seems to have been first distinctively brought into use under Luitprand. The feeling of enmity which, for a long time at least, existed between the people and their conquerors, was increased by religious differences, and on this account the new power was specially obnoxious to the authorities of the Roman Church. A state of war generally prevailed between the two powers. The Church writers are constant and bitter in their complaints of Lombard impiety and oppressions — at least during the earlier period of

their dominion — in the wasting of churches and monasteries, and the treatment of ecclesiastics. The Lombard clergy themselves, however, do not seem to be charged as active participants in these deeds. Gregory the Great discerns in the times signs of the approaching judgment. "What is happening in other parts of the world," he says, "we know not; but in this the end of all things not merely announces itself as approaching, but shows itself as actually begun" (Dial. 3). Such representations of the spirit and course of the conquerors must be taken with considerable qualification. Still more untrustworthy are the accounts given, especially by Gregory, of numerous miraculous interferences in behalf of the true faith.

The Lombards were Arians. Unlike the Franks, who became by religious sympathy the natural defenders of the pope, they, with the Goths, Vandals, Burgundians, and Suevians, had been converted to Christianity, about the end of the 5th century, by Arian missionaries. Such was the case with the German tribes generally on the lower Danube. But there were among them many, some of whom entered Italy, who were still heathens, and worshipped their gods Odin and Freia south of the Alps. There were probably also some Catholic Pannonians and Noricans who, with their bishops, had joined the expedition. The first influence exerted by Rome for the conversion of the Lombards was through the wife of Alboin, a niece of Clovis, who was a good Roman Catholic, and had been enjoined by the bishop of Treves to convert her husband from his Arian heresy. Theodolinda of Bavaria also exerted a like influence upon her husband Autharis, and under his reign the Catholic faith made considerable progress. On the death of Autharis (590), Theodolinda married Agilulf, and under his government also she continued to labor for the advancement of the Catholic Church, hoping thereby to refine the manners of her own people. Theodolinda persuaded Agilulf to restore a portion of their property and dignities to the Catholic clergy, and to have his own son baptized according to the Catholic rite an example which was followed by multitudes. Her brother Gundwald, duke of Asti, she influenced to build the magnificent Basilica of St. John the Baptist at Monza, near Milan, in which in subsequent times was kept the Lombard crown, called the *Iron Crown*; indeed, she improved any and every opportunity to advance the interests of the Catholics, and thus hastened the successful establishment of their religion among the Lombards. Gregory the Great (590-604), founder of the papacy, maintained frequent correspondence with the queen in a friendly relation, similar to that existing between Gregory VII and the

countess Matilda. On the occasion of the baptism of her children she received a present from Gregory. Earlier he had sent her four Books of Dialogues, "because he knew that she was true to the faith in Christ, and strong in good works" (Paul. Diac. 4:5).

If the Roman Church had met with material losses by the Lombard invasion, it now gained much for the power of the papacy in the more complete dependence with which all parts of Italy began to look to Rome for a common defense of their faith. Rome became a certain center of national life through the diffused power of its bishops, and what the Roman Empire had lost by arms the Roman Church was to regain by peaceful means. After Gregory's death Agilulf received the monk Columban with great favor, and allowed him to settle where he would. At Milan he wrote against Arianism. He founded the powerful monastery of Bobbia, which was subsequently very influential in the conversion of the Lombards. Grundeberg, daughter of Theodolinda, married successively the kings Ariowald and Rotharis. Under the latter there was a Catholic and Arian bishop in each city. Aribert (653-661), the son of duke Gunduald, was the first Catholic king. Dollinger says of him, "Rex Horibertus, pius et catholicus, Arrianorum abolevit haeresem et Christianam fidem fecit crescere." The Lombards became now enthusiastic churchmen; many monasteries and churches were founded and richly endowed. There was always, however, a certain degree of independence manifest among them. At the Lateran Council of 649, summoned by Martin I, Milan and Aquileia were not represented. A certain patriarchal and metropolitan prerogative was allowed the pope, with a due reservation of national liberty. In the latter half of the 7th century internal contests for the Lombard crown secured a greater degree of attachment to the Church, while the disputes of Rome with Constantinople brought the Lombards to the defense of the former. In the 8th century the powerful king Luitprand (713-35), who raised the Lombard kingdom to its highest prosperity, sought anxiously to complete the conquest of all Italy, and before 800 it may be said that the national unity of Italy was complete. Each subject was called a Lombard. *SEE LUITPRAND*. The Church was subject to the state. Though its clergy and bishops obtained increasing power, it was not of a political character as in France. The bishops were subject to the king, and the inferior clergy to the subordinate judges. The bishops were chosen by the people. The cloisters were subject to magisterial power. But the prospect looming up before the popes of soon becoming themselves subject to the rule of the

barbaric Lombards, they now entered upon that Machiavelian policy which they long incessantly pursued, of laboring to prevent a union of all Italy under one government, in order to secure for themselves the greater power in the midst of contending parties. This, with the disputes which arose concerning the succession to the Lombard throne, led to the downfall of the Lombard kingdom within no long time after it had reached its utmost greatness. Gregory III, in his distress, fixed his gaze on the youthful greatness of a transalpine nation, the Franks, to afford him the necessary assistance in the struggle now ensuing. The movement against the Lombards was initiated at the election of Zachary, by discarding the customary form of obtaining the consent of the exarchate's authority, at this time vested in the Lombard king; and Stephen II made way for Pepin, after having anointed him to the patriciate, i.e., the governorship of Rome, to make war upon Aistulf, the successor of Luitprand. Naturally enough, Pepin's military successes were all turned to the advantage of the pope in securing to him the exarchate and Pentapolis. New causes of hostility between the Frank and Lombard monarchs arose when Charlemagne sent back to her father his wife, the daughter of the Lombard king Desiderius (754-774). In the autumn of 773 Charlemagne invaded Italy, and in May of the following year Pavia was conquered, and the Lombard kingdom was overthrown. In 803 a treaty between Charlemagne, the western, and Nicephorus, the eastern emperor, confirmed the right of the former to the Lombard territory, with Rome, the Exarchate, Ravenna, Istria, and part of Dalmatia; while the Eastern empire retained the islands of Venice and the maritime towns of Dalmatia, with Naples, Sicily, and part of Calabria. See Tiurk, *Die Longobarden und ihr Volksrecht* (Rost. 1835); Flegler, *Das Konigreich der Longobarden in Italien* (Leipz. 1851); Abel, *Der Untergang d. Longobardenreichs in Italien* (Gott. 1858); Leo, *Gesch. d. itatl. Staaten* (1829), vol. i; Hautleville, *Hist. des Communes Lolmbardes depuis leur origine jusqu'a la fin du xiii Sisle* (Paris, 1857), volume 1; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, page 50 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 1:472; 2:39 sq. **SEE LOMBARDY.**

Longobardi, Niccolô,

a Jesuit missionary, was born in Switzerland in 1565. He went to China as missionary in 1596. and died in 1655 at Pekin. He wrote *De Confucio ejusque Doctrina Tractatus*. See Leiboritz's notes to a recent edition. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Longuerue, Louis Du Four

abbé de, an eminent, learned French ecclesiastic, born at Charleville January 6, 1652, was the son of a Norman nobleman. When but four years old he was generally known as a learned prodigy. At fourteen he understood several Oriental languages, and undertook to get a complete knowledge of the holy Scriptures by making diligent study of the fathers and of the Jewish and Christian commentators. The Sorbonne, which he sometimes visited, only gave him a distaste for scholastic theology; he preferred to reconstruct positive theology from the original, after the manner of P. Petau, where he found more exactness and stability. In 1674 he was provided with the abbotship of St. Jean-du-jard, near Melun, and in 1684 with that of Sept-Fontaines, in the diocese of Rheims. After receiving orders he entered the Seminary of St. Magloire, and shut himself up there in complete solitude for fifteen years. When he re-entered the world he opened his house to learned men, and kept up with them a regular correspondence, and manifested a great eagerness to instruct those who consulted him. Longuerue consecrated his whole life to labor; he knew no other rest except that of change of occupation. No part of the domain of learning was strange to him, but he much preferred history. His constitution and memory were good. In conversation he was lively, satirical, critical, humorous, and cynical. He took no part in religious controversy. He died in 1732. Among his works of interest to us are *Traite d'un auteur de la communion Romaine touchant la transubstantiation, ou il fitit voir que selon les principes de sont Eglise ce dogme ne peut etre un article de foi* (London, 1686): — *Dissertations touchant les Antiquites des Chaldeans et des Egyptiens* (in the *Lettres choisies* of Richard Simon): — *Dissertation sur le passage de Flavius Josephe en feaveur de Jesus Christ* (in the *Bibl. ancienne et moderne* of Le Clerc, 7:237-288): — *Remarques sur la vie du cardinal Wolsey contraires a ceux qui ont escrit contre sa reputation* (in the *Memoire de Litterat.* of P. Desmolets). See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biogr. and Mythol.* s.v.; *General Biographical Dictionary*, s.v.

Longueval, Jacques

a learned French Jesuit, was born in the suburbs of Peronne March 18, 1680. At the age of nineteen he entered the Society of Jesus, and afterwards taught rhetoric and theology in different colleges of his order. On account of a violent work published upon the religious quarrels of the

period, he was first exiled, but later received permission to reside at the house of professed Jesuits in Paris. He died January 11, 1735. Among his published works are *Traite du Schisme* (Brussels, 1718) [a Refutation of this work was published in the same year by Meganck]: — *Dissertation sur les Miracles* (Paris, 1730, 4to): — *Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane* (Paris, 1730-1749, 18 volumes, 8vo); Longueval wrote only the first eight volumes, reaching the year 1138; the others have been written by Fontenay, Brumoy, and Berthier. The work has been reprinted at Nimes (1782) and at Paris (1825). Longueval is also the author of the greater part of the *Reflexions Morales*, an appendix to the *Nouveau Testament* of P. Lallemand. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biogr. and Mythol* s.v.; Fontenay, *Eloge de Longueval*, in *Histoire Gallicane*, volume 9.

Lonsdale, John, D.D.,

a distinguished English prelate, was born at Newmillerdam, near Wakefield, January 17, 1788, and was the son of the Reverend John Lensdale, vicar of D.rfield and incumbent of Chapelthorpe. Young Lonsdale entered Eton College at the age of 11, and completed his studies finally at King's College, Cambridge, where he got nearly all the prizes, and took the B.A. in 1811. He then studied law for a time, but changing for theology, he was ordained priest in 1815. Shortly after he was made examining chaplain to archbishop Sutton and assistant preacher at the temple. In 1821 he was appointed to the office of Christian advocate to Cambridge University, and in the following year domestic chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. From 1831 to 1843 he was prebendary of St. Paul's; from 1839 to 1843, principal of King's College, London, and rector of Southfleet, Kent. He was also archdeacon of Middlesex during 1842 and 1843, and was for some time chaplain at Lincoln's Inn. In 1844, finally, he was appointed, by Sir Robert Peel, bishop of Lichfield. He died at Erdeshall Castle, Staffordshire, October 19, 1867. Bishop Lonsdale was greatly celebrated in the English pulpit; while yet in the infancy of his ministry, two courses of his university sermons, as well as several occasional discourses, were asked for and received by the public (London, 1820, 1821). In 1849 he published, with archbishop Hale, a volume of *Annotations of the Gospels*, *SEE HALE*. He is spoken of as "a man of remarkable humility, averse to controversy, and never willing to enter into a public discussion of great questions in theology, from the belief that others were better qualified than he to handle them; but, withal, he was

unflinching in his adherence to what he believed to be right." He was greatly beloved, not only by his own Church, but by the Dissenters also. See Appleton's *Ann. Cyclop.* 1867. page 451; *Am. Ch. Rev.* 1868, page 675.

Looking-glass

SEE MIRROR.

Loop

(only in the plural *twal | ululaoth'*, windings; Sept. (ἄγκυλαι, Vulg. *ansulae*), an attachment or knotted "eye," probably of cord, corresponding to the knobs or "taches" (μυσᾶα) in the edges of the curtains of the tabernacle for joining them into a continuous circuit, fifty to a curtain, and formed of blue material (¹²³⁴Exodus 26:4, 5,10,11; 36:11, 12, 17). *SEE TABERNACLE.*

Loos (Callidius), Cornelius,

a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Gonda, Holland, in 1546, and was educated at Louvain. He entered the priesthood, and was made doctor of theology at Mentz, where, in a sojourn of several years, he composed most of his works. He afterwards became archbishop of Treves; but, on account of his opinions upon magic, published in a book styled *De vera et falsa magia* (1592), he was forced to remove from his diocese, though he retracted his heretical views. He went to Brussels, and there exercised the humble functions of vicar of the parish. He was soon accused of falling back into his old opinions, and was arrested and imprisoned. He was about to be accused a third time, when he died at Brussels, February 3, 1595. Loos was very zealous against Protestants. Among his works the following are of theological and general interest: *Defensio adversus Chr. Franckenium coeterosque sectariospanis adorationem impie asserentes* (Mayence, 1581): — *Thuribulum aureum sanctorum precationum* (ibidem, 1581): — *Illustrium Germaniae Scriptorum Catalogus* (ibidem, 1581): — *Ecclesiae Venetus* (Cologne, 1585): — *Annotationes in Ferum super Joannem*, often reprinted. See Sweert, *Athene Belgicae*; Foppens, *Biblioth. Belgicae*; Martin Delrio, *Disquisit. magicae*, 54:5; Bayle, *Dict. Hist. et Crit.* (Calliditis); Niceron, *Memoires*; Paquot, *Memoires*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Lope de Vega

SEE VEGA.

Lope de Vera, Y Alarcan,

a Christian convert to Judaism, suffered martyrdom for his apostasy by the hands of the inquisitors' tribunal of Spain. The descendant of a noble Spanish family, he had, while a student at Salamanca, interested himself in the study of Jewish literature and Judaism, and finally made a public confession of his belief in Judaism as the only revealed religion. He was imprisoned at Valladolid, and, persisting in his decision, was condemned to death at the stake, July 25, 1644. He was at the time of his death only about twenty-five years old, and had suffered imprisonment for nearly five years. See Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 10:101.

Loqui, Martin.

SEE TABORITES.

Lorance, James Houston

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Mount Pleasant, Tennessee, June 1, 1820. He was educated in Princeton College, N.J., and in divinity in the Princeton Theological Seminary (class of 1846), and was licensed by New Brunswick Presbytery, commenced active work at Whitesville, Alabama, and subsequently was ordained by Palmyra Presbytery as pastor at Hannibal, Missouri. He removed to Courtland, Alabama, in 1851, and there continued his pastoral labors until his death, July 1, 1862. Mr. Lorance was an able and eminent preacher, pleasing and affable in manners, and firm but not obstinate in his conscientious attachment to the doctrines and polity of the Church of his fathers. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1867, page 444. (J.L.S.)

Lord

is the rendering in the A.V. of several Heb. and Greek words, which have a very different import from each other. "Lord" is a Saxon word signifying ruler or governor. In its original form it is hlaford, which, by dropping the aspiration, became laford, and afterwards, by contraction, lord.

1. **hwby]** *Yehovah', Jehovah*, the proper name of the God of the Hebrews, which should always have been retained in that form, but has almost invariably been translated in the English Bible by LORD (and printed thus in small capitals), after the example of the Sept. (Κῶριος) and Vulg. (Dominus). *SEE JEHOVAH.*

2. **ˆwda;** *adon'*, one of the early words (hence in the early Phoenico-Greek A donis) denoting the most absolute control, and therefore most fitly represented by the English word lord, as in the A. V. (Sept. κύριος, Vulg. dominus). It is not properly a divine title, although occasionally applied to God (^{<0340>}Psalm 114:7; properly with the art. in this sense, ^{<0233>}Exodus 23:13), as the supreme proprietor (^{<0083>}Joshua 3:13); but appropriately denotes a master, as of slaves (^{<0204>}Genesis 24:4, 27; 39:2, 7), or a king, as ruler of subjects (^{<0458>}Genesis 45:8; ^{<2353>}Isaiah 26:13), a husband, as lord of the wife (^{<0182>}Genesis 18:12). It is frequently a term of respect, like our Sir, but with a pronoun attached ("my lord"), and often occurs in the plural. *SEE MASTER.*

A modified form of this word is *Adonay'* (**ywwda}** Sept. Κύριος, *lord, master*), "the old plural form of the noun **ˆwda;** *adon*, similar to that with the suffix of the first person, used as the pluralis excellentiae, by way of dignity, for the name of JEHOVAH. The similar form with the suffix, is also used of men, as of Joseph's master (^{<0342>}Genesis 39:2, 3 sq.), of Joseph himself (^{<0420>}Genesis 42:30, 33; so also ^{<2304>}Isaiah 19:4). The Jews, out of superstitious reverence for the name JEHOVAH, always, in reading, pronounce *Adonai* where *Jehovah* is written, and hence the letters **hwhy** are usually written with the points belonging to Adonai, JEHOVAH. The view that the word exhibits a plural termination without the affix is that of Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v. **ˆwd**), and seems just, though rather disapproved by professor Lee (Lex. in **ˆwda**). The latter adds that "our English Bibles generally translate **hwby** by LORD, in capitals; when preceded by **ˆwdah**, they translate it GOD; when **twabx**, *tzabaoth*, follows, by LORD, as in ^{<2301>}Isaiah 3:1, 'The Lord, the LORD of Hosts.' The copies now in use are not, however, consistent in this respect" (Kitto). "In some instances it is difficult, on account of the pause accent, to say whether *Adonai* is the title of the Deity, or merely one of respect addressed to men. These have been noticed by the Masorites, who distinguish the former in their notes as 'holy,' and the latter as 'profane.' (See ^{<0183>}Genesis 18:3; 19:2, 18; and

compare the Masoretic notes on ^{<0213>}Genesis 20:13; ^{<2591>}Isaiah 19:4)." *SEE ADONAI.*

3. Κύριος, the general Greek term for supreme mastery, whether royal or private; and thus, in classical Greek, distinguished from θεός, which is exclusively applied to God. The "Greek Κύριος, indeed, is used in much the same way and in the same sense as Lord. It is from κῦρος, authority, and signifies 'master' or 'possessor.' In the Septuagint, this, like Lord in our version, is invariably used for 'Jehovah' and Adonai;' while θεός, like GOD in our translation, is generally reserved to represent the Hebrew 'Elohim.' Κύριος in the original of the Greek Testament, and Lord in our version of it, are used in much the same manner as in the Septuagint; and so, also, is the corresponding title, Dominus, in the Latin versions. As the Hebrew name JEHOVAH is one never used with reference to any but the Almighty, it is to be regretted that the Septuagint, imitated by our own and other versions, has represented it by a word which is also used for the Hebrew 'Adonai,' which is applied not only to God, but, like our 'Lord,' to creatures also, as to angels (^{<018D>}Genesis 19:2; ^{<2706>}Daniel 10:16, 17), to men in authority (^{<0423>}Genesis 42:30, 33), and to proprietors. owners, masters (^{<0458>}Genesis 45:8). In the New Testament, Κύριος, representing 'Adonai,' and both represented by Lords, the last, or human application of the term, is frequent. In fact, the leading idea of the Hebrew, the Greek, and the English words is that of an owner or proprietor, whether God or man; and it occurs in the inferior application with great frequency in the New Testament. This application is either literal or complimentary: literal when the party is really an owner or master. as in ^{<0104>}Matthew 10:24; 20:8; 21:40; ^{<4166>}Acts 16:16, 19; ^{<801E>}Galatians 4:1, etc.; or when he is so as having absolute authority over another (^{<4038>}Matthew 9:38; ^{<210E>}Luke 10:2), or as being a supreme lord or sovereign (^{<4256>}Acts 25:26); and complimentary when used as a title of address, especially to superiors, like the English Master, Sir; the French Sieur, Monsieur; the German Herr, etc., as in ^{<0137>}Matthew 13:27; 21:20; ^{<4178>}Mark 7:8; ^{<4154>}Luke 9:54." See Winer, *De voce Κύριος* (Erlang. 1828).

4. I [B] master in the sense of domination, applied to only heathen deities, or else to human relations, as husband, etc., and especially to a person skilled or chief in a trade or profession (like the vulgar boss). To this corresponds the Greek δεσπότης, whence our "despot." *SEE BAAL.*

The remaining and less important words in the original, thus rendered in the common Bible (usually without a capital initial), are: **ryb**gebir', prop. denoting physical strength or martial prowess; **rci** sar, a title of nobility; **vyl æ** shalish', a military officer, *SEE CAPTAIN*; and **rs**, *se'ren*, a Philistine term; also the Chald. **ar**mare', an official title (hence the Syriac *mar*, or bishop); and **bri** rab, a general name = *praefect*, with its reduplicate **brbri** rabreban', and its Greek equivalent **ῥαββονί**, "Rabboni."

Lordly

occurs in the A.V. only in the expression **pyrdai pse**se'phel addirim', bowl of [the] nobles, i.e., a large vessel fit to be used for persons of quality (~~QRE5~~Judges 5:25). *SEE DISH*.

Lord, Benjamin

D.D., a Congregational minister. was born in 1693 at Saybrook, Connecticut, graduated at Yale College in 1714, was chosen tutor in 1715, was ordained pastor November 20, 1717, in Norwich, and there preached until his death, March 31, 1784. He was made a member of Yale College corporation in 1740, and remained such till 1772. Dr. Lord published *True Christianity explained and exposed, wherein are some Observations respecting Conversion* (1727): — *Two Sermons on the Necessity of Regeneration* (1737): — *Believers in Christ only the true Children of God, and born of him alone, a sermon* (1742): — *God glorified in the Works of Providence and Grace: a remarkable instance of it in the various and signal Deliverances that evidently appear to be wrought for Mercy Wheeler, lately restored from extreme Impotence and Confinement* (1743); and several occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:297.

Lord, Daniel Minor

a Presbyterian minister, was born April 9, 1800, at Lyme, Connecticut, and was educated at Amherst College and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J., and in April 1834, was licensed by the Second Presbytery of Long Island, and subsequently ordained at Southampton. In 1835 the Presbytery dismissed him to the Suffolk South Association. Soon after he became pastor of the Boston Mariners' Church. In August 1848, he became

the first pastor of the Shelter Island Church, where he remained until his death, August 26, 1861. Mr. Lord published *The History of Pitcairn's Island; also various articles on The moral Claims of Seamen stated and enforced*, and for several years was editor and almost sole writer and publisher of a review, in which he ably, logically, and clearly discussed profound theological questions. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, page 305. (J.L.S.)

Lord, Eleazer

an American theological writer, was born in 1798. With an excellent preparatory education, improved by close study to such a degree that in 1821 Dartmouth College, and in 1827 Williams, conferred on him the honorary degree of A.M., he devoted a portion of his time during an active business life as a merchant, president of an insurance company, and for some years of the Erie Railway Company, to the study of theological science. In 1866 he received from the University of New York the degree of LL.D. Blindness saddened his latter years, but his treasured learning comforted him. He died at Piermont, N.Y., June 3, 1871.

Lord, Isaiah

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Pharsalia, Chenango County, New York, July 16, 1834, was converted at the age of sixteen, and, joining the Methodist Episcopal Church, at once began to preach. In 1854, while employed as a teacher, his gentle bearing and godly admonitions led many to the cross and salvation. In 1855 he joined the Oneida Conference, and labored in the following places with acceptability and success: Summer Hill, Harford, Borodino, Smyrna, Union Valley, Amber, Freeville, East Homer, and Georgetown, where he died August 21, 1870. "He was a man of stern integrity and sterling worth, fully committed to all the great moral enterprises of the day... His mission was lovingly and fearlessly executed. His piety was deep and real, and his death was but the beginning of everlasting life." — *Conf. Minutes*, 1871.

Lord, James Cooper

a philanthropic New York merchant and iron manufacturer of our day, deserves a place here for his great efforts to advance the interests of his fellow-men. He founded in 1860 "The First Ward Industrial School;" later,

a free reading-room, a library, and erected two churches for the benefit of his workmen and their neighbors. He died February 9, 1869.

Lord, Jeremiah S.

D.D., a Reformed (Dutch) minister of note was born at Brooklyn, New York, about 1817, and was educated at Union College, class of 1836. He entered the ministry in 1843 at Montville, N.J., where he labored until 1847, when he assumed the charge of the Reformed Church of Griggstown, New Jersey. In the year following, however, he accepted a call from the Reformed Church in Harlem, and there he labored until his death, April 2, 1869. "Few ministers of our denomination," says the *Intelligencer* (April 8, 1869), "were more highly esteemed by their brethren, or enjoyed in a higher measure the confidence and affection of their people, than did this most excellent brother. The Lord blessed him in his work, and gave him many souls as seals to his ministry.... His preaching was characterized by great earnestness and solemnity. The love of Christ in the gift of himself was the central theme of his discourses. His style was clear, compact, and persuasive. His was indeed a most useful life, and his example of faithfulness, earnest zeal, and self-sacrificing devotion to the duties of his high and holy calling is a rich legacy to all his surviving brethren in the ministry."

Lord, John King

a Congregational minister, was born March 22, 1819, at Amherst, N.H. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1863, entered the ministry in 1841, and was ordained pastor in Hartford, Vermont, November, 1841, where he remained three years. October 21, 1848, he was installed pastor in Cincinnati, Ohio, where he died, July 13, 1849. A volume of his sermons was published in 1850. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:761.

Lord, Nathan

D.D., LL.D., an eminent American divine and educator, was born at South Berwick, Maine, November 28, 1793; was educated at Bowdoin College (class of 1809), and studied theology at Andover Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1815. After quitting the college he acted as assistant in Phillips Exeter Academy. Now a theologian. He at once entered the active work of the ministry as pastor of the Congregationalists at Amherst, N.H., the only church he ever served. He remained with his people until

1828. when he was called to the responsible position of president of Dartmouth (College, where he remained until his death, September 9, 1870. Possessed of the highest attainments of scholarship, great executive ability, a winning address, equanimity of temper, remarkable "firmness of character and devotion to principle, and unwearied application to labor, Dr. Lord made Dartmouth College one of the most popular of our higher educational institutions: 1824 students were graduated from its halls during his presidency. As a theologian he was. like Edwards, Hopkins, and Bellamy, of the school advocating a strictly liberal interpretation of prophecy, but he has left us few remains in print. He occasionally contributed to our theological quarterlies, and published several sermons and essays. The following deserve notice: *Letter to the Reverend David Dama, D.D., on Prof. Park's Theology of New England* (New Engl. 1852); *On the Millennium* (1854); and *Letters to Ministers of the Gospel of all Denomzinations on Slavery* (1854-5), in which he defended the institution of slavery as sanctioned by the Bible, thereby greatly provoking opposition and criticism from Northern divines. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v.; *New Amer. Cyclops* s.v.; also the *Annual* for 1870.

Lord, Nathan L.

a Baptist missionary and physician, was born in Norwich, Connecticut, in December, 1821, was educated at the Western Reserve College (class of 1847), and, after completing a theological course, was employed for a time as agent and financial secretary of the college. Having decided to devote himself to the missionary work, he was ordained in October 1852, and sailed with his wife for Ceylon. After six years of faithful labor, the failure of his health compelled him to return to this country, where he remained nearly four years, during a portion of which time he performed with great acceptance the duties of a district secretary of the Board of Missions in the southern districts of the West. He also attended several courses of medical lectures, receiving the degree of M.D. at Cleveland, Ohio. In 1863 he sailed with his wife and children for the Madura Mission of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, but the climate of India proving unfavorable to his health, he returned in June 1867. He died January 24, 1868.

Lord's Day

The expression so rendered in the Authorized English Version (**ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ**) occurs only once in the New Testament, viz., in ~~Rev~~ Revelation 1:10, and is there unaccompanied by any other words tending to explain its meaning. It is, however, well known that the same phrase was, in after ages of the Christian Church, used to signify the first day of the week, on which the resurrection of Christ was commemorated. Hence it has been inferred that the same name was given to that day during the time of the apostles, and was in the present instance used by St. John in this sense, as referring to an institution well known, and therefore requiring no explanation. This interpretation, however, has of late been somewhat questioned. It will be proper here, therefore, to discuss this point, as well as the early notices of this Christian observance. leaving the general subject to be treated under SABBATH. The broader topic of the hebdomadal division of time will be discussed under the head of WEEK.

I. Interpretation of the Phrase "Lord's Day" in the Passage in question. — The general consent both of Christian antiquity and of modern divines has referred it to the weekly festival of our Lord's resurrection, and identified it with "the first day of the week," on which he rose, with the patristical "eighth day," or "day which is both the first and the eighth" — in fact, with **ἡ τοῦ Ἡλίου ἡμέρα**, the "Solis dies," or "Sunday" of every age of the Church. On the other hand, the following different explanations have been proposed.

1. Some have supposed St. John to be speaking, in the passage above referred to, of the Sabbath, because that institution is called in ~~Isaiah~~ Isaiah 58:13, by the Almighty himself, "My holy day." To this it is replied; If St. John had intended to specify the Sabbath, he would surely have used that word, which was by no means obsolete, or even obsolescent, at the time of his composing the book of the Revelation. It is added, that if an apostle had set the example of confounding the seventh and the first days of the week, it would have been strange indeed that every ecclesiastical writer for the first five centuries should have avoided any approach to such confusion. 'hey do avoid it; for, as **Σάββατον** is never used by them for the first day, so **Κυριακή** is never used by them for the seventh day. *SEE SABBATH.*

2. A second opinion is, that St. John intended by the "Lord's day" that on which the Lord's resurrection was *annually* celebrated, or, as we now term it, — *Easter day*. On this it need only be observed, that though it was never questioned that the weekly celebration of that event should take place on the first day of the hebdomadal cycle, it was for a long time doubted on what day in the *annual* cycle it should be celebrated. Two schools, at least, existed on this point until considerably after the death of St. John. It therefore seems unlikely that, in a book intended for the whole Church, he would have employed a method of dating which was far from generally agreed upon. It is to be added that no patristical authority can be quoted, either for the interpretation contended for in this opinion, or for the employment of ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα to denote Easter day. *SEE EASTER.*

3. Another theory is, that by "the Lord's day" St. John intended "the day of judgment," to which a large portion of the book of Revelation may be conceived to refer. Thus, "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day" (ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ) would imply that he was rapt, in spiritual vision, to the date of that "great and terrible day," just as St. Paul represents himself as caught up locally into Paradise. Now, not to dispute the interpretation of the passage from which the illustration is drawn (^{<47124>}2 Corinthians 12:4), the abettors of this view seem to have put out of sight the following considerations. In the preceding sentence St. John had mentioned the place in which he was writing — Patmos — and the causes which had brought him thither. It is but natural that he should further particularize the circumstances under which his mysterious work was composed, by stating the exact day on which the revelations were communicated to him, and the employment, spiritual musing, in which he was then engaged. To suppose a mixture of the metaphorical and the literal would be strangely out of keeping. Though it be conceded that the day of judgment is in the New Testament spoken of as ἡ τῶν Κυρίου Ἡμέρα, the employment of the adjectival form constitutes a remarkable difference, which was observed and maintained ever afterwards (comp. ^{<41008>}1 Corinthians 1:8, 14; 5:5; ^{<3182>}1 Thessalonians 5:2; ^{<3182>}2 Thessalonians 2:2; ^{<21724>}Luke 17:24, ^{<6080>}2 Peter 3:10). There is also a critical objection to this interpretation, for γίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ is not = diem gere (comp. ^{<6012>}Revelation 4:2). This third theory, then, which is sanctioned by the name of Augusti, must be abandoned.

4. As a less definite modification of this last view we may mention, finally, that others have regarded the phrase in question as meaning simply "the day of the Lord," the substantive being merely exchanged for the adjective, as in ^{<417>}1 Corinthians 11:20: κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, "the Lord's Supper," which would make it merely synonymous with the generally expected temporal appearance of Christ on earth: ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου, "'the day of the Lord'" (^{<418>}1 Thessalonians 5:2). Such a use of the adjective became extremely common in the following ages, as we have repeatedly in the fathers the corresponding expressions Dominicae crucis, "the Lord's cross;" Dominicae nativitatıs, "the Lord's nativity" (Tertullian, *De Idol.* page 5); λογίων κυριακῶν (Eusebius, *Histor.* ^{<419>}*Ecclesiastes* 3:9). According to their view, the passage would mean, "In the spirit I was present at the day of the Lord," the word "day" being used for any signal manifestation (possibly in allusion to ^{<420>}Joel 2:31), as in ^{<421>}John 8:56: "Abraham rejoiced to see my day." The peculiar use of the word ἡμέρα, as referring to a period of ascendancy, appears remarkably in ^{<422>}1 Corinthians 4:3, where ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας is rendered "man's judgment." Nevertheless, this interpretation, besides the objection of its vagueness as a date, is clogged with all the difficulties that attach to the preceding one.

All other conjectures upon this point may be permitted to confute themselves, but the following cavil is too curious to be omitted. In Scripture the first day of the week is called ἡ μία σαββάτων, in post-scriptural writers it is called ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα as well; therefore the book of Revelation is not to be ascribed to an apostle, or, in other words, is not part of Scripture. The logic of this argument is only surpassed by its boldness. It says, in effect, because post-scriptural writers have these two designations for the first day of the week, therefore scriptural writers must be confined to one of them. It were surely more reasonable to suppose that the adoption by post-scriptural writers of a phrase so pre-eminently Christian as ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα to denote the first day of the week, and a day so especially marked, can be traceable to nothing else than an apostle's use of that phrase in the same meaning.

II. Early Notices of this Christian Observance. — Supposing, then, that ἡ Κυριακὴ Ἡμέρα of St. John is the Lord's day, as now applied to the first day of the modern week, we have to inquire here, What do we gather from holy Scripture concerning that institution? How is it spoken of by early writers up to the time of Constantine? What change, if any, was brought

upon it by the celebrated edict of that emperor, whom some have declared to have been its originator?

1. Scripture says very little concerning it, but that little seems to indicate that the divinely-inspired apostles, by their practice and by their precepts, marked the first day of the week as a day for meeting together to break bread, for communicating and receiving instruction, for laying up offerings in store for charitable purposes, for occupation in holy thought and prayer. The first day of the week so devoted seems also to have been the day of the Lord's resurrection, and therefore to have been especially likely to be chosen for such purposes by those who "preached Jesus and the resurrection."

The Lord rose on the first day of the week (τῇ νυῦσαββάτων), and appeared, on the very day of his rising, to his followers on five distinct occasions — to Mary Magdalene, to the other women, to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, to St. Peter separately, to ten apostles collected together. After eight days (μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀκτώ), that is, according to the ordinary reckoning, on the first day of the next week, he appeared to the eleven (^{401b}John 20:26). He does not seem to have appeared in the interval — it may be to render that day especially noticeable by the apostles, or it may be for other reasons. But, however this question be settled, on the day of Pentecost, which in that year fell on the first day of the week (see Bramhall, *Disc. of the Sabbath and Lord's Day*, in *Works*, 5:51, Oxford edition), "they were all with one accord in one place," had spiritual gifts conferred on them, and in their turn began to communicate those gifts, as accompaniments of instruction, to others. At Troas (^{401b}Acts 20:7), many years after the occurrence at Pentecost, when Christianity had begun to assume something like a settled form, St. Luke records the following circumstances: St. Paul and his companions arrived there, and "abode seven days, and upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." From the statement that "Paul continued his speech till midnight," it has been inferred by some that the assembly commenced after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day of the week had commenced, according to the Jewish reckoning (Jahn's *Bibl. Antiq.* § 398), which would hardly agree with the idea of a commemoration of the resurrection. But further, the words of this passage, Ἐνδὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμένων τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ κλάσαι ἄρτον... have been by some considered to imply that such a weekly observance was then the established custom; yet it is obvious that

the mode of expression would be just as applicable if they had been in the practice of assembling daily. Still the whole aim of the narrative favors the reference to what is now known as Sunday. In ~~410~~1 Corinthians 16:1, 2, St. Paul writes thus: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches in Galatia, even so do ye: Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him. that there be no gatherings when I come." This direction, it is true, is not connected with any mention of public worship or assemblies on that day. But this has naturally been inferred; and the regulation has been supposed to have a reference to the tenets of the Jewish converts, who considered it unlawful to touch money on the Sabbath (Vitringa, *De Synagogâ*, transl. by Bernard, pages 75-167). In consideration for them, therefore, the apostle directs the collection to be made on the following day, on which secular business was lawful; or, as Cocceius observes, they regarded the day "non ut festum, sed ut ἐργάσιμον" (not as a feast, but as a working day; Vitringa, page 77). Again, the phrase μία τῶν σαββάτων is generally understood to be, according to the Jewish mode of naming the days of the week, the common expression for the first day. Yet it has been differently construed by some, who render it "upon one of the days of the week" (*Tracts for the Times*, 2:1, 16). In ~~5105~~Hebrews 10:25, the correspondents of the writer are desired "not to forsake the assembling of themselves together, as the manner of some is, but to exhort one another," an injunction which seems to imply that a regular day for such assembling existed, and was well known; for otherwise no rebuke would lie. Lastly, in the passage given above, St. John describes himself as being in the Spirit "on the Lord's day."

Taken separately, perhaps, and even all together, these passages seem scarcely adequate to prove that the dedication of the first day of the week to the purposes above mentioned was a matter of apostolic institution, or even of apostolic practice. But, it may be observed, that it is, as any rate, an extraordinary coincidence, that almost as soon as we emerge from Scripture we find the same day mentioned in a similar manner, and directly associated with the Lord's resurrection; and it is an extraordinary fact that we never find its dedication questioned or argued about, but accepted as something equally apostolic with confirmation, with infant baptism, with ordination, or at least spoken of in the same way. As to direct support from holy Scripture, it is noticeable that those other ordinances which are usually considered scriptural, and in support of which Scripture is usually

cited, are dependent, so far as mere quotation is concerned, upon fewer texts than the Lord's day is. Stating the case at the very lowest, the Lord's day has at least "probable insinuations in Scripture" (Bp. Sanderson), and so is superior to any other holy day, whether of hebdomadal celebration, as Friday in memory of the crucifixion, or of annual celebration, as Easter day in memory of the resurrection itself. These other days may be, and are, defensible on other grounds, but they do not possess anything like a scriptural authority for their observance. If we are inclined still to press for more pertinent scriptural proof, and more frequent mention of the institution, for such we suppose it to be, in the writings of the apostles, we must recollect how little is said of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and how vast a difference is naturally to be expected to exist between a sketch of the manners and habits of their age, which the authors of the holy Scriptures did not write, and hints as to life and conduct, and regulation of known practices, which they did write.

2. On quitting the canonical writings we turn naturally to Clement of Rome. He does not, however, directly mention "the Lord's day," but in ~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 1:40, he says, *πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν*, and he speaks of *ὠρισμένοι καιροὶ καὶ ραι*, at which the Christian *προσφορά καὶ λειτουργία* should be made.

Ignatius, the disciple of St. John (ad. Magn. c. 9), contrasts Judaism and Christianity, and, as an exemplification of the contrast, opposes *σαββατίζειν* to living according to the Lord's life (*κατὰ τὴν Κυριακὴν ζῶνζῶντες*).

The epistle ascribed to St. Barnabas, which, though certainly not written by that apostle, was in existence in the earlier part of the 2d century, has (c. 15) the following words: "We celebrate the eighth day with joy, on which, too, Jesus rose from the dead."

A pagan document now comes into view. It is the well-known letter of Pliny to Trajan, written (about A.D. 100) while he presided over Pontus and Bithynia. "The Christians (says he) affirm the whole of their guilt or error to be that they were accustomed to meet together on a stated day (*stato die*), before it was light, and to sing hymns to Christ as a god, and to bind themselves by a sacramentun, not for any wicked purpose, but never to commit fraud, theft, or adultery; never to break their word, or to refuse, when called upon, to deliver up any trust; after which it was their custom

to separate, and to assemble again to take a meal, but a general one, and without guilty purpose" (*Epist.* 10:97).

A thoroughly Christian authority, Justin Martyr, who flourished A.D. 140, stands next on the list. He writes thus: "On the day called Sunday (τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρῳ) is an assembly of all who live either in the cities or in the rural districts, and the memoirs of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read." Then he goes on to describe the particulars of the religious acts which are entered upon at this assembly. They consist of prayer, of the celebration of the holy Eucharist, and of collection of alms. He afterwards assigns the reasons which Christians had for meeting on Sunday. These are, "because it is the First Day, on which God dispelled the darkness (τὸ σκοτός) and the original state of things (την ὕλην), and formed the world, and because Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead upon it" (*Apol.* 1:67). In another work (*Dial. c. Tryph.*) he makes circumcision furnish a type of Sunday. "The command to circumcise infants on the eighth day was a type of the true circumcision by which we are circumcised from error and wickedness through our Lord Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week (τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων); therefore it remains the chief and first of days." As for σαββατίζειν, he uses that with exclusive reference to the Jewish law. He carefully distinguishes Saturday (ἡ κρονικῆ), the day after which our Lord was crucified, from Sunday (ἡ μετὰ την κρονικὴν ἡτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέρα), upon which he rose from the dead. If any surprise is felt at Justin's employment of the heathen designations for the seventh and first days of the week, it may be accounted for thus. Before the death of Hadrian, A.D. 138, the hebdomadal division (which Dion Cassius, writing in the 3d century, derives, together with its nomenclature, from Egypt) had, in matters of common life, almost universally superseded in Greece, and even in Italy, the national divisions of the lunar month. Justin Martyr, writing to and for heathen, as well as to and for Jews, employs it, therefore, with a certainty of being understood.

The strange heretic, Bardesanes, who, however, delighted to consider himself a sort of Christian, has the following words in his book on "Fate," or on "the Laws of the Countries," which he addressed to the emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus: "What, then, shall we say respecting the new race of ourselves who are Christians, whom in every country and in every region the Messiah established at his coming; for, lo! wherever we be, all of us are called by the one name of the Messiah, Christians; and upon one day,

which is the first of the week, we assemble ourselves together, and on the appointed days we abstain from food" (Cureton's *Translation*).

Two very short notices stand next on our list, but they are important from their casual and unstudied character. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, A.D. 170, in a letter to the Church of Rome, a fragment of which is preserved by Eusebius (*Eccles. Hist.* 4:23), says, *τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάζομεν, ἐν ἣ ἀνέγνωμεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν*. And Melito, bishop of Sardis, his contemporary, is stated to have composed, among other works, a treatise on the Lord's day (*ὁ περὶ τῆς Κυριακῆς λόγος*).

The next writer who may be quoted is Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, A.D. 178. He asserts that the Sabbath is abolished; but his evidence to the existence of the Lord's day is clear and distinct (*De Orat.* 23; *De Idol.* 14). It is spoken of in one of the best-known of his Fragments (see Beaven's *Irenaeus*, page 202). But a record in Eusebius (5:23, 2) of the part which he took in the Quarta-Deciman controversy shows that in his time it was an institution beyond dispute. The point in question was this: Should Easter be celebrated in connection with the Jewish Passover, on whatever day of the week that might happen to fall, with the churches of Asia Minor, Syria, and Mesopotamia, or on the Lord's day, with the rest of the Christian world? The churches of Gaul, then under the superintendence of Irenaeus, agreed upon a synodical epistle to Victor, bishop of Rome, in which occurred words somewhat to this effect: "The mystery of the Lord's resurrection may not be celebrated on any other day than the Lord's day, and on this alone should we observe the breaking off of the paschal fast." This confirms what was said above, that while, even towards the end of the 2d century, tradition varied as to the yearly celebration of Christ's resurrection, the weekly celebration of it was one upon which no diversity existed, or was even hinted at.

Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 194, comes next. One does not expect anything very definite from a writer of so mystical a tendency, but he has some things quite to our purpose. — In his *Strom.* (4:3) he speaks of *τὴν ἀρχιγονον ἡμέραν, τὴν τῷ ὄντι ἀνάπαυσιν ἡμῶν, τὴν δὴ καὶ πρῶτην τῷ ὄντι φωτὸς γένεσιν, κ. τ. λ.*, words which bishop Kaye interprets as contrasting the seventh day of the Law with the eighth day of the Gospel. As the same learned prelate observes, "When Clement says that the Gnostic, or transcendental Christian, does not pray in any fixed place,

or on any stated days, but throughout his whole life, he gives us to understand that Christians in general did meet together in fixed places and at appointed times for prayer." But we are not left to mere inference on this important point, for Clement speaks of the Lord's day as a well-known and customary festival (*Strom.* 7), and in one place gives a mystical interpretation of the name (*Strom.* 5).

Tertullian, whose date is assignable to the close of the 2d century, may, in spite of his conversion to Montanism, be quoted as a witness to facts. He terms the first day of the week sometimes Sunday (*Dies Solis*), sometimes *Dies Dominicus*. He speaks of it as a day of joy ("Diem Solis laetitiae indigemus," *Apol.* c. 16), and asserts that it is wrong to fast upon it, or to pray standing during its continuance ("Die Dominico jejuniū nefas dūimons, vel de geniculis adorare," *De Cor.* c. 3). Even business is to be put off, lest we give place to the devil ("Differentes etiam negotia, ne quem Diabolo locum demus," *De Orat.* c. 13).

Origen contends that the Lord's day had its superiority to the Sabbath indicated by manna having been given on it to the Israelites, while it was withheld on the Sabbath. It is one of the marks of the perfect Christian to keep the Lord's day.

Minucius Felix (A.D. 210) makes the heathen interlocutor, in his dialogue called *Octavius*, assert that the Christians come together to a repast "on a solemn day" (*solenni die*).

Cyprian and his colleagues, in a synodical letter (A.D. 253), make the Jewish circumcision on the eighth day prefigure the newness of life of the Christian, to which Christ's resurrection introduces him, and point to the Lord's day, which is at once the eighth and the first.

Commodian (circ. A.D. 290) mentions the Lord's day. Victorinus (A.D. 290) contrasts it, in a very remarkable passage, with the Parasceve and the Sabbath.

Lastly, Peter, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 300), says of it, "We keep the Lord's day as a day of joy, because of him who rose thereon."

The results of our examination of the principal writers of the two centuries after the death of St. John may be thus summed up. The Lord's day (a name which has now come out more prominently, and is connected more explicitly with our Lord's resurrection than before) existed during these

two centuries as a part and parcel of apostolical, and so of scriptural Christianity. It was never defended, for it was never impugned, or, at least, only impugned as other things received from the apostles were. It was never confounded with the Sabbath, but carefully distinguished from it (though we have not quoted nearly all the passages by which this point might be proved). It was not an institution of severe sabbatical character, but a day of joy (*χαρμοσύνη*) and cheerfulness (*εὐφροσύνη*), rather encouraging than forbidding relaxation. Religiously regarded, it was a day of solemn meeting for the holy Eucharist, for united prayer, for instruction, for almsgiving; and though, being an institution under the law of liberty, work does not appear to have been formally interdicted, or rest formally enjoined, Tertullian seems to indicate that the character of the day was opposed to worldly business. Finally, whatever analogy may be supposed to exist between the Lord's day and the Sabbath, in no passage that has come down to us is the fourth commandment appealed to as the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's day. Ecclesiastical writers reiterate again and again, in the strictest sense of the words, "Let no man, therefore, judge you in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days" (⁵¹²¹⁶Colossians 2:16). Nor, again, is it referred to any sabbatical foundation anterior to the promulgation of the Mosaic economy. On the contrary, those before the Mosaic aera are constantly assumed to have had neither knowledge nor observance of the Sabbath. As little is it anywhere asserted that the Lord's day is merely an ecclesiastical institution, dependent on the post-apostolic Church for its origin, and by consequence capable of being done away, should a time ever arrive when it appears to be no longer needed.

If these facts be allowed to speak for themselves, they indicate that the Lord's day is a purely Christian institution, sanctioned by apostolic practice, mentioned in apostolic writings, and so possessed of whatever divine authority all apostolic ordinances and doctrines (which were not obviously temporary, or were not abrogated by the apostles themselves) can be supposed to possess.

3. But, on whatever grounds "the Lord's day" may be supposed to rest, it is a great and indisputable fact that four years before the (Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, it was recognised by Constantine, in his celebrated edict. as "the venerable Day of the Sun." The terms of the document are these:

"Imperator Constantinus Aug. Helpidio.

"Omnes iudices urbanaeque plebes et cunctarum artium officia venerabili Die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturae libenter licenterque inserviant, quoniam frequenter evenit ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis aut vineae scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas coelesti provisione concessa." — *Dat. Non. Mart. Crispo II et Constantino II Coss.*

Some have endeavored to explain away this document by alleging, 1st. That "Solis Dies" is not *the* Christian name of the Lord's day, and that Constantine did not therefore intend to acknowledge it as a Christian institution. 2d. That, before his conversion, Constantine had professed himself to be especially under the guardianship of the sun, and that, at the very best, he intended to make a religious compromise between sunworshippers, properly so called, and the worshippers of the "Sun of Righteousness," i.e., Christians. 3dly. That Constantine's edict was purely a calendrical one, and intended to reduce the number of public holidays, "Dies Nefasti" or "Feriati," which had, so long ago as the date of the "Actiones Verrinae," become a serious impediment to the transaction of business; and that this was to be effected by choosing a day which, while it would be accepted by the paganism then in fashion, would, of course, be agreeable to the Christians. 4thly. That Constantine then instituted Sunday for the first time as a religious day for Christians. The fourth of these statements is absolutely refuted, both by the quotations made above from writers of the 2d and 3d centuries, and by the terms of the edict itself. It is evident that Constantine, accepting as facts the existence of the "Solis Dies," and the reverence paid to it by some one or other, does nothing more than make that reverence practically universal. It is "venerabilis" already. It is probable that this most natural interpretation would never have been disturbed had not Sozomen asserted, without warrant from either the Justinian or the Theodosian Code, that Constantine did for the sixth day of the week what the codes assert that he did for the first (*Eccles. Hist.* 1:8; comp. Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 4:18). The three other statements concern themselves rather with what Constantine meant than with what he did. But with such considerations we have little or nothing to do. He may have purposely selected an ambiguous appellation. He may have been only half a Christian, wavering between allegiance to Christ and allegiance to Mithras. He may have affected a religious syncretism. He may have wished his people to adopt such syncretism. He may have feared to offend the pagans. He may have hesitated to avow too openly his inward leanings to

Christianity. He may have considered that community of religious days might lead by-and-by to community of religious thought and feeling. He may have had in view the rectification of the calendar. But all this is nothing to the purpose. It is a fact, that in the year A.D. 321, in a public edict, which was to apply to Christians as well as to pagans, he put especial honor upon a day already honored by the former — judiciously calling it by a name which Christians had long employed without scruple, and to which, as it was in ordinary use, the pagans could scarcely object. What he did for it was to insist that worldly business, whether by the functionaries of the law or by private citizens, should be intermitted during its continuance. An exception, indeed, was made in favor of the rural districts, avowedly from the necessity of the case, covertly, perhaps, to prevent those districts where paganism (as the word *pagus* would intimate) still prevailed extensively from feeling aggrieved by a sudden and stringent change. It need only be added here that the readiness with which Christians acquiesced in the interdiction of business on the Lord's day affords no small presumption that they had long considered it to be a day of rest, and that, so far as circumstances admitted, they had made it so long before.

Were any other testimony wanting to the existence of Sunday as a day of Christian worship at this period, it might be supplied by the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325. The fathers there and then assembled make no doubt of the obligation of that day — do not ordain it — do not defend it. They assume it as an existing fact, and only notice it incidentally in order to regulate an indifferent matter — the posture of Christian worshippers upon it (*Conc. Nic. canon 20*).

Chrysostom (A.D. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest (*σχολάζειν*) on the Lord's day. To the same effect is an injunction in the forgery called the Apostolical Constitutions (7:24), and various other enactments from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1100, though by no means extending to the prohibition of all secular business.

See Pearson, *On the Creed*, 2:341, edit. Oxf.; Jortin, *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* 3:236; Baxter, *On the Divine Appointment of the Lord's Day*, page 41, ed. 1671; Hessey, *Bampton Lecture for 1860*; Gilfillan, *The Sabbath*, page 8. **SEE SUNDAY.**

Lord's Prayer

the common title of the only form given by Jesus Christ to his disciples. Matthew inserts it as part of the Sermon on the Mount (~~400~~ Matthew 6:9-13); nor is it inappropriate to the connection there, for the general topic of that part of the discourse is prayer. Luke, however, explicitly assigns the occasion for its delivery as being at the request of the disciples (~~210~~ Luke 11:2-4); and we cannot reasonably suppose either that they had forgotten it, if previously given them, or that our Lord would not have referred to it as already prescribed. The following analysis exhibits its comprehensive structure:

Picture for Lord's Prayer

The closing doxology is omitted by Luke, and is probably spurious in Matthew, as it is not found there in any of the early MSS. The prayer is doubtless based upon expressions and sentiments already familiar to the Jews; indeed, parallel phrases to nearly all its contents have been discovered in the Talmud (see Schöttgen and Lightfoot, s.v.). This, however, does not detract from its beauty or originality as a whole. The earliest reference found to it, as a liturgical formula in actual use, is in the so-called *Apostolical Constitutions* (q.v.), which give the form entire, and enjoin its stated use (7:44), but solely by baptized persons, a rule which was afterwards strictly observed. The Christian fathers, especially Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, are loud in its praise, and several of them wrote special expositions or treatises upon it. Cyril of Jerusalem is the first writer who expressly mentions the use of the Lord's Prayer at the administration of the holy Eucharist (*Catech. Myst.* 1). St. Augustine has also alluded to its use on this solemn occasion (*Hom.* 83). The *Ordo Romanus* prefixes a preface to the Lord's Prayer, the date of which is uncertain. It contains a brief exposition of the prayer. All the Roman breviaries insist upon beginning divine service with the Lord's Prayer; but it has been satisfactorily proved that this custom was introduced as late as the 13th century by the Cistercian monks, and that it passed from the monastery to the Church. The ancient homiletical writings do not afford any trace of the use of the Lord's Prayer before sermons (see Riddle, *Manual of Christian Antiquities*). Its absurd repetition as a Pater Noster (q.v.) by the Romanists has perhaps led to an undue avoidance of it by some Protestants. In all liturgies (q.v.) of course it occupies a prominent place, and it is usual in many denominations to recite it in public services

and elsewhere. That it was not designed, however, as a formula of Christian prayer in general is evident from two facts: 1. It contains no allusion to the atonement of Christ, nor to the offices of the Holy Spirit; 2. It was never so used or cited by the apostles themselves, so far as the evidence of Holy Writ goes, although Jerome (*Adv. Pelag.* 3:3) and Gregory (*Epp.* 7:63) affirm that it was used by apostolical example in the consecration of the Eucharist. The literature of the subject is very copious (see the *Christ. Remembrancer*, January 1862). Early monographs are cited by Vobeding, *Index Programmatum*, page 33 sq., 131. Among special recent comments on it we may mention those of Bocker (Lond. 1835), Anderson (*ibid.* 1840), Manton (*ib.* 1841), Rowsell (*ibid.* 1841), Duncan (*ibid.* 1845), Kennaway (*ibid.* 1845), Prichard (*ibid.* 1855), Edwards (*ibid.* 1860), and Denton (*ib.* 1864; N.Y. 1865). **SEE PRAYER.**

Lord's Supper

the common English name of an ordinance instituted by our Savior in commemoration of his death and sufferings, being one of the two sacraments universally observed by the Christian Church.

I. Name. — It is called "the Lord's Supper" (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον) in ^{<410>}1 Corinthians 11:20 because it was instituted at supper-time. Synonymous with this is the phrase "the Lord's table" (τράπεζα Κυρίου, ^{<410>}1 Corinthians 10:21), where we also find the name "the cup of the Lord" (ποτήριον Κυρίου). Many new terms for it were early introduced in the Church, among which the principal are Communion (κοινωνία, a festival in common), a term borrowed from ^{<410>}1 Corinthians 10:16, and Eucharist (Εὐχαριστία and εὐλογία), "a giving of thanks," because of the hymns and psalms which accompanied it. Among the many other Greek and Latin names applied to the Lord's Supper, but for which we have no exact equivalent, we mention Σύναξις, "a collection" (for celebrating the Lord's Supper), Λειτουργία (Liturgy, q.v.), Μυστήριον (Sacrament, q.v.), AMissa (Mass, q.v.), etc. **SEE EUCHARIST.**

II. Biblical Notices. —

1. Original Accounts. — The institution of this sacrament is recorded by ^{<410>}Matthew 26:26-29, ^{<410>}Mark 14:22-25, ^{<420>}Luke 22:19 sq., and by the apostle Paul (^{<410>}1 Corinthians 11:24-26), whose words differ very little from those of his companion, Luke; and the only difference between Matthew and Mark is, that the latter omits the words "for the remission of

sins." There is so general an agreement among them all that it will only be necessary to recite the words of one of them: "Now, when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve" to eat the Passover which had been prepared by his direction, "and as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (⁴⁸⁰Matthew 26:20, 26-28). Its institution "in remembrance" of Christ is recorded only by Luke and Paul. John does not mention the institution at all, but the discourse of Jesus in chapter 6:51-59 is referred by many interpreters to the Lord's Supper. Paul warns the Corinthians (⁴⁸⁰1 Corinthians 10:1.6-21) that they cannot partake of the Lord's table and at the same time eat of the pagan sacrifices, because (verse 19) "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God;" and in another part of his first epistle (11:27-29), that "whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; but let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." Other passages of the New Testament are referred by many exegetical writers to the Lord's Supper, but they establish no new point concerning the Biblical doctrine. They will be examined, however, in detail in this connection, leaving the ecclesiastical relations of the subject for the title COMMUNION *SEE COMMUNION*.

2. Paschal Analogies. — This is an important inquiry in the discussion of the history of that night when Jesus and his disciples met together to eat the Passover (⁴⁸⁹Matthew 26:19; ⁴¹⁴⁶Mark 14:16; ²²¹³Luke 22:13). The manner in which the paschal feast was kept by the Jews of that period differed in many details from that originally prescribed by the rules of Exodus 12. The multitudes that came up to Jerusalem met, as they could find accommodation, family by family, or in groups of friends, with one of their number as the celebrant, or "proclaimer" of the feast. The ceremonies of the feast took place in the following order (Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, 13; Meyer, *Comm. in* ⁴⁸³Matthew 26:26).

(1.) The members of the company that were joined for this purpose met in the evening and reclined on couches, this position being then as much a matter of rule as standing had been originally (comp. ⁴⁸¹Matthew 26:20,

ἀνέκειτο ; ^{<0214>} Luke 22:14; and ^{<0133>} John 13:23, 25). The head of the household, or celebrant, began by a form of blessing "for the day and for the wine," pronounced over a cup, of which he and the others then drank. The wine was, according to rabbinic traditions, to be mixed with water; not for any mysterious reason, but because that was regarded as the best way of using the best wine (comp. 2 Macc. 15:39).

(2.) All who were present then washed their hands; this also having a special benediction.

(3.) The table was then set out with the paschal lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, and the dish known as Charoseth (**ἡ τσωῆ**), a sauce made of dates, figs, raisins, and vinegar, and designed to commemorate the mortar of their bondage in Egypt (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 831).

(4.) The celebrant first, and then the others, dipped a portion of the bitter herbs into the Charoseth and ate them.

(5.) The dishes were then removed, and a cup of wine again brought. Then followed an interval which was allowed theoretically for the questions that might be asked by children or proselytes, who were astonished at such a strange beginning of a feast, and the cup was passed round and drunk at the close of it.

(6.) The dishes being brought on again, the celebrant repeated the commemorative words which opened what was strictly the paschal supper, and pronounced a solemn thanksgiving, followed by Psalm 113 and 114.

(7.) Then came a second washing of the hands, with a short form of blessing as before, and the celebrant broke one of the two loaves or cakes of unleavened bread, and gave thanks over it. All then took portions of the bread and dipped them, together with the bitter herbs, into the Charoseth, and so ate them.

(8.) After this they ate the flesh of the paschal lamb, with bread, etc., as they liked; and, after another blessing, a third cup, known especially as the "cup of blessing" was handed round.

(9.) This was succeeded by a fourth cup, and the recital of Psalm 115-118, followed by a prayer, and this was accordingly known as the cup of the Hallel, or of the Song.

(10.) There might be, in conclusion, a fifth cup, provided that the "great Hallel" (possibly Psalm 120-137) was sung over it. *SEE PASSOVER.*

Comparing the ritual thus gathered from rabbinic writers with the N.T., and assuming

(a) that it represents substantially the common practice of our Lord's time, and

(b) that the meal of which he and his disciples partook was really the Passover itself, conducted according to the same rules, we are able to point, though not with absolute certainty, to the points of departure which the old practice presented for the institution of the new. To (1.) or (3.), or even to (8.), we may refer the first words and the first distribution of the cup (^{<2217>}Luke 22:17, 18); to (2.) or (7.), the dipping of the sop ($\psi\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$) of ^{<4136>}John 13:26; to (7.), or to an interval during or after (8.), the distribution of the bread (^{<4136>}Matthew 26:26; ^{<4142>}Mark 14:22; ^{<2219>}Luke 22:19; ^{<4113>}1 Corinthians 11:23, 24); to (9.) or (10.) ("after supper," ^{<2219>}Luke 22:20), the thanksgiving, and distribution of the cup, and the hymn with which the whole was ended. It will be noticed that, according to this order of succession, the question whether Judas partook of what, in the language of a later age, would be called the consecrated elements, is most probably to be answered in the negative.

The narratives of the Gospels show how strongly the disciples were impressed with the words which had given a new meaning to the old familiar acts. They leave unnoticed all the ceremonies of the Passover, except those which had thus been transferred to the Christian Church and perpetuated in it. Old things were passing away, and all things becoming new. They had looked on the bread and the wine as memorials of the deliverance from Egypt. They were now told to partake of them "in remembrance" of their Master and Lord. The festival had been annual. No rule was given as to the time and frequency of the new feast that thus supervened on the old, but the command, "Do this as oft as ye drink it" (^{<4113>}1 Corinthians 11:25), suggested the more continual recurrence of that which was to be their memorial of one whom they would wish never to forget. The words, "This is my body," gave to the unleavened bread a new character. They had been prepared for language that would otherwise have been so startling by the teaching of John (^{<4162>}John 6:32-58), and they were thus taught to see in the bread that was broken the witness of the closest possible union and incorporation with their Lord. The cup, which was "the

new testament' (δ¹ιαθήκη) "in his blood," would remind them, in like manner, of the wonderful prophecy in which that new covenant had been foretold (²⁴³³Jeremiah 31:31-34), of which the crowning glory was in the promise, "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." His blood shed, as he told them, "for them and for many," for that remission of sins which he had been proclaiming throughout his whole ministry, was to be to the new covenant what the blood of sprinkling had been to that of Moses (⁰²⁴⁸Exodus 24:8). It is possible that there may have been yet another thought connected with these symbolic acts. The funeral customs of the Jews involved, at or after the burial, the administration to the mourners of bread (comp. ²⁴⁰⁷Jeremiah 16:7, "neither shall they break bread for them in mourning," in marginal reading of A.V.; Ewald and Hitzig, ad loc.; ²⁶⁴⁷Ezekiel 24:17; ²⁸⁰⁴Hosea 9:4; Tob. 4:17), and of wine, known, when thus given, as "the cup of consolation." May not the bread and the wine of the Last Supper have had something of that character, preparing the minds of Christ's disciples for his departure by treating it as already accomplished? They were to think of his body as already anointed for the burial (⁴²³²Matthew 26:12; ⁴¹⁴⁸Mark 14:8; ⁶¹¹⁷John 12:7), of his body as already given up to death, of his blood as already shed. The passover meal was also, little as they might dream of it, a funeral feast. The bread and the wine were to be pledges of consolation for their sorrow, analogous to the verbal promises of ⁶¹⁴⁰John 14:1, 27; 16:20. The word δ¹ιαθήκη might even have the twofold meaning which is connected with it in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

May we not conjecture, without leaving the region of history for that of controversy, that the thoughts, desires, emotions of that hour of divine sorrow and communion would be such as to lead the disciples to crave earnestly to renew them? Would it not be natural that they should seek that renewal in the way which their Master had pointed out to them? From this time, accordingly, the words "to break bread" appear to have had for the disciples a new significance. It may not have assumed, indeed, as yet, the character of a distinct liturgical act; but when they met to break bread, it was with new thoughts and hopes, and with the memories of that evening fresh on them. It would be natural that the Twelve should transmit the command to others who had not been present, and seek to lead them to the same obedience and the same blessings. The narrative of the two disciples to whom their Lord made himself known "in breaking of bread" at Emmaus

(~~420~~ Luke 24:30-35) would strengthen the belief that this was the way to an abiding fellowship with him.

3. Later N.-T. Indications. — In the account given by the writer of the Acts of the life of the first disciples at Jerusalem, a prominent place is given to this act, and to the phrase which indicated it. Writing, we must remember, with the definite associations that had gathered round the words during the thirty years that followed the events he records, he describes the baptized members of the Church as continuing steadfast in or to the teaching of the apostles, in fellowship with them and with each other, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers (~~440~~ Acts 2:42). A few verses further on, their daily life is described as ranging itself under two heads:

(1.) that of public devotion, which still belonged to them as Jews ("continuing daily with one accord in the Temple");

(2.) that of their distinctive acts of fellowship: "breaking bread from house house (or 'privately,' Meyer), they did eat their meat in gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people." Taken in connection with the account given in the preceding verses of the love which made them live as having all things common, we can scarcely doubt that this implies that the chief actual meal of each day was one in which they met as brothers, and which was either preceded or followed by the more solemn commemorative acts of the breaking of the bread and the drinking of the cup. It will be convenient to anticipate the language and the thoughts of a somewhat later date, and to say that apparently they thus united every day the Agapi, or feast of love, with the celebration of the Eucharist. So far as the former was concerned, they were reproducing in the streets of Jerusalem the simple and brotherly life which the Essenes were leading in their seclusion on the shores of the Dead Sea. It would be natural that, in a society consisting of many thousand members, there should be many places of meeting. These might be rooms hired for the purpose, or freely given by those members of the Church who had them to dispose of. The congregation assembling in each place would come to be known as "the Church" in this or that man's house (~~510~~ Romans 16:5, 23; ~~510~~ 1 Corinthians 16:19; ~~504~~ Colossians 4:15; ~~500~~ Philemon 1:2). When they met, the place of honor would naturally be taken by one of the apostles, or some elder representing him. It would belong to him to pronounce the blessing (εὐλογία) and thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία), with which the meals of devout Jews always began and ended. The materials for the meal would

be provided out of the common funds of the Church or the liberality of individual members. The bread (unless the converted Jews were to think of themselves as keeping a perpetual passover) would be such as they habitually used. The wine (probably the common red wine of Palestine, ^{<4123>}Proverbs 23:31) would, according to their usual practice, be mixed with water, Special stress would probably be laid at first on the office of breaking and distributing the bread, as that which represented the fatherly relation of the pastor to his flock, and his work as ministering to men the word of life. But if this was to be more than a common meal, after the pattern of the Essenes, it would be necessary to introduce words that would show that what was done was in remembrance of their Master. At some time before or after the meal of which they partook as such, the bread and the wine would be given with some special form of words or acts, to indicate its character. New converts would need some explanation of the meaning and origin of the observance. What would be so fitting and so much in harmony with the precedents of the paschal feast as the narrative of what had passed on the night of its institution (^{<4123>}1 Corinthians 11:23-27)? With this there would naturally be associated (as in ^{<4123>}Acts 2:42) prayers for themselves and others. Their gladness would show itself in the psalms and hymns with which they praised God (^{<8104>}Hebrews 2:46,47; ^{<5153>}James 5:13). The analogy of the Passover, the general feeling of the Jews, and the practice of the Essenes may possibly have suggested ablutions, partial or entire, as a preparation for the feast (^{<8102>}Hebrews 10:22; ^{<6111>}John 13:1-15; comp. Tertull. *de Oral.* c. 11; and, for the later practice of the Church, August. *Serm.* 244). At some point in the feast, those who were present, men and women sitting apart, would rise to salute each other with the "holy kiss" (^{<4161>}1 Corinthians 16:20; ^{<4712>}2 Corinthians 13:12; Clem. Alex. *Paedagog.* 3, c. 11; Tertull. *de Orat.* c. 14; Justin Mart. *Apol.* 2). Of the stages in the growth of the new worship we have, it is true, no direct evidence, but these conjectures from antecedent likelihood are confirmed by the fact that this order appears as the common element of all later liturgies.

The next traces that meet us are in 1 Corinthians, and the fact that we find them is in itself significant. The commemorative feast has not been confined to the personal disciples of Christ, or the Jewish converts whom they gathered round them at Jerusalem. It has been the law of the Church's expansion that this should form part of its life everywhere. Wherever the apostles or their delegates have gone, they have taken this with them. he

language of St. Paul, we must remember, is not that of a man who is setting forth a new truth, but of one who appeals to thoughts, words, phrases that are familiar to his readers, and we find accordingly evidence of a received liturgical terminology. The title of the "cup of blessing" (^{<4616>}1 Corinthians 10:16), Hebrew in its origin and form (see above), has been imported into the Greek Church. The synonym of "the cup of the Lord" (^{<4612>}1 Corinthians 10:21) distinguishes it from the other cups that belonged to the Agaps. The word "fellowship" (**κοινωνία**) is passing by degrees into the special signification of "communion." The apostle refers to his own office as breaking the bread and blessing the cup (^{<4616>}1 Corinthians 10:16). The table on which the bread was placed was the Lord's table, and that title was to the Jew, not, as later controversies have made it, the antithesis of altar (**θυσιαστήριον**), but as nearly as possible a synonyme (^{<3007>}Malachi 1:7, 12; ^{<3412>}Ezekiel 41:22). But the practice of the Agape, as well as the observance (of the commemorative feast, had been transferred to Corinth, and this called for a special notice. Evils had sprung up which had to be checked at once. The meeting of friends for a social meal, to which all contributed, was a sufficiently familiar practice in the common life of Greeks of this period, and these club-feasts were associated with plans of mutual relief or charity to the poor (comp. Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Antiq.* s.v. Eranoi). The Agape of the new society would seem to him to be such a feast, and hence came a disorder that altogether frustrated the object of the Church in instituting it. Richer members came, bringing their supper with them, or appropriating what belonged to the common stock, and sat down to consume it without waiting till others were assembled and the presiding elder had taken his place. The poor were put to shame and defrauded of their share in the feast. Each was thinking of his own supper, not of that to which we now find attached the distinguishing title of "the Lord's Supper." When the time for that came, one was hungry enough to be looking to it with physical, not spiritual craving; another so overpowered with wine as to be incapable of receiving it with any reverence. It is quite conceivable that a life of excess and excitement, of overwrought emotion and unrestrained indulgence, such as this epistle brings before us, may have proved destructive to the physical as well as the moral health of those who were affected by it, and so the sickness and the deaths of which Paul speaks (^{<4613>}1 Corinthians 11:30), as the consequences of this disorder, may have been so, not by supernatural infliction, but by the working of those general laws of the divine government which make the punishment the traceable consequence of the sin. In any case, what the

Corinthians needed was to be taught to come to the Lord's table with greater reverence, to distinguish (διακρίνειν) the Lord's body from their common food. Unless they did so, they would bring upon themselves condemnation. What was to be the remedy for this terrible and growing evil he does not state explicitly. He reserves formal regulations for a later personal visit. In the mean time, he gives a rule which would make the union of the Agape and the Lord's Supper possible without the risk of profanation. They were not to come even to the former with the keen edge of appetite. They were to wait till all were met, instead of scrambling tumultuously to help themselves (^{<4113>}1 Corinthians 11:33, 34). In one point, however, the custom of the Church of Corinth differed apparently from that of Jerusalem: the meeting for the Lord's Supper was no longer daily (^{<4112>}1 Corinthians 11:20,33). The directions given in ^{<4112>}1 Corinthians 16:2 suggest the constitution of a celebration on the first day of the week (compare Just. Mart. *Apol.* 1:67; Pliny, *Ep. ad Trät.*). The meeting at Troas was on the same day (^{<4107>}Acts 20:7).

The tendency of this language, and therefore, probably, of the order subsequently established, was to separate what had hitherto been united. We stand, as it were, at the dividing point of the history of the two institutions, and henceforth each takes its own course. The Agape, as belonging to a transient phase of the Christian life, and varying in its effects with changes in national character or forms of civilization, passes through many stages; becomes more and more a merely local custom, is found to be productive of evil rather than of good, is discouraged by bishops and forbidden by councils, and finally dies out. Traces of it linger in some of the traditional practices of the Western Church. There have been attempts to revive it among the Moravians and other religious communities, but in no considerable body does it survive in its original form. **SEE LOVEFEAST.** On the other hand, the Lord's Supper also has its changes. The morning celebration takes the place of the evening. New names — Eucharist, Sacrifice, Altar, Mass, Holy Mysteries — gather round it. New epithets and new ceremonies express the growing reverence of the people. The mode of celebration at the high altar of a basilica in the 4th century differs so widely from the circumstances of the original institution that a careless eye would have found it hard to recognize their identity. Speculations, controversies, superstitions, crystallize round this as their nucleus. Great disruptions and changes threaten to destroy the life and unity of the Church. Still, through all the changes, the Supper of the Lord vindicates its

claim to universality, and bears a permanent testimony to the truths with which it was associated.

In ~~401~~ Acts 20:11 we have an example of the way in which the transition may have been effected. The disciples at Troas meet together to break bread. The hour is not definitely stated, but the fact that Paul's discourse was protracted till past midnight, and the mention of the many lamps, indicate a later time than that commonly fixed for the Greek δῆπνον. If we are not to suppose a scene at variance with Paul's rule in ~~413~~ 1 Corinthians 11:34, they must have had each his own sup. per before they assembled. Then came the teaching and the prayers, and then, towards early dawn, the breaking of bread, which constituted the Lord's Supper, and for which they were gathered together. If this midnight meeting may be taken as indicating a common practice, originating in reverence for an ordinance which Christ had enjoined, we can easily understand how the next step would be (as circumstances rendered the midnight gatherings unnecessary or inexpedient) to transfer the celebration of the Eucharist permanently to the morning hour, to which it had gradually been approximating. Here also in later times there were traces of the original custom. Even when a later celebration was looked on as at variance with the general custom of the Church (Sozomen, *supra*) it was recognized as legitimate to hold an evening communion, as a special commemoration of the original institution, on the Thursday before Easter (Augustine, *Ep.* 118; *ad Jan.* c 5-7); and again on Easter eve, the celebration in the latter case probably taking place "very early in the morning, while it was yet dark" (Tertullian, *ad Uxor.* 2, c. 4).

The recurrence of the same liturgical words in ~~425~~ Acts 27:35 makes it probable, though not certain, that the food of which Paul thus partook was intended to have, for himself and his Christian companions, the character at once of the Agape and the Eucharist. The heathen soldiers and sailors, it may be noticed, are said to have followed his example, not to have partaken of the bread which he had broken. If we adopt this explanation, we have in this narrative another example of a celebration in the early hours between midnight and dawn (comp. verse 27:39), at the same time, i.e. as we have met with in the meeting at Troas.

All the distinct references to the Lord's Supper which occur within the limits of the N.T. have, it is believed, been noticed. To find, as a recent writer has done (*Christian Remembrancer*, April 1860), quotations from

the Liturgy of the Eastern Church in the Pauline Epistles involves (ingeniously as the hypothesis is supported) assumptions too many and bold to justify our acceptance of it. Extending the inquiry, however, to the times as well as the writings of the N.T., we find reason to believe that we can trace in the later worship of the Church some fragments of that which belonged to it from the beginning. The agreement of the four great families of liturgies implies the substratum of a common order. To that order may well have belonged the Hebrew words Hallelujah, Amen, Hosanna, Lord of Sabaoth; the salutations "Peace to all," "Peace to thee;" the Sursum Corda (ἄνω σχῶμεν τὰς καρδίας), the Trisagion, the Kyrie Eleison. We are justified in looking at these as having been portions of a liturgy that was really primitive; guarded from change with the tenacity with which the Christians of the 2d century clung to the traditions (the παραδόσεις of ^{² Thessalonians 2:15; 3:6) of the first, forming part of the great deposit (παρακαταθήκη) of faith and worship which they had received from the apostles and have transmitted to later ages (comp. Bingham, *Eccles. Antiq.* book 15, chapter 7; Augusti, *Christl. Archaol.* B. 8; Stanley on 1 Corinthians 10 and 11).}

III. Ecclesiastical Representations. — The Christian Church attached from the first great and mysterious importance to the Lord's Supper. In accordance with the original institution, all Christians used wine and bread, with the exception of the Hydroparastates (Aquarii), who used water instead of wine, and the Artotvrites, who are said to have used cheese along with bread. The wine was generally mixed with water (κράμα), a anan allegorical signification was given to the mixture of these two elements. In the writings of the fathers of the first three centuries we meet with some passages which speak distinctly of symbols, and, at the same time, with others which indicate belief in a real participation of the body and blood of Christ. Ignatius, Justin, and Irenaeus laid great stress on the mysterious connection subsisting between the Logos and the elements. Tertullian and Cyprian are representatives of the symbolical aspect, though both occasionally call the Lord's Supper simply the body and blood of Christ. The symbolical interpretation prevails in particular among the Alexandrine school. Clement called it a mystic symbol which produces an effect only upon the mind, and Origen decidedly opposed those who took the external sign for the thing itself. The idea of a sacrifice, though not yet of a daily propitiatory sacrifice, appears in the writings of Justin and Irenaeus. Cyprian says that the sacrifice is made by the priest, who acts

instead of Christ, and imitates what Christ did. It is not quite certain, but probable, that the Ebionites celebrated the Lord's Supper as a commemorative feast; the mystical meals of some Gnostics, on the contrary, bear but little resemblance to the Lord's Supper. The development of liturgies in and after the third century, and the introduction of many mystical ceremonies, showed that the fathers generally regarded the Lord's Supper, with Chrysostom, as a "dreadful sacrifice." They clearly speak of a real union of the communicants with Christ; some, also, of a real change from the visible elements into the body and blood of Christ. though most of their expressions can be understood both of consubstantiality or of transubstantiation. Theodoret drew a clear distinction between the sign and the thing signified, while Augustine sought to unite its more profound mystical significance with the symbolical. Gelasius, bishop of Rome, very decidedly denied "the ceasing of the substance and nature of bread and wine." The notion of a daily repeated sacrifice is distinctly set forth in the writings of Gregory the Great. A violent controversy concerning the Lord's Supper arose in the 9th century. Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corvey, clearly propounded the doctrine of transubstantiation in his *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini*, addressed to the emperor Charles the Bald, between 830 and 832. He was opposed by Ratramnus in his treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, which was written at the request of the emperor, who drew a distinction between the sign and the thing represented by it, between the internal and the external. The most eminent theologians of the age, as Rabanus Maurus and Scotus Erigena, took an active part in the controversy. Gerbert (afterwards pope Sylvester II) endeavored to illustrate the doctrine of transubstantiation by the aid of geometrical diagrams. Toward the middle of the 11th century the doctrine of transubstantiation was rejected by Berengar, canon of Tours (q.v.), who principally condemned the doctrine of an entire change in such a manner as to make the bread to cease to be bread. Several synods in succession, between 1050 and 1079, condemned his views. At one of these synods cardinal Humbert imposed upon Berengar an oath that he believed "*corpus et sanguinem Domini non solum sacramento sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri.*" Among the scholastics, Lanfranc developed the distinction between the subject and the accidents. The term *transubstantiatio* was first used by Hildebert of Tours, though similar phrases, as *transitio*, had previously been employed (by Hugo of St. Victor and others). Most of the earlier scholastics, and, in particular, the followers of Lanfranc, defended both the change of the

bread into the body of Christ and that of the "accidentia sine subjecto," both of which were inserted in the Decretum Gratiani (about 1150), and declared an article of faith by the fourth Council of Lateran. Later, the Scholastics discussed a great many subtle questions, such as, Do animals partake of the body of Christ when they happen to swallow a consecrated host? By the institution of the Corpus-Christi day by pope Urban IV (1264), the doctrine of transubstantiation received a liturgical expression. However, a considerable time before, it had become a custom in the Latin Church that the laity received the Lord's Supper only in the form of the host. Alexander Hales, Bonaventura, and Thomas Aquinas expressly demanded that only the priests should partake of the cup. The Hussites demanded the admission of the laity also to a partaking of the cup, and the refusal of this demand by the Council of Constance was one of the causes of the Hussite War. The doctrine that Christ existed wholly in either of the elements (for which doctrine the theologians used the expression *concomitance*) was expressly confirmed by the Council of Basle. The number of those who during the Middle Ages expressed their dissent from the doctrine of transubstantiation is limited.

The doctrine of *impanation*, or a coexistence of Christ's body with the bread, was first advanced by John of Paris, who was followed by William Ockham and Durandus de Sancto Porciano. Both transubstantiation and impanation were combated by Wickliffe, who, with Berengar of Tours, believed it a change from the inferior to the superior. His views were probably shared by Jerome of Prague, while Huss seems to have believed in transubstantiation. The Reformers of the 16th century agreed in rejecting transubstantiation as unscriptural, but they differed among themselves in several points. Carlstadt believed that the words of institution were to be understood **δεικτικῶς**, i.e., that Christ, while speaking to them, had pointed at his own body. Zuingle took the word "is" (**ἐστὶ**) in the sense of signifies, and viewed the Lord's Supper merely as an act of commemoration, and as a visible sign of the body and blood of Christ. (Ecolampadius differed from Zuingle only grammatically, retaining the literal meaning of "is," but taking the predicate, "my body" (**τὸ σῶμα μου**), in a figurative sense. Luther believed it impossible to put any of these constructions on the letter of the Scripture, and adhered to the doctrine of the real-presence of Christ's body and blood in, with, and under the bread and wine (consubstantiation). Together with this view he professed a belief in the ubiquity of the body of Christ. Calvin rejected the doctrine of the real

presence; but, after the precedence of Bucer, Myronius, and others, spoke of a real, though spiritual participation of the body of Christ which exists in heaven. This participation, however, he restricted to the believer, while Luther agreed with the Roman Church in maintaining that also infidels partook of Christ's body, though to their own hurt. Attempts at mediating between the views of Luther and Calvin were early made, and there were crypto-Calvinists in the Lutheran, and crypto-Lutherans in the Calvinistic churches. But the Lutheran view received a dogmatic fixation in the Formula Concordiae, which shut out any further influence of Calvinism. The decline of Lutheran orthodoxy in general caused also the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper to grow into disuse, and the Protestant theologians generally adopted the views either of Calvin or of Zuingli. The latter, at length, prevailed. (See the *Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.* October 1860; Muller, *De Lutheri et Calvinii sententiae de Sacra Coena*, Hal. 1853.) It was in particular, adopted by the Arminian churches, as also by the Socinians. In the Church of England there was from the beginning a real-presence and a spiritual-presence party, and the controversy between them frequently became very hot. The real-presence party generally agreed with the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, but some of its writers advanced views more resembling those of the Roman Church. In the 19th century the High-Church parties of the German Lutheran Church, and of the Episcopal Church of England, Scotland, and America, revived and emphasized again the doctrine of the real presence. Under the influence of rationalistic theology and speculative theology a number of new interpretations sprang up like mushrooms, and disappeared again just as fast. The leading theologians of the United Evangelical Church of Germany in the 19th century fell back on the doctrine of Calvin, and emphasized the (real and objective communication of the whole God-man Christ to the believer, and the same views have become predominant in the German Reformed Church of America. Very different from the doctrine of all the larger Christian denominations were the views which some mystic writers of the ancient and mediaeval Church intimated, and which were fully developed in the 16th century by Paracelsus, and afterwards adopted by the Society of Friends. They regard communion as something essentially internal and mystical, and deny the Lord's Supper to be an ordinance which Christ desired to have perpetuated. — Lavater, *Historia controversiae Sacramentariae* (Tig. 1672); Hospinianus, *Hist. Sacramentaria* (Tig. 1602); Planck, *Geschichte d. Entstehung, etc., des protest. Lehrbegriffs*,

2:204 sq., 471 sq.; 3, (1.) 376 sq.; 4:6 sq.; 5, (1) 89 sq., 211 sq., (2) 7 sq.; 6:732 sq. *SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.*

IV. *Form of Celebration.* —

1. *The Elements.* —

(a) At the institution of the Lord's Supper Christ used unleavened bread. The primitive Christians carried with them the bread and wine for the Lord's Supper, and took the bread which was used at common meals, which was leavened bread. When this custom ceased, together with the Agape, the Greeks retained the leavened bread, while in the Latin Church the unleavened bread became common since the 8th century. Out of this difference a dogmatic controversy in the 11th century arose, the Greek Church reproaching the Latin for the use of unleavened bread, and making it heresy. At the Council of Florence, in 1439, which attempted to unite both churches, it was agreed that either might be used; but the Greeks soon rejected, with the council also, the toleration of the unleavened bread, and still maintain the opposite ground at the present day.

We see, from ~~1~~1 Corinthians 11:24, that in the apostolic Church the bread was broken. This custom was discontinued in the Roman Church when, in the 12th and 13th centuries, the host or holy wafer was cut in a peculiar way, so as to represent upon it a crucified Savior. Luther retained the wafer, but the Reformed churches reintroduced the use of common bread and the breaking of it. The same was the case with the Socinians and the United Evangelical Church of Germany. In the Episcopal Church of England, and the churches derived from it, cut pieces of common wheaten bread are given into the hands of the communicants. See J.G. Hermann, *Hist. convertationum de pane asymo* (Lips. 1737); Marheineke, *Das Brod in Abendmahle* (Berlin, 1817).

(b) The second element used by Christ was wine. It is not certain of what color the wine was, nor whether it was pure or mixed with water, and both points were always regarded as indifferent by the Christian Church. The use of mixed wine is said to have been introduced by pope Alexander I; it was expressly enacted in the 12th century by Clement III, and divers allegorical significations were given to the mingling of these two elements. Also the Greek Church mingles the wine with water, while the Armenian and the Protestant churches use pure wine.

The question as to whether the wine originally used in the Lord's Supper was fermented or not, would seem to be a futile one in view of the fact,

1. that the unfermented juice of the grape can hardly, with propriety, be called wine at all;
2. that fermented wine is of almost universal use in the East; and,
3. that it has invariably been employed for this purpose in the Church of all ages and countries.

But for the excessive zeal of certain modern well-meaning reformers, the idea that our Lord used any other would hardly have gained the least currency. *SEE WINKE.*

In accordance with the original institution, both elements were used separately during the first centuries, but it became early a custom to carry to sick persons bread merely dipped in wine. The Manichaeans, who abstained wholly from wine, were strongly opposed by teachers of all other parties, and pope Gelasius I, of the 5th, called their practice *grande sacrilegium*. In the 10th century it became frequent in the West to use only consecrated bread dipped in wine, but it was not before the end of the 13th century that, in accordance with the doctrine, then developed by the Scholastics, that Christ was wholly present in both bread and wine, and that the partaking of the bread was sufficient, the Church began to withhold the wine from the laity altogether. The Waldenses, Wickliffe, Huss, and Savonarola protested against this withdrawal of the cup, and all the Protestant denominations agreed in restoring the use of both elements. The Greek Church has always used the wine for the laity also. See Spitler, *Geschichte des Kelches im Abendmahl* (Lemgo, 1780); Schmidt, *De fatis calicis eucharistici* (Helmstadt, 1708).

2. Consecration and Distribution of the Elements. — To “consecrate” meant in the ancient Church only to set apart from common and devote to a sacred use. But, by degrees, a magical effect was attributed to consecration, as was already done by Augustine, and when the doctrine of transubstantiation became prevalent in the Roman Church, it was supposed that the pronouncement of the words “This is my body” changed the elements into the body and blood of Christ. The formula which were used at the consecration were at first free, but afterwards fixed by written liturgies. All liturgies contain the words of institution and a prayer; the liturgy of the Greek Church, moreover, a prayer to the Holy Spirit to

change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. In the ancient Church both elements were distributed by the deacons, afterwards only the wine; at a later period of the Church, again, both elements. According to the Protestant theologians, the administration belongs properly to the ministers of the Church; but Luther, and many theologians with him, maintained that where no regular teachers can be obtained, this sacrament may be administered by other Christians to whom this duty is committed by the Church.

3. *Time and Place.* — In the apostolic Church, as we have seen, the Lord's Supper was regularly celebrated in the public assemblies, hence in private dwellings, at common tables, during the persecutions in hidden places at the sepulchers of the martyrs, and, later, in the churches at special tables or altars. In imitation of its first celebration by Christ, it was at first celebrated at night; later, it became almost universally connected with the morning service. In the primitive Church, Christians partook of it almost daily; and when this was made impossible by the persecutions, at least several times a week, or certainly on Sundays. In the 5th century many theological writers complain of the laxity of Christians in the participation of the Lord's Supper, and afterwards several synods had to prescribe that all Christians ought to partake of it at least a certain number of times. The fourth Synod of Lateran, in 1415, restricted it to once a year. The Reformers insisted again on a more frequent participation, without, however, making any definite prescriptions as to the number of times. Many of the Protestant states punished those who withdrew altogether from it with exile, excommunication, and the refusal of a Christian burial.

4. *Persons by whom, and the Manner in which the Lord's Supper is received.* — In the primitive Church all baptized persons were admitted to the Lord's Supper; afterwards the catechumens and the lapsi were excluded from it. Communion of infants is found in an early period, and is still used in the Greek Church. See Zorn, *Hist. eucharist. infant.* (Berl. 1742). To those who were prevented from being present at the public service the consecrated elements were carried by deacons. Thus it was especially carried to the dying as a Viaticum, and until the 5th or 6th century it was even placed in the mouth of the dead, or in their coffin (see Schmidt, *De eucharistia mortuorum*, Jena, 1645).

The apostles received the Lord's Supper reclining, according to Eastern custom. Since the 4th century the communicants used to stand, afterwards

to kneel, the men with uncovered head, the women covered with a long white cloth.

Since the 4th century a certain order was introduced in approaching the communion table, so that first the higher and lower clergy, and afterwards the laity came.

The self-communion of the laity is prohibited by all Christian denominations. The self-communion of officiating clergymen is the general usage in the Roman Church, but also permitted and customary in the Episcopal Church, among the Moravians, and with other denominations.

5. *Ceremonies in Celebration.* — In the Roman Church the communicants, after having confessed and received absolution, approach the communion table, which stands at some distance from the altar, and receive kneeling a host from the priest, who passes round, taking the host out of a chalice which he holds in his left hand, repeating for each communicant the words "Corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam aeternam." The communion service of the Greek Church is nearly the same as that of the ancient Church.

In the Lutheran Church the communion is preceded by a preparatory service, confession (q.v.). After the sermon the clergyman consecrates the host and the wine at the altar. Amid the singing of the congregation, the communicants, first the men, then the women, step, either singly or two at a time, to the altar, where the clergyman places the host in their mouth, and reaches to them the cup, using the following or a similar formula: "Take, eat, this is the body of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; it may strengthen and preserve you in the true faith unto life everlasting. Amen. Take, drink, this is the blood," etc. The service is concluded with a prayer of thanks, and with the blessing. During the service frequently candles burn on the altar.

In the Reformed, Presbyterian, Congregational, Arminian, etc., churches, the service begins commonly with a formula containing the passage 1 Corinthians 11. The communicants step, in most places singly, to the communion table, and the broken bread and the cup are given into their own hands. In some places they remain sitting in the pews, where the elders carry to them bread and wine; in others, twelve at a time sit around a table. Private communion of the sick is an exception.

In the Episcopal Church of England the service of the Lord's Supper is immediately preceded by a general confession of sins, which is followed by a prayer of consecration and the words of institution. The clergymen first commune themselves, then the communicants who approach without observing any distinction, and kneel down at the communion table, receiving the bread (which is cut) and the cup into their hands. The same service takes place in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and substantially in the Methodist churches.

The Socinians have, on the day before they celebrate the Lord's Supper, a preparation ("discipline") with closed doors, when the preacher exhorts the Church members, rebukes their faults, reconciles enemies, and sometimes excludes those guilty of grave offences from the Church. On the following day, at public service, the altar tables are spread and furnished with bread and wine. The communicants sit down round the table, and take with their hands the bread, which is broken by the preacher, and the cup.

The service of the Moravians approaches that of the primitive Church. It is celebrated every fourth Sunday at the evening service, and was formerly connected with the Agape (love feasts), washing of feet, and the kiss of peace.

On the ceremonies in the Eastern churches, see *Ritus Orientalium, Coptorum, Syrorum, et Armenorum, in administrandis Sacramentis*. Ex Assemanis, Renandotio, Trombellio aliisque fontibus authenticis collectos. Edidit Henricus Denziger, Ph. et S. Th. Doc. et in Univ. Wirceburgensi Theol. Dogmat. Prof. (tom. 1, London, D. Nutt, 1863).

V. The Literature on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is very extensive. A history of the doctrine was given by Schulz (Rationalistic), *Die christliche Lehre vom heiligen Abendmahl* (2d ed. Leipsic, 1831); Ebrard (Evangelical), *Das Dogma vom Abendmahl und seine Geschichte* (Frankfort, 1845); Kahnis (High Lutheran), *Die Lehre vom Abendmahl* (Leipsic, 1851); L.J. Ruckert (Rationalistic), *Das Abendmahl, sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche* (Leipsic, 1856, 2 volumes). For many other foreign monographs, see Danz, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. Abendmahl; Volbeding, *Index*, page 50; Hase, *Leben Jesu*, page 194; Malcom, *Theol. Index*, page 275. The following are the principal English works on the subject: Wilberforce (Puseyite), *Doctrine of the Eucharist* (Lond. 1853). and *Sermons on the Holy Communion* (ib. 1854); J. Taylor (in opposition to Wilberforce), *True Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London, 1855); Goode

(W.), *Nature of Christ's Person in the Eucharist* (1856); Pusey (E.B.), *Real Presence* (1853-7); Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*; Turton (Bp.), *Eucharist, and Wiseman's Reply* (in ten Essays, 1854). More general are Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (Edinburgh, 1864, 5 volumes, 8vo), volume 2, div. 2, page 116; and his *Protest. Theol.* page 298; Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, volume 1, § 73; Heppe, *Dogmatik*, page 455; Cunningham, *Hist. Theol.* 1:205; 2:142 sq.; Auberlen, *Dis. Revel.* page 210 sq.; Browne, *Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*, page 683 sq.; Forbes, *Explan. of the XXXIX Articles*, 2:496; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, page 482 sq.; J. Pye Smith, *Christian Theology*, page 686 sq.; Baur, *Dogmengesch.* 3:10, 247; Liddon, *Our Lord's Divinity* (see Index under Eucharist); Munscher, *Dogmengesch.* 2:673 sq. See also *Ch. of Engl. Quart.* 1855, January art. 1; *Evangel. Rev.* 1866, page 369 sq.; *Method. Quart. Rev.* 1860 (October), page 648 sq.; 1870 (April), page 301; *Jatrb. deutsche Theol.* 1867, 2:21 sq.; 1868, volume 1 and 2; 1870, volume 3 and 4; *Stud. u. Krit.* 1841, 3:715 sq.; 1839, 1:69, 123; 1840, 2:389; 1844, 2:409; 1866, 2:362; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. Wissensch. Theol.* 1867, p. 84; *Christian Monthly*, 1844 (May), page 542; *Christian Rememb.* 1853 (October), pages 93, 263; 1867, page 84; Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1854 (October), page 102; *Bibl. Sacra*, 1862, art. 6; 1863, page 3; *Hercersb. Rev.* 1858, page 103; *Chr. Review*, 1866, page 11 sq.; *Christian Rev.* 40, 191; *Lit. and Theol. Rev.* 1836 (September); *Bapt. Quart. Review*, 1870 (October), page 497; *Contemp. Rev.* 1868 (July and November); *Edinb. Rev.* 1867 (April), page 232; *Brit. Quart. Rev.* 1868, page 113; *Princeton Rev.* 1848; *Brit. and For. Ev. Review*, 1868, page 431; *Westm. Rev.* 1871, page 96 sq. An account of the mode of the celebration of the Lord's Supper by the various denominations is given by Scheibel, *Feier des heiligen Abendmahls bei den verschiedenen Religionsparteien* (Breslau, 1824). **SEE SUPPER.**

Lorenz, Johann Michael,

a German theologian, was born at Strasburg June 16, 1692, and was educated at the university of that city. In 1713 he obtained the degree of A.M.; in 1714 he was appointed preacher in his native place; in 1722, professor ordinary of divinity at his alma mater. In addition to this, he was appointed in 1724 visitor of Williams College; in 1728, morning preacher and prebendary of the foundation of St. Thomas; in 1734, pastor of the Thomas Church; in 1741, vice-president of the ecclesiastical conference. The doctorate in divinity he obtained in 1722. He died August 13, 1752.

By more than fifty Latin dissertations on dogmatical and exegetical theology Lorenz gained an honorable name in theological literature. We only mention *Dissertatio de unctione Spirituali, ad 1 Joh. 2:27* (Argentorati. 1723, 4to). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Lorenzo Or Lorenzetto, Ambrogio And Pietro Di,

two celebrated Italian painters of the 14th century, were born at Siena about 1300. They were brothers, as we learn from an inscription which was attached to their pictures of the "Presentation" and of the "Marriage of the Virgin," destroyed in 1720. The principal of their works, which was painted in the Minorite convent at Siena, and represented the fatal adventures of some missionary monks, has been destroyed. In the first compartment a youth was represented putting on the monastic costume, in another, the same youth was represented with several of his brother monks about to set out for Asia, to convert the Mohammedans in a third, these missionaries are already at their place of destination, and are being chastised in the sultan's presence, and are surrounded and mocked by a crowd of scoffing infidels; the sultan judges them to be hanged; in a fourth the young monk is already hanged to a tree, yet he notwithstanding continues to preach the Gospel to the astonished multitude, upon which the sultan orders their heads to be cut off; the next compartment is their ceremonious execution by the sword, and the scaffold is surrounded by a great crowd on foot and on horseback; after the execution follows a great storm, which is represented in all the detail of wind, hail, lightning, and earthquake, from all of which the crowd are protecting themselves as they best can, and this miracle, as it was considered, is the cause of many conversions to Christianity. Of the several pictures by Ambrogio mentioned by Ghiberti only one remains, the *Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple*, in the Scuole Regie. Of works by Pietro Lorenzo there is only one authenticated work; it is in the Stanza del Pilone, a room against the sacristy of the cathedral of Siena, and represents, according to Rumohr, some passages from the life of John the Baptist, his birth, etc. Vasari mentions many works by Pietro in various cities of Tuscany, and attributes to him a picture of the early fathers and hermits in the Campo Santo at Pisa. In 1355 Pietro was invited to Arezzo to paint the cathedral, in which he painted in fresco twelve stories from the life of the Virgin, with figures as large as life and larger, but they have long since perished; they were, however, in good preservation in the time of Vasari, who completely

restored them. He speaks of parts of them as superior in style and vigor to anything that had been done up to that time. — *English Cyclop.* s.v. See also Vasari, *Vite de Pittori*, etc.; Della Valle, *Lettere Sanesi*; Lanzi, *Storia Pittorica*, etc.; and especially Rumohr, *Italienische Forschungen*, in which the two Lorenzetti are treated of at considerable length.

Loretto Properly Loreto

(LAURETUI), an Italian city of some 8000 inhabitants, several miles south of Ancona, is renowned simply as a place of pilgrimage. It is the site of the celebrated sanctuary of the Virgin Mary called the Santa Casa, or Holy House. The church of Santa Casa was built in 1461-1513. The first mention of this santas casa is to be found in Flavius Blondus's (t 1463) *Italia illustrata*, where he says of it, "Celeberrimum totius Italiae sacellum beatae Virginis in Laureto." He mentions the many rich presents which were made to the shrine as a proof that "at this place the prayers for the intercession of the mother of God are granted," but he says nothing of the origin of the place. Pope Paul II (i 1471) granted indulgences to those who visited this shrine, and this example was followed by his successors. Baptista Mantuanus, in his *Redemptoris mundi matris ecclesiae Laurefanae historias* (Antwerp, 1576), relates, quoting a history found at the shrine itself (and probably written about 1450-80), that the house of the Virgin Mary, in which Christ was brought up, and which was said to have been discovered by St. Helena, was, after the total downfall of the country, and the destruction of its Christian churches by the Turks in May 1291, brought by the angels to Dalmatia, and four and a half years later to Italy, in the neighborhood of Recanati, and was thence finally transferred to its present site. This story is contradicted by the Church historians of the 14th century themselves, who say that in their day Mary's house at Nazareth was still visited by pilgrims. The houses of Recanati resembled each other very much, and the selection of the original habitation of the Virgin proved very difficult, as private interests became mixed up with it.

But now as to the church of the Santa Casa itself. It stands near the center of the town, in a piazza a which possesses other architectural attractions, the chief of which are the governor's palace, built from the designs of Bramante, and a fine bronze statue of pope Sixtus V. The great central door of the church is surmounted by a splendid bronze statue of the Madonna; and in the interior are three magnificent bronze doors filled with basreliefs, representing the principal events of scriptural and ecclesiastical

history. The celebrated Holy House stands within. It is a small brick house, with one door and one window, originally of rude material and construction, but now, from the devotion of successive generations, a marvel of art and of costliness. It is entirely cased with white marble, exquisitely sculptured, after Bramante's designs, by Sansovino, Bandinelli, Giovalni Bolognese, and other eminent artists. The subjects of the bas-reliefs are all taken from the history of the Virgin Mary in relation to the mystery of the incarnation, as the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity, with the exception of three on the eastern side, which are mainly devoted to the legend of the Holy House itself and of its translation. The rest of the interior of the church is rich with bas-reliefs, mosaics, frescoes, paintings, and carvings in bronze. Of this material, the finest work is the font, which is a masterpiece of art. The Holy House having been at all times an object of devout veneration, its treasury of votive offerings is one of the richest in the Western world. It suffered severely in the French occupation of 1796, but it has since received numerous and most costly accessions. Each of the innumerable gold and silver lamps kept burning at the shrine is endowed to the amount of several thousand dollars to secure their being always kept burning. The remainder of the wax candles and oil (of which some 14,000 pounds are burned annually) is sold as possessing sanative virtues, which are also supposed to accompany the use or even the handling of household vessels belonging to the shrine. As many as 40,000 masses have been said there in one year, which also adds greatly to the income. Popes Julius II, Sixtus V, and Innocent XII attached indulgences to the pilgrimages and prayers offered here, but nevertheless the number of pilgrims, which was said in 1600 to have reached 200,000 per annum, fell in the last century to 40,000, and in our own day remains at this number. The frescoes of the church are among the finest to be found in the world. The name it took from Laureta, a lady on whose estate the Suanta Casa remained for a while.

The history of this shrine has been critically examined by P.P. Bergerius, and in 1619 by Prof. Vernegger, of Strasburg. Its principal champions were Jesuits; among them we would mention Turrianus, Canisius, and Baronius. Imitations of the Santa Csasa have been erected in some places, as at Prague, near Augsburg, etc., and, in turn, became shrines. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:489.

Loria (Or Luria) Isaac

(by the Jews *yra* [*Lion*], the initials of *qj xy ybr yznça*), a noted rabbi and great expounder of the Cabala (q.v.), was born at Jerusalem in 1534, of a German-Jewish family. His father having died when he was a child, he was cared for by a rich uncle, and was dedicated to the study of the Talmud at Cairo. When twenty-four years of age he was considered one of the greatest Talmudists of that place. Unfortunately, however, Loria became an ardent admirer of the mystical writings of the Jews, and especially enraptured with the *Sohar* (q.v.), one of the Cabalistic works. The hermit of Cairo was the first to bring the intricate and confused system of the *Sohar* into order, unity, and congruity; he also made many valuable additions. A most remarkable feature of his views are the numerous divisions of his psychology, with its two sexes. Still, all these theories were, with him, only premises to lead on to a more important and practical branch in the Cabala, which he called the "*world of perfection*" (*Olam ha-Tikkun*). He also held peculiar views on the fall of man. By reason of Adam's original sin, he held, the higher and the infernal souls, the good and the evil, came into confusion, and became intermixed with each other, a transmigration and separation of souls was thus a necessity. In addition to this he teaches the *Superfaetatio*. He pretended to have a full knowledge concerning the origin, relation, and ramification of souls; further, to possess the power and faculty to compel the spirits of the upper world to take their abode in the bodies of living men, in order to reveal to them what is going on in the upper world; further, to be able to read on every man's brow in which relation his soul stands to the higher worlds. In Cairo nobody interested himself in his mysticism, and he therefore emigrated in 1569 to Safet, the cabalistic Jerusalem, where the Cabala was esteemed as high as the Bible. His superior knowledge, faculties, and gifts gradually secured him the favor of the Cabalists, and Loria was soon surrounded by troops of young and old Cabalists, who came to listen to his new revelations. He subsequently formed a cabalistic community, who lived together apart from the non-Cabalists, and according to his prescriptions. After Loria's death (August, 1572), Vital Calabrese became his successor and gathered his productions, while another of his disciples, the Italian Israel Saruk, propagated his teachings in Europe. Indeed, it may be said that the influence of this Cabalist extended more or less over all the Jews of the globe, and many of them to this very day follow this great Jewish mystic in assigning to the *Sohar* equal value as to the Bible. It must be

confessed, however, that by his influence he also called forth a revival in the Jewish communities everywhere, and a reaction in the pharisaic, lifeless prayers, while even upon the Christian theosophy, mysticism, and exegetical studies his influence was considerable. See Gritz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 9:437 sq.; 10:125; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenth.* 3:138,145; Fürst, *Bibliotl. Jud.* 2:257 sq.

Loria, Salomo

a noted rabbi, was born at Posen in 1510. Gifted with great talents, he devoted himself to a thorough research of Jewish literature. On account of his onslaughts on Jewish tradition he became involved in manifold controversies with his colleagues, and was persecuted; but, though personally disliked on account of his inclination to polemics, and not sparing even the private characteristics of living authorities, his just merits concerning the Talmud were recognized after all, and his commentaries on six volumes of the Talmud are held in high reputation among the Talmudic Jews to this very day. He died in 1573. See Gritz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 9:467 sq.; Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* 2:260 sq.

Lorin(us), Jean

a Jewish commentator on the Scriptures, distinguished in his day as an exegetical scholar, was born at Avignon in 1559; taught theology at Paris, Rome, and Milan, and died March 26, 1634, at Dole. For a list of his works, see Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 31:662.

Lorraine, Charles De Guise,

Cardinal of. *SEE GUISE, CHARLES.*

Lorsbach, Georg Wilhelm

a German theologian, was born at Dillenburg, in the duchy of Nassau, February 29, 1752. In 1768 he entered the University of Herborn; in 1771 he removed to that of Göttingen, and became there an enthusiastic student of the Oriental languages under Michaelis. After having finished the academical course, he spent four years in private study in his father's house, preparing himself for the ministry. In 1778 he became rector at Siegen; in 1786, at the grammar-school of his native place, and obtained, at the same time, the dignity of professor; in 1791, rector at the grammar-school of Herborn, and, at the same time, professor of Oriental languages at the

academy there, and in the following year was appointed to lecture at the university of that place on history and exegesis. In 1793 he became the third professor ordinary of divinity; in 1794, the second professor and a counselor of the Consistory. Having become famous, by reason of his literary contributions, as an eminent Orientalist, he was, in 1812, called to the University of Jena as professor of Oriental literature. The theological faculty of Marburg bestowed on him the degree of doctor of divinity. He died March 30, 1816. He belongs to the few and rare scholars of the ancient languages who combined acuteness with extensive learning. De Sacy places him among the first German Orientalists. He published an *Archiv d. morgenlandischen Literatur* (Marburg, 1791-94, 2 bde. 8vo). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Lorsch, Convent Of

(otherwise *Lauresham*, *Lauresheim*, *monasterium Laureacense*, *Laurissense*, *Laurissa*), situated four miles from Heidelberg, was established about A.D. 764 by countess Williswinda (widow of count Rupert, who, by order of Pepin, conducted pope Stephen back to Rome) and her son Cancor. Its first abbot is said to have been a near relative of the founders, Chrodegang of Metz. The first establishment was on an island of the Weschnitz, dedicated to St. Peter; a second was soon erected on a hill in the neighborhood. Charlemagne greatly interested himself in this monastery, and added to it as endowment Heppenheim (in January 773) and Oppenheim (in September 774), and personally attended the consecration. Louis the Pious, Lothaire, Louis the German, and Louis III all confirmed successively the donations of Charlemagne. But one of the greatest sources of prosperity for the convent was its having received from Rome the relics of St. Nazarius, which brought it numberless presents and donations, and soon made it one of the most prosperous convents at the time. Lorsch also enjoys great literary fame. Its monks especially distinguished themselves by their literary pursuits, to which the *Annales Laureshmenses* bear witness. The early part of these annals (703-768) is evidently derived from those of the convent of Murbach, which were very popular; but after that time they are clearly original, and continue down to 803. Aside from the less important *Annales Laurissenses minores*, we must mention the *Annales Laurissenses*, formerly called *plebeji* or *Loiseliani*, which are the most important annals of the time. Ranke has lately discovered in them the official work of a Carlovingian court historian, which was afterwards used by Einhard as the basis of the annals bearing his

name. Until the 11th century the convent enjoyed great prosperity. Then its reverses commenced, and, after various struggles, it fell in the 12th century, till "a planta pedis usque ad verticem non fuit in eo sanitas." The moral condition of the Lorsch monastery had greatly deteriorated ever since the 11th century, and it became necessary to inaugurate a reform. This task was entrusted to archbishop Sifried II of Mentz, A.D. 1229. His successor, Sifried III, however, was really the man who completed this task by subjecting the monks to the Cistercian rule, "ut ordo," says Gregory IX in his brief, "de nigro conversus in album purgetur vitiis et virtutibus augeatur." By him also were subsequently installed into Lorsch some Praemonstrant canons of the convent of All Saints (diocese of Strasburg), and the pope approved it as a new organization January 8, 1248. In the second half of the 16th century Lorsch was subjected to the rule of the electoral administration. Vainly did the Praemonstrants appeal to pope Alexander VII: the convent retained only the original foundation at Mentz and its dependencies. Not until after the completion of the treaty of Westphalia (1650) was a part of its other possessions restored to it. In 1651 the Palatinate renewed its claims to the lands of the convent, and questioned the propriety of the independence of Lorsch as a separate duchy, with representation in the Diet. The quarrel lasted nearly through the whole of the 18th century, but was finally settled in 1803, when the convent became the possession of the house of Hesse-Darmstadt. See Rettberg, *K. Geschichte Deutschlands*, 1:584 sq.; K. Dahl, *Beschreib. d. Furstenthums Lorsch* (Darmstadt, 1812, 4to); *Codex principis olim Laureshamensis*, etc., edit. Academ. elector. scient. Theodoro-Palatina, volume 3 (Mannh. 1768, 4to); Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 8:490.

Lort, Michael, D.D.

an English theologian, was born in 1725; entered Trinity College, Cambridge, 1745; became professor of Greek at Cambridge in 1759; rector of St. Matthew, London, in 1771; prebendary of St. Paul's in 1780. He died in 1790. His works were, *Papers in Archeology*, 1777, '79, '87: — *Short Comment on the Lord's Prayer*, 1790: — *Inquiry Relative to the Authorship of "The whole Duty of Man;"* and a small volume of Sernons. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.

Lo-ruha'mah

(Heb. *Lo-Rucha'mah*, **חַמְיָ רַחֵם** not pitied, as it is explained in both contexts, ^{<3006>}Hosea 1:6, Sept. **Ὀὐκ ἤλεη μένη**, Vulg. *Absque misericordia*, and as it is rendered in the Auth.Vers., ^{<3023>}Hosea 2:23, "not obtained mercy"), the name divinely appointed for the first daughter of the prophet Hosea by the formerly dissolute Gomer, a type of Jehovah's temporary rejection of his people by the Babylonian captivity in consequence of their idolatry (^{<3006>}Hosea 1:6; 2:23; comp. 2:1). B.C. cir. 725. *SEE HOSEA*.

Losada, Christopher

a martyr to the cause of Protestantism in Spain in the 16th century, was, at the time of his conversion under the preaching of Dr. Egidius, *SEE GIL, JUAN*, an eminent physician and learned philosopher. He was chosen pastor of a Protestant Church in Seville, which met ordinarily in the house of Isabella de Baena, "a lady not less distinguished for her piety than for her rank and opulence." Among the members of note in his congregation were Don Juan Ponce de Leon, and Domingo de Guzman, and others equally well celebrated. Arrested by the Inquisition in consequence of his zeal in diffusing Protestant principles among his countrymen, neither the prison nor the rack availed to make him renounce his convictions, and he was consequently condemned to the stake. He suffered death at an "auto-da-fe," solemnized at Seville September 24, 1559, in the square of St. Francis, and attended by four bishops, the members of the royal court of justice, the chapter of the cathedral, and a great assemblage of nobility and gentry, the occasion of the death penalty on twenty-one apostates from the Romish belief. The most distinguished individual aside from Dr. Losada was one of his members, Don Juan Ponce de Leon, whom we have mentioned above. They both bore their trial with admirable Christian patience, committing their souls to a faithful Creator. See Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, page 136; M'Crie, *Reformation in Spain*, pages 217, 300, 307. (J.H.W.)

Loscher, Johann Kaspar

a German theologian, was born at Werden May 8, 1636, and was educated at the University of Wittenberg. He flourished successively as superintendent of the churches of Sondershausen (1668), pastor at Erfurt

(1676), superintendent at Zwickau (1679), and then as senior preacher in the west Prussian city of Dantzic. In 1687 he was made doctor and professor of theology at his alma mater, and he remained there until his death, July 11, 1718. He wrote many theological dissertations, of but little value in our day.

Loscher, Valentin Ernst

a distinguished German theologian, was born at Sondershausen in 1673. He studied at the universities of Wittenberg (where his father, Caspar Loscher, was a professor) and Jena, and then went on a perigrinatio academica through the Netherlands and Denmark, and the cities Hamburg and Rostock. In the last-named place he connected himself with the anti-Pietist party, but after his return he devoted himself to historical studies, and delivered lectures on genealogy and heraldry, as well as on exegesis, morals, etc. In 1698 he was appointed superintendent by the duke of Weissenfels, and, some time after, began, in connection with some friends, the publication of the first theological periodical in Germany, the *Unschuldige Nachrichten von alten u. neuen theolog. Sachen* (20 volumes to 1720; continued by Henry Reinhard until 1731). This became the organ of the orthodox party in Saxony, as opposed to the pietism and indifferentism prevailing at the time. His sphere of influence was afterwards enlarged, first as superintendent of Delitzsch, and, later (1702), as professor in the University of Wittenberg. In 1704 he was appointed superintendent of Dresden and member of the supreme consistorial court. In this position his activity was soon manifested in the improved facilities for religious and secular instruction. Besides establishing several parish schools, he laid the foundation of a *seminarium ministerii*; at the same time he zealously instructed candidates for the ministry, preached both on Sundays and week-days, besides carrying on an extensive correspondence with the princes, states, and pastors who held fast to the orthodox faith, and opposed, with him, the inroads of pietism and indifferentism. He died February 12, 1741. Loscher left a collection of his letters forming five volumes folio, which are preserved in the Hamburg Library. His principal works are *Historia mortuum* (part 1:1707; part 3:1722): — *Die Reformationsakta*: — *Timotheus Verinus* (1718). See Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* s.v.; Tholuck, *Der Geist d. lutherischen Theologen Wittenb.* (1852); M.v. Engelhardt, *Valentin Ernst Loscher nach s. Leben u. Wirken* (Dorpat, 1853; 2d edit., Stuttg. 1856); Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent.* 1:109 sq., 116 sq., 130.

Loskiel, George Henry

a bishop of the Moravian Church, celebrated as a preacher, hymnologist, and author, was born November 7, 1740, at Angermunde, in Courland, where his father had charge of a Lutheran parish. In early life he joined the Moravians, and studied both theology and medicine at their college at Barby, in Germany. After practicing medicine for a time, he devoted himself wholly to the ministry, in Holland, Germany, and Livonia. In 1802 he was consecrated a bishop, and came to the United States in order to fill the office of president of the provincial board which governs the Moravian churches in this country. Failing health and other circumstances constrained him to retire from this position in 1810. Two years later he was elected into the general board of the Church at Berthelsdorf, in Saxony; but the war with Great Britain and the state of his health prevented him from leaving America. He died February 23, 1814, at Bethlehem, Pa. His two principal works are *Geschichte d. Mission der Evang. Brüder unter den indianern in N.A.* (1789), translated into English by La Trobe, and published in London (1794), a standard on the Moravian missions among the Indians, with a full account of their manners and customs, based upon the reports of the missionaries, and *Etwas fürs Herz auf dem Wege zure Ewigkeit* (Religious Meditations for every Day in the Year), a book which passed through eight editions (the last in 1848), and is still read with great profit by thousands of Christians in Germany. See De Schweinitz, *Life and Times of David Zeisberer* (Phila. 1871, 8vo), pages 662 sq. (E. de S.)

Losner, Christopher Friedrich,

a German theologian, noted in the department of exegesis, was born at Leipsic in 1734, and was educated at the university of that place. He afterwards held a professorship in his alma mater. He died there in 1803. His chief work is *Observationes ad Novum Testamentum. e Philone Alexandrino* (Leipsic, 1777, 8vo). In this work "the force and meaning of words are particularly illustrated, together with points of antiquity, and the readings of Philo's text. The light thrown upon the New Testament by the writings of Philo is admirably elucidated by Losner" (Horne). Another valuable production of his is *Observationes in reliquiis versionis Proverbiorum Salomonis Graecae Aquilae, Symmachi et Theodotionis.*

Loss

(prop. some form of the verb **dbā**; ἀπόλλυμι, but likewise a frequent rendering of several other Heb. and Gr. terms which usually imply an idea of damage). According to the Mosaic law, whoever among the Hebrews found any lost article (**hdba**) was required to take it to his home, and then endeavor to discover the proper owner (^(**hzb**)Deuteronomy 22:1-3). This would, of course, particularly apply to stray animals, and Josephus gives some special details with respect to money so found (*Ant.* 4:8. 29; compare the Mishna, *Shekal.* 7:2). In case of the abstraction of property while in the possession of the finder, the latter had not only to make it good, but also to add one fifth of its value, and even to make a sin-offering likewise (^(**hzb**)Leviticus 6:3 sq.). The Mishna makes many casuistical distinctions on this subject (*Baba Mezia*, 1:2), especially with regard to advertising (**zyrkh** i.e., κηρύττειν) the discovered property. *SEE DAMAGE.*

Loss, Lewis Homri

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Augusta, N.Y., July 1, 1803, and was educated at Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y. (class of 1828). In 1829 he was licensed and ordained by Oneida Presbytery, and installed pastor of the Church in Camden, Oneida County, N.Y. In the pastoral office he afterwards served in Elyria, Ohio; in Rockford and Chicago, Ill.; and in Jolliet and Marshalltown, Iowa. He was synodical missionary three years to the synod of Peoria, Illinois; also prominent in bringing into existence institutions of learning, as Beloit College and Rockford Female Seminary, Illinois. He died July 10, 1865. Mr. Loss was an eminently successful preacher, erecting many churches, and especially prominent in the Sabbath-school cause. He always had the fullest confidence of the men of the world; they recognized his worth as a man and a citizen. See Wilson, *Presb. Histor. Alm.* 1866, page 217. (J.L.S.)

Lossius, Caspiar Friedirici

a German theologian, was born at Erfurt Jan. 31, 1753, and was educated at the university of that place, which he entered in 1770. Dissatisfied with the innovations which Bahrdrdt undertook in theology, he removed in 1773 to the University of Jena; and again, not quite satisfied with the rationalistic innovations of the day, he was obliged to acquire the greater part of his learning by private study. In 1774 he became school-teacher at his native

place; in 1781 dean of Andreas Church, and in 1785 dean to the Prediger Church of the same place. He died March 26, 1817. Lossius was a man of great learning; the literature of the Reformation was almost his daily study. Having seen the danger which threatened his country, both religiously and morally, from the rationalistic innovations, and from the consequences of the French Revolution, he dedicated most of his time and talent as a popular author to the cause of the faith and principles of the fathers of the Reformation. Some of his productions passed through several editions in a short time. Some were even translated into French, and rescued thousands from moral degradation and spiritual destruction. A complete list of his works is given by Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* volume 2, s.v.

Lost Tribes

SEE CAPTIVITY; SEE ISRAEL.

Lot

(properly **l r76** or **l r6g**, *goral'*, **κλῆρος**, literally a pebble, used anciently for balloting; other terms occasionally thus rendered are **l bj** or **l bj**, *che'bel*, a portion, ^{<6319>}Deuteronomy 32:9; ^{<3168>}1 Chronicles 16:18; ^{<9451>}Psalms 105:11, referring to an inheritance; and **λαγχάνω**, to obtain by lot, ^{<6009>}Luke 1:9; ^{<6124>}John 19:24), strictly a small stone, as used in casting lots (^{<6168>}Leviticus 16:8; ^{<6354>}Numbers 33:54; ^{<6300>}Joshua 19:1. ^{<6246>}Ezekiel 24:6; ^{<6007>}Jonah 1:7), hence also a method used to determine chances or preferences, or to decide a debate. The decision by lot was often resorted to among the Hebrews, but always with the strictest reference to the interposition of God. As to the precise manner of casting lots, we have no certain information; probably several modes were practiced. In ^{<2163>}Proverbs 16:33 we read that "the lot," i.e., pebble, "is cast into the lap," properly into the bosom of an urn or vase. It does not appear that the lap or bosom of a garment worn by a person was ever used to receive lots.

The use of lots among the ancients was very general (see Dale, *Orac. ethn.* c. 14; Potter, *Greek Antiq.* 1:730; Adams, *Roman Ant.* 1:540 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Ant.* s.v. Sors) and highly esteemed (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 1:6, 46), as is natural in simple stages of society (Tacit. *Germ.* 10), "recommending itself as a sort of appeal to the Almighty secure from all influence of passion or bias, and a sort of divination employed even by the gods themselves (Homer, *Iliad*, 22:209; Cicero, *De Div.* 1:34; 2:41). The

word sors is thus used for an oracular response (Cicero, *De Div.*, 2:56). So there was a mode of divination among heathens by means of arrows, two inscribed and one without mark, **βελομαντεία** (^{<3042>}Hosea 4:12; ^{<3221>}Ezekiel 21:21; Mauritius, *De Sortitione*, c. 14, § 4; see also ^{<1787>}Esther 3:7; 9:24-32; Mishna, *Taanith*, 2:10). **SEE DIVINATION**. Among heathen instances the following additional may be cited:

- 1.** Choice of a champion, or of priority in combat (*Il.* 3:316; 7:171; Herod. 3:108);
- 2.** Decision of fate in battle (*Il.* 20:209);
- 3.** Appointment of magistrates, jurymen, or other functionaries (Aristot. *Pol.* 4:16; Schol. *On Aristoph.* Plut. 277; Herod. 6:109; Xenoph. *Cyrol.* 4:5, 55; Demosth. *c. Aristog.* 1:778, 1; comp. Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Dicastes);
- 4.** Priests (AEsch. *in Tim.* page 188, Bekk.);
- 5.** A German practice of deciding by marks on twigs, mentioned by Tacitus (*Germ.* 10);
- 6.** Division of conquered or colonized land (Thucydides, 3:50; Plutarch, *Pericles*, 84; Bockh, *Public Econ. of Ath.* 2:170)."

The Israelites sometimes had recourse to lots as a method of ascertaining the divine will (^{<2063>}Proverbs 16:33), and generally in cases of doubt regarding serious enterprises (^{<1787>}Esther 3:7; compare Rosenmüller, *Morgenl.* 3:301), especially the following: (a.) In matters of partition or distribution. e.g. the location of the several tribes in Palestine (^{<0465>}Numbers 26:55 sq.; 33:34; 34:13; 36:2; ^{<6442>}Joshua 14:2; 18:6 sq.; 19:5), the assignment of the Levitical cities (^{<6204>}Joshua 21:4 sq.), and, after the return from the exile, the settlement in the homesteads at the capital (^{<6100>}Nehemiah 11:1; compare 1 Macc. 3:36). Prisoners of war were also disposed of by lot (^{<2088>}Joel 3:3; ^{<3480>}Nahum 3:10; Obad. 11; compare ^{<0275>}Matthew 27:35; ^{<6124>}John 19:24; compare Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 4:5, 55). (b.) In criminal investigations where doubt existed as to the real culprit (^{<0874>}Joshua 7:14; ^{<0942>}1 Samuel 14:42). A notion prevailed among the Jews that this detection was performed by observing the shining of the stones in the high-priest's breastplate (Mauritius, c. 21, § 4). The instance of the mariners casting lots to ascertain by the surrendering of what offender the sea could be appeased (^{<3007>}Jonah 1:7), is analogous; but it is not clear, from

^{<2088>}Proverbs 18:18, that lots were resorted to for the determination of civil disputes. (c.) In the election to an important office or undertaking for which several persons appeared to have claims (^{<9009>}1 Samuel 10:19; ^{<4026>}Acts 1:26; comp. Herod. 3:128; Justin. 13:4; Cicero, *Verr.* 2:2, 51; Aristot. *Polit.* 4:16), as well as in the assignment of official duties among associates having a common right (^{<16094>}Nehemiah 10:34), as of the priestly offices in the Temple service among the sixteen of the family of Eleazar and the eight of that of Ithamar (^{<1347>}1 Chronicles 24:3, 5, 19; ^{<8009>}Luke 1:9), also of the Levites for similar purposes (^{<13238>}1 Chronicles 23:28; 24:20-31; 25:8; 26:13; Mishna, *Tamid*, 1:2; 3:1.; 5:2; Jonut, 2:2. 3, 4; *Shabb.* 23:2; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* in ^{<8008>}Luke 1:8, 9, volume 2, page 489). (d.) In military enterprises (^{<07200>}Judges 20:10; compare Val. Max. 1:5, 3).

In the sacred ritual of the Hebrews we find the use of lots but once prescribed, namely, in the selection of the scape-goat (^{<6168>}Leviticus 16:8 sq.). The two inscribed tablets of boxwood, afterwards of gold, were put into an urns which was shaken, and the lots drawn out (Joma, 3:9; 4:1). **SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF.** Eventually lots came into frequent usage (comp. the Mishna, *Shabb.* 23:2). In later times they even degenerated into a game of hazard, of which human life was the stakes (Josephus, *War*, 3:8, 7). Dice appear to have been usually employed for the lot (I r/G Æyl æhæ to "throw the die," ^{<6888>}Joshua 18:8; so hr/h, to *cast*, ^{<6886>}Joshua 18:6; δίδωμι, to *give*, ^{<4026>}Acts 1:26; I ρη; πίπτω, to *fall*, ^{<3007>}Jonah 1:7; ^{<5477>}Ezekiel 24:7; ^{<4026>}Acts 1:26), and were sometimes drawn from a vessel (I r/Ghiaxy;" the lot *came* forth," ^{<04375>}Numbers 32:54, so hl [; to "come up," ^{<0809>}Leviticus 6:9; comp. the Mishna, *Joma*, 4:1). A different kind of lot is elsewhere indicated in the Mishna (Josna, 2:1; comp. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* page 714). A sacred species of lot was by means of the **SEE URIM AND THUMMIM** (q.v.) of the high-priest (^{<04271>}Numbers 27:21; ^{<0206>}1 Samuel 28:6), which appears to have had some connection with the divination by means of the sacerdotal EPHOD (^{<02316>}1 Samuel 23:6, 9). Stones were occasionally employed in prophetic or emblematical lots (^{<04706>}Numbers 17:6 sq.; ^{<38110>}Zechariah 11:10, 14). **SEE PURIM.** Election by lot appears to have prevailed in the Christian Church as late as the 7th century (Bingham, *Eccles. Antiq.* 4:1, 1, volume 1, page 426; Bruns, *Conc.* 2:66). Here also we may notice the use of words heard, or passages chosen at random from Scripture. *Sortes Biblicae*, like the *Sortes Vigilance*, prevailed among Jews, as they have also among Christians, though denounced by several councils (Johnson, "Life of Cowley," Works, 9:8;

Bingham, *Eccl. Antiq.* 16:5, 3; id., 6:53 sq.; Bruns, *Conc.* 2:145-154, 166; Mauritius, c. 15; Hofmann, *Lex.* s.v. Sortes).

On the subject generally, see Mauritius, *De Sortitione ap. vet. Hebraeos* (Basil, 1692); Chrysander, *De Sortibus* (Halle, 1740); Benzel, *De Sortibus vet. in his Syntagma dissertat.* 1:297-318; Winckler, *Gedanken über dl. Spuren gottl. Providenz in Loose* (Hildesheim, 1750); Palaophili, *Abhandl. v. Gebrauchs d. Looses in d. heil. Schr.* in Semler's Hall. *Samml.* 1:2, 79 sq.; Junius, *De Sorte, remedio dubias caussas dirimendi* (Lips. 1746); Eenberg, *De Sortilegiis* (Upsal. 1705); Hanovius, *De electione per sortem* (Gedan. 1743; in German by Tramhold, Hamb. 1751); Bauer, *Vormitze Kunst*, etc. (Hildesh. 1750).

The term "lot" is also used for that which falls to one by lot, especially a portion or inheritance (^{<1650>}Joshua 15:1; ^{<0003>}Judges 1:3; ^{<1933>}Psalms 125:3; ^{<2374>}Isaiah 17:14; 47:6; ^{<4182>}Acts 8:21). Lot is also used metaphorically for portion, or destiny, as assigned to men from God (^{<1915>}Psalms 16:5): "And arise to thy lot in the end of days" in the Messiah's kingdom (^{<2723>}Daniel 12:13; comp. ^{<6116>}Revelation 20:6). *SEE HERITAGE.*

Lôt

SEE MYRRH.

Lot

(Heb. *id.*, פֶּלֶט, a covering, as in ^{<2327>}Isaiah 25:7; Sept. and N.T. Λότ, Josephus Αἰότος; occurs ^{<0112>}Genesis 11:27, 31; 12:4, 5; 13:1-14; 14:12, 16; 19:1-15, 18, 23, 29, 30, 36; ^{<1819>}Deuteronomy 2:9, 19; ^{<1938>}Psalms 83:8; ^{<2178>}Luke 17:28, 29, 32; ^{<6107>}2 Peter 2:7), the son of Haran and nephew of Abraham (^{<0112>}Genesis 11:27). His sisters were Milcah, the wife of Nahor, and Iscah, by some identified with Sarah. [In our treatment of the history, we freely avail ourselves of the articles in Kitto and Smith.] The following genealogy exhibits the family relations:

Picture for Lot 1

By the early death of his father (^{<0118>}Genesis 11:28), he was left in charge of his grandfather Terah, with whom he migrated to Haran, B.C. 2089 (^{<0113>}Genesis 11:31), and the latter dying there, he had already come into possession of his property when he accompanied Abraham into the land of Canaan, B.C. 2088 (^{<0125>}Genesis 12:5), and thence into Egypt, B.C. 2087

(^{<0120>}Genesis 12:10), and back again, by the way of the Philistines, B.C. 2086 (^{<0120>}Genesis 20:1), to the southern part of Canaan again, B.C. 2085 (^{<0130>}Genesis 13:1). Their united substance, consisting chiefly in cattle, was not then too large to prevent them from living together in one encampment. Eventually, however, their possessions were so greatly increased that they were obliged to separate, and Abraham, with rare generosity, conceded the choice of pasture-grounds to his nephew. Lot availed himself of this liberality of his uncle, as he deemed most for his own advantage, by fixing his abode at Sodom, that his flocks might pasture in and around that fertile and well-watered neighborhood (^{<0135>}Genesis 13:5-13). He had soon very great reason to regret this choice; for although his flocks fed well, his soul was starved in that vile place, the inhabitants of which were sinners before the Lord exceedingly. There "he vexed his righteous soul from day to day with the filthy conversation of the wicked" (^{<017>}2 Peter 2:7).

Not many years after his separation from Abraham (B.C. 2080), Lot was carried away prisoner by Chedorlaomer, along with the other inhabitants of Sodom, and was rescued and brought back by Abraham (Genesis 14), as related under other heads. *SEE ABRAHAM; SEE CHEDORLAOMER.* This exploit procured for Abraham much celebrity in Canaan; and it ought to have procured for Lot respect and gratitude from the people of Sodom, who had been delivered from hard slavery and restored to their homes on his account. But this does not appear to have been the result.

At length (B.C. 2064) the guilt of "the cities of the plain" brought down the signal judgments of heaven (^{<0190>}Genesis 19:1-29). Lot is still living in Sodom (Genesis 19), a well-known resident, with wife, sons, and daughters — married and marriageable. The rabbinical tradition is that he was actually "judge" of Sodom, and sat in the gate in that capacity. (See quotations in Otho, *Lex. Rabbin.* s.v. Loth and Sodomah.) But in the midst of the licentious corruption of Sodom — the eating and drinking, the buying and selling, the planting and building (^{<0173>}Luke 17:28), and of the darker evils exposed in the ancient narrative — he still preserves some of the delightful characteristics of his wandering life, his fervent and chivalrous hospitality (^{<0192>}Luke 19:2, 8), the unleavened bread of the tent of the wilderness (verse 3), the water for the feet of the wayfarers (verse 2), affording his guests a reception identical with that which they had experienced that very morning in Abraham's tent on the heights of Hebron (^{<0183>}Genesis 18:3, 6). It is this hospitality which receives the commendation

of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in words that have passed into a familiar proverb, "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares" (^{<830>}Hebrews 13:2). On the other hand, it is his deliverance from the guilty and condemned city — the one just man in that mob of sensual, lawless wretches — which points the allusion of St. Peter, to "the godly delivered out of temptations, the unjust reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished, an ensample to those that after should live ungodly" (^{<600>}2 Peter 2:6-9). The avenging angels, after having been entertained by Abraham, repaired to Sodom, where they were received and entertained by Lot who was sitting in the gate of the town when they arrived. While they were at supper the house was beset by a number of men, who demanded that the strangers should be given up to them, for the unnatural purposes which have given a name of infamy to Sodom in all generations. Lot resisted this demand, and was loaded with abuse by the vile fellows outside on that account. They had nearly forced the door, when the angels, thus awfully by their own experience convinced of the righteousness of the doom they came to execute, smote them with instant blindness, by which their attempts were rendered abortive, and they were constrained to disperse. Towards morning the angels apprised Lot of the doom which hung over the place, and urged him to hasten thence with his family. He was allowed to extend the benefit of this deliverance to the families of his daughters who had married in Sodom; but the warning was received by those families with incredulity and insult, and he therefore left Sodom accompanied only by his wife and two daughters. As they went, being hastened by the angels, the wife, anxious for those who had been left behind, or reluctant to remove from the place which had long been her home, and where much valuable property was necessarily left behind, lingered behind the rest, and was suddenly involved in the destruction by which — smothered and stiffened as she stood by saline incrustations — she became "a pillar of salt" (^{<010>}Genesis 19:1-26). This narrative has often been regarded as one of the "difficulties" of the Bible. But it surely need not be so. Even under the above extreme view of the suddenness of the event, the circumstances appear to be all sufficiently accounted for. In the sacred record the words are simply these: "His wife looked back from behind him, and became a pillar of salt;" words which neither in themselves nor in their position in the narrative afford any serious difficulty, even without the supposition of a miracle. It is true that, when taken with what has gone before, they seem to imply (verses 22, 23) that the work of destruction by fire (did not commence till after Lot had entered

Zoar. The storm, however, may have overtaken her in consequence of her delay. Later ages have not been satisfied to leave the matter, but have insisted on identifying the "Pillar" with some one of the fleeting forms which the perishable rock of the south end of the Dead Sea is constantly assuming in its process of decomposition and liquefaction (Anderson's *Off. Narr.* page 180). The first allusion of this kind is perhaps that in Wisd. 10:7, where "a standing pillar of salt, the monument ($\mu\nu\eta\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$) of an unbelieving soul," is mentioned with the "waste land that smoketh," and the "plants bearing fruit that never come to ripeness," as remaining to that day, a testimony to the wickedness of Sodom. This notion was regarded by the Roman Catholics as scriptural authority that might not be disputed. See the quotations from the fathers and others in Hofmann's *Lexikon* (s.v. Lot), and in Mislin, *Lieux Saints* (3:224). Josephus also (*Ant.* 1:11, 4) says that he had seen it, and that it was then remaining. So, too, do Clemens Romanus (*Epist.* 1:11) and Irenaeus (4:51, 64). So does Benjamin of Tudela, whose account is more than usually circumstantial (ed. Asher, 1:72). Rabbi Petachia, on the other hand, looked for it, but "did not see it; it no longer exists" (ed. Benisch, page 61). The same statement is to be found in travelers of every age, certainly of our own times (see Maundrell, March 30). The origin of these traditions relative to this pillar has lately been satisfactorily explained by the discovery by the American party under Lieut. Lynch of an actual column still standing on the south-western shore of the Dead Sea, at a place retaining the traces of the name of Sodom in the form of Usdum, of which he gives a pictorial sketch, describing it as a round pillar, about forty feet high, on a lofty pedestal, standing detached from the general mass of the mountain, of solid salt, slightly decreasing in size upwards, and capped with carbonate of lime; but, although himself a Catholic, he admits, with scientific candor, that it is merely the result of the action of the winter rains upon the rock-salt hills, which the cap of limestone has here protected, leaving the surrounding parts to wash away till a column has thus gradually been carved out (Narrative of Expedition, pages 307,308). Prof. Palmer also visited this singular object, called by the Arabs *Bint Sheik Lot*, or "Lot's [daughter] wife." He describes and gives a view of it as "a tall isolated needle of rock, which really does bear a curious resemblance to an Arab woman with a child upon her shoulder. The Arab legend of Lot's wife differs from the Bible account only in the addition of a few frivolous details. They say that there were seven cities of the plain, and that they were all miraculously overwhelmed by the Dead Sea as a punishment for their crimes. The prophet Lot and his family alone escaped

the general destruction. He was divinely warned to take all that he had and flee eastward, a strict injunction being given that they should not look behind them. Lot's wife, who had on previous occasions ridiculed her husband's prophetic office, disobeyed the command, and, turning to gaze upon the scene of the disaster, was changed into this pillar of rock" (*Desert of the Exodus* [Harper's], page 396 sq.). The expression of our Lord, "Remember Lot's wife" (^{<0173>}Luke 17:32), appears from the context to be solely intended as an illustration of the danger of going back or delaying in the day of God's judgments. From this text, indeed, it would appear as if Lot's wife had gone back or had tarried so long behind in the desire of saving some of their property. Then, as it would seem, she was struck dead, and became a stiffened corpse, fixed for the time to the soil by saline or bituminous incrustations. The particle of similitude must here, as in many other passages of Scripture, be understood, "like a pillar of salt." See Nagel, *De culpa uxoris Loti* (Altdorf; 1755); Distel, *De salute uxoris Lothi* (Altd. 1721); Waller, *Diss. de statua sal. uxoris Loti* (Lipsia, 1764); Wolle, *De facto et fato uxoris Loti* (Lips. 1730); Schwollmann, *Comm. qua de uxore L. in statuam sal. conversa dubitatur* (Hamburg, 1749); Milom, *Sendschr. u. d. Salzsaule in die L.'s Weib verwandelt worden* (Hamb. 1767); Clerici, *Diss. de statua salina*, in his *Comment. in Gen.*; Tieroff, *De statua salis* (Jen. 1657); Muller, *idem* (Helmstadt, 1764); Oedmann, *Samml.* 3:145; Bauer, *Hebr. Geschichte*, 1:131; Maii *Observat. sacr.* 1:168 sq.; H.v.d. Hardt, *Ephem. philol.* Page 67 sq.; Jenisch, *Eriorter zweier wichtig. Schriftstellen* (Hamb. 1761); Michaelis and Rosenmüller on ^{<0186>}Genesis 19:26; Gesenius, *Thesaur. Heb.* page 72.

Picture for Lot 2

Lot and his daughters meanwhile had hastened on to Zoar (q.v.), the smallest of the five cities of the plain, which had been spared on purpose to afford him a refuge; but, being fearful, after what had passed, to remain among a people so corrupted, he soon retired to a cavern in the neighboring mountains. and there abode (^{<0193>}Genesis 19:30). After some stay in this place, the daughters of Lot became apprehensive lest the family of their father should be lost for want of descendants, than which no greater calamity was known or apprehended in those times; and in the belief that, after what had passed in Sodom, there was no hope of their obtaining suitable husbands, they, by a contrivance which has in it the taint of Sodom, in which they were brought up, made their father drunk with wine, and in that state seduced him into an act which, as they well knew,

would in soberness have been most abhorrent to him. They thus became the mothers, and he the father, of two sons, named Moab and Ammon, from whom sprung the Moabites and Ammonites, so often mentioned in the Hebrew history (^{<01E8>}Genesis 19:31-38). With respect to Lot's daughters, Whiston and others are unable to see any wicked intention in them. He admits that the incest was a horrid crime, except under the unavoidable necessity which apparently rendered it the only means of preserving the human race; and this justifying necessity he holds to have existed in their minds, as they appear to have believed that all the inhabitants of the land had been destroyed except their father and themselves. But it is incredible that they could have entertained any such belief. The city of Zoar had been spared, and they had been there. The wine also with which they made their father drunk must have been procured from men, as we cannot suppose they had brought it with them from Sodom. The fact would therefore seem to be that, after the fate of their sisters, who had married men of Sodom and perished with them, they became alive to the danger and impropriety of marrying with the natives of the land, and of the importance of preserving the family connection. The force of this consideration was afterwards seen in Abraham's sending to the seat of his family in Mesopotamia for a wife to Isaac. But Lot's daughters could not go there to seek husbands; and the only branch of their own family within many hundred miles was that of Abraham, whose only son, Ishmael, was then a child. This, therefore, must have appeared to them the only practicable mode in which the house of their father could be preserved. Their making their father drunk, and their solicitous concealment of what they did from him, show that they despaired of persuading him to an act which, under any circumstances, and with every possible extenuation, must have been very distressing to so good a man. That he was a good man is evinced by his deliverance from among the guilty, and is affirmed by an apostle (^{<610>}2 Peter 2:7); his preservation is alluded to by our Savior (^{<278>}Luke 17:18, etc.); and in (^{<810>}Deuteronomy 2:9, 19, and ^{<980>}Psalms 83:9, his name is honorably used to designate the Moabites and Ammonites, his descendants. This account of the origin of the nations of Moab and Ammon has often been treated as if it were a Hebrew legend which owed its origin to the bitter hatred existing from the earliest to the latest times between the "children of Lot" and the children of Israel. The horrible nature of the transaction — not the result of impulse or passion, but a plan calculated and carried out, and that not once, but twice, would prompt the wish that the legendary theory were true. But even the

most destructive critics (as, for instance, Tuch) allow that the narrative is a continuation without a break of that which precedes it, while they fail to point out any marks of later date in the language of this portion; and it cannot be questioned that the writer records it as a historical fact. Even if the legendary theory were admissible, there is no doubt of the fact that Ammon and Moab sprang from Lot. It is affirmed in the statements of ~~CHD~~Deuteronomy 2:9 and 19, as well as in the later document of ~~CHD~~Psalm 33:8, which Ewald ascribes to the time when Nehemiah and his newly-returned colony were suffering from the attacks and obstructions of "Obiah the Ammonite and Sanballat the Horonite (Ewald, Dichter, Psalm 83).

This circumstance is the last which the Scripture records of the history of Lot, and the time and place of his death are unknown. A traditional respect has been shown to his memory (also that of his wife, who is called Edith, **hydy**] [one of his daughters being called Plutith, **tyfwl p**, in the tract Pirke Elieser, chapter 25) by the Talmudists (see Otho's *Lex. Rabb.* page 389) and Arabs (see Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* 2:495); and the Mohammedans still point out his grave in the village of Beni-Nain, east of Hebron (Robinson, *Researches*, 2:187). For the pretty legend of the repentance of Lot, and of the tree that he planted, which, being cut down for use in the building of the Temple, was afterwards employed for the cross, see Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep. V.T.* pages 428-431. The Mohammedan traditions of Lot are contained in the Koran, chiefly in chapter 7 and 11; others are given by D'Herbelot (s.v. Loth). According to these statements, he was sent to the inhabitants of the five cities as a preacher, to warn them against the unnatural and horrible sins which they practiced — sins which Mohammed is continually denouncing, but with less success than that of drunkenness, since the former is perhaps the most common, the latter the rarest vice of Eastern cities. From Lot's connection with the inhabitants of Sodom, his name is now given not only to the vice in question (Freitag, *Lexicon*, 4:136 a), but also to the people of the five cities themselves — the Lothi, or Kaum Loth. The local name of the Dead Sea is Bahr Lut-Sea of Lot. See Niemeyer, *Charakt.* 2:185 sq.; Blaufurs, *Le Loti hospitalitate* (Jena, 1751); Korner, *De indole genesrorum Lothi* (Weissenf. 1755); Seidenstruicker, in the *Schleswig Journal*, 1792, volume 6, and in Hencke's *Magaz.* 3:67 sq.; Bauer, *Mythol. d. Hebr.* 1:238 sq.; Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.

Lo'tan

(Heb. *Lotan'*, לֹטָן , *coverer*; Sept. Λωτάν), the first-named of the sons of Seir, the Horite, and a petty prince of Idumaea prior to the supremacy of the Esauites (^{<0361>}Genesis 36:20, 29; ^{<1018>}1 Chronicles 1:38). His sons are mentioned as being Hori and Hemam or Honam, and his sister as being named Timna (^{<0362>}Genesis 36:22; ^{<1019>}1 Chronicles 1:39), by which latter he was allied to Esau's oldest son (^{<0362>}Genesis 36:12). B.C. cir. 1927.

Lothaire Of Lorraine.

SEE HINCMAR; SEE NICHOLAS I (pope).

Lothaire I.

SEE LORES LE DEBONNAIRE; SEE PASCHAL I (pope).

Lothaire II

sometimes called LOTHAIRE OF SAXONY, succeeded Henry V as emperor of Germany in 1125. Lothaire was born in 1075, and was the son of Gebhard, count of Arnsberg. He is noted in Church history for the part he took in the struggle against Innocent II, whom he installed in Rome in 1136, a service for which he was rewarded by the papal incumbent with coronation at Rome (comp. the comments on this act by Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* page 37, note). He died in 1137. — Jaffe, *Gesch. des deutschen Reiches unter Lothar von Sachsen* (1843). *SEE INNOCENT II.*

Lothasu'bus

(Λωθάσουβος, Vulg. *Abusthas* v.r. *Sabuls*), one of the supporters of Esdras as he read the law (1 Esd. 9:44); evidently the HASHUM *SEE HASHUM* (q.v.) of the Heb. text (^{<1672>}Nehemiah 7:22).

Lots, Feast of

SEE PURIM.

Lot's Wife

SEE LOT.

Lotto, Lorenzo

a celebrated Venetian painter of the 16th century, is supposed by some to have been a native of Bergamo, but by others a native of Venice. Lotto lived, besides, at Bergamo, also some time at Trevigi, at Recanati, and at Loretto, where he died. His works range from 1513 to 1554. Lanzi ventures an opinion that Lotto's best works could scarcely be surpassed by Raffaelle or by Correggio, if treating the same subject. His masterpieces are the Madonnas of St. Bartolomeo and Santo Spirito, at Bergamo.

Lotus

SEE LILY.

Loudun, Convent Of.

SEE GRANDIER.

Louis (Or Luis) Of Granada,

a Spanish ascetic, theologian, and writer, was born at (Granada in 1504. In 1524 he joined the Dominicans, in the convent of Santa Cruz of Granada. In 1529 he was, on account of his great reputation, transferred to the convent of St. Gregory at Valladolid, where he attracted much attention by his preaching. He was afterwards recalled to Granada, to reform the convent of Scala Coeli, in the Sierra de Cordova. In the solitude of this convent he composed a number of religious works. He next went to Cordova as preacher, and became acquainted with John of Avila (q.v.), who acquired great influence over him. After spending eight years in Cordova, Louis went to Badajoz, where he founded a convent, of which he was the first abbot. Cardinal Henry, infant of Spain and archbishop of Eborá, desiring to avail himself of Louis's talents, attached him to his diocese. The queen of Portugal vainly offered to make him bishop of Viseu, and afterwards metropolitan of Braga; he accepted no office whatever, except that of provincial of his order in Portugal, which he held for some years. He finally retired into the convent of Santa Domingo of Lisbon, and devoted the remainder of his life to pastoral duties and to writing religious works. He died December 31, 1588. His works, a large number of which were translated into French, Italian, and German, are very numerous; among them the most important are, *Memorial de la vida Christiana* (Salamanca, 1566, 2 volumes, 8vo; Barcelona, 1614, fol.): —

Simbolo de la Fe (Salamanca, 1582, fol.; often reprinted and translated): — *Guida de Pecadores* (Salamanca, 1570, 8vo): — *Compendio de la dottrina Christiana* (Lisbon, 1564; Madrid, 1595, 4to): — *Institucion y regla de bien vivir para los que empiecan a servir a Dios* (Barcelona, 1566, 8vo; Madrid, 1616): — *Libro de la Oracion y Meditacion* (Salamanca, 1567, 8vo): — *Collectanea moralis Philosophiae* (Lisbon, 1571, 3 volumes, 8vo; Paris, 1582; and under the title *Loci communes Philosophiae moralis*, Cologne, 1604): — *Rhetorica ecclesiastica* (Lisbon, 1576, 4to), etc.; and a number of sermons. See Louis Munos, *La Vida y Virtudes de Luiz de Grenada* (Madrid, 1639, 4to); N. Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana*, 4; Quetil and Echard, *Scriptores ordines Praedicatorum*, 2; Tournon, *Hommes illustres de l'ordre de Saint-Dominique*. — Herzog, *Real-Encyclop.* 8:516; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 31:1034 sq. (J.N.P.)

Louis I

(German Ludwîq, Latin Ludovicus), called "*Le Debonnaire*," and also "*the Pious*," youngest son of Charlemagne, was born at Casseneuil A.D. 778. The great empire of the West had just been recreated by the heroic efforts of Charles, therefore honored with the title of "the Great;" but it was not absolutely the love of war and conquest, and the honor of his name, that had actuated Charles; he rather sought to accomplish what the great Ostrogoth Theodoric (q.v.) had contemplated, but failed to effect, viz., the unions of the Christian Germanic nations into one empire. Charlemagne, it must be remembered, was eminently "a champion of the Church," and, believing that the conversion of the Saxons and other Germanic tribes could be accomplished only by their subjection, he came to dream of a union of them all under one imperial head, and gratefully he accepted the result in his own coronation as "Charles Augustus" by pope Leo III, A.D. 800. **SEE CHARLEMAGNE.** But Charlemagne still believed in the independence of the imperial crown from the papal chair, and manifestly evinced this by one of his latest acts. As early as 806 he had made provision for his successors by apportioning to his three sons different parts of his possessions. To Pepin he gave Italy, to Louis, Aquitaine, and to Charles the remainder, consisting chiefly of German countries; but when, by the decease of two of these, he saw that upon Louis only would center all the responsibility of an imperial crown, he called him to his side in 813, when feeling his own end approaching, and at Aix-la-Chapelle, on a Sunday, when in the cathedral together, caused Louis to place the golden crown upon his head, and, thus crowned, presented his son as the future

king of all the Franks, without first awaiting the anointment of the pope. Not so independent was our Louis, who, in the year following the event just recorded, by the death of Charlemagne, became sole emperor of the West and king of France. Thus far the race of the Carolingians had produced consecutively four great men — a rare occurrence in history. With Louis I opened a new aera; for, though his personal appearance was by no means insignificant, being of a prepossessing countenance and of a strong frame, and so well practiced in archery and the wielding of the lance that none about him equaled him, "he was weak in mind and will, and his surname 'the Pious' implies not only that he was religious, but principally that he was so easy tempered that it required much to displease him." Or, as Milman puts it: "In his gentler and less resolute character religion wrought with an abasing and enfeebling rather than ennobling influence" (*Latin Christianity*, 2:514). A ruler of this description was not likely to hold in union the vast empire of Charlemagne. His first troubles arose with Bernard, son of Pepin, whom Charlemagne, on the decease of his eldest son, had made king of the Italian possessions. Bernard's ambition soared higher. He was not content with Italy; he desired the mastery over the whole of the imperial lands, and ungratefully conspired against his uncle. He was unsuccessful, however; was seized by the imperial troops, and condemned to death. Louis was determined to mitigate the lot of Bernard, but state interests compelled him to inflict the severe punishment of depriving his nephew of eyesight, which was the cause shortly after, no doubt, of his death. This conspiracy, as well as sundry the occurrences, made Louis feel the necessity of provisions for the succession, and, finally deciding in favor of the principle of primogeniture, his son Lothaire was appointed successor. Besides Lothaire, Louis had two sons, Pepin and Louis. To the former of these two he gave Aquitania; to the latter Bavaria, Bohemia, and Carinthia. Unfortunately, however, for the peace of the family, Louis lost his faithful companion, the mother of these children, shortly after this partition of his possessions, and, marrying a second wife, became the father of a fourth son, Charles, whose mother, Judith, conspired in his behalf for a portion of the imperial crown. This resulted in 830 in a revolt of Lothaire against his father, on the plea of the bad conduct of the step-mother. At a diet, however, which was held at Aix-la-Chapelle, the father and son were reconciled. Not so happily ended a second revolt in 833, when Louis, forsaken by his followers, was obliged to give himself up to his son Lothaire, who took him as prisoner to Soissons, sent the empress Judith to Tortona, and confined her infant son

Charles, afterwards Charles the Bald, the object of the jealousy of his half-brothers, in a monastery. A meeting of bishops was held at Compiègne, at which the archbishop of Rheims presided, and the unfortunate Louis, being arraigned before it, was found guilty of the murder of his nephew Bernard, and of sundry other offenses. He was deposed, condemned to do public penance in sackcloth, and was kept in confinement. This misusage of the emperor enraged the youngest son, Louis of Bavaria (840-876), "an energetic prince, of lofty stature and noble figure, with a fiery eye and a penetrating mind," and, after securing the assistance of his other brother, Pepin, in the following year, he obliged Lothaire to deliver up their father, who, after having been formally absolved by the bishops, was reinstated on the imperial throne. Not made wiser by past experience, Louis, listening to the selfish counsel of his wife, Judith, now assigned to his fourth son, Charles, the kingdom of Neustria, or Eastern France, including Paris, and, after Pepin's death, Aquitania also. Lothaire possessed all Italy, with Provence, Lyons, Suabia, Austrasia, and Saxony. But Louis of Bavaria, who had done most for his father, was favored least, and therefore set up his claim for all Germany as far as the Rhine, and being refused, determined to make war against his father, and invaded Suabia. The emperor Louis marched against him, and also assembled a diet at Worms to judge his rebellious son. Meantime, however, the emperor fell ill, and died on an island of the Rhine near Mentz, in June 840, after sending to his son Lothaire the imperial crown, his sword, and his scepter. Of what account this last act of Louis was may be inferred from the partition of the dominion. Lothaire, as emperor, held Italy, Provence, Burgundy, and Lorraine. Charles the Bald succeeded his father as king of France, and Louis of Bavaria retained all Germany. Thus ends the history of this man, whose life, notwithstanding his kind disposition, was "one continued scene of trouble and affliction, because he knew not how to govern his own house, much less his empire."

Of a prince so feeble and dependent as Louis proved himself in the affairs of state, we cannot, of course, expect the same vigor and determination towards the papacy that characterized the reign of Charlemagne, and it may be safely said that with the death of the latter a new aera opens in the history of the Latin Church. Charlemagne had proved an earnest supporter of the Church and the papacy, but he had known how to oppose their pretensions. Not so Louis. His feebleness and incapacity to govern gave rise to many abuses, or gave new life to such as had before been

successfully repressed. The whole reign of Louis, indeed, abounded in political disorders. "Distraction and weakness," says Neander (*Ch. Hist.* 3:301), "gave many opportunities for the Church to interfere in the political strifes," and for it the Church had been anxiously but patiently in waiting. With the coronation of Charlemagne the pope of Rome had transferred his allegiance from the East to the West, and thus, by his action, had not only conferred a most doubtful title on Charlemagne, but secured at the same time a political ascendancy of the papacy. Under Charlemagne, however, the thunders of the Church were controlled by the emperor; but in Louis "the Pious" was found a willing slave, and with rapid strides the Romish Church marched onward to establish its superiority over the empire. See PAPACY. What Louis would do for the Church was clearly seen in his submissive acts — the master of Europe in 822 a penitent before the prelates assembled at the Council of Attigny. Here the triumphs of the spiritual power, under the auspices of a rapid progress towards domination, were plainly foreshadowed. The hierarchy failed not to discover the hour of Louis's weakness, and day by day new laws were proposed and enacted, the ecclesiastical fabric enlarged and strengthened, the power of the secular authority enfeebled and abrogated. Prominent among the ecclesiastics who influenced the king to favor the Church and her institutions was Wala, abbot of Corbie. What Wala (q.v.) advised was worthy of adoption, and he had no sooner made his proposals than they became law. Thus the granting of monasteries to laymen, and grants of Church property at pleasure to the vassals of the crown without consent of the bishops, were abrogated, virtually making the bishops co-legislators; and by 829 the ecclesiastic royal counselor hesitated not to declare that "everything depended on keeping the line of demarcation clearly drawn between the ecclesiastical and the civil province, the king and the bishops concerning themselves only about the affairs which belonged to their respective callings." Unfortunately, however, the concessions which the king was daily making to the clergy gave to the bishops much of the business strictly belonging to the secular authority, and "the scope and the danger of the authority thus successively conferred upon the Church were most impressively manifested when Louis was deposed by his sons (in 833),... and Lothaire... determined to render impossible the restoration of his father to the throne... . The people had been invited by Louis himself, eleven years before, at Attigny, to see the bishops sit in judgment on their monarch; and the decretals (q.v.) of Siricius and Leo I, forbidding secular employment and the bearing of arms by any one who had undergone public

penance, were not so entirely forgotten but that they might be revived. Accordingly, when Lothaire returned to France, dragging his captive father in his train, he halted at Compiègne, and summoned a council of his prelates to accomplish the work from which his savage nobles shrunk. With unfaltering willingness they undertook the odious task, declaring their competency through the power to bind and to loose conferred upon their order as the vicars of Christ and the turnkeys of heaven. They held the wretched prisoner accountable for all the evils which the empire had suffered since the death of Charlemagne, and summoned him at least to save his soul by prompt confession and penitence, now that his earthly dignity was lost beyond redemption.... With that overflowing hypocritical unction which is the most disgusting exhibition of clerical craft, the bishops labored with him for his own salvation, until, overcome by their eloquent exhortations, he threw himself at their feet, begged the pardon of his sons, and implored their prayers in his behalf, and eagerly demanded the imposition of such penance as would merit absolution. The request was not denied. In the church of St. Mary, before the tombs of the holy St. Medard and St. Sebastian, the discrowned monarch was brought into the presence of his son and surrounded by a gaping crowd. There he threw himself upon a sackcloth, and four times confessed his sins with abundant tears, accusing himself of offending God, scandalizing the Church, and bringing destruction upon his people, for the expiation of which he demanded penance and absolution by the imposition of those holy hands to which had been confided the power to bind and to loose. Then, handing his written confession to the bishops, he took off sword and belt, and laid them at the foot of the altar, where his confession had already been placed. Throwing off his secular garments, he put on the white robe of the penitent, and accepted from his ghostly advisers a penance which should inhibit him during life from again bearing arms. The world, however, was not as yet quite prepared for this spectacle of priestly arrogance and royal degradation. The disgust which it excited hastened a counter-revolution; and when Louis was restored to the throne, Ebbo of Rheims and St. Agobard of Lyons, the leaders in the solemn pantomime, were promptly punished and degraded. Yet the piety of Louis held that the very sentence for the imposition of which they incurred the penalty was valid until abrogated by equal authority, and accordingly he caused himself to be formally reconciled to the Church before the altar of St. Denis, and abstained from resuming his sword until it was again belted on him by the hand of a bishop" (Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* page 319-321). "These

melancholy scenes," says Milman (Lat. Christianity, book 5, chapter 2), "concern Christian history no further than as displaying the growing power of the clergy, the religion of Louis gradually quailing into abject superstition, the strange fusion and incorporation of civil and ecclesiastical affairs." For six years more Louis the Pious swayed the scepter of the Carolingian empire, but he did it without power — a tool in the hands of contending factions, which at his death took up arms in open warfare, and continued their contest until Lothaire had been defeated on the field of Fontenay, and peace restored by the division of the empire at Verdun. But what is most eventful about these transactions in the life and reign of Louis the Pious, and leads us to assign them such prominence here, is the part which the clergy played in arranging, conducting, and accomplishing them, and thus bringing them under the sanction of religion. This circumstance alone is enough to show how the power of the Church was growing. But there was another and more important circumstance that still more clearly indicates it. Stephen IV had died, and a successor had been chosen who assumed the responsibility of the papal chair as Paschal I. Instead of waiting for his confirmation by Louis, he took immediate possession of the high dignity conferred upon him by the Church, and thus inaugurated the principle of independence of the pope from the emperor. It is true a deprecatory epistle was prudently dispatched from Rome, but the same liberty was taken by his successor Eugenius II, who contented himself with sending a legate to apprise the emperor of his accession, instead of awaiting the imperial sanction to the election; and though the Romans were afterwards obliged to bind themselves by oath never to consent to the installation of a pope elect until the sanction of the emperor had reached Rome, the effort was unavailing. Events were hurrying on destined to render all such measures futile, and to accomplish the revolution of European institutions, resulting in the power of the priesthood and the irresponsible autocracy of the pope (comp. Lea, *Studies in Ch. Hist.* pages 38-42).

In the question of image-worship alone, perhaps, it can be said that Louis played an independent part. It was under his commission that Claudius of Turin labored in the interests of iconoclasm, and it was by his influence, also, that Eugenius II was forced to amity towards the Eastern advocates of iconoclasm. Compare Milman, Latin Christianity, book 5, chapter 2, A.D. 839, and the articles *SEE CLAUDIUS*; *SEE CLEMENS*; *SEE ICONOCLASM*.

The most celebrated acts in the life of Louis worthy of special record in our work are his efforts to advance the Christian religion by the foundation of two religious institutions, viz., the monastery of Corvey and the archbishopric of Hamburg. The former he built for laborers among the Saxon colony he had caused to settle on the Weser, and it speedily became not only a religious center, but the best school for education in that country. The latter furthered the missionary cause among the northern nations, especially among the Juts, *SEE JUTLAND*, by the zealous labors of Anshar, *SEE ANSCHAR*, generally known as the "Apostle of the North" (compare Maclear, *Hist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages*, chapter 11). The kind treatment which Louis afforded to the Jews deserves particular mention. He took them under his especial protection, and suffered neither nobles nor clergy to do them harm. In this respect he simply carried out the policy of his father, but he certainly improved their condition during his reign (comp. Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 5, chapter 8; and our article JEWS, volume 4, page 908, col. 2). See Funck, *Ludwigs der Fromme* (Frkf.-a.-M. 1832); Himly, *Wala et Louis le Debonnaire* (Par. 1849); Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity* (N.Y. 1864, 8 volumes, 12mo), 2, book 4, chapter 12; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:351 sq.; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, chapter 4; Lea, *Studies in Ch. hist.* (see Index); Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, chapters 5 and 6; Baxmann, *Politik der Papste*, 1 (see Index). (J.H.W.)

Louis VI Of The Palatinate,

was born July 4, 1539, and succeeded his father, Frederick III, in 1576. The late elector had been a strong Calvinist, but Louis VI had imbibed Lutheran principles at the court of Philibert of Bavaria, and gradually introduced them into the country.

Louis VII Of France,

called "Le Jeune," son of Louis le Gros, was born in 1119, and succeeded his father in 1137. By nature of a cruel disposition, he had been especially harsh towards disobedient subjects, and, under the pretense that he must aid the Church to atone for his great sins, he was advised by St. Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, to go on a crusade. Accordingly, the king set out, at the head of a large army, in 1147. Suger and Raoul, count of Vermandois, Louis's brother-in-law, were left regents of the kingdom. This second crusade proved unsuccessful: the Christians were defeated near Damascus,

and Louis, after several narrow escapes, returned to France in 1149. The repudiation of his first wife, Eleanor of Aquitaine, and his marriage with Constance of Castile, brought on a war with Henry II of England, who had taken Eleanor for his wife. The war was, however, unimportant in its consequences. In Henry's controversy with Thomas a Becket, Louis VII greatly furthered the cause of Becket (comp. Robertson, *Becket* [London, 1859, sm. 8vol, page 211 sq., 295). He died at Paris in September, 1180. See Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, page 327 sq.; Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, book 8, chapter 6 and ch. 8. (J.H.W.)

Louis IX

(or ST. Louis) OF FRANCE (1226-1270), was born in Poissy, April 25, 1215, and succeeded his father, Louis VIII, when but twelve years of age, his mother, Blanche de Castile, acting as regent. During the minority of the king there was a constant struggle between the crown and the feudal lords, headed by Thibaut, count of Champagne, and the count of Brittany. Amid these troubles queen Blanche displayed great firmness and ability, and Louis, as soon as he was old enough, by the assistance of those who had remained faithful to the crown, made war against Henry III, king of England, who had supported the French refractory nobles, and beat the English in 1242 at Tailleburg, at Saintes, and at Blaye, but finally made a truce of five years with the English sovereigns, at the same time pardoning also his rebellious nobles. During an illness Louis had made a vow to visit the Holy Land, and in June 1248, after having appointed his mother regent, he set out for the East with an army of 40,000 men, to conquer the Holy Sepulchre. He landed first in Egypt and took Damietta, but was made prisoner at the battle of Mansoura, and compelled to pay a heavy ransom. He then sailed, with the remainder of his army, now only 6000 strong, to Acre, and carried on the war in Palestine, but without success. After the death of his mother (November 1252), he made preparations for his return to France. At home in 1254, he now applied himself with great diligence to the interests of his realm. It was Louis IX of France that first gave life to Gallicanism by his "Pragmatic Sanction," which he enacted in 1268. **SEE GALLILCAN CHURCH.** He also published several useful statutes, known as the *Etablissements de St. Louis*; established a police in Paris, under the orders of a *prevot*; organized the various trades into companies called confrairies; founded the theological college of La Sorbonne, so called after his confessor; created a French navy, and made an advantageous treaty with the king of Aragon, by which the respective limits and jurisdictions of

the two states were defined. The chief and almost the only fault of Louis, which was, however, that of his age, was his religious intolerance; he issued oppressive ordinances against the Jews, had a horror of heretics, and used to say "that a layman ought not to dispute with the unbelievers, but strike them with a good sword across the body." By an ordinance he remitted to his Christian subjects the third of the debts they owed to Jews, and this "for the good of his soul." This same spirit of fanaticism led him (in July 1270) to undertake, against the wishes of his best friends, another crusade—a crusade the most ignoble, and not the least calamitous of all the *crusades* (q.v.). He sailed for Africa, laid siege to Tunis, and, while there, died in his camp of the plague, August 25, 1270. Pope Boniface VIII canonized him in 1297. See *Histoire de St. Louis* (edited by Ducange, with notes, Paris, 1668, folio, English trans.); Petitot, *Collection compl. des memoires relatifs à l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1824); *Dissertations et reflexions sur l'histoire de St. Louis*; Le Nain de Tillemont, *Vie de St. Louis* (ed. J. de Gaule, Paris, 1846, 5 volumes); H.L. Scholten, *Geschichte Ludwigs IX* (Münster, 1850-1853, 2 volumes); E. Alex. Schmidt, *Gesch. v. Frankreich*, 1:486 sq.; K. Rosen, *Die pragm. Sanktion, welche unter d. Namen Ludwigs IX v. Frankreich auf uns gekommen ist* (Munich, 1853); Neander, *Church Hist.* 4:203 sq.; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, page 618 sq.; and the works already cited in the article **SEE GALLICAN CHURCH. SEE PAPACY.**

Louis XIV, Of France,

grandson of Henry IV, and third of the Bourbons, was born in 1638. The regency of his mother, Anne of Austria, controlled by cardinal Mazarin (q.v.), continued during the minority of the sovereign. So far, indeed, as the policy of Mazarin was concerned, it prevailed until his death in 1661, when Louis first really assumed for himself the reins of government, and indicated the principles of his administration. During the minority of its youthful sovereign the country had been distracted by civil wars. those of the Fronde, partly through Spanish influences, partly through an unsatisfied and factious element of the French nobility. Perplexing difficulties, moreover, and even actual conflicts of the regent and her minister with the Parliament and States General, had more than once arisen, usually terminating, however, in the triumph of the former, Louis himself, in his eighteenth year, dismissing one of these bodies, and forbidding any future exercise of some of its most important functions. The internal difficulties, so far as due to the hostile policy of the Spanish court, were disposed of by

the marriage of Louis with the infanta Maria Theresa in 1660, through the skillful management of Mazarin. The effect of these troubles, however, was to shape, to some degree, the policy of Louis, and to enable him to carry it out successfully. That policy was to avoid all conflict of authority by centring all power in the person of the sovereign.

The administration of Louis, extending over a period of great significance in the secular condition and history of Europe, concerns us here in view of its principles and results religiously and ecclesiastically; for, while it may be said that one of the grand objects of this administration was to supersede Austria as the paramount Catholic sovereignty of Europe, it sought this end in connection with the destruction and diminution of Protestantism, not only in France, but elsewhere. To enable us to consider his policy as it affected the religious condition of France and Europe, the course of his civil and military administration must, however, be first examined.

Louis's civil policy — the consolidation of all power in the hands of the sovereign, detaching the crown from its alliance with all the legislative, judicial, and municipal institutions — he himself has best interpreted for us. "The worst calamity which can befall any one of our rank," is his language to the dauphin, "is to be reduced to that subjection in which the monarch is obliged to receive the law from his people.... It is the will of God that every subject should yield to his sovereign implicit obedience... I am the state!" These assertions of supreme prerogative are put forth, indeed, in connection with a recognition of accountability to the divine Source from which such powers are derived; but below him there was no accountability, no limitation to the action of his royal vicegerent. Consistently with this theory was the operation of his internal administration. The first and most effective instrument for the carving out of such policy was a thorough military organization. This was perfected to a degree hitherto unknown, among its new features the most effective to the end proposed being the emanation of all commissions, promotions, and distinctions from the king; doing away altogether with the possibility of the existence of such a balance of power as had previously been maintained, and rendering impossible all limitation of prerogative. The States-General — the great central legislative representation of the clergy, nobles, and commons — ceased to exist. The provincial states, having a more limited function of the same nature, shared the same fate. The Parliaments, from registering, protecting, and partly legislative bodies, became simply judicial tribunals to execute, under the forms of law, the decrees of a royal master. That in the

thorough working out of this system Louis exhibited rare administrative ability cannot be denied. "That he possessed the peculiar capacity of selecting efficient subordinates is no less manifest. That, moreover, under his rule there was a great evolution of administrative, military, and literary capacity is equally undoubted. Not so salutary or favorable were the results, however. Louis's policy eventually broke down the resources of the country; and it set in operation certain tendencies, which only worked themselves out in the crash of the French Revolution.

But this concentration of all power in the person of the sovereign had in view the carrying out of an external as well as an internal policy. "Self-aggrandizement," to use his own words, "is at once the noblest and most agreeable occupation of kings," and this he did not always pursue under the real requirements of truth and right. "In dispensing with the strict observance of treaties, we do not," said he, "violate them; for the language of such instruments is not understood literally; it is conventional phraseology, just as we use complimentary expressions in society." These two sentences are the text, of which the internal policy of Louis may be regarded as constituting the commentary. His reign, counting from the death of Mazarin, was characterized by four great wars, occupying altogether forty-two years, or seven ninths of its continuance. The first of these was his attack upon Spanish Flanders, and this in violation of the treaty of the Pyrenees, made at his marriage, by which all claim of inheritance, in right of his wife, to Spanish territory was solemnly renounced. Out of this contest, at first opposed, but afterwards (1670) assisted by England, for a long time varying in successes, but, on the whole, to the advantage of France, Louis, by the treaty of Nimeguen, 1678, came forth with the possession of a large addition of territory, a part of which was the duchy of Lorraine, and to which he afterwards added Strasburg, then a free German citypossessions which remained a part of France until restored to Germany by the war of 1870. Next, to provoke a war of nine or ten years' duration was his claim for his sister, the duchess of Orleans, to a portion of the Palatinate, enforced by an invasion of the territory in question. To repel this movement the League of Augsburg was formed, consisting of the emperor of Germany, the kings of Spain, Denmark, and Sweden, the duke of Savoy, and eventually of the king of England. This war, characterized by the devastation of the Palatinate and the sack of Heidelberg, terminated with the Peace of Ryswick, 1697, leaving Louis without a navy, his finances embarrassed, his people

impoverished, and many of them suffering from actual starvation. But by far the greatest contest was provoked by Louis's claim for his family to the succession of the crown of Spain, for which there were three competitors — Louis, the emperor Leopold, and the elector of Bavaria. Through the influence of the pope and of the Spanish nobility, Louis had succeeded in procuring the succession for his grandson, the duke of Anjou. To this Holland, under threat of invasion, had been forced to accede; and William of England, unable to secure the cooperation of Parliament in the way of resistance, was obliged to pursue the same course. Leopold, however, began hostilities, and in a short time England, Holland, and Denmark united with him in the Second Alliance, and the conflict only ended in 1713 with the Peace of Utrecht, leaving the duke of Anjou upon the throne of Spain, but at the expense to France of the damage and humiliation of many defeats, and the loss of many colonies, besides a distinct provision against the union of France and Spain under the same monarch. During this last contest, moreover, with external enemies, there had been an internal war destroying the national resources, that of the Camisards in the Cevennes, infuriated and maddened by religious persecution into rebellion. *SEE CAMISARDS.*

Louis's religious and ecclesiastical policy is exhibited in connection with his treatment of the national Church, and its central head, the papacy; his action with reference to a division of sentiment among different portions of this national Church; and, last of all, in his treatment of his Protestant subjects. As to the national Church, it may be said that he found the machinery of ecclesiastical despotism made to his hands, in the concordat of Leo X and Francis I, already mentioned. His peculiarity consisted in the skill with which such machinery was worked, the thoroughness and extent of its operation. The "liberties of the Gallican Church," which usually meant the liberty of the monarch to control all temporalities, and to fleece all classes of the beneficed clergy without dividing the wool with the pope, was energetically asserted during the reign of Louis. His effort was to free the national Church from the control of the papacy; through his appointments, to make it subservient to his general policy. His treatment of the pope, especially in connection with the question of the privilege of the French ambassador at Rome, was harsh and overbearing; and although compelled, in 1691, to yield in certain assertions of prerogative, it but slightly affected the exercise of his ecclesiastical supremacy. His bishops were, many of them, learned, able, and eloquent. There was a higher

standard, both of literary taste and of ecclesiastical propriety, than in reigns preceding. Their writings constitute this period, in some respects, one of the most brilliant in the history of the Church of France. But these writings contain no vigorous protest against the vices and cruelties of their royal master, and many of them are implicated in the support of his most flagrant cruelties and acts of oppression. It was perfectly understood that no other course would be tolerated. His own account to Massillon of the effect produced upon him by his court preachers will enable us to understand the character of their preaching. "I have heard a great many speakers in my chapel, and I have been very well pleased with them; when I hear you, I am displeased with myself." But the unfavorable testimony of this one faithful witness, and of at least one other not less faithful, Fenelon, could not counteract the flattery of so many others. The difficulty with the Jansenists constitutes, perhaps, one of the most striking illustrations of this despotic policy in ecclesiastical and religious matters. In this contest between Jesuitism and a purer form of Romanism, the pope, and, through the pope and the Jesuits, Louis, became a party. *SEE JANSENIUS.*

It is, however, in the course pursued towards his Protestant subjects that the policy of Louis may be recognized; that the ecclesiastical and religious history of his reign has an interest altogether unique and peculiar, namely, the position of the Huguenots and Dissenters, holding, under the law, certain legal privileges — among others, the exercise of freedom, not only of religious opinion, but of worship. The old-fashioned orthodox practice of extermination by fire and sword had been already tried, more than once, without success. At the close of every such unsuccessful effort, terms had been made insuring them conditions of existence. Prior to the Edict of Nantes, such terms constituted rather a truce than a peace; and when the contesting parties had rested a little, the truce ended and the conflict was renewed. This, however, was not the case with the Edict of Nantes, which really constituted a peace, and was more favorable to the Huguenots than any preceding arrangement; and, although containing in it some objectionable features, became to the Protestants the charter of their existence. They and the Catholics, under different ecclesiastical laws, were alike under the law of the land — enjoyed its sanctions, lived under its protection. Louis, whose great doctrine was uniformity and submission in all things, therefore proposed for himself the task, not of violating this great compact with his Protestant subjects, but of doing away with the necessity of its existence by bringing them all within the national Church.

Urged forward in this attempt by his mistress, Madame de Maintenon, wholly under the control of the Jesuits, and by the latter themselves, on the plea that by such a course he would merit the forgiveness of heaven for the many sins of his youth, especially his illicit connection with Madame de Montespan, two great agencies were immediately set in operation to the attainment of this result — those of bribery and intimidation. Conversions were sought by purchase, or by appeals to the interests or ambition of the Parties concerned: Special provision was made for the purchase of such conversions by a fund collected of one third of the profits of all ecclesiastical benefices, and placed in the hands of a Huguenot renegade, to be used for this purpose. The matter went so far that there was a regular scale of prices for converts of different grades, and large successes were published as the result of this mode of operation. To cut off the temptation of relapse, so as to insure the price of a second conversion, an edict was issued condemning all relapsed persons to banishment for life and confiscation of their property. With these efforts, moreover, which only reached the weak and worthless, was combined the other element of harassment and intimidation. Commissions of Romish clergy were instituted, sometimes upon their own motion, sometimes upon popular complaint. and with the well-understood approval of court officials, to investigate the legal titles of churches of the Huguenots, which for the purpose had been called in question. One infelicity in the position of the Protestants, even under the Edict of Nantes, was that which was connected with what may be called the Church territorial system. They were territorially in the dioceses of Romish bishops, in the parish limits of Romish priests, in some indefinite manner regarded as in their pastoral charge, and these annoying questions of Church property could thus be easily started. The result, in many cases where these titles were called in question, was a long, vexatious litigation, ending in the decision that it was imperfect, and that the church building should be shut up and demolished. The decisions of the sovereign were well known, and loyalty, ambition, and interest alike found their expression and exercise through these agencies in the rank of proselytism.

As, however, these proved insufficient to the attainment of the desired end, and the law still guaranteed the legal existence of the as yet unconverted Protestants, more vigorous steps were taken prior to the final one in the direction of annoyance and severity. Without, therefore, revoking the existing law, it was subverted by new edicts of the most vexatious and

harassing character. Many of these may be found detailed under the article *SEE HUGUENOTS*.

There was, however, another form of operation in this effort of exterminating Protestantism by conversion. Human wickedness, in this effort, found out the way to commit a new crime. This new crime, unique and preeminent in the achievements of malicious ingenuity, had to be described by a new name, and the world thus heard for the first time of the Dragonnade — the dragooning of people out of one religion into another. The process was that of quartering soldiers — Romanists, of course, the bigotry of the Romanist being combined with the brutality of the soldier — in the families and houses of Protestants. The commanders were instructed to quarter them on Protestant families, and to keep them there until the families were brought over to the Catholic faith, and then to transfer them to others of the same character and for the same object. As the army employed for this purpose was a large one, so whole districts at once were subjected to this intolerable annoyance and oppression. Multitudes, of course, yielded; and where they subsequently recanted their act of weakness, they became subject to banishment and confiscation. The suffering involved may be more easily imagined than described. "The dragoons," says one who passed through it, "fixed their crosses to their musketoons, so as the more readily to compel their hosts to kiss them; and if the kiss was not given, they drove the crosses against their stomachs and faces. They had as little mercy for the children as for the adults, beating them with these crosses or with the flats of their swords, so violently as not seldom to maim them. The wretches also subjected the women to their barbarities: they whipped them, they disfigured them, they dragged them by the hair through the mud or along the stones. Sometimes they would seize the laborers on the highway, or when following their carts, and drive them to the Romish churches, pricking them like oxen with their own goads to quicken their pace." If, in any case, these outrages were resisted, and there was anything like a Protestant gathering, the result was a massacre. The mere collection of such population, to indicate that they were not all carried over to the national Church, was thus treated. Upon the assumption, therefore, that these agencies, after having operated for four or five years, had accomplished their intended purpose; that Protestantism, to any calculable degrees had ceased to exist, in 1685 the Edict of Nantes, as no longer of any use or necessity, was abrogated. To proclaim the falsehood and cruelty of this pretense, and the proceedings

based upon it, they were followed by enactments against the non-existent Protestantism (see volume 4, page 396, col. 1). The only privilege left to the Protestants was the permission of enjoying their religion in private. The non-intent of this concession was best exhibited by the declaration of an ordinance of Louis himself thirty years later (1715), "that every man who had continued to reside in France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 had given conclusive proof that he was a Catholic, because only as a Catholic he would have been allowed to dwell there, and, therefore, if any man persisted in Protestantism, he must be treated as a relapsed heretic. In other words, if such a one emigrated in 1685 as a Protestant, he was condemned to the galleys. If he did not, he was regarded as a Catholic, and at any subsequent period could be proceeded against for his Protestantism as a relapsed Catholic."

Within five months after his ordinance against Protestants just mentioned the career of Louis terminated. To use the language of another, "He was an infirm and aged man. He had survived his children and his grandchildren. He had been overwhelmed by the victories of Eugene and Marlborough. He was oppressed with debt. He was hated by the people who had idolized him, and was compelled to listen to the indignant invectives which the whole civilized world poured forth against his blind and inhuman persecutions. He died declaring to his spiritual advisers that, being himself ignorant of ecclesiastical questions, he had acted under their guidance and as their agent in all that he had done against either the Jansenists or the protestant heretics, and on those his spiritual advisers he devolved the responsibility to the Supreme Judge." There can be no question that in many cases the persecuting policy of Louis was quickened by the influence of Madame de Maintenon and her ecclesiastical advisers; that in many cases his subordinate agents pursued courses of outrage and cruelty exceeding his intentions; that such men as Bossuet, Arnauld, Flechier, and the whole Gallican Church, in approving this policy, identified themselves with it in its guilt and in its consequences; but, after all, it was essentially his policy. It was the carrying out in ecclesiastical the autocratic principle enunciated with reference to civil matters. The concentration of all power in the hands of the sovereign required that he should be not only the State, but the Church.

Louis dying September 1, 1715, was succeeded by his great-grandson, Louis XV. His son the dauphin and his eldest grandson died at an earlier period. Some of his children, the fruit of an adulterous connection with

Madame de Montespan, were legitimized during his lifetime, but the act was annulled after his death. In regard to other children from similar connections no such action was taken. After the death of his first wife he privately married Madame de Maintenon. The works of Louis are contained in six volumes. They are occupied with instructions for his sons, and with correspondence bearing upon the history of his times. His reign may be regarded as one of the most brilliant in the annals of French literature. In the department of theological and controversial literature this was peculiarly the case, while in that of pulpit eloquence there was an array of talent and genius beyond parallel.

Literature. — Voltaire, *Siecle de Louis XIV*; Pellisson, *Histoire de Louis XIV*; Dangeau, *Journ. de la cour de Louis XIV*; *Lettres de Madame le Maintenon*; Larrey, *Hist. de France sous le Regne de Louis XIV*; Capefigue, *Louis XIV son Gouvernement, etc.* (1837, 6 volumes, 8vo), James, *Life and Times of Louis XIV* (Bohn's ed., Lond. 1851, 2 volumes, 12mo); Smedley, *Hist. Ref. Rel. in France* (N.Y. 1834, 3 volumes, 18mo), Barnes's Felice, *Hist. Protest. France* (Lond. 1853, 12mo); Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch.* 5:86 sq.; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. Engl.* (Ch. of Restoration, see Index in volume 2); Hase, *Ch. Hist.* (see Index); Ranke, *Hist. Papacy*, 2:272 sq., 293; *Student's France* (Harper's), page 410 sq.; Vehse, *Mem. of the Court of Austria*, 2:14 sq.; *Quart. Rev.* (Lond.), 1818 (July); *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1844, page 470 sq. See also the references in the articles *SEE FRANCE* and *SEE HUGUENOTS*. (C.W.)

Louse

SEE LICE.

Louvard, Francois

a French Jansenistic theologian of the Benedictine order, was born in Chamgeneteux in 1661, entered the convent of Saint Melaine, in Brittany, in 1679, and studied sacred and profane literature. In 1700 he was transferred to the convent of St. Denis, near Paris, to devote himself to the study of the text of St. Gregory Nazianzen. In 1713 pope Clement XI published the memorable bull "Unigenitus." The ecclesiastics of St. Maur all silently opposed it except Louvard, who openly denounced it, and was therefore greatly censured by P. le Tellier as one disobeying the apostolic decrees. He was exiled to Corbie, in the diocese of Amiens, but here also he frankly pronounced his opposition to the bull, and he was sent into

confinement in the monastery of Landevenec, in Brittany. In 1715, on the death of Louis XIV, Louvard was restored to the monastery of St. Denis. In 1717, several bishops and two monks, one of them Louvard, called a meeting of the opponents of the bull, and became so troublesome even to the government that Louis XV exiled some of them, and published an edict that whosoever recommenced the controversy should be treated as a rebel to the public peace. Louvard protested. He had been the first of his order to oppose the bull; now, almost all the Benedictines were on his side; and, receiving no reply, he renewed his appeal with the four bishops in 1720. On complaint to the general of the order Louvard was specially interrogated, and, being found thoroughly bent on both present and future opposition, he was exiled to Tuffé. Here he wrote new polemics, preached, and taught the simple inhabitants that there was a difference between the holy religion of P. Quesnel and the manufactured heresies of the disciples of Loyola. In 1723 he was transferred to Cormori, diocese of Tours. Here he continued proselyting. The general of his order offered to forgive him all the past if he would cease. He refused, and had to be placed in the monastery of St. Laumer, at Blois; but, still continuing his opposition, he was removed to the monastery of St. Gildas de Bois, in Brittany. Louvard persisting in his attacks on the Jesuits, the latter brought charges against him as plotting against the state, and he was imprisoned in the castle of Nantes in 1728. Here he published a manifest against his accusers, and was therefore transferred to the Bastille in the same year. In 1734 a *lettre de cachet*, signed by the king, transferred him to the monastery of Rabais, diocese of Meaux. But Louvard, continuing in his former course, was to be rearrested. Apprised of this, he made his escape to the Carthusian monastery of Schonau, in Holland, where he died in April 1739. Among his numerous works the following are of special importance: *Lettre contenant quelques Remarques sur les OEuvr'es de St. Gregoire de Nazianze*, in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, volume 33 (1704): — *Prospectus novae editionis operum S. Gregorii* (1708): — *OEuvres de St. Gregoire* (1778-1840): — *De la Necessite de l'Appel des eglises de France au futur Concile general* (1717): — *Lettre au Cardinal de Noailles, pour prouver a cette eminence que la constitution Unigenitus n'est recevable en aucune facon* (1718): — *Relation abregee de l'Imprisonnement de dom Louvarde* (1728). See D. Tassin, *Hist. Litter. de la Congregation de St. Maur*; D. Clemencet, *Preface de l'Edition des OEuvres du St. Gregoire de Nazianze*; B. Hareau, *Hist. Litter. du Maine*, 2:175; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:28 sq.

Love

(prop. $\text{hbh}\grave{\alpha}\text{i } \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$) is an attachment of the affections to any object, accompanied with an ardent desire to promote its happiness: 1, by abstaining from all that could prove injurious to it; 2, by doing all that call promote its welfare, comfort, or interests, whether it is indifferent to these efforts, or whether it appreciates them. This is what Kant calls practical love, in contradistinction from pathological love, which is a sort of sensual self-love, and a desire for community in compliance with our own feelings. In reality, love is something personal, emanating from a personal being and directed towards another, and thus its moral or immoral character is determined by the fact of its being called forth by the real worth of the personality towards which it is directed, or by the physical appearance of the latter, or by the advantages it may offer.

In the Christian sense, as we find it spoken of in the Word of God, love is not merely a peculiar disposition of the feelings, or a direction of the will of the creature, though this also must have its root in the creative principle, in God. God is love, the original, absolute love (G119 1 John 4:9). As the absolute love, he is at once subject and object, i.e., he originally loved himself, had communion with himself, imparted himself to himself, as also we see mention made of God's love before the creation of the world, the love of the Father towards the Son (G172 John 17:24), Derived from this love is the love which calls into being and preserves his creatures. Creatures, that is, existences which come from God, are through him and for him; not having life by themselves, but immediately dependent upon God existing by his will, and consequently to be destroyed at his will; created in time, and consequently subject to time, developing themselves in it to the full extent of their nature according to God's thoughts, with the possibility of departing therefrom, which it were impossible to suppose of God, the eternally real and active idea of himself. In regard to the creature, the divine love is the will of God to communicate to it the fullness of his life, and even the will to impart, according to its receptive faculty, this fullness into something which is not himself, yet which, as coming from God, tends also towards God, and finds its rest in him, and its happiness in doing his will. But, as emanating from an active God this love, with all its fullness, can only be directed towards a similarly organized and consequently personal creature, conscious of its relation to God and of himself as its end, possessing in itself the fullness of created life (microcosm).

It must, then, be man towards whom this divine love is directed as the object of God's delight, created after his image. This love is manifested in the earnestness of the discipline (commands and threats, ^{<0027>}Genesis 2:17) employed to strengthen this resemblance to God, to educate man as a ruler by obedience, as also by the intercourse of God with man; and, after the fall, by the hope and confidence awakening promises, as well as in the humiliating condemnation to pain, labor, and death. All these contain evidences of love, of this will of God to hold man in his communion, or to restore him to it. At the bottom of it lies an appreciation of his worth, namely, of his inalienable resemblance to God, of the imparted divine breath. This appreciation is also the foundation of compassionate love, for it is only on this ground that man is worthy of the divine affection. But it is also the ground which renders him deserving of punishment. For punishment, this destiny of evil, which is felt as a hinderance of life, is in one respect an expiation, i.e. a retrieving of God's honor, being incurred by that disregard of the value of his communion with God, and consequently of the real life, which must be considered as injurious to the life of man, and leading him to ruin; on the other hand, it is inducement to conversion, as this consequence of sin leads man to recognize the restoration of this disturbed relation to God as the one thing needful and desirable. Punishment consequently proceeds in both cases on the assumption of the worth of man in the eye of God, and is a proof of it. Hence the anger of God, as manifested by these punishments, is but another form of his love. It is a reaction of rejected love which manifests itself in imparting suffering and pain on the one who rejects it, proving thereby that its rejection is not a matter of indifference to it. This love may not be apparent at first sight, but it is clearly revealed in God's conduct towards all mankind, as well towards the heathen as towards the chosen people. God allowed the heathen to walk in their own ways (^{<4447>}Acts 14:17); he allows them to fall into all manner of evil (^{<4121>}Romans 1:21 sq.) in order to bring them to a sense of their misery and helplessness as well as of their guilt. But at the bottom of this anger there is still love, and this is clearly shown in the fact that he manifested himself to them in their conscience, and also took care of them (^{<4447>}Acts 14:17; 17:25 sq.). But, if this love is thus evinced towards the heathen, it is still more clearly manifested towards the chosen people, the fact of their choice being itself a manifestation of that love (^{<0006>}Deuteronomy 7:6 sq.), which is further shown both in the blessings and punishments, the anger and the mercy, of which they were the objects. Holiness and mercy are the chief characteristics of the divine love as

manifested towards Israel; the one raising them above their weaknesses, their evils, and their sins; the other understanding these failings, and seeking to deliver and restore them. But in both also is manifested the constancy of that love, its faithfulness; and the exactitude with which it adheres to the covenant it had itself made evinces its righteousness by saving those who fear God and obey his commandments. Both holiness and mercy are, for the moral, religious consciousness, harmonized in the expiatory sacrifice, in a figurative, typical manner in the O.T., and in a real, absolute manner in the N.T. The divine right in regard to fallen humanity is maintained, the death penalty is paid, but in such a manner that the chief of all, the divine Son of man, who is also Son of God, suffers it for all, of his own free will, and out of love to man, in accordance with the wishes of his Father. Thus the curse of sin and death is removed from humanity, and the possibility of a new existence of righteousness and felicity restored.

The New Covenant is therefore the full revelation of the spirit and object of the divine love. The incarnation of the Son of God is the revelation of God himself, and leads to his self-impartment by the Holy Spirit. Hence the eternal love discloses itself as being, in its inner nature, the love of the Father for the Son, and of the Son for the Father by the Holy Ghost, which proceeds from both, and is the fullness of the love that unites them, whence we can say that. God is love; as also, in its manifestation, it is the divine love towards fallen creatures, which is the will to restore their perfect communion with God by means of the all-sufficient expiatory sacrifice of the God-man, and the communication of the Holy Spirit, by which both the Father and the Son come to dwell in the hearts of men, thus forming a people of God's own, as was postulated, but not yet realized in the O.T. The love of God in man, therefore, is the consciousness of being loved by God (^{<BIB>}Romans 5:5), resulting in a powerful impulse of love towards the God who has loved us first in Christ (^{<BIB>}1 John 4:19), and an inward and strong affection towards all who are loved by God in Christ (^{<BIB>}1 John 4:11); for the divine love, even when dwelling in man, remains all-embracing. This love takes the form of a duty (^{<BIB>}1 John 4:11), but at the same time becomes a gradually strengthening inclination. And this is the completion or the ripening of the divine love in man (**ἐν τούτῳ τετελείωται**), that it manifests itself in positive results for the advantage of others.

We find the beginning and examples of this love under the old dispensation where mention is made of desire after God, joy in him, eagerness to serve

him, zeal in doing everything to please and honor him. The inclination towards those who belong to God, the holy communion of love in God, that characteristic feature of the N.T., is also foreshadowed in the O.T. by the people of God, who are regarded as one in respect to him, and whose close, absolute communion with God is represented by the image of marriage. This image is still repeated in the N.T., nevertheless in such a manner that the union is represented as not yet accomplished; for, though Christ is designated as the bridegroom and the Church as the bride, the wedding is made to coincide with the establishment of his kingdom. Thus considered, the love of God and the furtherance of the love of God are still a figurative expression. God wants the whole heart of his people: one love, one sacrifice, exclusively directed towards him, so that none other should exist beside it; and that all inclinations of love towards any creature should be comprised in it, derived from it, and return to it. On this account his love is called jealous, and he is said to be a jealous God. This jealousy of God, however, this decided requiring of an exclusive submission on the part of his people, is, on the other hand, the tenderest carefulness for their welfare, their honor, and their restoration. The close connection, indeed the unity of both, is evident. The effect of this jealousy of God is to kindle zeal in those who serve him, and consequently opposition against all that opposes, or even does not conduce to his service. This is a manifestation of love towards God, which love is essentially a return of his own love, and consequently gratitude, accompanied by the highest appreciation, and an earnest desire for communion with him. It includes joy in all that serves God, absolute submission to him, and a desire to do everything for his glory. The love in God, i.e., the love of those who feel themselves bound together by that common bond, is essentially of the same character; but, from the fact of its being directed towards creatures who are afflicted with many failings and infirmities, must also include — as distinguished from the love towards God — a willingness to forgive, which makes away with all hinderances to full communion, a continual friendliness under all circumstances, consequently patience and gentleness, zeal for their improvement, and sympathy for their failings and misfortunes. But as the love of the creative, redemptive, and sanctifying God, extending further than merely those who have attained to that communion with him, embraces all, so should also the love of those who love God. Yet in the divine love itself there is a distinction made, inasmuch as God's love towards those who love him and keep his commandments is a strengthening, sustaining pleasure in them (~~4342~~ John 14:21, 23), while his

love towards the others is benevolence and pity, which, according to their conduct, the disposition of their hearts. and their receptivity, is either not felt at all by them, or only produces pain, fear o, or, again, hope, desire, etc., but not a feeling of complete, abiding joy. So in the love of the children of God towards the human race we find the distinction between brotherly and universal love (^{<6120>}Romans 12:10; ^{<8101>}Hebrews 13:1; ^{<6012>}1 Peter 1:22; ^{<6007>}2 Peter 1:7). In both we find the characteristics of kindness and benevolence, sympathy, willingness to help, gentleness, and patience; but in the universal love there is wanting the feeling of delight, of an equal aim, a complete reciprocity, of conscious unity in the one highest good.

Love also derives a special determination from the personality, the spiritual and essential organization of the one who loves, and also his particular position. It manifests itself in friendship as a powerful attraction, a hearty sympathy of feelings, a strong desire for being together and enjoying a communion of thoughts and feelings. In sexual love it is a tender reciprocal attraction, a satisfaction in each other as the mutual complement of life, and a desire for absolute and lasting community of existence. Parental, filial, and brotherly love can be considered as a branch of this affection. Both friendship and love have the full sanction of Christian morals when based on the love of God. As wedded love is an image of the relation between the Lord and his people, or the Church (^{<4023>}Ephesians 5:23 sq.), so paternal, filial, and brotherly love are respectively images of the love of God towards his children, of their love towards him, and of their love towards each other. All these relations may want this higher consecration, and yet be well regulated; they have then a moral character. But they may also be disorderly: friendship can be sensual, selfish, and even degenerate into unnatural sexual connection; sexual love may become selfish, having no other object but the gratification of lust; parental love may change to self-love, producing over-indulgence, and fostering the vices of the children; brotherly love can degenerate into flattery and spoiling. Thus this feeling, which in its principle and aim should be the highest and noblest, can become the most common, the worst, and the most unworthy. Both kinds of love are mentioned in Scripture. The highest and purest tendency of the heart is in the Bible designated by the same name as the more natural, immoral, or disorderly tendency. The same was the case among the Greeks and Romans: "Ἔρως, Amor., and Ἀφροδίτη, Venus, had both significations, the noble and the common; but Christianity has in Christ and in his Church the perfect illustration and example of true love, whose

absolute type is in the triune life of God himself. This divine love, as it exists in God, and through the divine Spirit in the heart of man, together with the connection of both, is represented to us in Scripture as infinitely deep and pure. We find it thus represented in the Old Testament (see ^{<BIB>}Deuteronomy 33:3; ^{<BIB>}Isaiah 49:13 sq.; 57:17 sq.; 55:7 sq.; ^{<BIB>}Jeremiah 31:20; 32:37 sq.; ^{<BIB>}Ezekiel 34:11 sq.; ^{<BIB>}Hosea 3:2 sq.; ^{<BIB>}Micah 7:18 sq.). Then in the whole mission of Christ, and in what he stated of his own love and of the Father's, see ^{<BIB>}Matthew 11:28; Luke 15; ^{<BIB>}John 4:10, 14; 6:37 sq.; 7:37 sq.; 9:4; 10:12 sq.; 12:35; 13:1; 15:12, 13; 17; and, for the testimony of the apostles, ^{<BIB>}Romans 5:5 sq.; 8:28 sq.; 11:29 sq.; 1 Corinthians 13; ^{<BIB>}Ephesians 1:3, 17 sq.; 5:1 sq.; ^{<BIB>}1 John 3:4, etc. These statements are corroborated by the testimony of Christians in all ages, who have all been witness to this love, however much their views may have differed on other points. In later times, ethical essays on the subject have thrown great light on the nature and modes of manifestation of this love; see among them, Daub, *Syst. d. christl. Moral*, 2:1, page 310; Marheineke, *Syst. d. theol. Moral*, page 470; Rothe, *Theol. Ethik*, 2:350. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:388 sq. See *Wesleyana*, page 54.

Love, Christopher

a Presbyterian divine, was born at Cardiff, Wales, in 1618; entered the active work of the ministry in 1644, in London, after which he became a member of the Assembly of Divines. After the death of Charles I, to whom he had previously been opposed, he entered into a plot against Cromwell, for which cause he was executed in August, 1651. Mr. Love was the author of a number of sermons and theological treatises published in 1645-54. As a writer, he was plain, impressive, evangelical. See Wild, *Tragedy of Christopher Love*; Neal, *Puritans*, 1:528; 2:123 sq.; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.

Love, John M.

D.D., an eminent Scotch divine, was born at Paisley, Scotland, in 1757. He was one of the founders of the London Missionary Society. He died in 1825. Dr. Love published in 1796 *Addresses to the People of Otaheite*, republished after his death; also 2 volumes of *Sermons and Lectures* in 1829; a vol. of *Letters* in 1838; 34 *Sermons*, preached 1784-5, in 1853. See

Chambers and Thomson, *Biogr. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen*, 1855, volume 5; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.

Love Family

SEE FAMILISTS.

Love-feast

In the article AGAPE *SEE AGAPE* (q.v.) the subject has been treated so far as it relates to an institution in the early Church. It remains for us here only to speak of the love-feast as observed in some Protestant churches, especially the Methodist connection. In a strictly primitive form, the love-feast is observed by the Moravian Brethren. They celebrate it on various occasions, "generally in connection with a solemn festival or preparatory to the holy communion. Printed odes are often used, prepared expressly for the occasion. In the course of the service a simple meal of biscuit and coffee or tea is served, of which the congregation partake together. In some churches the love-feast concludes with an address by the minister" (E. de Schweinitz, *Moravians Manual* [Philad. 1859, 12mo], page 161). From the Moravians Wesley borrowed the practice for his own followers, assigning for its introduction into the Methodist economy the following reasons: "In order to increase in them [persons in bands (q.v.)] a grateful sense of all his [God's] mercies, I desired that one evening in a quarter all the men in band, on a second all the women, would meet, and on a third both men and women together, that we might together 'eat bread,' as the ancient Christians did, 'with gladness and singleness of heart.' At these love-feasts (so we termed them, retaining the name as well as the thing, which was in use from the beginning) our food is only a little plain cake and water; but we seldom return from them without being fed not only with the 'meat which perisheth,' but with 'that which endureth to everlasting life' (Wesley, *Works*, 5:183). In the Wesleyan Church only members are attendants at love-feasts, and they are appointed by or with the consent of the superintendent (*Minutes*, 1806). Admission itself is gained only by a ticket; and as it frequently happened that members would lend their tickets to strangers, it was enacted in 1808 that "no person who is unwilling to join our society is allowed to attend a love-feast more than once, nor then without a note from the traveling preacher;".... and "that any person who is proved to have lent a society ticket to another who is not in society, for the purpose of deceiving the door-keepers, shall be suspended for three

months" (comp. Grindrod, *Laws and Regulations of Wesl. Methodism* [Lond. 1842], page 180). In the Methodist Episcopal Church the rule also exists that admission to love-feasts is to be had by tickets only (comp. Discipline, part 2, chapter 2, § 17 [2]), but the rule is rarely, if ever observed, and they are frequently attended by members of the congregation as well as by the members of the Church. By established usage, the presiding elder (and in his absence only the minister in charge) is entitled to preside over the love-feasts, and they are therefore held at the time of the Quarterly Conference. *SEE CONFERENCE, METHODIST*. The manner in which they are now generally observed among Methodists is as follows: They are opened by the reading of the Scriptures, followed by the singing of a hymn, and then by prayer. During and after the dealing out of the bread and water, the different members of the congregation so disposed relate their Christian experience since the last meeting, etc. This is also the occasion for a report of the prosperity of the Church on the part of the pastor and by rule of Discipline (part 2, chapter 2, § 17); for the report of the names of those who have been received into the Church or excluded therefrom during the quarter; also the names of those who have been received or dismissed by certificate, and of those who have died or have withdrawn from the Church. Among the Baptists, in their missionary churches abroad, they seem to celebrate the real Agape. At Berlin, Prussia, they are held quarterly, and are made the occasion of a general social gathering, substituting coffee and cake for the Tread and water; but this practice is by no means general among the communicants of that Church. (J.H.W.)

Love, Virgins of

a female order in the Romish Church, called also Daughters of Charity (q.v.), whose office it is to administer assistance and relief to indigent persons confined to their beds by sickness and infirmity. The order was founded by Louisa le Gras, and received, in the year 1660, the approbation of the pope.

Lovejoy, Elijah Parish

a Presbyterian minister. noted for his and slavery activity, was the son of the Rev. Daniel Lovejoy, and was born at Albion, Maine, November 9, 1802; graduated at Waterville College, Maine, September 1826; and taught for a time in St. Louis, Missouri. In 1832 he was converted, and united

with the Presbyterian Church, and entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J. The following spring he obtained license to preach from the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, and began preaching in Newport, Rhode Island, and in New York City. In 1833 he established the St. Louis Observer, a weekly religious newspaper, in St. Louis, Missouri. In 1836, on account of a bitter dislike for the Observer's opposition to slavery and the prevailing principles on divorce, a mob destroyed Mr. Lovejoy's printing-office. The same year he removed to Alton, Illinois, where he established and maintained by solicited contributions "The Alton Observer." Continuing in his anti-slavery movements, resolutions were passed against him, and his press was twice destroyed by a pro-slavery mob. While defending a third press near his premises at Alton, he was mortally wounded, November 7, 1837.

Lovejoy, Owen

a Congregational minister, brother of the preceding, was born at Albion, Me., January 6, 1811. From 1836 to 1854 he was minister in charge of a Congregational Church at Princeton, Illinois. He was elected a member of Congress by the Republicans of the third district of Illinois in 1856 was re-elected in 1858, 1860, and 1852, and is included among the eminent opponents of the slave power. He died at Brooklyn, New York, March 25, 1864.

Lovejoy, Theodore A.

a Methodist preacher, was born at Stratford, Connecticut, February 18, 1821; was converted in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1842, and soon after joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1847 he joined the New York East Conference, remaining a faithful and valued member of the same till his death, at Watertown, Connecticut, June 7, 1867. See W.C. Smith, *Sacred Memories* (New York, 1870), page 301.

Loveys, John

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Devon County, England, May 7, 1804; was confirmed in the Church of England in his youth; in 1825 was converted, and united with the Wesleyan Methodists; emigrated to America in 1829; spent one year at Cazenovia Seminary, N.Y., and in 1830 entered the Black River Conference. In 1834 he was stationed at Ogdensburg; in 1836 was made presiding elder on Potsdam District; then

preached at Oswego (1839), and various other appointments, until his death, August 30, 1849. He was a valuable preacher, clear, original, vigorous, and devout; an "excellent economist," a "diligent student," and a man of large spirit and liberal influence. *Minutes of Conferences*, 4:474; *Black River Conference Memorial*, page 249. Low Churchmen, a name for persons who, though attached to the system of government maintained in the Church of England, or in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, as "the Church," yet consider that the ministrations of other churches are not to be disregarded. *SEE LATITUDINARIANS*. The term was primarily applied to those who disapproved of the schism made by the Non-jurors, and who distinguished themselves by their moderation towards Dissenters. *SEE RITUALISM*.

Löwe, ben-Bezalel

a rabbi and Jewish teacher of note, was born probably in Posen about 1525. Of his early history but little is authenticated. We find him first occupying a position of influence and prominence at Prague, where he was best known as "the learned Rabbi Lowe," towards the close of the 16th century (1573). Previous to his coming to Prague he had been rabbi over a congregation in Moravia for some twenty years. In 1583 he was elected chief rabbi of the Jews in the Bohemian capital. In 1592 he became chief rabbi of Posen and Poland; he returned, however, in 1593 to Prague, and there died in 1609. He left nineteen different works, of which several are yet in manuscript in the library of the University of Oxford, England. Besides his great Talmudical knowledge, which made him one of the first authorities of his time, he also enjoyed a great reputation as mathematician and philosopher. He seems to have also possessed great knowledge of astronomy and astrology, the favorite studies of the age. He was befriended by the renowned Tycho Brahe, astronomer at the court of the emperor Rudolph II; and the latter also, it is said, honored the rabbi, and at one time admitted him to a prolonged audience; indeed, it is a well-established fact that his extended knowledge and unblemished character secured for himself and the Jews of his time happier days, and, like a sunbeam in the midst of dark clouds, appears the short period in which he officiated as rabbi in the sad history of the Jewish congregation of Prague. He was opposed to the unscientific manner in which the Talmud was studied, by hunting after imaginary contradictions and difficulties (Pilpul), and he called into existence new societies for a more scientific study of the same. In connection with his son-in-law, rabbi Chayim Wahle, he founded a

seminary for Talmudical studies. The rabbi's knowledge of natural philosophy caused him frequently to make experiments, which gave birth to many legends, as the ignorant saw in them the supernatural power of the Cabalist. A Christian Bohemian historian claims for the rabbi the honor of inventing the camera-obscura. See Gritz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 9:496 sq.; Sekles, *Some Jewish Rabbis* (5), in the *Jewish Messenger* (N.Y. 1871); Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, 2:266 sq. (J.H.W.)

Löwe, Joel, Ben-Jehudah Loeb

(also called *Bril*, **ryb**, from the initials **byl hdwhy ybr ʿb**, *ben-R. Jehudah Loeb*), a Jewish writer of note, born about 1740, was a distinguished disciple of Moses Mendelssohn, and afterwards, although a Jew, held a professorship in the William's school at Breslau. He died in that city, February 11, 1802. Besides many valuable contributions to Biblical exegesis and literature in the Berlin Magazine for the Advancement of Jewish Scholarship, entitled *Mleassef* or *Sammler* (Collector), of which he was at one time also editor, he published

(1) *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, with an elaborate Introduction, written conjointly with Wolfssohn, to Mendelssohn's German translation of this book (Berlin, 1788; republished in Prague, 1803; Lemberg, 1817): —

(2) *Annotations on Ecclesiastes*, also conjointly with Wolfssohn, published with Mendelssohn's commentary on this book, and Friedlainers' German translation (Berlin, 1788): —

(3) *Commentary on Jonah*, with a German translation (Berl. 1788): —

(4) *Commentary on the Psalms*, with an extensive introduction (**l arçy twrymz rwab µ[**) containing an elaborate treatise on the musical instruments of the ancient Hebrews, as well as on Hebrew Poetry; published with Mendelssohn's German translation of this book (Berlin, 1785-91): —

(5) *German Translation and Heb. Commentary on the Sabbatic and Festival Lessons from the Pentateuch and the Prophets*, **SEE HAPHTARAH**, (Berl. 1790-91): —

(6) *German Translation of the Pentateuch for beginners, preparatory to Mendelssohn's version* (Breslau. 1818): —

(7) *Elementary Hebrew Grammar*, entitled װַׁל הַיְדוּמׁ [, according to logical principles, for the use of teachers (Berlin, 1794; republished in Prague, 1803). Of his articles published in quarterlies, the following are the most important: — 1. *Notes on Joshua and the Song of Songs*, in *Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek* (Leips. 1789), 2:183 sq.: — 2. *Treatise on Personification of the Deity and the Sephiroth*, *ibid.* (Leips. 1793), 5:378 sq. See Fürst, *Biblioth. Hebraica*, 2:268; Steinschneider, *Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, col. 1627 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, s.v.; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 11:131 sq.

Lowell, Charles

D.D., a Unitarian Congregational minister of note, son of judge John Lowell, to whom Massachusetts is indebted for the clause in her Constitution which abolished slavery, was born in Boston August 15, 1782, and was educated first at Andover Academy, and later at Harvard College, class of 1800. After graduation he went abroad, and traveled extensively in the Old World. At Edinburgh he entered the divinity school of the university, and spent there three semesters. On his return home he studied theology with Reverend Dr. Zedekiah Sanger, of South Bridgewater, and Rev. David Tappan, professor of divinity at Cambridge, and was ordained pastor over the West Church, in Boston, January 1, 1806. In 1837 his feeble health demanded relief, and the Reverend Cyrus A. Bartol was ordained as his colleague. Dr. Lowell continued his pastoral connection until his death (at Cambridge, January 20, 1861), although he officiated but occasionally. He was remarkable for kindness, integrity, directness and simplicity of character, and was a most zealous and consistent opponent of slavery. As a preacher his popularity was eminent, and he was almost adored by his parishioners. Graceful as an orator, with a voice of uncommon sweetness, he preached with such an ardor and sincerity that he seemed to his hearers to be almost divinely inspired. He published some twenty different discourses, a volume of *Occasional Sermons* (Bost. 1856, 12mo), and a volume of *Practical Sermons* (1856): — *Meditations for the Afflicted, Sick, and Dying; and Devotional Exercises for Communicants*. He also contributed largely to the periodical literature of his day. Among his surviving children are Prof. Lowell, the poet; the Reverend Robert Lowell, author of "The New Priest in Conception Bay," a novel of Newfoundland life; and Mrs. Putnam, the well-known writer on Hungarian history. See *Christian Examiner*, 1870,

page 389; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Drake, *Dict. Am. Biog.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, s.v.

Lowell, John

an American philanthropist, deserves our notice as the founder (in 1839) of "the Lowell Institute," at an expense of \$250,000, to maintain forever in Boston, his native place, annual courses of free lectures on natural and revealed religion, the natural sciences, philology, belles-lettres, and art. Mr. Lowell was born May 11, 1799, and was entered student at Harvard in 1813; but was compelled already, in 1815, by poor health, to seek relief by residence in the East. He died at Bombay March 4, 1836. He was a superior scholar, and possessed one of the best private libraries in America. See *New American Cyclop.* s.v.

Lower Parts Of The Earth

(/ra,t/NTj J), properly valleys (²⁴²³Isaiah 44:23); hence, by extension, *Sheol*, or the under-world, as the place of departed spirits (³⁵¹⁹Psalms 63:9; ⁴⁰¹⁹Ephesians 4:9), and by metonymy any hidden place, as the womb (³⁵¹¹Psalms 131:15). In the original of ³⁵¹¹Ezekiel 26:20; 32:18, 24, the words are transposed, and used in the second sense.

Löwisohn, Salomon

a Jewish writer of note, and really the first Jew who chronicled the history of his people in the German tongue, was born at Moor, Hungary, in 1789, and was truly a self-made man. Amid the greatest difficulties he acquired an education, and particularly a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew. Possessed of great poetical talent, he wrote *hxyll m ʿwrwqy*, a sort of *Ars Poetica* (Vienna, 1816). The first work in which a Jew applied Clio's pencil to the history of the chosen people of God, in a German version, was Löwisohn's *Vorlesungen über die neuere Geschichte der Juden* (Vienna, 1820, 8vo) which starts with their dispersion, and dwells at length on the Talmud and its authors. Unfortunately, however, the young man so well endowed to do this work, so auspiciously began, was brought to an early grave by disappointment in love. He died of broken heart, in his native place, in 1822. See Grätz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 11:453 sq.; *Oriental. Literaturbl.* 1840, col. 10; *Beth El.* 1856, page 72 sq. (J.H.W.)

Lowman, Abraham

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Indiana County, Pennsylvania, in 1835; made an early profession of faith, and joined the Associate Reformed Congregation at Jacksonville, Pennsylvania; entered the Theological Seminary of the First Associate Reformed Synod (class of 1857); was licensed by the Presbytery of Westmoreland, and in 1858 received and accepted a call from the Associate Reformed congregation at Brookville, Pennsylvania, but while preparing to enter upon the active duties of this charge he suddenly died, November 27, 1858. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1860, page 159.

Lowman, Moses

a learned English dissenting divine, was born in London in 1680, and was educated at Middle Temple, and subsequently at Leyden and Utrecht. In 1710 he became minister of a Presbyterian congregation at Clapham, Surrey, where he labored until his death in 1752. He was eminently skilled in Jewish antiquities, and is the author of a learned work on the *Civil Government of the Hebrews* (London, 1740, 1745, 1816, 8vo); of a *Paraphrase and Notes of Revelation* (1737, 1745, 4to; 1791, 1807, 8vo), of which work Doddridge remarked that he had "received more satisfaction from it, in regard to many difficulties in that book, than he ever found elsewhere, or expected to have found at all:" — *Argument from Prophecy in proof that Jesus is the Messiah* (London, 1733, 8vo), which Dr. Leland calls "a valuable book;" and *Rationale of the Ritual of Hebrew Worship* (1748, 1816, 8vo). See *Prot. Diss. Mag.* volume 1 and 2; Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, s.v.

Lowrie, John Marshall

D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, July 16, 1817, and was educated for two years in Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., and afterwards at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. (class of 1840); and then at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J. (class of 1842). In April 1842, he was licensed by Newton Presbytery, and soon after, accepting a call to the churches of Blairstown and Knowton, in Warren County, N.J., he was ordained and installed by Newton Presbytery October 18, 1843. In 1846 he accepted a call to Wellsville, Ohio; subsequently he removed to Lancaster, Ohio, and thence to Fort Wayne, Ind., where he labored faithfully until his death, September 26, 1867. Dr. Lowrie

contributed largely to the press, and wrote many precious gems in poetry and prose; he was a man of more than ordinary gifts, a clear, vigorous intellect, and sound judgment; he excelled in systematic arrangement, clear statement, and forcible argument. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alto.* 1868, page 115 sq.

Lowrie, Reuben

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Butler, Pa., November 24, 1827, and was educated at the University of New York City, where for one year he served as tutor; studied theology at Princeton, N.J.; afterwards became principal of a presbyterial academy in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania; was licensed by the Luzerne Presbytery in 1851, at which time he engaged in the work of foreign missions among the Choctaw Indians; in 1853 he was ordained, and April 22 sailed as missionary to Shanghai, China. Here he applied himself to the study of the Chinese language, translated the *Shorter Catechism*, and a *Catechism on the Old-Testament History*, into this dialect; devoted much time to the completion of a *Dictionary of the Four Books*, commenced by his deceased brother; he had also nearly finished a *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* in Chinese when he died, April 26, 1860. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1861, page 96.

Lowrie, Walter Macon

a Presbyterian missionary to China, was born in Butler, Pennsylvania, in 1819 (?), graduated from Jefferson College in 1837, passed a theological course at Princeton, was ordained by the Second Presbytery of New York, and entered on his ministerial labors. While passing from Shanghai to Ningpo, August 19, 1847, he was thrown overboard by pirates, and drowned at sea, about twelve miles from Chapoo, China. The date of his embarkation from America is not known, but he was in China some time prior to 1842. He was a young man of fine powers and large culture, and promised much for the Church and the world. His piety was of a lofty, self-denying stamp, which made him equal to all obstacles, and his career was opening grandly when thus suddenly called to his reward. He wrote *Letters to Sabbath-school Children: — Land of Sinim, or Exposition of Isaiah 49* (Phila. 1846, 18mo). A volume of his *Sermons* preached in China was also published (1851, 8vo). See Pierson, *Missionary Memorial*, page 396; *New York Observer*, January 8, 1848; *Memoirs of W.M. Lowrie* (New York, Carter and Brothers, 1849); *Princeton Review*, 22:280.

Low Sunday

the first Sunday after Easter, so called because it was customary to repeat on this day some part of the solemnity which was used on Easter day, whence it took the name of Low Sunday, being celebrated as a feast, but of a lower degree than Easter day itself.

Lowth, Robert

D.D., a distinguished English prelate, and son of William Lowth (q.v.), was born at Buriton November 27, 1710. In 1737 he graduated master of arts at Oxford University, and in 1741 was elected professor of poetry in his alma mater. Entering the ecclesiastical order, he was presented with the rectory of Ovington, in Hampshire, in 1744. After a four year's residence on the Continent, he was, on his return in 1750, appointed by bishop Hoadley archdeacon of Winchester, and three years after to the rectory of East Woodhay in Hampshire. It was in this very year that Lowth published his valuable work *De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum, Praedectiones Academicæ* (Oxon. 1753, 4to; 2d edit. with annot. by Michaelis, Götting. 1758; Oxf. 1763; Gotting, 1768; Oxford, 1775, 1810; with notes by Rosenmüller, Leips. 1815; and last and best, Oxford, 1821, 8vo). An English translation of the first 18 lectures was prepared by Dr. Dodd for the *Christian Magazine* (1766-67), and of all by Dr. Gregory (Lond. 1787, 1816, 1835, 1839, 1847); a still more desirable English translation was prepared by Prof. Stowe (Andover, 1829, 8vo). "In these masterly and classical dissertations," says Ginsburg (in Kitto, *Cycl. Of Bibl. Lit.* 2, s.v.), "Lowth not only evinces a deep knowledge of the Hebrew language, but philosophically exhibits the true spirit and characteristics of that poetry in which the prophets of the O.T. clothed the lively oracles of God. It does not at all detract from Lowth's merits that both Abrabanel and Azariah de Rossi had pointed out two centuries before him the same features of Hebrew poetry [see Rossi] upon which he expatiates, inasmuch as the enlarged views and the invincible arguments displayed in his handling of the subject are peculiarly his own; and his work is therefore justly regarded as marking a new epoch in the treatment of the Hebrew poetry. The greatest testimony to the extraordinary merits of these lectures is the thorough analysis which the celebrated [Jewish] philosopher Mendelssohn, to whom the Hebrew was almost vernacular gives of them in the *Bibliothek der schnszen Wissenschaften und derfreien Künste*, volume 1:1756." In 1751 Lowth received the degree of doctor in divinity from the University of

Oxford by diploma. In 1755 he went to Ireland as chaplain to the marquis of Hartington, then appointed lord lieutenant, who nominated him bishop of Limerick, a preferment which he exchanged for a prebend of Durham and the rectory of Sedgefield. In 1766 Dr. Lowth was appointed bishop of St. David's, whence a few months later he was translated to the see of Oxford, and thence, in 1777, he succeeded Dr. Terrick in the diocese of London. In 1778, only one year after his appointment at London, he gave to the public his last and greatest work, *Isaiah: a new Translation, with a preliminary Dissertation, and Notes* (13th edit. 1842, 8vo). This elegant and beautiful version of the evangelical prophet, of which learned men in every part of Europe have been unanimous in their eulogiums, and which is alone sufficient to transmit his name to posterity, aimed "not only to give an exact and faithful representation of the words and sense of the prophet by adhering closely to the letter of the text, and treading as nearly as may be in his footsteps, but, moreover, to imitate the air and manner of the author, to express the form and fashion of the composition, and to give the English reader some notion of the peculiar turn and cast of the original." In the elaborate and valuable Preliminary Dissertation where bishop Lowth states this, he enters more minutely than in his former production into the form and construction of the poetical compositions of the O.T., lays down principles of criticism for the improvement of all subsequent translations, and frankly alludes to De Rossi's view of Hebrew poetry, which is similar to his own. See Rossi. This masterly work soon obtained a European fame, and was not only rapidly reprinted in England, but was translated into German by professor Koppe, who added some valuable notes to it (Götting. 1779-81, 4 volumes, 8vo). It must not, however, be presumed that the work did not meet also with opposition, so far as the views of the author could lead to difference in opinion; and we incline with Dr. G.B. Cheever to the belief that Lowth's "only fault as a sacred critic was a degree of what archbishop Seeker denominated the '*rabies emendandi*,' or rage for textual and conjectural emendations. The prevalence of this spirit in his work on Isaiah was the only obstacle that prevented its attaining the name and rank, as classic in sacred literature, which has been accorded to the Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews" (*North Amer. Rev.* 31:376; comp. here Horne, *Bibl. Bib.* 1839, 287). On the death of archbishop Cornwallis, the primacy was offered to Dr. Lowth, a dignity which he declined on account of his advanced age and family afflictions. In 1768 he lost his eldest daughter, and in 1783 his second daughter suddenly expired while presiding at the tea-table; his eldest son was also suddenly

cut off in the prime of life. Bishop Lowth himself died November 3, 1787. The other and minor writings of bishop Lowth, consisting of (1) *Tracts*, belonging to his controversy with bishop Warburton (q.v.), to which a trifling difference of opinion on the book of Job gave rise: — (2) *Life of William of Wyckham* (1758): — (3) *Short Introduction to English Grammar* (1762). The *Sermons and other Remains of Bishop Lowth* were published with an *Introductory Memoir* by the Reverend Peter Hall, A.M. (London, 1834, 8vo). See *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Bp. Lowth* (Lond. and Gotting. 1787, 8vo); *Blackwood's Magazine*, 29:765, 902; *Gentl. Magazine*, 57, 58, etc.; Kitto, *Journal of Sac. Lit.* 1:94, 295; 5:373; 17:138; *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Darling, *Eccles. Biog.* 2:1873; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.; and especially Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Auth.* volume 2, s.v.

Lowth, Simon

D.D., an English non-juring divine, was born in Northamptonshire about 1630. In 1679 we find him vicar of St. Cosmus, a position of which he was deprived in 1688. He died in 1720. Dr. Simon Lowth published *Historical Collections concerning Ch. Affairs* (Lond. 1696, 4to), besides several theological treatises (1672-1704). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.

Lowth, William

D.D., a distinguished English divine, father of bishop Robert Lowth, was born in London September 11, 1661. He was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, whence he was elected to a scholarship at St. John's College, Oxford, in 1675, when not yet 14 years old; became M.A. in 1683, and B.D. in 1688. His *Vindication of the Divine Authority of the Old and New Test.* (Lond. 1692; 3d edit. with two sermons, 1821, 12mo), in answer to Le Clerc's attacks on the inspiration of Scripture, brought him prominently into notice; and the first to favor him was bishop Mew, of Winchester, who had been president of St. John's College, and well knew Lowth's great attainments. He made him his chaplain, and presented him with a prebendal stall in his cathedral at Winchester in 1696, and with the living of Buriton and Petersfield in 1699. Dr. Lowth died May 17, 1732. Though less celebrated as a writer than his son Robert, he is generally acknowledged to have been the profounder scholar, and might, and no doubt would, have attained to as great distinction in the Church as his son

had he lived as much in the public eye, and, instead of serving others in the preparation of their works, gone directly before the people himself. So great, indeed, was his modesty, that, in an estimate of his scholarship, we can be just only after a careful inquiry of the amount and extent of the assistance he furnished to the works of his contemporaries, upon whom Dr. Lowth, having carefully read and annotated almost every Greek and Latin author, whether profane or ecclesiastical, especially the latter, dispensed his stores with a most liberal hand. The edition of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, by Dr. (afterwards archbishop) Potter; that of Josephus, by Hudson; the *Ecclesiastical Historians*, by Reading (Cambridge); the *Bibliotheca Biblica*, were all enriched with valuable notes from his pen. Bishop Chandler, of Durham, during the preparation of his *Defense of Christianity from the prophecies of the Old Testament*, against the discourse of the "Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion," and in his vindication of the "Defence" in answer to *The Scheme of literal Prophecy considered*, held a constant correspondence with him, and consulted him upon many difficulties that occurred in the course of that work. Many other English scholars were also indebted to Dr. William Lowth's labors for important aid. But the most valuable part of his character was that which least appeared in the eyes of the world. His piety, diligence, hospitality, and beneficence rendered his life highly exemplary, and greatly enforced his public exhortations. Besides the Vindication already mentioned above, Dr. Lowth wrote Directions for the profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures, etc. (1708, 12mo; 7th edit. Lond. 1799, 12mo), an excellent little work, which has gone through many editions; and last, but chiefly, *A Commentary on the prophetical Books of the Old Testament*, originally published in separate portions (1714-1725), and afterwards collected in a folio volume as a continuation of bishop Patrick's commentary, and generally accompanying the commentary collected severally from Patrick, Whitby, Arnald, and Lowman (best editions of the whole commentary, Lond. 1822, 6 volumes, royal 4to; Philad. 1860, 4 volumes, imp. 8vo). "Lowth," says Orme (*Bibl. Bib.*), "is one of the most judicious commentators on the prophets. He never prophesies himself, adheres strictly to the meaning of the inspired writer, and is yet generally evangelical in his interpretations. There is not much appearance of criticism; but the original text and other critical aids were doubtless closely studied by the respectable author. It is often quoted by Scott, and.... is pronounced by bishop Coutson the best commentary in the English language." See Life of Dr. William Lowth by his son, *Biog. Brit.*;

Churchman's Magazine, 1809 (March and April), 781 sq.; Jones, *Christian Biog.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* 2:1875; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* 7:75; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* volume 2, s.v.

Loyola, Ignatius Of, St.

or, with his full Spanish name, Don *Inigo Lopez de Recalde*, the founder of the Jesuits, was born in 1491, in the Castle of Loyola, which was situated not far from Azpeytia, in the Spanish province of Guipuscoa. He was the youngest of the eleven children of Don Bertand, Senor d'Aguez y de Loyola, and Martina Saez de Balde. His family prided itself on belonging to the ancient, pure nobility of the country, and was distinguished for chivalric sentiment. After receiving his first instruction in religion from his aunt, Dofia Maria de Guevara, a fervid Catholic, he became a page at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic. But Ignatius had too great a desire for glory to be satisfied with court life, and, following the example of his brothers, who served in the army, he resolved to become a soldier. During the first campaign in which he took part he distinguished himself at the siege of Najara, a small town situated on the frontier of Biscaya, the capture of which was partly attributed to his bravery. The town was given up to pillage, in which he took, however, no part. His life at this time, as one of his biographers says, was by no means regular; "being more occupied with gallantry and vanity than anything else, he generally followed in his actions the false principles of the world, and in this way he continued to live until his twenty-ninth year when God opened his eyes." During the siege of Pampeluna, the capital of Navara, by the French, he was, on May 20, 1521, severely wounded by a cannon ball in both legs. The French, after taking the place, honored his courage, and had him transported on a litter to his native castle of Loyola, which is not far from Pampeluna. As the first operation had not been successful, the leg had to be broken again and to be reset anew. The extreme painfulness of this operation brought on a fever on the eve of the festival of the apostles Peter and Paul, which it was thought would prove fatal; but this fever suddenly ceased, and Ignatius ascribed his unexpected recovery to the miraculous aid of the prince of the apostles, who, as he states, appeared to him in a dream, touched him with his hand, and cured him from his fever. But, notwithstanding this belief in his miraculous recovery, Ignatius remained imbued with a worldly spirit. The recovery proved, however, not to be complete, and Ignatius, in order to get fully restored, had to submit to several other painful operations, in

spite of all of which his right leg remained considerably shorter than the other. While his recovery was slowly proceeding, he demanded novels for pastime; but as no books of this class were to be found in the castle, he received in their stead a *Life of Jesus Christ and of the Saints*. He read this at first without the least interest in the subject, and only because no other book could be found; but gradually his fiery imagination learned how to derive food from this reading, and a determination sprang up to imitate the spiritual combats which he found described in this book. and to excel the saints in heroic deeds. For a time the reviving thirst of glory, and a strong attachment to, a lady of the royal court, continued to prove formidable obstacles, but finally he fully overcame them, and began the new career upon which he had resolved to enter with a pilgrimage to the convent of Montserrat, famous for the immense concourse of pilgrims from all parts of the world to a miraculous picture of the Virgin Mary. To conceal his design, he pretended to make a visit to his old friend the duke of Najara, and immediately after making the visit dismissed his two servants, and took alone the road to Montserrat. There, during three successive days, he made a general confession of all the sins of his life, and took the vow of chastity. Before the picture of the Virgin Mary he held a vigil, hung up his sword and dagger on the altar, and then repaired to Manresa, a small town situated about three leagues from Montserrat, and containing a convent of the Dominican order and a hospital chiefly for pilgrims. Here he desired to live unknown until the pestilence should cease at Barcelona, and the opening of the port should allow him to carry out his wish of visiting the Holy Land. He first entered the hospital, and there practiced the austere asceticism, until it became known that he was a nobleman, when the number of persons who came to see him from curiosity induced him to hide himself in a neighboring cave which was known to few, and which no one had yet dared to enter. The horrors of this place, and the cruel, unnatural asceticism to which he gave himself up, produced a state of mind in which he believed himself alternately to be attended by temptations of the devil and to be gladdened by visions of the Savior and the holy Virgin. Gradually he began to be settled in his mind, and resolved to labor for the conversion and sanctification of souls. He began to speak in public on religion, and made the first draft of his famous book of the *Spiritual Exercises* (*Exercitia Spiritualia*), in the composition of which he claims to have had divine aid. This book has contributed more than any other to the erection of the new papal theocracy which has recently been completed by the promulgation of the doctrine of papal infallibility. It consists of meditations, which are

grouped in four divisions or weeks. The first week, after an introductory meditation on the destiny of man and of all created things, occupies itself with sin, its hideousness, and its terrible consequences. The second week has for its basis the meditation on the kingdom of Christ, who is represented as being in the highest sense of the word the king by the grace of God, whose call to the spiritual campaign all men have to obey, and in whose service every noble heart will feel itself inspired to noble deeds. In a life-picture of Christ it is shown how man must prove himself in the war for and with Christ. The meditation then turns to the mysteries of incarnation, to the childhood of Jesus, and his retired life in Nazareth. Here the contemplation of the life of Christ is interrupted by the meditation on the two banners: the horrid banner of the prince of darkness is unfolded by the side of the lovely banner of Christ before the eyes of the soul, which is eagerly courted on both sides. Returning to the public life of Christ, which is now followed step by step, the Exercises prepare the mind for finally determining the future course of life. During the third week the sufferings and the death of the Lord are meditated upon, in order to strengthen the soul for all the combats which a resolution to lead a religious life must entail. The subjects of the fourth week are taken from the mysteries of the resurrection and ascension of Christ. The whole is concluded with a meditation on the love of God. The book was for the first time printed in Rome in 1548, and on July 31 of the same year approved by pope Paul III, and urgently recommended to the faithful. In the hands of the Jesuits this book subsequently became one of the chief instruments which secured the thoroughly military discipline of their order, as well as of their devoted adherents.

After passing ten months in Manresa, Ignatius, in January, 1523, embarked at Barcelona for the Holy Land. He spent a few days in Rome, then went to Venice, where he embarked for Jerusalem on July 14, and arrived there on September 4. It was his wish to remain here, in order to labor for the conversion of the people of the East; but the provincial of the Franciscan monks, who had been authorized by the popes either to retain the pilgrims or to send them home again, did not allow him to stay. Accordingly, he had to return to Europe, and arrived in Venice in January 1524. In March he was again on Spanish soil, and having become convinced during his voyage of the importance of a literary education for the accomplishment of his plans, he entered, although 33 years old, a grammar-school at Barcelona, where he studied, in particular, the elements of Latin. Two years later he

went, with three disciples whom he had gained at Barcelona, to the University of Alcala, which a short time before had been founded by cardinal Ximenes. Here he was, with his companions, imprisoned for six weeks, by order of the Inquisition, for giving religious instruction without special authorization. After being released, he went, at the advice of the archbishop of Toledo, to the University of Salamanca to continue his studies. But, when there, he had new difficulties with the Inquisition; he resolved to leave Spain, and, not accompanied by any of his disciples, went to the University of Paris, where he studied from February 1528, to the end of March, 1535, and on March 14, 1533, obtained the title of master of arts. Here his plan was fully matured to establish a society of men who might aid him in carrying out his religious ideas. The first who was gained for the plan was Pierre Lefevre (Petrus Faber), who for some time had been his tutor in his philosophical studies. The second was Francis Xavier, a young nobleman of Novara. Soon after they were joined by the Spaniards Jacob Lainez, Alphonse Salmeron, and Nicholas Alphonse Bobadilla, and the Portuguese Simon Rodriguez d'Azendo. For the first time they were called together by Ignatius in July 1534. On August 15, on the festival of the assumption of the Virgin Mary, he took them to the church of the Abbey of Montmartre, near Paris, where, having received the communion from the hands of Lefevre, the only priest in their midst, they all, with a loud voice, took the solemn vow to make a voyage to Jerusalem, in order to labor for the conversion of the infidels of the Holy Land; to quit all they had in the world besides what they indispensably needed for the voyage; and in case they should find it impossible either to reach Palestine or remain there, to throw themselves at the feet of the pope, offer him their services, and go wherever he might send them. As several members of the company had not yet finished their theological studies, it was agreed that they should remain at the university until January 25, 1537. Ignatius in the meanwhile undertook to labor against the further progress of the Reformation in France; his ascetic practices soon undermined again his health, and, at the advice of his physician, he had to return to his native land, where he soon recovered. On January 6, 1537, he was met at Venice by all his companions, who, after his departure from Paris, had been joined by Claude le Jay, Jean Codure, and Pasquier Brouet. Two months later all the members of the society were sent by Ignatius to Rome, he himself remaining at Venice, as he believed the influential cardinal Caraffa (subsequently pope Paul IV) to be unfriendly to him. The pope, Paul III, received the companions of Ignatius favorably, and gave them permission

to be ordained priests by any bishop of the Catholic Church. As the war between Venice and the sultan made it impossible for Ignatius to go with his companions to Palestine, Ignatius, who had again united all the members of the society at Vicenza, resolved to go with Lefevre and Lainez to Rome, in order to place the services of his society at the disposal of the pope. Before separating, Ignatius instructed all his companions, in case they were asked who they were, and to what society they belonged, to reply that they belonged to the Society of Jesus, as they had united for a combat against heresy and vice under the banner of Jesus Christ. On his journey to Rome, Ignatius claimed to have had another vision in the lonely, decayed sanctuary of Storia, about six miles from Rome, and to have received a direct promise of divine aid and protection. At Rome Ignatius succeeded in gaining the entire confidence of the pope. A charge of heresy and sorcery, which a personal enemy brought against him, was easily refuted, but it was found more difficult to overcome the opposition to his projected order from three cardinals, by whose advice the pope was chiefly guided. But, undaunted by this great obstacle, as Helvot (*Histoire des Ordes es Monalstique*, ed. Migne, 2:643) says, "he continued his urgent representations with the pope, and redoubled his prayers to God with all the greater confidence, as, not doubting the success of his enterprise, he promised to God three thousand masses in recognition, and thanksgiving for the favor which he hoped to obtain from his divine Majesty." The steady progress of the Reformation overcame, however, at last the reluctance of the cardinals, and, by the bull of September 27, 1540, *Regimini militantis ecclesie*, the pope gave to the new order the papal sanction and the name Society of Jesus. At the election of a general of the new order Ignatius received a unanimous vote. He at first declined to accept; but when, at a second election, he was again found to be the unanimous choice of his brethren and when his confessor, the Franciscan monk father Theodore, urged him not to resist the call of God, he was prevailed upon to accept. He soon drew up the constitution of his order, which, however, did not receive the final sanction until after his death. In November 1554, in consequence of his failing health, he appointed father Nadal his assistant. During the following spring he believed himself to have sufficiently recovered to do without this support, but during the summer of 1556 his health broke entirely down, and he died on July 31, 1556. The only three wishes which he professed to have, the approbation of his order by the Church, the sanction of his book of spiritual exercises by the pope, and the promulgation of the constitution of his order, were fulfilled. During

the sixteen years from the foundation of the order until the death of Ignatius, the order spread with a rapidity rarely equaled in the history of monastic orders. *SEE JESUITS*. In 1609 Ignatius was beatified by pope Paul V; in 1622 he was canonized by Gregory XV. The Acta Sanctorum for July 31 gives, besides the Commentarius praeuius, two biographies of Ignatius — one by Gonzales, based on communications received from Ignatius himself, and another by Ribadeneira. Larger works on the life of Ignatius have been written by Ribadeneira, Maffei, and Orlandini. There is hardly a language spoken which has not furnished us a biography of Ignatius; in English we have his life by Isaac Taylor and by Walpole. See also Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 6:524; Ranke, *Röm.-Päpste*, 3:383; *Retrospective Rev.* (1824), volume 9; and the literature in the art. *JESUITS SEE JESUITS* . (A.J.S.)

Lo'zon

Δοζών, Vulg. Deldon), one of the sons of "Solomon's servants" who returned with Zorobabel (1 Esd. 5:33); the DARKON *SEE DARKON* (q.v.) of the Heb. lists (^{<1276>}Ezra 2:56; ^{<1378>}Nehemiah 7:58).

Lubbert(us), Librand(us),

a Reformed clergyman and professor of divinity at Franecker, was born at Longoworde, Friesland, in 1556, and was educated at Wittenberg University, where he gained great perfection in Hebrew. Afterwards he diligently attended the lectures at Geneva, and still later went to Neustadt, to hear the Calvinistical professors. Lubbert then entered the ministry, and accepted a call to the Reformed Church of Brussels; later he removed to Embden. In 1584 he went to Friesland as preacher to the governor and deputies of the provincial states, and also read lectures on divinity at Franecker University, then just opened. He received the title of D.D. from Heidelberg University. In the controversies concerning the Scriptures, the pope, the Church, and councils, he wrote against the celebrated divines Bellarmine, Gretserus, Socinus, Arminius, Peter Bertius, Vorstius, and Grotius's *Pietas Ordineum Hollandiae*. He preached zealously, pointedly, and eloquently against all the evils of his times, both in the Church and out of it. He observed the statutes severely, and sometimes refused rectorships because of the debauchery of unreformable scholars. He died at Franecker January 21, 1625.

Lubec, Reformation In

SEE HANSE Towns (in Supplement).

Lubienietski

(Latinized LUBIENIECIUS), STANISLAS, of a family greatly distinguished in the Polish Socinian controversy, being the most prominent of five who have become particularly identified with the Socinian movement in Poland, was born at Cracow August 23, 1623. He was minister of a Church at Lublin until driven out by the arm of power for his opinions in 1657, when all anti-Trinitarians were expelled from Poland. He went first to Sweden, and sought the influence of the Swedish monarch for the Unitarians, but was signally disappointed at the conclusion of peace between Sweden and Poland at Oliva. Lubienietski found more favor at the court of the Danes; he was obliged, however, to quit the capital because of his able advocacy of heretical opinions, and the danger to Lutheranism, and he finally settled at Hamburg, where he died May 18, 1675. His death is stated to have been caused by poison — a fact borne out by the death of his two daughters, and the serious illness of his wife, after eating of the same dish; but the Hamburg magistracy neglected to institute the investigation usual in cases of sudden death. His theological works are numerous, and may be found in Sandius, *Bibl. Antitrin.* (Freist. 1684), with the exception of the *Historia Reformationis Polonicae*, published in 1685 at Freistadt, with a life prefixed. Of his secular works, his *Theatrum Cometicum* has a worldwide celebrity. See *Engyl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Krasinski, *Hist. Ref. in Poland*, 2, chapter 14; Fock, *Der Socinianismus* (Kiel, 1847).

Lu'bim

(Heb. *Lubimz'*, לִיבִימִי, from the Arab., signifying inhabitants of a *thirsty* land, ^{<348B>}Nahum 3:9; "Lubims," ^{<442B>}2 Chronicles 12:3; 16:8; also *Lubbin'*, לִיבִימִי Libyans," ^{<2714B>}Daniel 11:43; Sept. everywhere Λιβυες), the Libyans, always joined with the Egyptians and Ethiopians; being "mentioned as contributing, together with Cushites and Sukkiim, to Shishak's army (^{<442B>}2 Chronicles 12:3); and apparently as forming with Cushites the bulk of Zerah's army (^{<446B>}2 Chronicles 16:8); spoken of by Nahum (^{<348B>}Nahum 3:9) with Put or Phut, as helping No-Amon (Thebes), of which Cush and Egypt were the strength; and by Daniel (^{<2714B>}Daniel 11:43) as paying court with the Cushites to a conqueror of Egypt or the Egyptians. These particulars

indicate an African nation under tribute to Egypt, if not under Egyptian rule, contributing, in the 10th century B.C., valuable aid in mercenaries or auxiliaries to the Egyptian armies, and down to Nahum's time, and a period prophesied of by Daniel, probably the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, *SEE ANTIOCHUS IV*, assisting, either politically or commercially, to sustain the Egyptian power, or, in the last case, dependent on it. These indications do not fix the geographical position of the Lubim, but they favor the supposition that their territory was near Egypt, either to the west or south. For more precise information we look to the Egyptian monuments, upon which we find representations of a people called REBU or LEBU (R and L having no distinction in hieroglyphics), who cannot be doubted to correspond to the Lubim. These Rebu were a warlike people, with whom Menptah (the son and successor of Rameses II) and Rameses III, who both ruled in the 13th century B.C., waged successful wars. The latter king routed them with much slaughter. The sculptures of the great temple he raised at Thebes, now called that of Medinet Abui, give us representations of the Rebu, showing that they were fair, and of what is called a Shemitic type, like the Berbers and Kabyles. They are distinguished as northern, that is, as parallel to, or north of, Lower Egypt. Of their being African there can be no reasonable doubt, and we may assign them to the coast of the Mediterranean, commencing not far to the westward of Egypt. We do not find them to have been mercenaries of Egypt from the monuments, but we know that the kindred Mashashasha-u were so employed by the Bubastite family, to which Shishak and probably Zerah also belonged; and it is not unlikely that the latter are intended by the Lubim, used in a more generic sense than Rebu, in the Biblical mention of the armies of these kings (Brugsch, *Geogr. Isschr.* 2:79 sq.). We have already shown that the Lubim are probably the Mizraite LEHABIM: if so, their so-called Shemitic physical characteristics, as represented on the Egyptian monuments, afford evidence of great importance for the inquirer into primeval history. The mention in Manetho's *Dynasties* that, under Necherophes, or Necherochis, the first Memphite king, and head of the third dynasty (B.C. cir. 2600), the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but returned to their allegiance through fear, on a wonderful increase of the moon, may refer to the Lubim, but may as probably relate to some other African people, perhaps the Naphtuhim, or Phut (Put). The historical indications of the Egyptian monuments thus lead us to place the seat of the Lubim, or primitive Libyans, on the African coast to the westward of Egypt, perhaps extending far beyond Cyrenaica. From the earliest ages of which we have any record,

a stream of colonization has flowed from the East along the coast of Africa, north of the Great Desert, as far as the Pillars of Hercules. The oldest of these colonists of this region were doubtless the Lubim and kindred tribes, particularly the Mashawasha-u and Taken-nu of the Egyptian monuments, all of whom appear to have ultimately taken their common name of Libyans from the Lubim. They seem to have been first reduced by the Egyptians about B.C. 1250, and to have afterwards been driven inland by the Phoenician and Greek colonists. Now, they still remain on the northern confines of the Great Desert, and even within it, and in the mountains, while their later Shemitic rivals pasture their flocks in the rich plains. Many as are the Arab tribes of Africa, one great tribe, that of the Beni 'Ali, extends from Egypt to Morocco, illustrating the probable extent of the territory of the Lubim and their cognates. It is possible that in ³⁸¹⁵Ezekiel 30:5, Lub, **bwl** , should be read for Chub, **bwk**; but there is no other instance of the use of this form: as, however, **dwl** and **pydwe** are used for one people, apparently the Mizraite Ludim, most probably kindred to the Lubim, this objection is not conclusive. *SEE CHUB; SEE LUDIM.* In ³⁴¹⁹Jeremiah 46:9, the A.V. renders Phut 'the Libyans;' and in ³⁸¹⁵Ezekiel 38:5, Libya." *SEE LIBYA.*

Lubin, Augustin

a French monk, was born in Paris January 29, 1624; was early admitted to the Order of Reformed Augustinian monks, became their provincial at Bourges, and assistant general at Rome. He died at Paris March 7, 1695. Lubin had a particular knowledge of all the benefices of France and the abbeys of Italy. He published many learned works on ancient and sacred geography; among others, *Tabulel Sacrae Geographica* (Paris, 1670): — *Martyrologium Romanum, cum tabulis geographis et notis historicis* (Paris, 1660): — *Tables geographiques pour les Vies des hommes illustres de Plutarque, dresses sur la traduction de l'Abbe Tallemant* (Paris, 1671): — *Clef du grand Pouille des Benefices de France*, containing the names of the abbeys, of their founders, their situation, etc. (Paris, 1671); etc. See Dupin, *Auteurs ecclesiast. du dixseptieme siecle; Journal des Savants*, 1695, page 220.

Lubin, Eilhard

one of the most learned Protestants of his time, was born at Westersted, in Oldenburg, March 24, 1556, of which place his father was minister. He was

educated first at Leipsic, where he prosecuted his studies with great success, and for further improvement went thence to Cologne. After this he visited the several universities of Helmstadt, Strasburg, Jena, Marburg, and, last of all, Rostock, where he was made professor of poetry in 1595, and ten years later was advanced to the divinity chair in the same university. He died in June 1621. One of his works deserves special mention, *Phosphorus de prima causa et natura mali, tractatus hypermetaphysicus*, etc. (Rostock, 1596, and 8vo and 12mo in 1600), in which he established two coeternal principles (not matter and a vacuum, or void, as Epicurus did, but), God and the nihilum, or nothing. God, he supposed, is the good principle, and nothing the evil principle. He added that sin was nothing else but a tendency towards nothing, and that sin had been necessary in order to make known the nature of good; and the applied to this nothing all that Aristotle says of the first matter. He was answered by Grawer, but published a reply entitled *Apologeticus quo Alb. Graw. calumniis respond.*, etc. (Rostock, 1605). He likewise published the next year, *Tractatus de causa peccati, ad theologos Augustinea confessionis in Gernmaniai*. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s.v.

Luca, Giovanni Battista

an Italian prelate, was born at Venosa, Naples, in 1614. He raised himself by merit from poverty to the highest stations in the Church. He became referendary of the two signatures, and auditor of pope Innocent XI, who appointed him cardinal September 1, 1681. Before entering the Church Luca had been a lawyer, and treatises on jurisprudence form the greater part of his works. He died at Rome February 5, 1683. His *Theatrum Veritatis et Justitiae* (1697, 7 volumes) treats of canon and civil law, and was very highly esteemed. Among his remaining works are the following: *Concilium Tridentium, ex recensione J. Gallimarti et Aug. Barbosae, cum notis Cardinalis de Luca* (Cologne, 1664). See Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, volume 8; Migne, *Hist. des Cardinaux*, in the *Encyclop. Ecclesiast.*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Lucanus Or Lucianus

a disciple of Marcion and the Gnostics, flourished in the latter part of the second century. He denied the reality of the body of Christ, as well as the immateriality and immortality of the soul. He regarded the souls of animals as of the same kind with those of men, and allowed the resurrection of the

former. He is known to have been the author of numerous forgeries: among others, the *History of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary*, the *Protevangelion*, or *History of James*, the *Gospel of Nicodemus*. He seems to have been the same heretic who is sometimes called *Lucius*, *Leicius*, *Leucius*, *Lentitizs*, *Leontius*, *Lentius*, *Seleucus*, *Charinus*, *Nexocharides*, and *Leonides*. — Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v. See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:245. *SEE LUCIAN, ST.*

Lucarius, Cyrillus.

SEE CYRIL, LUCAR.

Lu'cas

(Δουκᾶς, Vulg. *Lucas*), a friend and companion of Paul during his imprisonment at Rome (Philemon 24). A.D. 57. He is doubtless the same as Luke, the beloved physician, who is associated with Demas in Colossians 4:14, and who remained faithful to the apostle when others forsook him (2 Timothy 4:11), on his first examination before the emperor. For the grounds of his identification with the evangelist Luke, *SEE LUKE.*

Lucas, De Tuy (Or Tudensis),

a Spanish theologian and writer, was born at Leon, where he became canon of St. Isidore, and was afterwards appointed deacon of Tuy, in Galicia. In 1227 he made a journey to Jerusalem, saw pope Gregory IX in Italy, and also the general of the Order of Franciscans. He was appointed bishop of Tuy in 1239, and died in 1250. He wrote a Chronicle of Spain, extending from 670 to 1236 (published by Schott in his *Hisp. Ill.*, Francf. 1663, fol., volume 4), and a *Vita et historia translationis S. Isidori*, which is reproduced in the article on that saint in the *Acta Sanctorum*, April 4. The second part of this work, which does not at all relate to St. Isidore, is a passionate and superficial attack against the Cathari (q.v.); valuable, however, for its information concerning some customs of that sect in the south of France and in Spain. This part of Lucas's work was published separately by Mariana, under the inappropriate title of *Libri tres de altera vita fideique controversiis contra Albigensium errores* (Ingolst. 1613, 4to; reprinted in the *Biblioth. Patrum Maximna*, 25:188, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of Cologne, 13:228). Lucas also rejected as heretical the view which afterwards obtained of the three persons of the Trinity being of

different ages, and asserted, contrarily to the then prevailing notion, that Christ ought not to be represented as crucified with the feet crossed, but with the two feet side by side, each pierced with a separate nail. — Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 8:558. (J.N.P.)

Lucas, Franciscus

(BRUGIESIS), one of the ablest of the Roman Catholic theologians of the 16th century, was born at Bruges in 1549. He studied theology at Louvain, and became at once celebrated for his knowledge of the sacred languages and their cognate dialects. In 1562 he was appointed archdeacon and dean of the cathedral of St. Omer, and there he remained until his death, February 19, 1619. As the fruits of his great scholarship he has left us mainly works of value in Biblical theology. The following deserve special mention: (1) the edition of the *Biblia Regia* (brought out by Plantin, the famous printer of Antwerp, under the auspices of Philip II of Spain), which Lucas superintended. But the work by which he is principally known is (2) his *Commentarius in Quatuor Evangelia* (Antw. 1606), which was completed by *Supplementum Commmentar. in Luc. et Joann.* (Antw. 1612, 1616), a commentary of no ordinary merit. "Entirely passing by, or alluding in the briefest manner to the mystical sense, and omitting all doctrinal discussions, he explains clearly and concisely the literal meaning, illustrating it frequently from the Greek and Latin fathers, as well as from later writers of authority, though never burdening his pages with lists of conflicting authorities. His plan is a simple one, and judiciously carried out. He chooses one sense, and that the one which the sacred writer appeared to have had in view, and briefly expounds and illustrates that, never distracting his readers with varying interpretations only mentioned to be rejected. Lucas had no mean critical ability, and his knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac was exact and trustworthy. A truly devotional spirit breathes through the whole." (3) *Notationes in Sacr. Bibl.* (Antw. 1580-83), with a careful summary of the various readings, which were also appended to the edition of the Vulgate that appeared from the press of Plantin with Emman. Sa's notes (Antw. 1624), under the title *Fr. Lucre, Roman. correct. in Bibl. Latin. loc. insigniora.* (4) *Sacrorum Bibliorum Vulgatae editionis Concordantiae* (Antw. 1606, 5 volumes, fol.; best ed. Antw. 1642). See Fabricius, *Hist. Biblioth.* page 1 and 3; Dupin, *Auteurs Ecclesiast. du dix-septienze Siecle*, col. 1572; Simon, *l'Hist. Crit. des Versions du Nouv. Test.* chapter 3; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, volume 32, s.v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* volume 2, s.v.

Lucas, Richard

an English clergyman and moralist, was born in 1648 in Radnorshire, Wales, entered Jesus College, Oxford, in 1664, and, after taking his degree, was for some time engaged in teaching. He finally entered the ministry, and became vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, London, in 1683. In 1696 he became prebend of Westminster. Blindness afflicted him in his later years. He died in June, 1715, at London. He published a number of occasional sermons (1683-1704; 3d edit. 1710, 2 volumes; 1712-16-17, 3 volumes; and 2d ed. 1722, 3 volumes). Among his devotional treatises the following are highly recommended by such critics as Knox, dean Stanhope, bishop Jebb, Sir Richard Steele, and Dr. Doddridge: *Inquiry after Happiness* (1685, 2 volumes): — *Practical Christianity, or an Account of the Holiness which the Gospel enjoins, with the Motives to it, etc.* (5th edit. 1700; last edit. 1838). See Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, s.v.

Luce, Abraham

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Northville, Long Island, N.Y., March 13, 1791; studied at Clinton Academy, Easthampton, and afterwards theology with the Reverend Jonathan Hunting, of Southold, and Reverend Dr. Aaron Woolworth of Bridgehampton, Long Island, and also with Prof. Porter, of Andover, Massachusetts. In 1812 he was licensed by the Long Island Presbytery, and in 1813 was ordained pastor of the church at Westhampton. He was chosen for three consecutive years to represent the Presbytery in the General Assembly, and was a great many times elected moderator. He died October 23, 1865. Mr. Luce was a man of fine abilities, and superior as an executive officer. He held a high place in the esteem and confidence of his ministerial brethren, and was always placed first on responsible commissions and committees. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Alm.* 1867, page 311.

Lucernarium

(*λυχναψία*), a name given to the evening service of the ancient Church, because ere it began it was usually dusk, and the place had to be lighted up with lamps. See Bingham, *Antiqu. Christian Church*, book 13, chapter 9, § 7. *SEE HOURS*; *SEE VESPERS*.

Lucia

ST., a Roman Catholic saint of the 3d or the beginning of the 4th century, is said to have been of a noble Sicilian family. Her legendary history is as follows. Having gone on a pilgrimage with her mother to the grave of St. Agatha for the restoration of the latter's health, she resolved to become a nun. Her mother assented, but a young man whom she was engaged to marry, angry at her resolution, denounced her as a Christian. She acknowledged the truth of the charge when brought before the judges, and was condemned to enter a brothel; but when Paschasius gave the order to take her thence it was found impossible to move her from the spot, even though yokes of oxen were employed to draw her. Paschasius now attempted to burn her, and had boiling pitch and oil poured on her, but in vain; he then ran her through with a sword, when she prophesied the downfall of Diocletian, the death of Maximian, and the arrest and death of Paschasius. She died after partaking of the body of the Lord, and on the spot a church was afterwards erected. Her life is contained in Laurentius Servius's *De praebatis Sanctosnum* histories, December 13, and in a number of martyrologues, but it has often been attacked as spurious even by Romanists, and is therefore not found in the *Acta Sanctorum*. She is commemorated on December 13. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:496; *Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Lucian

(*Δουκιανός*), a celebrated Greek rhetorician, the Voltaire of Grecian literature, was born at Samosata, a city on the west bank of the Euphrates, in the Syrian province of Commagene. We possess no particulars respecting his life on which any reliance can be placed except a few scattered notices in his own writings. From these it appears that he was born about the latter end of Trajan's reign (A.D. 53-117), that he lived under both the Antonines, and died about the end of the 2d century. His parents, who were in humble circumstances, placed him with his maternal uncle, a sculptor, in order to learn statuary; but he soon quitted this trade, and applied himself to the study of the law. He afterwards practiced at the bar in Syria and Greece; but, not meeting with much success in this profession, he resolved to settle in Gaul as a teacher of rhetoric, where he soon obtained great celebrity and numerous scholars. He appears to have remained in Gaul till he was about forty, when he gave up the profession of rhetoric, after having acquired considerable wealth. During the remainder

of his life we find him traveling about from place to place, and visiting successively Macedonia, Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and Bithynia. The greater part of his time, however, was passed in Athens, where he lived on terms of the greatest intimacy with Demonax, a philosopher of great celebrity, and where he probably wrote most of his works, which principally consist of attacks upon the religion and philosophy of his age. Towards the latter part of his life he held a lucrative public office in Egypt, which was bestowed upon him by the emperor Commodus. The account of his being torn to death by dogs for his attack on the Christian religion rests on no credible authority, and was probably invented by Suidas, who appears to have been the earliest to relate it.

The writings of Lucian, in the form of dialogue, are in a remarkably pure and elegant Greek style, free from the false ornaments and artificial rhetoric which characterize most of the writings of his contemporaries. Modern critics have usually given him his full need of praise for these excellences, and have also deservedly admired the keenness of his wit, his great talent as a writer, and the inimitable ease and flow of his dialogue; but they have seldom done him the justice he deserves. They have either represented him as merely a witty and amusing writer, but without any further merit, or else they have attacked him as an immoral and infidel author, whose only object was to corrupt the minds of his readers, and to throw ridicule upon all religion. But these opinions appear to us to have arisen from a mistaken and one-sided view of the character of Lucian and an intent to utterly ignore the peculiarities of the period in which he flourished. He seems to us to have endeavored to expose all kinds of delusion, fanaticism, and imposture; the quackery and imposition of the priests, the folly and absurdity of the superstitious, and especially the solemn nonsense, the prating insolence, and the immoral lives of the philosophical charlatans of his day (see his *Alexander*). Lucian may, in fact, be regarded as the Aristophanes of his age, and, like the great comic poet, he had recourse to raillery and satire to accomplish the great objects he had in view. His study was human character in all its varieties, and the times in which he lived furnished ample materials for his observation. Many of his pictures, though drawn from the circumstances of his own days, are true for every age and country. As an instance of this, we mention the essay entitled *On those who serve the Great for Hire*. If he sometimes discloses the follies and vices of mankind too freely, and occasionally uses expressions which are revolting to our ideas of morality, it should be recollected that every

author ought to be judged by his standard of religion and morality. The character of Lucian's mind was decidedly practical; he was not disposed to believe anything without sufficient evidence of its truth, and nothing that was ridiculous or absurd escaped his raillery and sarcasm. The tales of the poets respecting the attributes and exploits of the gods, which were still firmly believed by the common people of his age, were especially the objects of his satire and ridicule in his dialogues and in many other of his works. That he should have attacked the Christians in common with the false systems of the pagan religion will not appear surprising to any one who considers that Lucian probably never took the trouble to inquire into the doctrines of a religion which was almost universally despised in his time by the higher orders of society, who did, indeed, visit with ridicule all religious belief. Says Gibbon (Harpers' edit. 1:36), "We may be well assured that a writer conversant with the world would never have ventured to expose the gods of his country to public ridicule had they not already been the objects of secret contempt among the polished and enlightened orders of society." Volaterranus, indeed, affirmed, but without stating his authority, that Lucian apostatized from Christianity, and was accustomed to say he had gained nothing by it but the corruption of his name from Lucius to Lucianus. So also the scholiast on the *Peregrius* calls him **παραβάτης**, while the scholiasts on the *Verae Historia* and other pieces frequently apostrophize him in the bitterest terms, and make the most far-fetched and absurd charges against him of ridiculing the Scriptures. These accusations of blasphemy, however, could be made only against an apostate, and such, it is now well established, Lucian was not. Born of pagan parents. he led the life of a pagan philosopher of the 2d century, when, as Gibbon tells us, "the ingenious youth who, from every part, resorted to Athens, and the other seats of learning in the Roman empire, were alike instructed in every school to reject and to despise the religion of the multitude" (1:36). Lucian is no more amenable to the charge of blasphemy than Tacitus or any other profane author, who, from ignorance of the Christian religion, has been led to vilify and misrepresent it. The charge might be urged with some color against Lucian if it could be shown that he was the author of the dialogue entitled *Philopatris*. A sneering tone pervades the whole piece, which betrays so intimate a knowledge of Christianity that it could hardly have been written but by one who had been at some time within the pale of the Church. Some eminent critics, and among them Fabricius (Biblioth. *Graeca*, 5:340 [ed. Harles]), have held Lucian accountable for this production, but it is now pretty generally

admitted not to be from his pen. (Compare Gesner, *De Aetate et Auctore Philopatridis*, in which it is shown that the piece could not have been Lucian's; and many considerations are brought forward which render it very probable that the work was composed in the reign of Julian the Apostate. Compare Neander, *Church History*, 2:89, note 5.)

The works of Lucian may be divided into,

I. RHETORICAL. — *Περὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου*, *Somnium seu Vita Luciani*: Ἡρόδοτος, *Herodotus sive Aetion*; Ζεύξις, *Zeuxis sive Antiochus*; Ἀρμονίδης, *Harmonides*; Σκύθης ἢ Πρόξενος, *Scytha*; Ἰππίας ἢ Βαλανεῖον, *Hippias seu Bableum*; Προσλαλία ἢ Λιόνυσος, *Bacchus*; Προσλαλία ἢ Ἡρακλῆς, *Hercules Gallicus*; *Περὶ τοῦ ἠλεκτροῦ ἢ τῶν κύκνων*, *De Electro seu Cygnis*; *Περὶ τοῦ οἴκου* *De Domo*; *περὶ τῶν διψάδων*, *De Dipsadibus*; *τυραννοκτόνος*, *Tyrannicida* (perhaps spurious); *Ἀποκηρυττόμενος*, *Abdicatus* (attributed sometimes to Libanius); *Φάλαρις πρῶτος καὶ δεύτερος*, *Phalaris prior et alter*; *Μύιας ἐγκώμιον*, *Encomium Muscae*; *Πατρίδος ἐγκώμιον*, *Patriae Encomium*.

II. CRITICAL WORKS. — *Δίκηφωνηέτων*, *Judicium Vocalium*; *Λεξιφάνης*, *Lexiphanes* (considered by some as directed against the *Onomasticon* of Pollux, by others against Athenseus); *Πῶς δεῖ ιστορίαν συγγράφειν*, *Quomodo Historia sit conscribenda*, the best of Lucian's critical works; *Ῥητόρων διδάσκαλος*, *Rhetorum Preceptor*; *Ψευδολογιστής*, *Pseudologista*; *Δημοσθένους ἐγκώμιον*, *Demosthenis Encomium* (rejected by some as spurious); *Ψευδοσοφιστής*, *Pseudosophista* (also attacked, and on better grounds than the preceding).

III. BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS. — *Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ Ψευδόμαντις*, *Alexander seu Pseudomantis*; *Δημόνακτος βίος*, *Vita Demonactis*; and *Περὶ τῆς Περεγρίνου τελευτῆς*, *De Vortē Peregrini*. This last work, containing an account of the life and voluntary auto-da-fe of Peregrinus Proteus, a fanatical cynic and apostate Christian, who publicly burnt himself from an impulse of vain-glory about A.D. 165, is really, for us, the most important work under consideration; for Lucian here discharges his satire upon Cynicism and Christianity. Peregrinus, a perfectly contemptible man, after having committed the commonest and grossest crimes — adultery, sodomy, and patricide — joins the credulous Christians in

Palestine, cunningly imposes on them, soon rises to the highest repute among them, and, becoming one of the confessors in prison, is loaded with presents by them, in fact, almost worshipped as a god, but is afterwards excommunicated for eating some forbidden food (probably meat of the idolatrous sacrifices), then casts himself into the arms of the Cynics, travels about everywhere in the filthiest style of that sect, and at last, about the year 165, in frantic thirst for fame, plunges into the flames of a funeral pile before the assembled populace of the town of Olympia for the triumph of philosophy. "Perhaps this fiction of the self-burning," says Dr. Schaff (*Church History*, 1:189), "was meant for a parody on the Christian martyrdom, possibly of Polycarp, who about that time suffered death by fire at Smyrna.... An Epicurean worldling and infidel, as Lucian was, could see in Christianity only one of the many vagaries and follies of mankind, in the miracles only jugglery, in the belief of immortality an empty dream, and in the contempt of death and the brotherly love of the Christians, to which he was constrained to testify, a silly enthusiasm." We certainly find in Lucian a singular combination of impartiality and injustice. Wrongly interpreting rather than misrepresenting the Christian belief, he treats its advocates oftener with a compassionate smile than with hatred. He nowhere urges persecution. He never calls Christ an impostor, as Celsus does, but a "crucified sophist," a term which he uses as often in a good as in a bad sense. But then, in the end, both the Christian and the heathen religions amount, in his view, to imposture; and there is in all his writings, says Pressense (*Early Years of Christianity*, 2 [N.Y. 1871, 12mo], 454), "scarcely a page which is not an insult to religion in itself. That by which he is mainly distinguished is what may be called his universal impiety, his contempt of all greatness, goodness, or glory. He was the most accomplished disciple of the *nil admirari* school," and hence he has most aptly been termed the Voltaire of his day (compare Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch. d. ersten sechs Jahrh.* [Leipsic, 1869] page 161). It remains a question simply whether in these contemptuous exhibitions of all religion he aimed merely to satirize the failings of the advocates of religious belief, or whether he actually himself believed nothing. The latter must certainly be doubted when we consider his expose of Pyrrhonismn (q.v.); and we are inclined to accept as most just the treatment he has received at the hands of Thomas Dyer, in Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* 2:814, col. 2, based on Lucian's own statement in his *Ἀλιεύς* (§ 20), and in his *Alexander* (§ 54), where he indignantly spurns the charge of immorality brought against him. Mr. Dyer concedes that Lucian was "a hater of pride,

falsehood, and vainglory, and an ardent admirer of truth, simplicity, and all that is naturally amiable." (Comp. however, the dissertations by Krebs, *De Malitioso Luciani Consilio Religionem, Christianam scurrili dicacitate vanam et ridiculam reddendi* [*Opusc. Acad.* page 308 sq.], and Eichstadt, *Lucianus num scriptis suis adjuvare voluerit Religionem Christianam* [Jena, 1822].)

IV. ROMANCES. — Under this head may be classed the tale entitled *Λούκιος ἢ Ὕνος*, *Lucius sive Asinus*, and the *Ἀληθοῦς ἱστορίας λόγος ἁ καὶ β*, *Verae Historiae*. The adventures related in the latter work are of the most extravagant kind, but show great fertility of invention. It was composed, as the author tells us in the beginning, to ridicule the authors of extravagant tales, including Homer's *Odyssey*, the *India* of Ctesias, and the wonderful accounts of lambulus of the things contained in the great sea. The adventure with the robbers in the cave is thought to have suggested the well-known scene in *Gil Blas*. That the *Verae Historiae* supplied hints to Rabelais and Swift is sufficiently obvious, not only from the nature and extravagance of the fiction, but from the lurking satire.

V. DIALOGUES. — These dialogues, which form the great bulk of his works, are of very various degrees of merit, and are treated in the greatest possible variety of style, from seriousness down to the broadest humor and buffoonery. Their subjects and tendencies, too, vary considerably. Still we may divide them into three classes: first, those which are more exclusively directed against the heathen mythology; next, those which attack the ancient philosophy; and, lastly, those in which both the preceding objects are combined, or which, having no such tendency, are mere satires on the manners of the day, and the follies and vices natural to mankind. In the first class may be placed *Προμηθεὺς ἢ Καύκασος*, *Prometheus seu Caucasus*; *Ἐνάλιοι Διάλογοι*, *Dei Marini*; *Ζεὺς Ἐλεγχόμενος*, *Jupiter Confutatus*; *Ζεὺς τραγῶδος*, *Jupiter Tragoedus*, which strikes at the very existence of Jupiter and that of the other deities; *Θεῶν ἔκκλησις*, *Deorum Concilium*; *Τὰ πρὸς Κρόνον*, *Saturnalia*. To the second class belong *Βίων πρᾶσις*, *Vitarum Auctio*: in this humorous piece the heads of the different sects are put up to sale, Hermes being the auctioneer. The *Ἄλιεὺς ἢ Ἀναβιῶντες*, *Piscator seu Reviviscentes*, is a sort of apology for the preceding piece, and may be reckoned among Lucian's best dialogues; *Ερμώτιμος* is chiefly an attack upon the Stoics, but its design is also to show the impossibility of becoming a true philosopher; *Εὐνοῦχος*, *Eunuchus*; *Φιλοψευδής*, on the

love of falsehood natural to some men purely for its own sake. Some commentators have thought that the Christian miracles were alluded to in § 13 and § 16, but this does not seem probable; the [Δραπέται](#), *Fugitivi*, is directed against the Cynics, by whom Lucian seems to have been attacked for his life of Peregrinus; [Ευμπόσιον ἢ Λαπίθαι](#), *Convivium seu Lapithae*, is one of Lucian's most humorous attacks on the philosophers. The third and more miscellaneous class, containing some of his best, includes [Τίμων ἢ μισάνθρωπος](#), *Timon*, which may perhaps be regarded as Lucian's masterpiece. The [Νεκρικοὶ Διάλογοι](#), *Dialogi Mortuorum*, are perhaps the best known of all Lucian's works. The subject affords great scope for moral reflection, and for satire on the vanity of human pursuits. Among modern writers, these dialogues have been imitated by Fontenelle and lord Lyttelton. The [Μένιπος ἢ Νεκρομαντεία](#), *Vecyomanteia*, bears some analogy to the *Dialogues of the Dead*: it wants, however, Lucian's pungency, and Du Saul thought that it was written by Menippus himself. The [Ἰκαρομένιπος ἢ Ὑπερνέφελος](#), *Icaro-Menippus*, on the contrary, is in Lucian's best vein, and a masterpiece of Aristophanic humor. [Χάρων ἢ ἐπισκοποῦντες](#), *Contemplantes*, is a very elegant dialogue, but of a graver turn than the preceding; it is a picture of the smallness of mankind when viewed from a philosophic as well as a physical height. The [Κατάπλους ἢ Τῦρραννος](#), *Kataplus sive Tyrannus* is, in fact, a dialogue of the dead. [ὄνειρος ἢ Ἀλεκτρύων](#), *Somnium seu Gallus*, justly reckoned among the best of Lucian's. [Δίς κατηγορούμενος](#), *Bis Accusatus*, so called from Lucian's being arraigned by Rhetoric and Dialogue, is chiefly valuable for the information it contains of the author's life and literary pursuits. We may here also mention the [Κρονοσόλων](#), *Crono-Solon*, and the [Ἐπιστολαὶ Κρονικαί](#) *Epistolae Saturnales*, which turn on the institution and customs of the *Saturnalia*. Among the dialogues which may be regarded as mere pictures of manners, without any polemical tendency, may be reckoned [Ἔρωτες; Ἐταιρικοὶ Διάλογοι](#), *Dialogi Meretricii*; [Πλοῖον ἢ Εὐχαί](#), *Navigium seu vota*. Among the dialogues which cannot be placed in any of the above three classes are the [Εἰκόνες](#), *Imagines*, which some suppose to have been addressed to a concubine of Verus, and which Wieland conjectures to have been intended for the wife of Marcus Antoninus; [Υπὲρ τῶν Εἰκόνων](#), *Pro Imaginibus*, a defense of the preceding, with the flattery of which the lady who was the subject of it pretended to be displeased. [Τόξαρις](#), *Toxaris*, on friendship; [Ἀνάχαρσις](#), *Anacharsis*, an attack upon the Greek gymnasium; [Περὶ ἀρχήσεως](#), *De Saltatione*: this piece is hardly worthy of Lucian, but contains some curious

particulars of the art of dancing among the ancients. *Διάλεξις πρὸς Ἡσίδον*, *Dissertatio cūsm lesiōdo*, the genuineness of which is doubted.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS PIECES. — These bear in their form some analogy to the modern essay: *Πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα Προμηθεὺς εἰ ἐν λόγοις*, *Ad eum qui dixerat Prometheus es in Verbis*; *Περὶ θυσίων*, *De Sacrificiis*, against the absurdities of the heathen worship, and especially of the Egyptian. *Περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μισθῷ συνόντων*, *De Mercede Conductis*; *Απολογία περὶ τῶν ἐπιμ. συν.*, *Apologia pro de Here. Cond.*; *Ἵπὲρ τοῦ ἐν τῇ προσαγορεύσει παταίσματος*, *Pro Lapsu in Salutando*, playful little piece, though containing some curious learning. *Περὶ πένθους*, *De Luctu*, in opposition to the received opinion concerning the infernal regions.

Πρὸς ἀπαίδευτον, *Adversus Indoctum*, is a bitter attack upon a rich man who thought to acquire a character for learning by collecting a large library. *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ ῥᾶδίως πιστεύειν διαβολῇ*, *Non temere credendum esse Delittoni*.

VII. POEMS. — These consist of two mock tragedies, *Τραγοποδάγρα* and *Ὠκύπους*, and about fifty epigrams, the genuineness of some of which is considered doubtful. The following works, which have sometimes been ascribed to Lucian, are considered by the most eminent critics as spurious: *Ἀλκῶν ἢ περὶ Μεταμορφώσεως*, *Halcyon seu de Transformatione*, deemed to be by Leo the Academician; *Περὶ τῆς Ἀστρολογίας*, *De Astrologia*; *Περὶ τῆς Συρίας θεοῦ*, *De Dea Syriat*; *Κυνικός*, *Cynicus*; *Χαρίδημος ἢ περὶ καλλοῦς*, *Charidemus seu de Pulchro*; *Νέρων ἢ περὶ τῆς ὀρυχῆς τοῦ Ἴσθμοῦ*, *Nero, seu de Fossione Isthmi*.

It is probable that the greater part of Lucian's rhetorical pieces, as well as some others, are lost. "His writings have a more modern air than those of any other classic author; and the keenness of his wit, the richness yet extravagance of his humor, the fertility and liveliness of his fancy, his proneness to skepticism, and the clearness and simplicity of his style, present us with a kind of compound between Swift and Voltaire. There was abundance to justify his attacks in the systems against which they were directed, yet he established nothing in their stead" (Dyer, in Smith, s.v.).

Editions. — Lucian's works were first published (in Greek) at Florence in 1496, folio, from rather incorrect MSS.; a corrected edition was brought out at Venice by Antoni Francini in 1535 (2 volumes, 8vo), very good and

scarce. The first edition of the Greek text with a Latin version appeared at Basle in 1563 (4 volumes, 8vo), the result of the work of several savans: the parts of Erasmus, T. Morus, J. Micyllus, are deserving of praise; this is not the case with that of Vincent Obsopoeus. The notes by Samnbucus are considered of no account, but those of Gilbert Cousin are highly esteemed. In 1730 the distinguished philologist, Tib. Hemsterhuys, began to print his excellent edition; but dying in 1736, before a quarter of it had been finished, the editorship was assigned to J.F. Reitz, a much less capable man: it appeared at Utrecht in 1743 (4 volumes, 4to; republished by Schmidt, at Mittau, 1776-1780, 8 volumes, 8vo). This edition contains a large number of valuable notes; the last volume is a lexicon. A much esteemed edition is that of Deux-Ponts, 1789-93, 10 volumes, 8vo, which is a careful reprint of Hemsterhuys's edition, the lexicon being replaced by an index, and the 10th volume containing the various readings compiled by Belin de Ballu from the MSS. in the Royal Library of Paris. In 1800 Schmieder published at Halle a text without translation, with various readings compiled from the libraries of France and Germany. There were to appear commentaries in connection with it, which, however, were not published. This edition is much esteemed, although some of the various readings are thought to have been collected without sufficient care. The edition of Lehmann (Lpz. 1821-31, 9 volumes, 8vo), with a large number of notes, is of great use for the correct understanding of the text. A much esteemed edition is that of C. Jacobitz (Lpz. 1837-41, 4 volumes, 8vo); the text was established with the aid of the most valuable MSS. and with the greatest care. Dindorf published in 1840, at Paris, a Greek text of Lucian, with a Latin version, but no notes, which forms part of the *Bibliotheca Graec*, and stands deservedly high. Separate pieces of Lucian's have been often published.

Lucian has been translated into most of the European languages. In French the best editions are by Belin de Ballu in 1788 (6 volumes, 8vo), and by Eugene Talbot (Par. 1857, 2 volumes, 18mo). Among the English versions may be named one by several parties, including W. Moyle, Sir H. Shere, and Charles Blount (Lond. 1711). It was several years preparing, and Dryden wrote for it a life of Lucian, which is very incorrect. Carr's version (1773-1798, 4 volumes, 8vo) is a pretty correct translation, but the notes are valueless. The best English version is that of Dr. Franklin (Lond. 1780, 2 volumes, 4to, and 1781, 4 volumes, 8vo), but some of the pieces are omitted. Mr. Hooke's version (London, 1820, 2 volumes, 4to) is of little

value. In 1675 Charles Cotton published a burlesque imitation of some of the dialogues: it was reprinted in 1686 and 1751. The best German translation of Lucian has been furnished by Wieland (Leips. 1788, 6 volumes, 8vo). The notes accompanying it are also valuable; but the translator left out some pieces which he considered of minor interest. Another good translation is by Pauly (Stuttgart, 1828-1831, 15 volumes, 12mo). See, besides the authorities already quoted, Jacob, *Characteristic Lucian's v. Samosata* (1832); Tiemann, *Versuch u. Lucian und seine Philosophie* (1804); Struve, *Specimina ii de AEtate et vita Luciani* (1829-30); Passow, *Lucian u. d. Gesch.* (1854); Tzschirner, *Fall des Heidenthums*, 1:315 sq.; Baur, *Die drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, page 395 sq.; Donaldson, *Greek Literature*, chapter 54, § 3 and 4; Lardner, *Works*, 8, chapter 19; Farrar, *Crit. Hist. Free Thought*, page 48 sq.; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* 1828; Fraser's *Magazine*, 1839; *Journal Sac. Lit.* volumes 10 and 12; and especially Planck, in *Studien u. Kritiken*. 1851, and in an English version in the *Biblioth. Sacra*, 1853 (April and July) Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol.* 3:812, and the excellent article by Theodor Keim, in Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie* 6, 8:497-504.

Lucian

ST., presbyter of Antioch, and a martyr, is said by some to have been born at Samosata, in the Syrian province of Commagene, about the middle of the 3d century. His parents died while he was yet a boy, and, left to depend upon his own resources, the twelve-year old lad removed to Edessa, where he was baptized, and became a pupil of Macarius, an eminent Biblical scholar. He entered the ministry as a presbyter at Antioch, and finally assumed the lead of a theological school, which he himself founded. He became greatly celebrated both as an ecclesiastic and as a Biblical scholar, and was an ornament of the Christian Church when suddenly cut down by martyrdom, which he suffered A.D. 312, by order of Maximin, during the reign of Diocletian. He was drowned, and was buried at Helenopolis, in Bithynia. Lucian is frequently mentioned by ecclesiastical writers not only as a man of great learning, but also as noted for his piety. Eusebius calls him a "person of unblemished character throughout his whole life" (*Hist. Eccl.* 8:13); and Chrysostom, on the anniversary of Lucian's martyrdom, pronounced a panegyric upon him which is still extant. Jerome informs us, in his *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers* (c. 77), that "Lucian was so laborious in the study of the sacred writings that in his own time some copies of the Scriptures were known by the name of Lucian;" and we learn

from another part of his works (*Praef. in Paralip.* 1:1023) that Lucian's revision of the Septuagint version of the Old Test. was generally used in the churches, from Constantinople to Antioch. Lucian also made a revision of the New Testament, which Jerome considered inferior to his edition of the Septuagint. There were extant in Jerome's time some treatises of Lucian concerning faith, and also some short epistles; but none of these have come down to us, with the exception of a few fragments.

There has been considerable dispute among critics respecting Lucian's belief in the Trinity. From the manner in which he is spoken of by most of the Trinitarian fathers, and from the absence of any censure upon his orthodoxy by Jerome and Athanasius, it has been maintained that he must have been a believer in the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity; but, on the other hand, Epiphanius, in his *Anchoret* (35, volume 2, page 40, D), speaks of the Lucianists and Arians as one sect; and Philostorgius (who lived about 425, and wrote an account of the Arian controversy, of which considerable extracts are preserved by Photius) expressly says that Eusebius of Nicomedia, and many of the principal Arians of the 4th century, were disciples of Lucian; yet this does not prove that their Arian principles were derived from Lucian's teachings. It is nevertheless probable that Lucian's opinions were not quite orthodox, since he is said, by his contemporary Alexander (in Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* 1, c. 4, page 15, B), to have been excluded from the Roman Catholic Church by three bishops in succession, for advocating the doctrines of Paul of Samosata. Indeed, it was from Lucian's school at Antioch that the great teacher of Arianism (q.v.), Arius of Alexandria, came. According to Epiphanius, Lucian was originally a follower of Marcion, but finally formed a sect of his own, known as Lucianists, agreeing, however, in the main with the Marcionites (q.v.). Like the latter, the Lucianists conceived of the Demiurgos, or Creator, as distinct from the perfect God, ὁ ἀγαθός, "the good one;" and described the Creator, who was also represented as the judge, as ὁ δίκαιος, "the just one." Besides these two beings, between whom the commonly received attributes and offices of God were divided, the Lucianists reckoned a third, ὁ πονηρός, "the evil one." Together with the Marcionites, they condemned marriage, and, according to some, though rather questionable authorities, they even denied the immortality of the soul, asserting it to be material, and to be followed by an entirely new substance (*tertium quiddam*). *SEE GNOSTICISM*. Lucian himself, however, repented of his heresy, and returned to the Roman Catholic

communion before his death. It was probably on the occasion of his return to the orthodox fold that he gave to the Church his Confession of Faith, which is mentioned by Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* 3:5), and given at length by Socrates (*Hist. Eccles.* 2:10), and which was promulgated by the semi-Arian or Eusebian Synod of Antioch, A.D. 341 (compare Smith, *Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Biog.* 2:81 1. col. 1; Bull, *Def. Fid. Niccen.* 2:13, § 4-8).
SEE LUCANUS.

There have been three other persons of the name of Lucian connected with the history of the Church: one suffered martyrdom in 250; the second was the first bishop of Beauvais; and the third wrote, about 415, a letter on the whereabouts of the body of St. Stephen. See, besides the authorities already quoted, Tillemont, *Memoires*, 5:474; Ceillier, *Hist. des Aut. Sac.* l.c.; Cave, *Hist. litt.* Ad. ann. 294; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 3:715 sq. Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, 8:504 sq.; *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

Lucianists Or Lucanists

a sect so called from their founder. **SEE LUCANUS.**

Lucidus

a presbyter in the Gallic Church in the 5th century, was one of the most distinguished members of the ecclesiastical party which in that period defended the doctrines of St. Augustine against Semi-Pelagianism then greatly preponderating in the Church. The views of Lucidus are to be ascertained from the works resulting from the controversy between himself and Faustus of Rieg, who obliged him to recant. The latter wrote against Lucidus his *Fausti Rejensis epistola ad Lucidum*, and the recantation of Lucidus — probably posterior to the Synod of Aries, 475, as indicated by the expression, "Juxta praedicandi recentia statuta concilii damno vobiscum sensum ilium," etc. — is entitled *Lucidi errorem emendantis libellus ad episcopos*. In some respects Lucidus, indeed, had gone further than St. Augustine himself, especially in regard to predestination. allowing no free agency to man, and making all the workings of human conscience to be but the effects of the immediate and gratuitous influence of God. Such, at least, is the accusation which was brought against him at the Council of Aries. The text of his recantation is to be found in all the *Bibl. Patr.* and in the collections of councils. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 2:454; Mansi, 7:1008 sq.; *Bibl. PP. edit.* 2, volume 4, page 875; Wiggers, *August. u. Pelag.*

2:225, 329, 346; Schröckh, *Kirchengesch.* 18:148 sq.; Gfrorer, *Kirchengesch.* volume 2, part 2. (J.N.P.)

Lu'cifer

(Heb. *Heylel'*, לִלְיָהֵ Sept. ὁ Ἐωσφόρος), a word that once occurs in the English Version in the lines,

*"How art thou fallen from heaven,
O Lucifer, son of the morning!
How art thou cut down to the ground,
Which didst weaken the nations!"*

(²³⁴¹²Isaiah 14:12). It is taken from the Vulgate, which understood the Hebrew word to be the name of the morning star, and therefore rendered it by the Latin name of that star, Lucifer, i.e., "light-bringing." The derivation has been supposed to be from לִלְיָהֵ; *halal'*, to shine. The same word here translated "Lucifer," however, occurs also in ³²¹²Ezekiel 21:12 [17], as the imperative of לִלְיָהֵ; *yalal'*, "to howl," "to lament," and is there rendered "howl." Some take it in the same acceptance in the above passage, and would translate. "Howl, son of the morning!" But to this the structure of the verse is entirely opposed, for the parallelism requires the second line to refer entirely to the condition of the star before it had fallen, as the parallel member, the fourth line, does to the state of the tree before it was cut down. Hence the former derivation is to be preferred, namely, "brilliant," "splendid," "illustrious," or, as in the Septuagint, Vulgate, the rabbinical commentators, Luther, and others, "brilliant star;" and if *Heylel'*, in this sense, was the proper name among the Hebrews of the morning star, then "Lucifer" is not only a correct but beautiful interpretation, both as regards the sense and the application. That it was such is probable from the fact that the proper name of the morning star is formed by a word or words expressive of brilliance, in the Arabic and Syriac, as well as in the Greek and Latin (see Gesenius, *Commentar*, ad loc.). Tertullian and Gregory the Great understood this passage of Isaiah in reference to the fall of Satan; in consequence of which the name Lucifer has since been applied to Satan, and this is how the usual acceptance of the word. But Dr. Henderson, who in his Isaiah renders the line "Illustrious son of the morning!" justly remarks in his annotation: "The application of this passage to Satan, and to the fall of the apostate angels, is one of those gross perversions of Sacred Writ which so extensively obtain, and which are to be traced to a proneness to

seek for more in any given passage than it really contains, a disposition to be influenced by sound rather than sense, and an implicit faith in received interpretations." The scope and connection show that none but the king of Babylon is meant. In the figurative language of the Hebrews, a star signifies an illustrious king or prince (⁽⁴²⁴⁷⁾Numbers 24:17; compare ⁽⁴¹²⁸⁾Revelation 2:28; 22:16). The monarch here referred to, having surpassed all other kings in royal splendor, is compared to the harbinger of day, whose brilliancy surpasses that of the surrounding stars. Falling from heaven denotes a sudden political overthrow — a removal from the position of high and conspicuous dignity formerly occupied (comp. ⁽⁴¹²⁸⁾Revelation 6:13; 8:10). Delitzsch adopts the same view (Comment. ad loc.). "In another and far higher sense, however, the designation was applicable to him in whom promise and fulfillment entirely corresponded, and it is so applied by Jesus when he styles himself 'The bright and morning Star' (⁽⁴²¹⁶⁾Revelation 22:16). In a certain sense it is the emblem also of all those who are destined to live and reign with him (⁽⁴¹²⁸⁾Revelation 2:28)."

SEE STAR.

Lucifer, Bishop Of Cagliari,

in Sardinia, surnamed Calaritanus, a noted character in ecclesiastical history, the founder of an independent sect known as Luciferians, flourished about the middle of the 4th century. At the Council of Milan, held in 354, he appeared as joint legate with Eusebius of Vercelli from pope Liberius, and here he displayed great opposition to the Arian believers. He refused to hold any communion with the clergy who had, during the reign of Constantius, conformed to the Arian doctrines, although it had been determined in a synod at Alexandria, in 352, to receive again into the Church all the Arian clergy who openly acknowledged their errors, and was, in consequence, imprisoned for a time, and finally banished. He took up his residence in Syria, but here also became involved in disputes, and greatly increased the disorders which agitated the Church at Antioch by his ordination of Paulinus as bishop in opposition to Meletius. Disapproved and ignored by his former friends and associates, he retired in disgust to his native island, and there founded an independent sect, whose distinguishing tenet was that no Arian bishop, and no bishop who had in any measure yielded to the Arians, even although he repented and confessed his errors, could enter the bosom of the Church without forfeiting his ecclesiastical rank; and that all bishops and others who admitted the claims of such persons to a full restoration of their

privileges became themselves tainted and outcasts — a doctrine which, had it been acknowledged at this period in its full extent, would have had the effect of excommunicating nearly the whole Christian world. Lucifer died during the reign of Valentinian, about A.D. 370.

The number of Luciferians is believed to have been always small; Theodoret says that the sect was extinct in his day (*Hist. Eccles.* 3, c. 5, page 128, D). Their opinions, however, excited considerable attention at the time when they were first promulgated, and were advocated by several eminent men; among others, by Faustinus, Marcellinus, and Hilarius Diaconus. Jerome wrote a work in refutation of their doctrines, which is still extant. Augustine remarks, in his work on Heresies (c. 81), that the Luciferians held erroneous opinions concerning the human soul, which they considered to be of a carnal nature, and to be transfused from parents to children. Compare the article NOVATIANS *SEE NOVATIANS* .

Lucifer himself is acknowledged by Jerome and Athanasius to have been well acquainted with the Scriptures, and to have been exemplary in private life, but he appears to have been a man of violent temper and great bigotry. His writings were first published entire by Johannes Tillius, bishop of Meaux (Paris, 1568, 8vo), and were dedicated to pope Pius V: Two Books addressed to the Emperor Constantius in Defense of Athanasius: — On Apostate Kings: — On the Duty of having no Communion with Heretics: — On the Duty of dying for the Son of God: — On the Duty of showing no Mercy to those who sin against God; and a short Epistle to Florentius. The best edition, however, is by the brothers Coleti (Venet. 1778, fol.). See Schonemann, *Bibliotheca Patr. Lat.* 1, § 8; Neander, *Ch. History*, 2:396 sq. Moshelm, *Eccles. History*, book 2, cent. 4, part 2, chapter 3, § 20; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, 2:428 sq., 438,457; Walch, *Gesch. d. Ketzereien* (Lpz. 1766), 3:388 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* volume 2, s.v. (J.H.W.)

Luciferians

(L) is the name of a sect founded by Lucifer of Cagliari (q.v.), which originated as follows: In 360 the Arians of Antioch had chosen Seletius of Sebaste, formerly a Eusebian, but afterwards an adherent of the Nicene Confession, their bishop. But his inaugural discourse convinced them of their mistake about his views, and they deposed him after the lapse of only a few days. Meletius was next chosen bishop of the Homoousian congregation at Antioch. The appointment of one who had been an Arian

was, however, resisted by a part of the people, headed by Paulinus, a presbyter. Athanasius and the Synodd of Alexandria. A.D. 362 used every influence to heal this schism. But Lucifel of Cagliari, whom the synod for this purpose reputed to Antioch, took the part of the opposition, and ordained Paulinus counter-bishop. What next followed has been narrated under LUCIFER. A comparison of this sect with the English Puritans is made by Punchard, *Hist. of Congregationalisms* 1, chapter 3.

(II.) The same name was afterwards applied to some heretics of the Middle Ages, who were accused of addressing prayers of the devil (Lucifer). It was particularly applied to fourteen of these heretics who were burned alive at Tangermünde, in Prussian Saxony (1336), by order of the elector of Brandenburg, influenced by the representations of the superior of the Franciscans. These heretics were probably Fratricelli (q.v.).

Lucifugae

or LUCIFUGAX NATIO, Light-haters; a serm of reproach given to the early Christians, because in times of persecution they frequently held their assemblies at night, or before the break of day.

Lucilla

SEE DONATISTS.

Lu'cius

(Λεύκιος v.r. Λούκιος), a Roman consul (ὑπάτος Ῥωμαίων), who is said to have written the letter to Ptolemy (Euergetes) which assured Simon I of the protection of Rome (B.C. cir. 139-8; 1 Macc. 15:10, 15-24). The whole form of the letter — the mention of one consul only, the description of the consul by the proenomen, the omission of the senate and of the date (comp. Wernsdorf, *De fide Macc.* § 119) — shows that it cannot be an accurate copy of the original document; but there is nothing in the substance of the letter which is open to just suspicion. Josephus omits all mention of the letter of "Lucius" in his account of Simon, but gives one very similar in contents (Ant. 14:8, 5), as written on the motion of Lucius Valerius in the ninth (nineteenth) year of Hyrcanus II; and unless the two letters and the two missions which led to them were purposely assimilated, which is not wholly improbable, it must be supposed that he has been guilty of a strange oversight in removing the incident from its proper place.

The imperfect transcription of the name has led to the identification of Lucius with three distinct persons:

(1.) [Lucius] Furius Philus (the lists, Clinton, *Fasti Hell.* 3:114, give P. Furius Philus), who was not consul till B.C. 136, and is therefore at once excluded.

(2.) Lucius Caecilius Metellus Calvus, who was consul In B.C. 142, immediately after Simon assumed the government. On this supposition it might seem not unlikely that the answer which Simon received to an application for protection, which he made to Rome directly on his assumption of power (comp. 1 Macc. 14:17,18) in the consulship of Metellus, has been combined with the answer to the later embassy of Numenius (1 Macc. 14:24; 15:18).

(3.) But the third identification with Lucius Calpurnius Piso, who was consul B.C. 139, is most probably correct. The date exactly corresponds, and, though the praenomen of Calpurnius is not established beyond all question, the balance of evidence is decidedly against the common lists. The *Fasti Capitolini* are defective for this year, and only give a fragment of the name of Popillius, the fellow-consul of Calpurnius. Cassiodorus (Chron.), as edited, gives *Cn.* Calpurnius, but the eye of the scribe (if the reading is correct) was probably misled by the names in the years immediately before. On the other hand, Valerius Maximus (1:3) is wrongly quoted from the printed text as giving the same prsenomen. The passage in which the name occurs is in reality no part of Valerius Maximus, but a piece of the abstract of Julius Paris inserted in the text. Of eleven MSS. of Valerius which have been examined, it occurs only in one (Mus. Bri. *Burn.* 209), and there the name is given Lucius Calpurnius, as it is given by Mai in his edition of Julius Paris (*Script. Vet. Nova Coll.* 3:7). Sigonius says rightly (*Fasti Cons.* page 207): "Cassiodorus prodit consules *Cn.* Pisonem... epitoma *L.* Calpurnium." The chance of an error of transcription in Julius Paris is obviously less than in the *Fasti* of Cassiodorus; and even if the evidence were equal, the authority of 1 Macc. might rightly be urged as decisive in such a case.

Lucius Of Adrianople

(or Hadrcianople), an Eastern prelate of note, flourished as bishop of Adrianople in the 4th century. Decidedly orthodox in his opinions, the predominant and powerful Arians deposed him from his see, and in 340 or

341 we meet him at Rome before pope Julius I pleading for his restoration. Although he went back with a demand from the Roman pontiff to reinstate the deposed orthodox bishop, the Oriental prelates refused to recognize the papal authority, and he did not recover his see until the emperor Constantius, constrained by the threats of his brother Constans, then emperor of the West, restored Lucius (about 347). Upon the death of Constans (350), Lucius was again deposed by the infuriated Arians, and banished. He died in exile. He is commemorated in the Romish Church February 11. See Athanasius, *Apolog. de Fuga sua*, c. 3; *Arianor. ad Monach.* c. 19; Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2:15,23, 26; Bolland, *Acta Sanct. Februarii*, 2:519; Smith, *Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. and Myth.* 2:825.

Lucius Of Alexandria,

an Arian prelate, flourished about the middle of the 4th century. He was elected patriarch by the Arians, when, upon the death of the emperor Constantius (361) and the murder of the Arian patriarch, George of Cappadocia, Athanasius had recovered the patriarchate of Alexandria, and expelled the Arians from the churches. Even in the lifetime of Athanasius the two patriarchs wrangled much for authority, but the contest became fierce between Arian and Orthodox after the decease of Athanasius (373). The latter had nominated his successor without any regard to Lucius, and it was only after the deposition and imprisonment of Peter, the nominee, who had in the mean while been ordained, that Lucius regained the patriarchate, to hold it only until Peter, who had made his escape to Rome, returned with letters confirming his ordination (A.D. 377 or 378). Lucius was, in all probability, never again restored. In 380 he is found in company with Demophilus, Arian patriarch of Constantinople, just as he was withdrawing from the city by order of expulsion. Nothing more is known of Lucius. According to Jerome, he wrote Solemnes de Paschate Epistolae and minor treatises. See Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* 3:4; 4:21 sq., 24, 37; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* ad ann. 371; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, 9:247; Labbe, *Concilii*, volume 6, col. 313; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* 2:825.

Lu'cius

(Λούκιος, for Latin Lucius, a common Raman name), surnamed the CYRENIAN (ὁ Κυρηναῖος, "of Cyrene"), thus distinguished by the name of his city-the capital of a Greek colony in Northern Africa, and remarkable for the number of its Jewish inhabitants-is first mentioned in the N.T. in

company with Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Manaen, and Saul, who are described as prophets and teachers of the Church at Antioch (~~413~~ Acts 13:1). A.D. 44. These honored disciples having, while engaged in the office of common worship, received commandment from the Holy Ghost to set apart Barnabas and Saul for the special service of God, proceeded, after fasting and prayer, to lay their hands upon them. This the first recorded instance of a formal ordination to the office of evangelist, but it cannot be supposed that so solemn a commission would have been given to any but such as had themselves been ordained to the ministry of the Word, and we may therefore assume that Lucius and his companions were already of that number. Whether Lucius was one of the seventy disciples, as stated by Pseudo-Hippolytus, is quite a matter of conjecture, but it is highly probable that he formed one of the congregation to whom Peter preached on the day of Pentecost (~~420~~ Acts 2:10); and there can hardly be a doubt that he was one of "the men of Cyrene" who, being "scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen," went to Antioch preaching the Lord Jesus (~~419~~ Acts 11:19, 20).

In the Apostolical Constitutions, 7:46, it is stated that Paul consecrated Lucius bishop of Cenchree, which is probably a mere inference from the supposition that the epistle to the Romans was written from that Corinthian port. Different traditions make Lucius the first bishop of Cyrene and of Laodicea, in Syria. — Smith, s.v.

It is commonly supposed that Lucius is the kinsman of Paul mentioned by that apostle as joining with him in his salutation to the Roman brethren (~~512~~ Romans 16:21). A.D. 55. There is, however, no sufficient reason for regarding him as identical with Luke the Evangelist, though this opinion was apparently held by Origen (*ad loc.*), and is supported by Calmet, as well as by Wetstein, who adduces in confirmation of it the fact reported by Herodotus (3:121), that the Cyrenians had throughout Greece a high reputation as physicians. But it must be observed that the names are clearly distinct. The missionary companion of Paul was not Lucius, but Lucas or Lucanus, "the beloved physician," who, though named in three different epistles (~~514~~ Colossians 4:14; ~~511~~ 2 Timothy 4:11; Philemon 24), is never referred to as a relation. Again, it is hardly probable that Luke, who suppresses his own name as the companion of Paul, would have mentioned himself as one among the more distinguished prophets and teachers at Antioch. Olshausen, indeed, asserts confidently that the notion of Luke and

Lucius being the same person has nothing whatever to support it (Clark's *Theol. Lib.* 4:513). *SEE LUKE.*

Lucius

king OF ENGLAND, said to have introduced Christianity into Britain in the second half of the 2d century. *SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF (I).*

Lucius, Samuel

SEE LUTZ.

Lucius I

pope, succeeded Cornelius as bishop of Rome, after the death of the latter, in Sept. 252. He was soon after banished from Rome, but returned, and is spoken of as a martyr as early as March, 253. There seems, however, to be no precise information as to the length of his pontificate. Nicephorus (*H.E.* 6:7) states that he held the office six months; Eusebius (*H.E.* 7:2) says eight; and the *Liber Pontific.* three years and eight months, which must certainly be an error. The latter work ascribes to him the ordinances forbidding any but persons of the purest morals and the best conduct to officiate at the altars, and all priests from entering alone the residence of a woman; also those directing that the pope and the bishops were always to be attended by two priests and three deacons, who should bear witness of their conduct. A pseudo-decretal letter is also ascribed to him. According to Cyprian, Lucius I must have suffered a short exile from a Rome during his pontificate, for Cyprian wrote Lucius a letter of congratulation on the occasion of his return from exile (*Ep.* 61 *ad Luc.*). According to this author (*Ep.* 65), Lucius wrote several letters on the treatment of backsliders, but they are not known at present. See Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 1:61; Tillemont, *Memoires*, 4:118 sq.

Lucius II

pope, of Bologna, properly GERHARD CACCIANAMICI, was a regular Augustinian chorister of St. John of Lateran. He was made cardinal priest of Santa Croce of Jerusalem by Honorius II, and vice-chancellor and librarian of the Church of Rome by Innocent II. He was finally elected pope after the death of Celestine II, March 12, 1144. Soon after his accession, the Romans, under the guidance of Arnold of Brescia, rose against the papal authority, determined, by an Arnoldian spirit, *SEE*

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA, to re-establish the old republic, and to this end appointed a patrician in the capitol to govern them, and chose Jordan, son of Peter Leo, as such, giving him all the revenues of the city, and restricting the pope to the tithes and voluntary offerings. "Caesar should have the things that are Caesar's, the priest the things that are the priest's, as Christ ordained when Peter paid the tribute-money" (compare Neander, *Ch. History*, 4:151). The pope attempted to oppose this revolution, and, at the head of a band of armed followers, went forth to attack the capitol, but was wounded by a stone, and died of this wound, February 25, 1145. See Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire*, 6:426 sq.; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, page 226 sq.; Bower, *History of the Popes*, 6:52 sq. **SEE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.**

Lucius III

properly UBALDO ALLUCINGOLI, belonged to a distinguished family of Lucca. He was made cardinal priest of St. Praxedas by Innocent II in 1140, and cardinal bishop of Ostia and Velletri by Adrian IV in 1158. Having distinguished himself in some negotiations with France, Sicily, and the emperors Frederick, he became a prominent member of the "holy college," and was finally elected pope September 2, 1181. Soon after his arrival at Rome, however, he got into difficulties with the Romans, and was finally obliged to flee the city. Christian, archbishop of Mentz and chancellor of the emperor, started to assist him with a large army, but died on the way. In 1183 Lucius returned to Rome, but his conduct and that of his followers having created fresh troubles, he soon left that city forever and retired to Verona. where he was nearer his imperial protector. The emperor himself arrived at Verona soon after, and the two princes held a consultation on the state of the Church. In this council the Romans were denounced as enemies of the Church, and the Waldenses also were put under the ban, and a crusade was advised to help the persecuted Christians in the East. While engaged in demanding assistance for the crusaders from the kings of England and France, Lucius fell sick and died, November 24, 1185. His letters are in Mansi, *Coll. Cociliorum*, 22. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4:609; Bower, *Hist. of the Popes*, 6:159 sq.; *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:202; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity.*, 4:439 sq. Buske, *Med. Popes and Crusaders*, 2:155, 165, 168.

Luck, Johann Philipp

a German theologian, was born at Erbach August 28, 1728. In 1745 he entered the University of Jena. In 1750 he became preacher at Gütterbach; two years later, town-pastor at Michelstadt; in 1757, assessor of the Consistory; two years afterwards, counselor of the same; and in 1781 was appointed court-preacher. He died November 8, 1791. Well posted in all branches of theology, especially in Church history, familiar with the French, and furnished with the gift of eloquence, he was a most active and efficient worker for the preservation of the moral and religious principles of the Reformation. As a commentator, he was an opponent of the innovations of Baehrdt. The best of his works in this line are his *Erläuterungen des Briefes Pauli an die Gemeinen zu Galatien* (Jena, 1753, 4to): — *Erläuterungen des Briefes Pauli an die Romier* (ibid. 1753, 4to). See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Lücke, Gottfried Christian Friedrich

an eminent German theologian, was born at Egel, near Magdeburg, August 23, 1781. He studied theology at the universities of Halle and Göttingen. In 1813 he became lecturer in the latter university, and in 1816 went to Berlin University, and there lectured on the exegesis of the N.T. Here he became intimate with De Wette and Schleiermacher, whose views greatly influenced the remainder of his career as a theologian. In 1818 he was, at the same time as Gieseler, appointed professor at the newly-established University of Bonn and in 1827 became professor of theology at Göttingen. He died in that city February 14, 1855. He wrote *Commentatio de Ecclesia Christianorum apostolica* (Götting 1813 4to): — *Ueber den neutestam. Kanon des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Berlin, 1816, 8vo): — *Grundriss d. neutestam. Hermeneutik u. ihrer Gesch.* (Götting. 1817, 8ro): — *Commentar. 2 d. Schriften d. l'Evangelisten Johannes* (Bonn, 1820-32, 4 volumes, 8vo; 3d edit. 1843-56: transl. into English under the title *Commentary on the Epistles of St. Johns*, Edinb. 1837, 12mo): — *Quaestiones ac vindiciae Didymianie* (Göttingen, 1829, 4 parts, 4to). He also took part with De Wette and Schleiermacher in the publication of the *Theologische Zeitschrift* (Berlin, 1819-22, 3 parts, 8vo), and with Gieseler in that of the *Zeitschrift für gebildete Christen* (Elberfeld, 1823 and 1824, 4 parts, 8vo). He also contributed some valuable articles to the *Theolog. Studien u. Kritiken*. Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 32:165; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:569; Herzog, *Real-Encyklops.*

8:525 sq.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:1879; Kitto, *Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit.* 2:860.

Luckenbach, Abraham

a Maoravian missionary among the Delaware tribe of the North American Indians, was born in Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, May 5, 1777; entered Nazareth Hall, a boy's boarding-school at Nazareth, Pennsylvania; taught there in 1797, and in 1800 became a missionary, "and labored as such with great faithfulness at various stations for forty-three years, when he retired to Bethlehem, where he died, March 8, 1854." Luckenbach edited the second edition of Zeisberger's Delaware Hymn-book, and published in the Delaware language Select O.-T. Scripture Narratives. See De Schweinitz, *Life and Times of David Zeisberger*, page 659.

Luckey, Samuel, D.D.,

a noted minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Rensselaerville, Albany County, N.Y., April 4, 1791; entered the ministry in 1811, at Ottawa, Lower Canada; from 1812-16, inclusive, labored at Dutchess, Montgomery, Saratoga, and Pittstown, and in 1817-18 in the city of Troy. In 1819 he was at Rhinebeck and in 1820-21 at Shenectadys, where he received from Union College the degrees of master of arts and of doctor of divinity. The next ten years of his life were spent at New Haven, Brooklyn, Albany, and as presiding elder on the New Haven District. In 1822 he became principal of the Genesee Wesleyan Seminary at Lima, N.Y., where he remained four years. At the General Conference of 1836 he was a delegate, and was elected editor of *The Christian Advocate and Journal* at New York. At that time the office involved the senior editorship of the Book Room. After an honorable service of four years he returned to the itinerancy, first for a time at Duane Street, New York, and in 1842 was again transferred to the Genesee Conference. From this time to the day of his death (October 11, 1869) he remained in Western New York, residing mostly in Rochester City, but filling the offices of presiding elder, pastor, and chaplain of the Monroe County Penitentiary, in which latter position he served for nine years, bestowing great labor on the reclamation of the fallen. Dr. Luckey had also the honor to be appointed in 1847 one of the regents of the State University. He wrote an excellent treatise on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, a work on the Trinity (a respectable 12mo volume, which gained for him a wide repute for theological acumen and

polemic tact), and a small volume of *Ethic Hymns and Scriptural Lessons for Children*. The hymns, which are original and not without merit, are rhythmical paraphrases of Scripture, mostly of the Psalms. "Dr. Luckey was a man of no ordinary power of intellect. For depth of penetration and soundness of judgment he had few superiors. His knowledge of the forms and principles of law, both civil and ecclesiastical, was quite extensive. He was a thorough Methodist, and with the genius and historic development of his Church he was as familiar as with the alphabet. He long stood among the magnates of his people, and his history is woven in the history of his Church." See *Conf. Minutes*, 1870, page 280 sq.

Lucopetrians

is the name given to a sect of fanatics and ascetics who believed in a double Trinity, rejected marriage, scorned all external forms of worship, and adopted absurdly allegorical interpretations of Scripture. They were believed to have had as their founder an ecclesiastic by the name of Lucopetrus, but the probability is that Lucopetrus is a nickname, and it is said to have been given to a person called Peter, who promised to appear on the third day after his death, and who was called Wolf-Peter or Lucopetrus afterwards, because the devil on that day appeared to his followers in the shape of a wolf. *SEE BOGOMILES; SEE MESSALIANS.*

Lucretius, Titus Carus

a noted Roman poet, deserves a place here as the exponent of Epicurianism. He flourished some time towards the opening of the 1st century, but of his life we know almost nothing with certainty, as he is mentioned merely in a cursory manner in contemporary literature. St. Jerome, in his translation of the Chronicle of Eusebius, gives the date of his birth as B.C. 95 (according to others, 99), but he does not specify the source from which his statement is derived. It is alleged, further, that he died by his own hand, in the 44th year of his age, having been driven frantic by a love-potion which had been administered to him; that he composed his works in the intervals of his madness, and that these works were revised by Cicero; but all these statements rest on very insufficient authority, and must be received with extreme caution. His peculiar opinions rendered him specially obnoxious to the early Christians, and it is possible that the latter may have been too easily led to attribute to him a fate which, in its mysterious nature and melancholy termination, was deemed but a due

reward for the bold and impious character of his teachings. The great work on which his fame rests is *De Rerum Natura*, a philosophical didactic poem in six books (editio princeps, Brescia, about 1473; best editions by Wakefield [London, 1796, 3 volumes, 4to, and Glasgow, 1813s 4 volumes, 8vol, by Forbiger [Leips. 1828, 12mo], and by Lachmann [Berlin, 1850, 2 volumes]. English translations in verse by Creech [Lond. 1714, 2 volumes, 8vo], Good [Lond. 1805-7, 2 volumes, 4to]; in prose by the Reverend J.S. Watson. M.A. [London, *Bohn's Classical Library*, 1851, post 8vo]) — in large measure an exposition of the physical, moral, and religious tenets of Epicurus. **SEE EPICURIAN PHILOSOPHY**. "Regarded merely as a literary composition, the work of Lucretius stands unrivaled among didactic poems. The clearness and fullness with which the most minute facts of physical science, and the most subtle philosophical speculations are unfolded and explained; the life and interest which are thrown into discussions, in themselves repulsive to the bulk of mankind; the beauty, richness, and variety of the episodes which are interwoven with the subject-matter of the poem, combined with the majestic verse in which the whole is clothed, render the *De Rerum Natura*, as a work of art, one of the most perfect which antiquity has bequeathed to us" (Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.). See Smith, *Dict. Class. Biog.* s.v.

Lud

(Heb. id. **דל**, derivation unknown; Sept. **Λουδ**, but in Ezekiel **Λυδοί**; Auth.Vers. "Lydia," in ^{<3015>}Ezekiel 30:5), the name apparently of two nations. **SEE ETHOLOGY**.

1. The fourth son of Shem (B.C. post 2513), and founder of a tribe near the Assyrians and Aramasans (^{<0102>}Genesis 10:22; ^{<3017>}1 Chronicles 1:17). According to Josephus (*Ant.* 1:6, 4), they were the Lydians; in which opinion agree Eustathius, Eusebius, Jerome, and Isidore, and among moderns Bochart (*Phaleg.* 2:12) and Gesenius. On the contrary, Michaelis (*Spicileg.* 2:11.4 sq.) reads **דwh**, and understands the Indians (see also his Supplement, No. 1416; comp. Vater, *Comment.* 1:130). Lud would thus be represented by the Lydus of the mythical period (Herod. 1:7). "The Shemitic character of the manners of the Ludim, and the strong Orientalism of the art of the Lydian kingdom during its latest period and after the Persian conquest, but before the predominance of Greek art in Asia Minor, favor this idea; but, on the other hand, the Egyptian monuments show us in the 13th, 14th. and 15th centuries B.C. a powerful people called RUTEN

or LUDEN, probably seated near Mesopotamia, and apparently north of Palestine. whom some, however, make the Assyrians. We may perhaps conjecture that the Lydians first established themselves near Palestine, and afterwards spread into Asia Minor; the occupiers of the old seat of the race being destroyed or removed by the Assyrians." With the latter supposition, compare the apocryphal statement in Judith 2:23. *SEE LYDIA.*

2. One of the Hamitic tribes descended from Mizraim (Ludim, ^{<0103>}Genesis 10:13), apparently a people of Africa (perhaps of Ethiopia), sprung from the Egyptians, and accustomed to fight with bows and arrows (^{<370>}Ezekiel 27:1C; 30:5; ^{<2609>}Isaiah 66:19, where they are associated with Cush and Phut; comp. the Ludim, ^{<2400>}Jeremiah 46:9, and the Phud and Lud of Judith 2:23). Some have referred the name to the people of Luday, on the western coast of Africa, south of Morocco (see Michaelis, *Spicileg.* 1:259 sq.; also Suppl. No. 1417); and combine with this the mention of a river Laud in Tangitania (Pliny, 2). Others, as Bochart (*Phaleg*, 4:56) and Gesenius (*Comment.* ad loc. Isa.), regard them as a branch of the Ethiopians. Hitzig (*Comment.* ad loc. Isaiah and Jeremiah) thinks that the Libyans are intended (by an interchange of letters), but Nulbiua appears to be rather indicated by the scriptural notices. Still more improbable is the supposition of Forster (*Ep. ad Michael.* page 13 sq.), that the inhabitants of the oases are intended, designated in Coptic by a term having some resemblance to Lud. The Arabic interpreters have Tanites; the Targum of Jonathan renders inhabitants of the nome of Neut. The opinion of Michaelis (Suppl. No. 1418), that by the Ludim the prophets meant the Lydians, has lately been re-enforced by Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* page 746) with the remark that the Egyptians and Tyrians employed soldiers from Asia Minor in their armies (Herod. 2:152, 154, 163; 3:1). But the Egyptians, at least, had also mercenary troops from Africa, and the Asiatics referred to were only from Ionia and Caria. Rosellini (*Monument. stor.* III, 1:321 sq.) speaks of a province of Ludin, but the locality is uncertain. *SEE LUDIM.*

Luddimilia, Elisabeth Von Schwarzburg Rudolfstadt

a noted female hymnist of Germany, was born April 7, 1640, and died March 12, 1672. She wrote 215 hymns, many of which are the pearls of German sacred song. They were published entire in 1687, under the title *Die Stimme der Freundin* (new edit. 1868). See her biography by Thilo (1856).

Lideke, Christoph Witheim

a German theologian, was born at Schonberg, Prussia, March 3, 1737. In 1758 he went to the Levant as a preacher of the Danish mission, and afterwards became pastor of the Lutheran Church, and director of their school at Smyrna. In 1768 he accepted a call to Magdeburg as pastor; in 1773 to Stockholm, as German preacher and inspector of the German Lyceum. He died June 18, 1805. He was an excellent scholar in many branches of theology, has done much for mission and education, and by his contributions to the literature on the Orient contributed largely to Bible geography. His *Expositio brevis locorum Sacrae Scripturae ad Orientem sese referentium*, etc., deserves special mention (Halse, 1777, 8vo). — Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Lüderwald, Johann Balthasar, D.D.,

a German theologian, was born at Fahrland, Prussia, September 27, 1722. He attended the University of Helmstidt, and, having finished the academical course, became in 1742 tutor; in 1747, pastor at Glentorf, near Helmstidt; afterwards superintendent and first pastor at Forsfelde, where he died, August 25, 1796. He is noted as a defender of the truth against Lessing after the publication of the Wolfenbüttel Fragments by the latter. His *Commentatio de vi argumetznti, quod licitur e silentio Scriptoris* (Guelpherbyti. 1745, 8vo), deserves special mention. He also wrote *Spicilegium observationum in praestantissimum Deborce epinicum*, Judic. 5:4 (ibid. 1772, 4to). — Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Ludgardis

(LUDGARIS, or LUTGARDIS), a celebrated thaumaturgist of the 12th century, was born about 1182. At the early age of twelve she entered the Benedictine convent of St. Trudo, and soon gave evidence of mystic tendencies. She claimed to have visions in which she held familiar converse with the Virgin Mary, the angels, John the Baptist and the apostles, St. Catharine, and a number of other saints. Once she stated she had seen St. John the evangelist in the form of a shining eagle, who, opening her mouth with his beak, filled her with divine wisdom. But Christ himself was generally the object of her ecstatic visions. After taking the veil in 1200, she was in 1205 appointed abbess of the convent. In 1206, by advice of John de Lirot and of St. Christine, she entered the convent of the

Cistercians of Aquiric, near Brussels. Here her visions became still more striking and numerous: in her meditations on the sufferings of Christ her body became covered with blood, etc. She was also said to have worked a great number of miracles. She died June 16, 1246. Her biography was written by the Dominican Thomas Cantipratanus. See Alban Stolz, *Legenden* (Freib. 1856), volumr 2:1. c. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:511.

Ludicke, Johann August

a German theologian, was born at Cothen September 15, 1737, and was educated at the Universities of Halle and Frankfort-on-the-Oder. In 1759 he became tutor; in 1762, subrector of the German Reformed town-school of his native place; in 1776, pastor at Gnetsch, where he remained until 1813. He died at Cothen July 9, 1821. For a list of his works, see Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Lu'dim

(Heb. *Ludim'*, **לודים**, Sept. **Λωδιείμ**; in 1 Chronicles **לודים**, **Λωδιείμ** in Jer. **לודים**, A.V. "Lydians"), a Mizraitish or Egyptian people or tribe (**לודים** Genesis 10:13; **לודים** 1 Chronicles 1:11; **לודים** Jeremiah 46:9), probably the same with LUD, No. 2. From their position at the head of the list of the Mizraitites, it is probable that the Ludim were settled to the west of Egypt, perhaps further than any other race of the same stock. Isaiah mentions "Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow (**לודים**) Tubal, and Javan, the isles afar off" (66:19). Here the expression in the plural, "that draw the bow" (Vulg. (tendentes sagitam), may refer only to Lud, and therefore not connect it with one or both of the names preceding. A comparison with the other three passages, in all which Phut is mentioned immediately before or after Lud or the Ludim, goes to confirm the Sept. reading, Phut, **פוט**, for Pul, a word not occurring in any other passage, as the true one; and we also notice as coincident the extraordinary change from **לודים** to **מוסוך**. *SEE PUL; SEE MESECH*. Jeremiah, in speaking of Pharaoh Necho's army, makes mention of "Cush and Phut that handle the buckler, and the Ludim that handle [and] bend the bow" (46:9). Here the Ludim are associated with African nations as mercenaries or auxiliaries of the king of Egypt, and therefore it would seem probable, *primd facie*, that the Mizraitish Ludim are intended. Ezekiel, in the description of Tyre, speaks thus of Lud: "Persia, and Lud, and Phut were in thine army, thy men of war: buckler (**לודים**) and helmet hung they up in thee; they set thine

adorning" (27:10). In this place Lud might seem to mean the Shemitic Lud, especially if the latter be connected with Lydia; but the association with Phut renders it as likely that the nation or country is that of the African Ludim. In the prophecy against Gog a similar passage occurs. "Persia, Cush, and Phut (A. Vers. "Libya") with them [the army of Gog]; all of them [with] buckler ($\hat{c}g\text{ea}$) and helmet" (38:5). It seems from this that there were Persian mercenaries at this time, the prophet perhaps, if speaking of a remote future period, using their name and that of other well-known mercenaries in a general sense. The association of Persia and Lud in the former passage therefore loses somewhat of its weight. In one of the prophecies against Egypt Lud is thus mentioned among the supports of that country: "And the sword shall come upon Mizraim, and great pain shall be in Cush, at the falling of the slain in Mizraim, and they shall take away her multitude (Hn/mv), and her foundations shall be broken down. Cush, and Phut, and Lud, and all the mingled people ($br\text{ }[$), and Chub, and the children of the land of the covenant, shall fall by the sword with them" (30:4, 5). Here Lud is associated with Cush and Phut, as though an African nation. The Ereb, whom we have called "mingled people" rather than "strangers," appear to have been an Arab population of the Sinaitic peninsula, perhaps including Arab or half-Arab tribes of the Egyptian desert to the east of the Nile. Chub is a name nowhere, else occurring, which perhaps should be read Lub, for the country or nation of the Lubim. *SEE CHUB; SEE LUBIM.* The "children of the land of the covenant" maybe some league of tribes, as probably were the Nine-Bows of the Egyptian inscriptions; or the expressions may mean nations or tribes allied with Egypt, as though a general designation for the rest of its supporters besides those specified. It is noticeable that in this passage, although Lud is placed among the close allies or supporters of Egypt, yet it follows African nations, and is followed by a nation or tribe at least partly inhabiting Asia, although possibly also partly inhabiting Africa. *SEE EGYPT.*

There can be no doubt that but one nation is intended, in these passages, and it seems that thus far the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the Mizraïtish Ludim. There are no indications in the Bible known to be positive of mercenary or allied troops in the Egyptian armies, except of Africans, and perhaps of tribes bordering: Egypt on the east. We have still to inquire how the evidence of the Egyptian monuments and of profane history may affect our supposition. From the former we learn that several foreign nations contributed allies. or mercenaries to the Egyptian armies.

Among them, we identify the Reicu with the Lubim, and the SHARYATANA with the Cherethim, who also served in David's army. The latter were probably from the coast of Palestine, although they may have been drawn in the case of the Egyptian army from an insular portion of the, same people. The rest of these foreign troops seem to have been of African nations, but this is not certain. The evidence of the monuments reaches no lower than the time of the Bubastite line. There is a single foreign contemporary inscribed record on one of the colossi of the temple of Abu-Simbel in Nubia, noting the passage of Greek mercenaries of a Psammetichus, probably the first (Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, 2:329). From the Greek writers, who give us information from the time of Psammetichus downwards, we learn that Ionian, Carian, and other Greek mercenaries formed an important element in the Egyptian army in all times when the country was independent, from the reign of that king until the final conquest by Ochus. These mercenaries were even settled in Egypt by Psammetichus. There does not seem to be any mention of them in the Bible, excepting they be instructed by Lud and the Ludim in the passages that have been considered. It must be recollected that it is reasonable to connect the Shemitic Lud with the Lydians, and that at the time of the prophets by whom Lud and the Ludim are mentioned the Lydian on kingdom generally or always included the more western part of Asia Minor, so that the Lud and Ludim might well apply to the Ionian and Carian mercenaries drawn from this territory. *SEE LUD.*

The manner in which these foreign troops in the Egyptian army are characterized is perfectly in accordance with the evidence of the monuments, which, although about six centuries earlier than the prophet's time, no doubt represent the same condition of military matters. The only people of Africa beyond Egypt portrayed on the monuments whom we can consider as most probably of the same stock as the Egyptians are the REBU, who are the Lubim of the Bible, almost certainly the same as the Mizraitish Lehabim (q.v.); therefore we may take to REBU as probably illustrating the Ludim, supposing the latter to be Mizraitites, in which case they may indeed be included under the same name as the Lubim, if the appellation REBU be wider than the Lubim of the Bible, and also as illustrating Cush and Phut. The last two are spoken of as handling the buckler. The Egyptians are generally represented with small shields, frequently round; the REBU with small round shields, for which the term here used, ḡꜥ; the small shield, and the expression "that handle," are

perfectly appropriate. That the Ludim should have been archers, and apparently armed with a long bow that was strung with the aid of the foot by treading (**tvq,ykeD**) is noteworthy, since the Africans were always famous for their archery. The REBU. and one other of the foreign nations that served in the Egyptian army the monuments show the former only as enemies were bowmen, being armed with a bow of moderate length; the other mercenaries of whom we can only identify the Philistine Cherethim, though they probably include certain of the mercenaries or auxiliaries mentioned in the Bible-carrying swords and javelins, but not bows. These points of agreement, founded on our examination of the monuments, are of no little weight, as showing the accuracy of the Bible. *SEE SHIELD.*

Lüdke, Friedrich Germanus

a German theologian, was born at Stendal, Prussia, April 10, 1730. He began his academical course very young, upon its completion, became pastor of the Nicolai Church at Berlin, which office he held until his death, March 8, 1792. He was looked upon by his contemporaries as a man of an independent, decided, and philosophical mind, and ably defended the Christian truths. He was also an earnest advocate of tolerance, and wrote "About Tolerance and Freedom of Conscience." — Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.

Ludlow, John

D.D., LL.D., a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Acquackanonck, now Passaic, N.J., December 13, 1793; graduated at Union College, 1814, and at the Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N.J., 1817. His first settlement was in the First Reformed (Dutch) Church of New Brunswick, 1817; in 1819 he was elected professor in the theological seminary at that place; in 1823 he became pastor of the First Reformed (Dutch) Church in Albany, where he sustained himself with great power as a preacher, pastor, and public man. In 1834 he was made provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and retained that position with distinguished ability until 1852, when he returned to New Brunswick as professor of ecclesiastical history and Church government in the theological seminary, and also as professor of mental philosophy in Rutgers College. He died in 1857, in the full assurance of hope and of faith. In every respect Dr. Ludlow was "a mighty man," physically, mentally, spiritually; as a theologian, a preacher, and a leader of men. He was full of power. His intellect was like his bodily

frame, massive, compact, and vigorous. His will and his emotional nature were equally strong. His spirit and labors in the pulpit, in the professor's chair, at the head of the university, and in public bodies, were always direct, well ordered, and indomitable. "He adorned every relation that he sustained, and was one of the very finest specimens of intellectual and moral nobility." — Sprague, *Annals*; Memorial Sermons by Drs. George W. Bethune, Isaac Ferris, and W.J.R. Taylor; Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Church*; N.Y. Observer (1866); American College Presidents, 43. (W.J.R.T.)

Ludlow, Peter

a Baptist minister, was born in Enfield, Connecticut, August 8, 1797, of Presbyterian parentage. He was for a time a member of Princeton College, N.J.; then began the study of law, but his religious convictions became so deep that he decided to become a minister. The distinguished Summerfield aided him in his theological studies. He joined the Baptist Church, received license, and was ordained September 2, 1823 pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Providence, R.I. His continued ill-health necessitated his acceptance of a call to the Baptist Church in Georgetown, S.C. He died in New York, May 6, 1837. Reverend Dr. Jackson, of Newport, says of him: "His talents were of a high order, and he was not less distinguished for his evangelical views than for his attractive and effective eloquence." See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 6:727 sq.

Ludolf, Job

a noted Ethiopic scholar. also a lawyer and statesman of distinguished merit, was born at Eirfurt, in Thuringia, in 1624. After finishing his education, he spent several years in traveling, and subsequently filled important stations in his native city, and under the elector palatine at Frankfort. He then devoted himself to the completion of his works, of which his Ethiopic History, and his commentaries on it, his AnSharic and Ethiopic Grammars, and Ethiopic Lexicon, are the most valuable, and have universally met with the highest esteem from the learned.

Ludolph, De Saxonia

was distinguished among the Dominican mystics of the 14th century. He entered the order about A.D. 1300, and in further pursuance of his pious devotion became a Carthusian at Strasburg. His *Vita Jesu Christi* has often

been edited and translated into various languages. He flourished in Saxony, but the date both of his birth and death are unknown.

Lüers, John H.

an American Roman Catholic prelate of great ability and note, was born at Lütten, in Oldenburg, Germany, September 29, 1819, came to this country in 1833, and, after a short service as clerk, entered St. Mary 's Theological Seminary at Cincinnati, Ohio, and was consecrated priest in 1846, and bishop of Fort Wayne in 1858. He deserves the commendation of all Christian people for his great zeal in behalf of educational facilities for the lower classes of his Church. He was especially active during his presidency over the diocese of Northern Indiana, where he built many churches and established schools. He died in Cleveland, Ohio, June 29, 1871.

Luft, Friedrich Matthäus

a German theologian, was born at Kirch-Rüsselbach, August 3, 1705. In 1723 he entered the University of Altlorf, where his uncle, G.G. Zelter, was then professor of theology and of the Oriental languages. In 1730, when Prof. Zelter resigned his professorship and became pastor at Poppenreut, Luft accompanied him, and was made vicar in 1732. In 1733 he became the first chaplain at Fürth, where he unexpectedly died, May 24, 1740. His death caused great grief, since his knowledge and unwearied diligence gave promise of future usefulness and eminence. He rendered great service in issuing the Bible-work of Prof. Zelter. He himself committed only a few minor productions to print, but among his papers valuable MSS. were found, intended as preparations for quite extensive labors. See Döring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* volume 2, s.v.

Lugo, Juan De

a learned Spanish Jesuit and cardinal, was born at Madrid, November 25, 1583, and for twenty years was theological professor at Rome; was made cardinal in 1643, and died August 20, 1660. In his office as cardinal he was distinguished for his plain manner of life and his liberality to the poor. He wrote *De Incarnatione dominica* (Lyons, 1633, fol.): — *De Sacramentis in genere* (1635, fol.): — *Responsorum Moralium* lib. 6 (1651, fol.), etc. All his works were collected in seven large folios (Venice, 1751). Pallavicini boasted of having been his pupil. Liguori names him as a theologian next to Thomas Aquinas.

Lugo's brother FRANCISCO was also a Jesuit, and the author of several theological works. They are of minor value, however. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 32:212.

Lu'hith

(Heb. *Ltuchith'*, תַּיִךְ ¹⁰ [always with the art. prefixed], prob. tableted [see below]; Sept. Λουειθ, but in Jeremiah [תַּיִךְ הַ] Ἀλαώθ v.r. Ἀλώθ), a Moabitish place (but whether a town or not is uncertain, as it is only found in the phrase "ascent of Luhith"), apparently situated on an eminence between Zoar and Horonaim, on the track of the invading Babylonians (²³¹⁵Isaiah 15:5; ²⁴⁸⁵Jeremiah 48:5). According to Eusebius, it lay between Areopolis and Zoar. M. de Saulcy thinks it may be identified with a site on the hill *Nouehin*, about half way up on the south side of the ravine leading north-easterly from the northern opening of the peninsula of the Dead Sea (*Narrative*, 1:386, 267, and map). The position is probably not far from correct (although not between Ar and Zoar), but no such name appears on Robinson's or Zimmermann's map: it does, however, on Van de Velde's.

Luthith, "as a Hebrew word, signifies 'made of boards or posts' (Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, page 748); but why assume that a Moabitish spot should have a Hebrew name? By the Syriac interpreters it is rendered 'paved with flagstones' (Eichhorn, *Allg. Bibliothek*, 1:845, 872). In the Targums (*Pseudojon.* and *Jerus.* on ⁴²¹⁶Numbers 21:16, and Jonathan on ²³⁵⁰Isaiah 15:1) Lechaiath is given as the equivalent of Ar-Moab. This may contain an allusion to Luchith, or it may point to the use of a term meaning 'jaw' for certain eminences, not only in the case of the Lehi of Samson, but also elsewhere. See Michaelis, *Suppl.* No. 1307; but, on the other hand, Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* col. 1134."

Luini

(or *Lovino*), BERNARDINO, a celebrated painter of the Lombard school, born about 1460 at Luini, near the Lago Maggiore, was the ablest pupil of Leonardo da Vinci and of Stefano Scotto. He imitated the style and execution of his master Leonardo da Vinci so closely as to deceive experienced judges and yet his general manner has a delicacy and grace sufficiently original and distinct from that of Leonardo. Many of Luini's best and greatest works, in oil and in fresco, are still in a good state of preservation, namely, the *Magdalen* and *St. John with the Lamb*, in the

Ambrosian Library at Milan; the *Enthroned Madonna*, painted in 1521, the *Drunkenness of Noah*, and other works in the gallery of the Brera at Milan; the frescoes of the Monastero Maggiore, or San Maurizio, in the same city, from which, however, the ultramarine and gold have been scraped off; several at Saronno, among them his chef-d'oeuvre, *Christ disputing with the Doctors*; and other extensive and equally good works in the Franciscan convent Degli Angeli at Lugano, on the lake of that name. The date of his death is not exactly known, but he was alive in 1530.

He had a brother, AMBROGIO, who imitated his style, and several sons who also were painters. See *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.

Luitprand Or Liudprand,

king of Lombardy (A.D. 712-744), was born towards the close of the 7th century. In 702 his father, Ansprand, a powerful Lombard lord, and an adherent of king Luitbert, having been defeated by the usurper Aribert II, retired to the Bavarian court. He was joined there by Luitprand, but the other members of his family, having fallen into the hands of Aribert, were put to death. In 712 Luitprand and his father succeeded in overthrowing Aribert, and Ansprand dying shortly after, Luitprand succeeded to the throne. His first care was to restore peace to his kingdom, suffering from internal dissensions. He enacted a series of laws in the years 712, 717, 720, 721, 723, 724, 2, which, with the Edict of Rotharis, form the principal basis of the Lombard law as it remained in force in Northern Italy until the 14th, and in the kingdom of Naples until the 16th century. Peace and prosperity once restored to his people, Luitprand eagerly sought for an opportunity for the aggrandizement of his dominions. He had his eye especially on Rome and the exarchate, and when the quarrel broke out between the pope and the emperor of Constantinople concerning image worship, Luitprand suddenly announced himself and his Lombards devout worshippers of images, and, under pretense of taking the pope's part, he seized the exarchate of Ravenna and several cities. But pope Gregory II, alarmed at the growing power of Lombardy, and the prospect that hereafter the papacy might be deplendt on the rule of a people looked upon as vile barbarians, *SEE LOMBARDS*, preferred to seek aid in other quarters not only for himself, but also for the exarchate, whose days seemed about to be numbered. He therefore enjoined upon the duke of Venetia to aid the exarch in retaking the provinces seized by Luitprand. Gregory at the same time persuaded the inhabitants of the duchies of Spolcto and Benevento to

throw off the Lombard yoke. Luitprand, however, matched the pope in cunning, for he no sooner learned the position of the pontiff than he turned to the side of the exarch, and, after having aided him in subduing his insurgent provinces, marched himself against Rome, with the intention of taking his revenge on the pope. The latter, however, succeeded in pacifying Luitprand, and the Lombard returned into his kingdom. In 736, being dangerously ill, he surrendered for a while his power to his nephew Hildebrand, whom the Lombards had elected his successor, but when he recovered his health he found himself obliged to divide his authority with Hildebrand. In 739 Luitprand overcame a league formed against him by pope Gregory III, and the dukes of Spoleto and Benevento and the exarch of Ravenna, and, to punish the incumbent of the apostolic see, he appeared before the gates of Rome. The pope, in his distress, called upon Charles Martel for assistance. Gregory's appeal is truly touching: "His tears are falling night and day for the destitute state of the Church. The Lombard king and his son are ravaging the last remains of the property of the Church, which no longer suffices for the daily service; they have invaded the territory of Rome, and seized all his farms. His only hope is in the timely succor of the Frankish king." Valuable presents accompanied this appeal—among them the mystic keys of the sepulcher of St. Peter, and filings of his chains, which no Christian could resist — also a proffer of the title of "Patrician and Consul of Rome" — yes, the deliverer of the Eternal City was to become even the patron of the Romish Church. Of course Martel answered favorably to such an invitation. Unfortunately, however, for the Romish cause, he died shortly after. But, even before Martel could have taken the field against Luitprand, the latter had been induced to withdraw his troops from Rome. A state of hostility, however, continued between the Lombards and the Romans until the death of Gregory III. The next pontiff (Zachary) finally succeeded, by a personal visit to Luitprand, in securing a treaty with the Lombards by which the latter restored to the Church all the possessions taken from it during the war. Luitprand thereafter seems to have been favorably inclined towards Zachary and the Church. He died in January 744. See Paul Diacre, *Historia Longobardorum*; Anastasius, *Vitae Pontif.*; Muratori, *Annales Script. Ital.*; Hofer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* volume 32; Reichel, *See of Rome in the Middle Ages*, page 54 sq.; Milman, *Hist. Lat. Christ.* 2:374 sq. (J.H.W.)

Luitprand Or Liutprand,

a distinguished Italian historian, is supposed to have been born at Pavia about A.D. 920, of a noble family very high in favor at the court of king Hughes. Luitprand received a very good education, and was at an early age appointed deacon of the cathedral of Pavia. He soon after became chancellor of king Berengar, by whom he was, about 946, sent on a mission to Byzantium. After his return in 950, he fell under the displeasure of the king and of queen Willa, and retired to the court of Otho I of Germany. He remained there eleven years, learned the language of the country, and became acquainted with all the most distinguished characters. In 958 he began, at the request of the bishop of Elvira, to write a history of his own age, and he continued this task until 962, when he returned to Otho in Italy. He was now at once appointed bishop of Cremona, and was in 963 sent by Otho to pope John XII, ostensibly for the purpose of assuring the latter of the emperor's good will, but in reality to incite the Roman aristocracy against the pope. Shortly after, when the pope was accused before the Synod of Rome, Luitprand spoke against him in the name of the emperor. Two years afterwards Otho sent him again to Rome, together with the bishop of Spiers, to direct the pontifical election, a duty which he performed to the emperor's entire satisfaction. In 968 Luitprand went to Constantinople to negotiate a marriage between princess Theophania and the son of Otho, but herein he failed. In 971 he was sent, with some others, to renew negotiations for the same object, Nicephorus being dead; but he died himself soon after, in the early part of 972. His works, which are of great value for the history of those times, are *Antapodosis*, begun at Frankfort-on-the-Maine in 958, concluded in Italy in 962, a historical work, in which he seeks to revenge himself for the wrongs he had suffered, especially from Berengar and Willa: — *Liber de rebus gestis Ottonis Magni imperatoris*, an account of events from 960 to 964, which is the more valuable from the fact that Luitprand was an eyewitness and often an actor in all the occurrences he relates: — *Relatio de legatione Constantinopolitana* of 968, very important for the information it contains on events and customs, and the best written of Luitprand's works. The *Antapodosis* and *Historia Ottonis*, of which the original MS., partly in Luitprand's own handwriting, is preserved in the library of Munich, were published at Antwerp (1640, fol.), and in several historical works of the Middle Ages, as in those of Reuber and Du Chesne, and in the *Scriptores* of Muratori, volume 2. The best edition of Luitprand's works is contained

in Pertz, *Monumenta*, volume 3, who has also published them separately. A German translation of the *Antapodosis* was published by the baron of Osten-Sacken (Berlin, 1853), with an Introduction by Wattenbach. See Kopke, *De Vitas et Scriptis Luitprandi* (Berl. 1842, 8vo); Pertz, *Afonum.* 3:264; Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* (2d ed. Berl. 1866), page 209; Contzen, *Geschichtschreiber d. sachsichen Kaiserzeit*, etc. (Regensb. 1837); Giesebrecht, *Kaiserzeit*, 1:740, 742 sq.; Donniges, *Otto I*, page 199 sq.; Niebuhr, *SS. Byz.* volume 11; Martini, *U. d. Geschichtschreiber Liudprand*, in *Denkschrift. d. Kon. Akad. d. Wissensch.* of Munich, 1809, 1810; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:219; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:442; Baxmann, *Politik der Papste*, volume 2 (see Index).

Luke

the evangelist, and author of the Acts of the Apostles. Although himself not an apostle, he has admirably supplemented their labors by his pen, and has thus laid the literary world under lasting obligation.

I. His Name. — This, in the Greek form, Λουκᾶς, is abbreviated from Λουκανός, the Graecized representative of the Latin Lucanues, or Λουκιλιός, *Lucilius* (comp. *Silas* for *Silvanus*; *Annas* for *Annanus*; *Zenas* for *Zenodorus*: Winer, *Gram.* page 115). The contraction of ανός into ᾶς is said to be characteristic of the names of slaves (see Lobeck, *De Substantiv. in ᾶς exeuntibus*, in Wolf, *Analect.* 3:49), and it has been inferred from this that Luke was of heathen descent (which may also be gathered from the implied contrast between those mentioned ^{<S1012>}Colossians 4:12-14, and the οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, verse 11), and a libertus, or freedman. This latter idea has found confirmation in his profession of a physician (^{<S1014>}Colossians 4:14), the practice of medicine among the Romans having been in great measure confined to persons of servile rank (Middleton, *De Medicorum apud Roman. degent. Conditione*). To this, however, there were many exceptions (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Medicus), and it is altogether an insufficient basis on which to erect a theory as to the evangelist's social rank. So much, however, we may probably safely infer from his profession, that he was a man of superior education and mental culture to the generality of the apostles, the fishermen and tax-gatherers of the Sea of Galilee.

II. Scripture History. — All that can be with certainty known of Luke must be gathered from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul. The result is but scanty. He was not born a Jew, for he is not reckoned among them "of the circumcision" by Paul (comp. ^{<5104>}Colossians 4:11 with verse 14). If this be not thought conclusive, nothing can be argued from the Greek idioms in his style, for he might be a Hellenistic Jew, nor from the Gentile tendency of his Gospel, for this it would share with the inspired writings of Paul, a Pharisee brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. The date of his conversion is uncertain. He was not, indeed, "an eyewitness and minister of the Word from the beginning" (^{<4100>}Luke 1:2), or he would have rested his claim as an evangelist upon that ground. His name does not once occur in the Acts, and we can only infer his presence or absence from the sudden changes from the third to the first person, and vice versa, of which phenomenon, notwithstanding all that has of late been urged against it, this, which has been accepted since the time of Irenaeus (*Contr. Haer.* 3:14), is the only satisfactory explanation. Rejecting the reading **συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν**, ^{<4112>}Acts 11:28 (which only rests on D. and Augustine, *De Serm. Dom.* 2:17), which would bring Luke into connection with Paul at a much earlier period, as well as the identification of the evangelist with Lucius of Cyrene (^{<4110>}Acts 13:1: ^{<5102>}Romans 16:21), which was current in Origen's time (ad ^{<5103>}Romans 16:39; see Lardner, *Credibility*, 6:124; Marsh, *Michaelis*, 4:234), and would make him a kinsman of Paul, we first find Luke in Paul's company at Troas, and sailing with him to Macedonia (^{<4160>}Acts 16:10, 11). A.D. 48. Of his previous history, and the time and manner of his conversion, we know nothing, but Ewald's supposition (*Gesch. d. v. Isr.* 6:35, 448) is not at all improbable, that he was a physician residing in Troas, converted by Paul, and attaching himself to the apostle with all the ardor of a young convert. He may also, as Ewald thinks, have been one of the first uncircumcised Christians. His conversion had taken place before, since he silently assumes his place among the great apostle's followers without any hint that this was his first admission to the knowledge and ministry of Christ. He may have found his way to Troas to preach the Gospel, sent possibly by Paul himself. There are some who maintain that Luke had already joined Paul at Antioch (^{<4117>}Acts 11:27-30; see *Journal of Sacred Literature*, October 1861, page 170, and Conybeare and Howson's *Life of Paul*, chapter 5, new ed. Lond. 1861). He accompanied Paul as far as Philippi, but did not share in the imprisonment of his master and his companion Silas, nor, as the third person is resumed (^{<4170>}Acts 17:1), did he, it would seem, take any further part in the apostle's

missionary journey. The first person appears again on Paul's third visit to Philippi, A.D. 54 (^{401b}Acts 20:5, 6), from which it has been gathered that Luke had spent the whole intervening time — a period of seven or eight years — in Philippi or its neighborhood. If any credit is to be given to the ancient opinion that Luke is referred to in ^{408b}2 Corinthians 8:18 as "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches" (a view adopted by the Church of England in the collect for Luke's day), as well as the early tradition embodied in the subscription to that epistle, that it was sent from Philippi "by Titus and Lucas," we shall have evidence of the evangelist's missionary zeal during this long space of time. If this be so, we are to suppose that during the "three months" of Paul's sojourn at Philippi (^{401b}Acts 20:3) Luke was sent from that place to Corinth and this errand, the word "gospel" being, of course, to be understood, not, as Jerome and others erroneously interpret it, of Luke's written gospel, but of his publication of the glad tidings of Jesus Christ. The mistaken interpretation of the word "gospel" in this place has thus led some to assign the composition of the Gospel of Luke to this period, a view which derives some support from the Arabic version published by Erpenius. in which its writing is placed " in a city of Macedonia twenty-two years after the Ascension," A.D. 51. From their reunion at Philippi, Luke remained in constant attendance on Paul during his journey to Jerusalem (^{401b}Acts 20:6-21:18), and, disappearing from the narrative during the apostle's imprisonment at Jerusalem and Csesarea, reappears again when he sets out for Rome (^{420b}Acts 27:1). A.D. 56. He was shipwrecked with Paul (28:2), and traveled with him by Syracuse and Puteoli to Rome (verses 12-16), where he appears to have continued as his fellow-laborer (**συνεργός**, ^{502a}Philemon 1:24; ^{500a}Colossians 4:4) till the close of his first imprisonment, A.D. 58. The Second Epistle to Timothy (4:11) gives us the latest glimpse of the "beloved physician," and our authentic information regarding him beautifully closes with a testimony from the apostle's pen to his faithfulness amidst general defection, A.D. 64.

III. Traditionary Notices. — The above sums up all we really know about Luke; but, as is often the case, in proportion to the scantiness of authentic information is the copiousness of tradition, increasing in definiteness, be it remarked, as it advances. His Gentile descent being taken for granted, his birthplace was appropriately enough fixed at Antioch, "the center of the Gentile Church, and the birthplace of the Christian name" (Eusebius, *H.E.* 3:4; comp. Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.* 7; *In Matt.* Praef.), though it is to be

observed that Chrysostom, when dwelling on the historical associations of the city, appears to know nothing of such a tradition. He was believed to have been a Jewish proselyte, ignorant of Hebrew (Jerome, *Quaest. in Genesis* c. 46), and probably because he alone mentions their mission, but in contradiction to his own words (^{<40123>}Luke 1:23) — one of the seventy disciples who, having left our Lord in offense (^{<41111>}John 6:60-66), was brought back to the faith by the ministry of Paul (*Epiphan. Haer.* 51:11); one of the Greeks who desired to "see Jesus" (^{<41212>}John 12:20, 21), and the companion of Cleopas on the journey to Emmaus (*Theophyl. Proem in Luc.*). An idle legend of Greek origin, which first appears in the late and credulous historian Nicephorus Callisus (died 1450), *Hist. Eccl.* 2:43. and was universally accepted in the Middle Ages, represents Luke as well acquainted with the art of painting (**ἄκρως τὴν ζωγράφου τέχνην ἐξέπιστάμενος**), and assigns to his hand the first portraits of our Lord, his mother, and his chief apostles (see the monographs of Manni [Florent. 1764] and Schlichter [Hal. 1734]).

Nothing is known of the place or manner of his death, and the traditions are inconsistent with one another. Gregory Naz. reckons him among the martyrs, and the untrustworthy Nicephorus gives us full details of the time, place, and mode of his martyrdom, viz., that he was crucified to a live olive-tree in Greece, in his eightieth year. According to others, he died a natural death after preaching (according to Epiphanius, *Contra Haer.* 51:11) in Dalmatia, Gallia, Italy, and Macedonia; was buried in Bithynia, whence his bones were translated by Constantius to Constantinople (*Isid. Hispal.* c. 82; *Philostorgius* volume 3, chapter 29). See generally Koöhler, *Dissert. de Luca Ev.* (Lipsiae, 1695); Credner, *Einleit. ins N.T.* 1:124.

Luke, Gospel According To,

the third in order of the canonical books of the New Testament,

I. Author — Genuineness. — The universal tradition of Christendom, reaching up at least to the latter part of the 2d century, has assigned the third member of our Gospel collection to Luke, Paul's trusted companion and fellow-laborer, **συνεργός**, who alone continued in attendance on his beloved master in his last imprisonment (^{<5044>}Colossians 4:14; ^{<5024>}Philemon 1:24; ^{<5041>}2 Timothy 4:11). Its authorship has never been questioned until comparatively recent times, when the unsparing criticism of Germany — the main object of which appears to be the demolishing of every ancient

belief to set up some new hypothesis in its stead — has been brought to bear upon it, without, however, effectually disturbing the old traditional statement. The investigations of Semler, Hilgenfeld, Ritschl, Baur, Schleiermacher, Ewald, and others, have failed to overthrow the harmonious assertion of the early Church that the third Gospel, as we have it, is the genuine work of Luke. It is well known that, though the "Gospels" are referred to by Justin Martyr as a collection already used and accepted by the Church (*Apol.* 1:66; *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 10). and his works supply a very considerable number of quotations, enabling us to identify, beyond all reasonable doubt, these εὐαγγέλια with the first three Gospels, we do not find them mentioned by the names of their authors till the end of the 2d century. In the Muratorian fragment, which can hardly be placed later than A.D. 170, we read, "Tertium Evangelii librum secundum Lucam Lucas iste medicus post ascensum Christi cum eum Paulus quasi ut juris (τοῦ δικαίου) studiosum [itineris socium, Bunsen] secum adsumsisset nomine suo ex ordine [opinionem, Credner] conscripsit (Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne), et idem prout assequi potuit, ita et a nativitate Johannis incepit dicere" (Westcott, *Hist. of Can.*, page 559). The testimony of Irenaeus, A.D. cir. 180, is equally definite, Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο (*Contra Haer.* 3:1, 1), while from his enumeration of the many particulars, *pluria evangelii* (ib. 3:14, 3), recorded by Luke alone, it is evident that the Gospel he had was the same we now possess. Tatian's *Diatessaron* is an unimpeachable evidence of the existence of four Gospels, and therefore of that by Luke, at a somewhat earlier period in the same century. The writings of Tertullian against Marcion, cir. 207, abound with references to our Gospel, which, with Irenaeus, he asserts to have been written under the immediate guidance of Paul (*Ach. Marc.* 4:2; 4:5). In Eusebius we find both the Gospel and the Acts specified as θεόπνευστα βιβλία, while Luke's knowledge of the sacred narrative is ascribed to information received from Paul, aided by his intercourse with the other apostles (τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ἀποστόλων ὁμιλίας ὠφελημένος, *H.E.* 3:4 and 24). Eusebius, indeed, tells us that in his day the erroneous view which interpreted εὐαγγέλιον (Romans 2:16; comp. 2 Corinthians 8:18) of a written document was generally received, and that, in the words "according to my Gospel," Paul was supposed to refer to the work of the evangelist. This is also mentioned by Jerome (*De Vir. Illust.* 7), and accepted by Origen (Eusebius, *H.E.* 6:25) — one among many proofs of the want of the critical faculty among the fathers of that age.

Additional evidence of the early acceptance of Luke's Gospel may be derived from the *gnaestio vexata* of its relation to the Gospel of Marcion. This is not the place to discuss this subject, which has led critics to the most opposite conclusions, for a full account of which the reader may be referred to De Wette, *Einleit. in N.T.* pages 119-137, as well as to the treatises of Ritschl, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Hahn, and Volckmar. It will be enough for our purpose to mention that the Gnostic teacher Marcion, in pursuit of his professed object of restoring the purity of the Gospel, which had been corrupted by Judaizing teachers, rejected all the books of the canon with the exception of ten epistles of Paul and a gospel, which he called simply a gospel of Christ. We have the express testimony of Irenaeus (*Conr. Icaer.* 1:27, 2; 3:12,12, etc.), Tertullian (*Cont. Marc.* 4:1, 2, 6), Origen (*Colit. Cels.* 2:27), and Epiphanius (*Illusr.* 42:11) that the basis of Marcion's Gospel was that of Luke, abridged and altered by him to suit his peculiar tenets (for the alterations and omissions, the chief being its curtailment by the first two chapters, see De Wette, pages 123-132), though we cannot assert, as was done by his enemies among the orthodox, that all the variations are due to Marcion himself, many of them having no connection with his heretical views, and being, rather, various readings of great antiquity and high importance. Of late years, however, the opposite view, which was first broached by Semler, Griesbach, and Eichhorn, has been vigorously maintained, among others, by Ritschl and Baur, who have endeavored to prove that the Gospel of Luke, as we have it, is interpolated, and that the portions Marcion is charged with having omitted were really unauthorized additions to the original document. See Bleek, *Einl. in das N.T.* § 52. Volckmar, in his exhaustive treatise *Das Evansn. Marcions* (Lips. 1852), has satisfactorily disposed of this theory, and has demonstrated that the Gospel of Luke, as we now have it, was the material on which Marcion worked, and, therefore, that before he began to teach, the date of which may be fixed about A.D. 139, it was already known to and accepted by the Church. Zeller and Ritschl have since abandoned their position (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1851, pages 337, 528), and Baur has greatly modified his (*Isl-Markusevangel.* 1851, pages 191). See also Hahn, *Das Evangelium Marcions* (Konigsb. 1823); Olshausen, *Echtheit der vier Kanon. Ecanzyelien* (Kinignsb. 1823); Ritschl, *Das Evangeliumm Marcions* (Tubing. 1846); Baur, *Krit. Untersuchung über d. Kan. Evangelien* (Stubing. 1847); Hilgenfeld, *Krit. Untersuchunzenz* (Halle, 1850); bishop Thirlwall's *Introduction to Schleierunacher on St. Luke*; De

Wette, *Lehrbuch d. N.T.* (Berl. 1848); Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels* (Bost. 1844), 3, add. note C, page 49.

II. Sources. — The authorities from which Luke derived his Gospel are clearly indicated by him in the introduction (~~<ΕΥΧΕΙ>~~ Luke 1:1-4). He does not claim to have been an eye-witness of our Lord's ministry, or to have any personal knowledge of the facts he records, but, as an honest compiler, to have gone to the best sources of information then accessible, and, having accurately traced the whole course of the apostolic tradition from the very first, in its every detail (*παρηκολυθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς*), to have written an orderly narrative of the facts (*πραγμάτων*) already fully believed (*πεπληροφορημένων*) in the Christian Church, and which Theophilus had already learned, not from books, but from oral teaching *κατηχήθης*; comp. ~~<ΑΙΣΤ>~~ Acts 18:25; ~~<ΚΟΙΝ>~~ Galatians 6:5). These sources were partly the "oral tradition" (*παρέδοσαν*) of those "who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word," and partly the written records (to which Ewald, 6:40, on unexplained grounds, dogmatically assigns a non-Judaean origin) which even then "many" (*πολλοί*) had attempted to draw up, of which, though the evangelist's words do not necessarily bear that meaning, we may well suppose that he would avail himself. Though we thankfully believe that, as well in the selection of his materials as in the employment of them, Luke was acting under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, it will be remarked that he lays claim to no such supernatural guidance, but simply to the care and accuracy of an honest, painstaking, and well-informed editor, not so consciously under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as to supersede the use of his own mental powers. His use of his authorities is not mechanical; though often incorporating, apparently with little alteration, large portions of the oral tradition, especially in the case of the words of our Lord, or those with whom he conversed, and adopting narratives already current (of which the first two chapters, with their harsh Hebraistic phraseology, immediately succeeding the comparatively pure Greek of the dedication, are an example), the free handling of his pen is everywhere to be recognized. The connecting links and the passages of transition evidence the hand of the author, which may again be recognized in the greater variety of his style, the more complex character of his sentences, and the care he bestows in smoothing away harshnesses, and imparting a more classical air to the synoptical portions.

Notwithstanding the almost unanimous consent of the fathers as to the Pauline origin of Luke's Gospel (*Tertull. adv. Marc.* 4:5, "Lucre digestum Paulo adscribere solent;" Irenaeus, *Cont. Haer.* 3:1; Origen apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6:25; Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 3:4; Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.* 7), there is little or nothing in the gospel itself to favor such a hypothesis, and very much to contradict it. It is true that the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, ^{<412>}1 Corinthians 11:23-25, displays an almost verbal identity with ^{<427>}Luke 22:19, 20; and, as Paul affirms that he received his "from the Lord," it is highly probable that the evangelist has in this instance incorporated a fragment of the direct teaching of his master. But this is a solitary example (^{<426>}Luke 24:34, comp. with ^{<435>}1 Corinthians 15:5, is too trifling to deserve mention), and it is impossible that the evangelist should have expressed himself as he has done in his preface if he had derived the facts of his narrative from one who was neither "an eye-witness" nor "a minister of the Word from the beginning." Nor again in the general tone and character of the gospel, when impartially viewed, is there much that can fairly be considered as bearing out the hypothesis of a Pauline origin. Those who have sifted the gospel with this object have, it is true, gathered a number of passages which are supposed to have a Pauline tendency (see Hilgenfeld, *Evang.*, and the ingenious essay prefixed to this gospel in Dr. Wordsworth's *Greek Testament*), e.g. ^{<425>}Luke 4:25 sq.; 9:52 sq.; 10:30 sq.; 17:16-18; and the parables of the prodigal son, the unprofitable servant, and the Pharisee and publican, which have been instanced by De Wette as bringing out the apostle's teaching on justification by faith alone; but, as dean Alford has ably shown (*Greek Test.* 1:44, note b), such a list may easily be collected from the other gospels, while the entire absence of any definite statement of the doctrinal truths which come forward with the greatest prominence in the apostle's writings, and, with very scanty exceptions, of his peculiar theological phraseology, is of itself sufficient to prove how undue has been the weight assigned to Pauline influence in the composition of the gospel. It is certainly true that, in the words of bishop Thirlwall (*Schleiermacher On St. Luke*, Introd. page 128), "Luke's Gospel contains numerous indications of that enlarged view of Christianity which gave to the gospel, as preached by Paul, a form and an extent very different from the original tradition of the Jews," but no more can be legitimately inferred than that Luke was Paul's disciple, instructed by the apostle of the Gentiles, and naturally sharing in his view of the gospel as a message of salvation for all nations; not that his gospel was in any sense derived from him, or rested on the apostolic basis of Paul.

The question naturally arises whether the gospels of Matthew and Mark were among the **διηγήσεις** to which Luke refers. The answers to this have been various and contradictory, the same data leading critics to the most opposite conclusions. Meyer (*Comment.* 2:217) is of opinion that Luke availed himself both of Matthew and Mark, though chiefly of the latter, as the "primitive gospel;" while De Wette, on the other hand (*Einleit.* sec. 94, page 185), considers Mark's Gospel the latest of the three, and based upon them as authorities. In the face of these and other discordant theories, of which a list may be seen (De Wette, *Einleit.* § 88, pages 162-168), it will be wise not to attempt a categorical decision. A calm review of the evidence will, however, lead most unbiassed readers to the conclusion that all three wrote in perfect independence of one another; each, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, giving a distinct view of the great complex whole, the reflex of the writer's own individual impressions, and that least of all is Luke to be considered as a mere redacteur of the prior writings of his brother synoptists—a theory, the improbabilities and absurdities of which have been well pointed out by dean Alford in the Prolegomena to his Greek Testament, 1:2-6, 41.

III. Relation to Matthew and Mark. — Believing that no one of the three synoptical gospels is dependent on the others, and that the true explanation of this striking correspondence, not only in the broad outline of our Lord's life and work, and the incidents with which this outline is filled up, but also, to a considerable extent, in the parables and addresses recorded, and even in the language and forms of expression, is to be sought in the same apostolical oral tradition having formed the original basis of each, we have presented a very interesting point of inquiry in tracing the correspondence and divergence of the several narratives. In particular, a comparison of Luke with the other synoptists furnishes many striking and important results. With the general identity of the body of the history, we at once notice that there are two large portions peculiar to this evangelist, containing events or discourses recorded by him alone. These are the first two chapters, narrating the conception, birth, infancy, and early development of our Lord and his forerunner, and the long section (^{<015>}Luke 9:51-18:14) devoted to our Lord's final journey to Jerusalem, and comprising some of his most beautiful parables. We have also other smaller sections supplying incidents passed over by Matthew and Mark — the questions of the people and the Baptist's replies (^{<010>}Luke 3:10-14); Simon and the woman that was a sinner (^{<076>}Luke 7:36-50); the raising of the

widow's son (^{<081>}Luke 8:11-17); the story of Zacchaeus (^{<090>}Luke 19:1-10); our Lord's weeping over Jerusalem (^{<099>}Luke 19:39-44); the journey to Emmaus (^{<043>}Luke 24:13-35). In other parts he follows a tradition at once so much fuller and so widely at variance with that of the others as almost to suggest the idea that a different event is recorded (^{<046>}Luke 4:16-30; comp. ^{<035>}Matthew 13:54-58; ^{<001>}Mark 6:1-6; ^{<000>}Luke 5:1-11; comp. ^{<048>}Matthew 4:18-22; ^{<016>}Mark 1:16-20). Even where the language employed so closely corresponds as to remove all question of the identity of the events, fresh details are given, often of the greatest interest, e.g. *προσευχομένου* (^{<071>}Luke 3:21); *σωματικῶ εἶδει* (^{<072>}Luke 3:22); *πληρ. πνεύμ. ἁγ.* (^{<041>}Luke 4:1); *ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται, κ. τ. 50:* (^{<046>}Luke 4:6); *ἄρχι καιροῦ* (^{<043>}Luke 4:13); *δύναμις Κυρίου ην, κ. τ. 50:* (^{<057>}Luke 5:17); *καταλιτών ἅπαντα* and *δοχὴ μεγ.* (vs 28, 29); the comparison of old and new wine (^{<059>}Luke 5:39); *ἐπλήσθ. ἀνοίας* (^{<061>}Luke 6:11); *δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρξ.* (^{<069>}Luke 6:19); the cures in the presence of John's disciples (^{<072>}Luke 7:21), and the incidental remarks (ver. 29, 30); many additional touches in the narratives of the Gadarene demoniac (^{<085>}Luke 8:26-39), and the transfiguration, especially the fact of his "praying" (Luke records at least six instances of our Lord having prayed omitted by the other evangelists), and the subject of the conversation with Moses and Elijah (^{<028>}Luke 9:28-36); notices supplied (^{<029>}Luke 20:19; 21:37, 38), all tending to convince us that we are in the presence not of a mere copyist, but of a trustworthy and independent witness. Luke's account of the passion and resurrection is to a great extent his own, adding much of the deepest significance to the synoptical narrative, particularly the warning to Simon in the name of the twelve (^{<023>}Luke 22:31, 32); the bloody sweat (verse 44); the sending to Herod (^{<027>}Luke 23:7-12); the words to the women (verse 27-31); the prayer for forgiveness (ver. 34); the penitent thief (verse 39-43); the walk to Emmaus (^{<043>}Luke 24:13-35); and the ascension (verse 50-53).

It has been remarked that there is nothing in which Luke is more characteristically distinguished from both the evangelists than in his selection of our Lord's parables. There are no less than eleven quite peculiar to him:

- (1.) The two debtors;
- (2.) Good Samaritan;
- (3.) Friend at midnight;
- (4.) Rich fool;

- (5.) Barren fig tree;
- (6.) Lost silver;
- (7.) Prodigal son;
- (8.) Unjust steward;
- (9.) Rich man and Lazarus;
- (10.) Unjust judge;
- (11.) Pharisee and publican; and two others, the Great Supper, and the Pounds, which, with many points of similarity, differ considerably from those found in Matthew.

Of our Lord's miracles, six omitted by Matthew and Mark are recorded by Luke:

- (1.) Miraculous draught;
- (2.) The son of the widow of Nain;
- (3.) The woman with a spirit of infirmity;
- (4.) The man with a dropsy;
- (5.) The ten lepers;
- (6.) The healing of Malchus's ear.

Of the seven not related by him, the most remarkable omission is that of the Syrophenician woman, for which à priori reasoning would have claimed a special place in the so-called Gospel of the Gentiles. We miss also the walking on the sea, the feeding of the four thousand, the cure of the blind men, and of the deaf and dumb, the stater in the fish's mouth, and the cursing of the fig-tree.

The chief omissions in narrative are the whole section, Matthew 14-16:12; ^{<1065>}Mark 6:45-8:26; ^{<1092>}Matthew 19:2-12; 20:1-16, 20-28; comp. ^{<1105>}Mark 10:35-45; the anointing, ^{<1316>}Matthew 26:6-13; ^{<1143>}Mark 14:3-9.

With regard to coincidence of language, a most important remark was long since made by bishop Marsh (Michaelis, 5:317), that when Matthew and Luke agree verbally in the common synoptical sections, Mark always agrees with them also; and that there is not a single instance in these sections of verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke alone. A close scrutiny will discover that the verbal agreement between Luke and Mark is greater than that between Luke and Matthew, while the mutual dependence of the second and third evangelists on the same source is rendered still more probable by the observation of Reuss, that they agree both in excess and defect when compared with Matthew: that when Mark has elements

wanting in Matthew, Luke usually has them also; while, when Matthew supplies more than Mark, Luke follows the latter; and that where Mark fails altogether, Luke's narrative often represents a different *παράδοσις*, from that of Matthew.

IV. Character and general Purpose. — We must admit, but with great caution, on account of the abuses to which the notion has led, that there are traces in the gospel of a leaning towards Gentile rather than Jewish converts. The genealogy of Jesus is traced to Adam, not from Abraham, so as to connect him with the whole human race, and not merely with the Jews. Luke describes the mission of the Seventy, which number has usually been supposed to be typical of all nations; as twelve, the number of the apostles, represents the Jews and their twelve tribes.

On the supposed "doctrinal tendency" of the gospel, however, much has been written which it is painful to dwell on, but easy to refute. Some have endeavored to see in this divine book an attempt to ingraft the teaching of Paul on the Jewish representations of the Messiah, and to elevate the doctrine of universal salvation, of which Paul was the most prominent preacher, over the Judaizing tendencies, and to put Paul higher than the twelve apostles! (See Zeller, *Apost.*; Baur, *Kanon. Evang.*; and Hilgenfeld.) How two impartial historical narratives, the Gospel and the Acts, could have been taken for two tracts written for polemical and personal ends, is to an English mind hardly conceivable. Even its supporters found that the inspired author had carried out his purpose so badly that they were forced to assume that a second author or editor had altered the work with a view to work up together Jewish and Pauline elements into harmony (Baur, *Kanon. Evang.* page 502). Of this editing and re-editing there is no trace whatever; and the invention of the second editor is a gross device to cover the failure of the first hypothesis. By such a machinery it will be possible to prove in after ages that Gibbon's History was originally a plea for Christianity, or any similar paradox.

The passages which are supposed to bear out this "Pauline tendency" are brought together by Hilgenfeld with great care (*Evangelien*, page 220); but Reuss has shown, by passages from Matthew which have the same "tendency" against the Jews, how brittle such an argument is, and has left no room for doubt that the two evangelists wrote facts and not theories, and dealt with those facts with pure historical candor (Reuss, *Histoire de la Thiologie*, volume 3, b. 6, chapter 6). Writing to a Gentile convert, and

through him addressing other Gentiles, Luke has adapted the form of his narrative to their needs, but not a trace of a subjective bias, not a vestige of a personal motive, has been suffered to sully the inspired page. Had the influence of Paul been the exclusive or principal source of this gospel, we should have found in it more resemblance to the Epistle to the Ephesians, which contains (so to speak) the Gospel of Paul.

The chief characteristic of Luke's Gospel which distinguishes it from those of the other synoptists, especially Matthew, is its universality. The message he delivers is not, as it has sometimes been mistakenly described, for the Gentiles as such, as distinguished from the Jews, but for men. As we read his record, we seem to see him anticipating the time when all nations should hear the Gospel message, when all distinctions of race or class should be done away, and all claims based on a fancied self-righteousness annulled, and the glad tidings should be heard and received by all who were united in the bonds of a common humanity, and felt their need of a common Savior, "the light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of his people Israel." It is this character which has given it a right to the title of the Pauline Gospel, and enables us to understand why Marcion selected it as the only true exponent of Christ's Gospel. This universalism, however, is rather interwoven with the gospel than to be specified in definite instances; and yet we cannot but feel how completely it is in accordance with it that Luke records the enrollment of the Savior of the world as a citizen of the world-embracing Roman empire—that he traces his genealogy back to the head of the human race—that his first recorded sermon ([†]Luke 4:16-27) gives proof of God's wide-reaching mercy, as displayed in the widow of Sarepta and Naaman — that in the mission of the twelve, the limitation to the "cities of Israel" should have no place, while he alone records the mission of the seventy (a number symbolical of the Gentile world) — that in the sermon on the mount all references to the law should be omitted, while all claims to superior holiness or national prerogative are cut away by his gracious dealings with, and kindly mention of, the despised Samaritans (9:52 sq.; 10:30 sq.; 17:11 sq.).

As with the race in general, so with its individual members. Luke delights to bear witness that none are shut out from God's mercy — nay, that the outcast and the lost are the special objects of his care and search. As proofs of this, we may refer to the narratives of the woman that was a sinner, the Samaritan leper, Zacchaeus, and the penitent thief; and the parables of the lost sheep and lost silver, the Pharisee and publican, the rich man and

Lazarus, and, above all, to that "which has probably exercised most influence on the mind of Christendom in all periods" (Maurice, *Unity of the Gospel*, page 274), the prodigal son.

Most naturally also in Luke we find the most frequent allusions to that which has been one of the most striking distinctions between the old and modern world the position of woman as a fellow-heir of the kingdom of heaven, sharing in the same responsibilities and hopes, and that woman comes forward most prominently (the Syrophcencian, as already noticed, is a single marked exception) as the object of our Lord's sympathy and love. Commencing with the Virgin Mary as a type of the purity and lowly obedience which is the true glory of womanhood, we meet in succession with Anna the prophetess, the pattern of holy widowhood (comp. ^{<54RB>}1 Timothy 5:5); the woman that was a sinner; the widow of Nain; the ministering women (^{<4RB>}Luke 8:2, 3) Mary and Martha; the "daughter of Abraham" (^{<231>}Luke 13:11); and close the list with the words of exquisite tenderness and sympathy to the "daughters of Jerusalem" (^{<233>}Luke 23:28).

This universal character is one, the roots of which lie deep in Luke's conception of the nature and work of Christ. With him, more than in the other gospels, Jesus is "the second man, the Lord from heaven" (Lange); and if in his pages we see more of his divine nature, and have in the more detailed reports of his conception and ascension clearer proofs that he was indeed the Son of the Highest, it is here too, in "the life-giving sympathy and intercourse with the inner man, in the human fellowship grounded on not denying the divine condescension and compassion" (Maurice, u.s.), that we recognize the perfect ideal man.

Luke, it has been truly remarked, is the gospel of contrasts. Starting with the contrast between the doubt of Zacharias and the trustful obedience of Mary, we find in almost every page proofs of the twofold power of Christ's word and work foretold by Simeon (2:34). To select a few of the more striking examples: He alone presents to our view Simon and the sinful woman, Martha and Mary, the thankful and thankless lepers, the tears and hosannas on the brow of Olivet; he alone adds the "woes" to the "blessings" in the sermon on the mount, and carries on in the parables of the rich man and Lazarus, the Pharisee and publican, and the good Samaritan, that series of strong contrasts which finds so appropriate a close in the penitent and blaspheming malefactors.

Once more, Luke is the hymn-writer of the New Testament. "Taught by thee, the Church prolongs her hymns of high thanksgiving still" (Keble, *Christian Year*). But for his record the *Magnificat*, *Benedictus*, and *Nunc Dimittis* would have been lost to us; and it is he who has preserved to us the *Ave Maria*, identified with the religious life of so large a part of Christendom, and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which forms the culminating point of its most solemn ritual.

To turn from the internal to the external characteristics of Luke's Gospel, these we shall find no less marked and distinct. His narrative is, as he promised it should be, an orderly one (καθεξῆς, 1:3); but the order is one rather of subject than of time. As to the other synoptists, though maintaining the principle of chronological succession in the main outline of his narrative, "he is ever ready to sacrifice mere chronology to that order of events which was the fittest to develop his purpose according to the object proposed by the inspiring Spirit, grouping his incidents according to another and deeper order than that of mere time" (Maurice, u.s.). It is true that he furnishes us with the three most precise dates in the whole Gospel narrative (☞ Luke 2:2; 3:1, 23 — each one, be it remarked, the subject of vehement controversy), but, in spite of the attempts made by Wieseler and others to force a strict chronological character upon his gospel, an unprejudiced perusal will convince us that his narrative is loose and fragmentary, especially in the section ☞ Luke 9:49-18:14, and his notes of time vague and destitute of precision, even where the other synoptists are more definite (☞ Luke 5:12; comp. ☞ Matthew 8:1; ☞ Luke 8:4; comp. ☞ Matthew 13:1; ☞ Luke 8:22; comp. ☞ Mark 4:35, etc.).

"The accuracy with which Luke has drawn up his Gospel appears in many instances. Thus, he is particular in telling us the dates of his more important events. The birth of Christ is referred to the reign of Augustus, and the government of Syria by Cyrenius (2:1-3). The preaching of John the Baptist is pointed out as to its time with extreme circumstantiality (☞ Luke 3:1-2). But it is in lesser matters that accuracy is chiefly shown. Thus the mountain storm on the Lake of Gennesaret is marked by him with a minute accuracy which is not seen in Mark or Matthew (comp. ☞ Luke 8:23 with parallel Gospels, and with Josephus, *War*, 3:10; Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, chapter 6). In ☞ Luke 21:1, we read of a gesture on Christ's part which marks a wonderful accuracy on the part of Luke. We read there that Christ "looked up," and saw the rich casting their gifts into the treasury. From ☞ Mark 12:41 we learn the reason of Luke's

expression, which he does not give himself, for there we read that Christ, after warning his disciples against the scribes, "sat down," and would therefore have to look up in order to see what was going on. This minute accuracy marks Luke's description of our Lord's coming to Jerusalem across the Mount of Olives (~~4087~~ Luke 19:37-41). Travellers who are very accurate in topographical description speak of two distinct sights of Jerusalem on this route, an inequality of ground hiding it for a time after one has first caught sight of it (*Clerical Journal*, August 22, 1856, page 397). Luke distinctly refers to this nice topographical point; in verse 37 he marks the first sight of Jerusalem, and in verse 41 he marks the second sight of the city, now much nearer than before. The correctness of Luke's date in the matter of the government of Syria by Cyrenius has indeed been often questioned, but on insufficient grounds. The just way of dealing with very ancient documents which have given general proofs of trustworthiness, but which, in particular instances, make statements that do not appear to us to be correct, is to attribute this apparent want of correctness to our ignorance rather than to that of the writer. In the particular case before us recent research has shown that Cyrenius was in all probability twice governor of Syria, thus establishing, instead of overthrowing, the correctness of Luke" (Fairbairn). Compare Huschke, *Ueber den zur Zeit der Geburt Christi gehaltenen Census* (Breslau, 1840); Wieseler, *Chronologische Synopse der vier Evanzgelien* (Hamburg, 1843); Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der evanzgelischen Geschichte*. **SEE CYRENIUS.**

In his narrative we miss the graphic power of Mark, though in this he is superior to Matthew, e.g. chapter 7:1-10; comp. ~~4085~~ Matthew 8:5-13: chapter 8:41-56; comp. ~~4088~~ Matthew 9:18-26. His object is rather to record the facts of our Lord's life than his discourses, while, as Olshausen remarks (1:19, Clark's ed.), "He has the peculiar power of exhibiting with great clearness and truth our Lord's conversations, with all the incidents that gave rise to them—the remarks of the bystanders, and their results."

We may also notice here the passing reflections, or, as bishop Ellicott terms them (*Hist. Lect.* page 28), "psychological comments," called up by the events or actors which appear in his Gospel, interpolated ~~4070~~ by him as obiter dicta in the body of the narrative. We may instance ~~4070~~ Luke 2:50, 51; 3:15; 6:11; 7:29, 30, 39; 16:14; 20:20; 22:3; 23:12.

V. Style and Language. — Luke's style is more finished than that of Matthew or Mark. There is more of composition in his sentences. His writing displays greater variety, and the structure is more complex. His diction is substantially the same, but purer, and, except in the first two chapters, less Hebraized, as remarked by Jerome (*Comment. in AEs.*; compare *ad Damas. Ep.* 20). It deserves special notice how, in the midst of close verbal similarity, especially in the report of the words of our Lord and others, slight alterations are made by him either by the substitution of another word or phrase (e.g. ^{<4216>}Luke 20:6; comp. ^{<4216>}Matthew 21:26; ^{<4113>}Mark 11:32; ^{<4075>}Luke 7:25; ^{<4118>}Mark 11:8; ^{<4194>}Luke 9:14; ^{<4169>}Mark 6:39,40; ^{<4218>}Luke 20:28, 29; ^{<4121>}Mark 12:20, 22; ^{<4185>}Luke 8:25; ^{<4187>}Mark 8:27), the supply (^{<4216>}Luke 20:45; ^{<4128>}Mark 12:38; ^{<4178>}Luke 7:8; ^{<4189>}Matthew 8:9), or the omission of a word (^{<4125>}Luke 9:25; ^{<4165>}Matthew 16:26; ^{<4186>}Mark 8:36), by which harsh constructions are removed, and a more classical air given to the whole composition.

The Hebraistic character is more perceptible in the hymns and speeches incorporated by him than in the narrative itself. The following are some of the chief Hebraisms that have been noticed:

- (1.) the very frequent use of ἐγένετο in a new subject, especially ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ, with the accusative and infinitive, corresponding to בַּיְהוָה twenty-three times, not once in Matt., only twice in Mark;
- (2.) the same idiom, without ἐγένετο, e.g. ^{<4184>}Luke 9:34, 36; 10:35; 11:37;
- (3.) ἐγένετο ὥς, or ὥς alone of time, the Hebrew כ, e.g. ^{<4215>}Luke 2:15; 5:4, only once each in Matthew and Mark;
- (4.) Ὑψιστος, used for God= [^]יְהוָה I, five times, once in Mark;
- (5.) οἰσκος, for family τυβε
- (6.) ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν = הַתִּימָה four times, not once in the other gospels;
- (7.) ἀδικία in the genitive as an epithet, e.g. οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας, κριτῆς τῆς ἀδικίας;
- (8.) προσέθετο πέμψαι, ^{<4211>}Luke 20:11, 12;
- (9.) καρδία = בל e

On the other hand, we find certain classical words and phrases peculiar to Luke taking the place of others less familiar to his Gentile readers, e.g. ἐπιστάτης for ῥαββί, six times; νομικοί for γραμματείας, six times; ναί, ἀληθῶς, or ἐπ ἀληθείας for ἀμήν, which only occurs seven times to thirty in Matthew, and fourteen in Mark; ἄπειν λύχνον for καίειν λ., four times; λίμνη of the Lake of Gennesareth for θάλασσα, five times; παραλελυμένος for παραλυτικός; κλίνιδιον for κράββατος; φόρος for κῆνσος.

The style of Luke has many peculiarities both in construction and in diction; indeed, it has been calculated that the number of words used only by him exceeds the aggregate of the other three gospels. Full particulars of these are given by Credner (*Einleit.*) (copied by Davidson, *Introd. to the N.T.*) and Reuss (*Geschichte d. II. Schfri.-.*). The following are some of the most noteworthy. Of peculiar constructions we may remark,

(1.) the infinitive with the genitive of the article (Winer, *Gr. Gr.* 1:340), to indicate design or result, e.g. ^{<127>} Luke 2:27; 5:7; 21:22; 24:29; 1:9; 1:57; 2:21.

(2.) The substantive verb with the participle instead of the finite verb. ^{<161>} Luke 4:31; 5:10; 6:12; 7:8; 23:12 (Winer, § 6567). (3.) The neuter participle with the article for a substantive, ^{<116>} Luke 4:16; 8:34; 22:22; 24:14.

(4.) τό, to substantivise a sentence or a clause, especially in indirect questions, ^{<163>} Luke 1:63; 7:11; 9:46, etc.

(5.) εἰπεῖν πρὸς, sixty-seven times; λέγειν πρὸς, ten times; λαλεῖν πρὸς, four times, the first being used once by Matthew, and the others not at all by him or Mark.

(6.) Participles are copiously used to give vividness to the narrative, ἀναστάς, seventeen times; στραφεῖς, seven times; πεσών, etc.

(7.) ἀνῆρ used with a substantive, e.g. ἁμαρτωλός, ^{<118>} Luke 5:8; 19:7; and προφήτης, ^{<119>} Luke 24:19.

Of the words peculiar to, or occurring much more frequently in Luke, some of the most remarkable are, the use of Κύριος in the narrative as a synonym for Ἰησοῦν, which occurs fourteen times (e.g. ^{<173>} Luke 7:13; 10:1; 13:15, etc.), and nowhere else in the synoptical gospels save in the

addition to Mark, 16:19, 20; σωτήρ σωτηρία, σωτήριον, not found in the other gospels, except the first two once each in John; χάρις, eight times in the Gospel, sixteen in the Acts and only thrice in John, χαρίζομαι, χαριτόω; εὐαγγελίζομαι, very frequent, while εὐαγγέλιον does not occur at all; ὑποστρέφω, twenty-one times in the Gospel, ten in the Acts, and only once in Mark; ἐφιστάναί, not used in the other three gospels; διέρχεσθαι, thirty-two times in Luke's Gospel and the Acts, and only twice each in Matthew, Mark, and John; παραχρήμα, frequent in Luke, and only twice elsewhere, in Matthew; ὑπάρχω, seven times in Gospel, twenty-six in Acts, but nowhere in the other gospels, and τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, eight times in Gospel to three in Matthew alone; ἄπας, twenty times in Gospel, sixteen in Acts, to thrice in Matthew and four times in Mark; Ἱερουσαλήμ, instead of the Ἱεροσόλυμα of the other gospels; ἐνώπιον, twenty-two times in Gospel fourteen times in Acts, once besides in John; σύν, twenty-four times in Gospel, fifty-one in Acts, and only ten times in the other gospels; the particle το, which hardly appears in the other gospels, is very frequent in Luke's writings. The words ἀτενίζω, ἄτοπος, βουλή, βρεφος, δέομαι, δέησις, δοχή, δράχμη, θάμβος, θεμέλιον, ἴασις, καθότι, καθόλου, καθεξῆς, κακοῦβος, θκόραξ, λειος, λυτρόω, λύτρωσις, οἰκονομος-ία-έω, παιδύω, παύω, πλέω, πλήθος, πλήθω, πλήν, πράσσω, σιγάω, σκιρτάω, τυρβάζομαι, χήρα, σει, καθώς, are almost or quite peculiar to him; he is very partial to καί αὐτός and καὶ αὐτοί, εἰ, δέ, μή γε, and abounds in verbs compounded with prepositions, where the other evangelists use the simple verb.

Some omissions are to be noted: ἀληθής does not occur once, (ἀληθινός only once, εὐαγγελιον, διάκονος, δαιμονιζόμενος, not once; δαμονισθεῖς only once; and ὥστε, which is found fifteen times in Matthew, and thirteen in Mark, occurs only thrice in the whole gospel.

A few Latin words are used by Luke — ἄσσάριον, <0176> Luke 12:6; δηνάριος, <0174> Luke 7:41; λεγέωνς, <0180> Luke 8:30; μόδιον, <0133> Luke 11:33; σουδάριον, <0191> Luke 19:20; <0192> Acts 19:12, but no Hebrew or Syriac forms, except σίκερα, <0115> Luke 1:15.

On comparing the Gospel with the Acts, it is found that the style of the latter is more pure and free from Hebrew idioms, and the style of the later portion of the Acts is more pure than that of the former. Where Luke used the materials he derived from others, oral or written, or both, his style

reflects the Hebrew idioms of them; but when he comes to scenes of which he was an eye-witness, and describes entirely in his own words, these disappear.

VI. *Quotations from the O.T.* — It is a striking confirmation of the view propounded above of the character of Luke's Gospel, and the object of its composition, that the references to the O.T., the authority of which with any except the Jews would be but small, are so few — only twenty-four in the one against sixty-five in the other — when compared with their abundance in Matthew. Only eight out of the whole number are peculiar to our evangelist (marked with an asterisk in the annexed list), which occur in the portions where he appears to have followed more or less completely a **παράδοσις** of his own; the history of the birth and childhood of our Lord, the visit to Nazareth (chapter 4), and that of the passion. The rest are found in the common synoptical sections. We may also remark that, with the most trifling exceptions, Luke never quotes the O.T. himself, nor speaks on his own authority of events occurring in fulfillment of prophecy, and that his citations are only found in the sayings of our Lord and others. The following list is tolerably complete, exclusive of the hymns, which are little more than a cento of phrases from the O.T.

Picture for Luke

VII. *Time and Place of Composition.* — In the complete silence of Scripture, our only means for determining the above points are tradition and internal evidence. The statements of the former, though sufficiently definite, are inconsistent and untrustworthy. Jerome (*Praef. in Matthew*) asserts that it was composed "in Achaia and the regions of Boeotia," an opinion which appears to have been generally received in the 4th century (Gregory Nazianzen, **Ἐν Ἀχαΐαδι**), and has been accepted by Lardner (*Credibility*), who fixes its date A.D. 63 or 64, after the release of Paul. An Arabic version, published by Erpenius, places its composition "in a city of Macedonia, twenty-two years after the ascension," A.D. 51; a view to which Hiilgenfeld and Wordsworth (*Gr. Test.* 1:170) give in their adherence. A still earlier date, thirteen years after the ascension, is assigned by the subscription in some ancient MSS. Other statements as to the place are Alexandria Troas, Alexandria in Egypt (the Peshito and Persian versions, Abulfeda, accepted by Mill, Grabe, and Wetstein), Rome (Ewald, 6:40; Olshausen), and Caesarea (Bertholdt, Schott, Thiersch, Alford, Abp. Thomson).

Amid this uncertainty, it will be well to see if there is any internal evidence which will help us in determining these points. We are here met at the outset by those who are determined to see in every clear prophecy a vaticinium post eventum, and who find in the predictions of the overthrow of Jerusalem (^{<2134>}Luke 13:34, 35; 19:43, 44; 21:20-24), and the persecutions of our Lord's followers (^{<2172>}Luke 12:52, 53; 21:12), and the nearness of the παρουσία (^{<2125>}Luke 21:25-33), a clear proof that the Gospel was composed after A.D. 70. This has come to be regarded as a settled point by a certain school of criticism (Ewald, 5:134; De Wette, *Einleit.* page 298; Credner, *Einleit.*; Reuss, *Gesch. de Heil. Schr.* page 195; Meyer; Renan, *Vie de Jesus*, 16; Nicolas, *Etudes, N.T.*, etc.), though there is no small diversity among its representatives as to the time and place of its publication of the Gospel and the sources from which it was derived. Those, on the other hand, who, brought up in a sounder and more reverent school, see no a priori impossibility in a future event being foretold by the Son of God, will be led by the same data to a very different conclusion, and will discover sufficient grounds for dating the Gospel not later than A.D. 58. It is certain that the Gospel was written before the Acts of the Apostles (^{<4401>}Acts 1:1). This latter could not have been composed before A.D. 58, when the writer leaves Paul "in his own hired house" at Rome; nor probably long after, since otherwise the issue of the apostle's imprisonment and appeal to Caesar must naturally have been recorded by him. How long the composition of the Gospel preceded that of the Acts it is impossible to determine, but we may remark that the different tradition followed in the reports of the ascension in the two books renders it probable that the interval was not very small, or, at any rate, that the two were not contemporaneous. If we follow the old tradition given above, we may find reason for supposing that the interval between Luke's being left at Philippi (^{<4462>}Acts 16:12; 17:1) and his joining the apostle there again (20:5) was employed in writing and publishing his gospel. This view is accepted by Alford, *Proleg.* page 47, and is ably maintained by Dr. Wordsworth, *Gr. Test.* 1:168-170, though he weakens his argument by referring εὐαγγέλιον (^{<4718>}2 Corinthians 8:18) to a written gospel, a later sense never found in the New Test. Another and more plausible view, adopted by Thiersch, which has found very wide acceptance, is that the Gospel was written under the guidance and superintendence of Paul during his imprisonment at Caesarea, A.D. 55; but, as this imprisonment did not last for two years, as usually held, there is here no room for the composition. Olshausen, among others, places it a little later, during Paul's captivity at

Rome, where he may have had the acquaintance of Theophilus, if, as Ewald (6:40) maintains, the latter was a native of Rome. This view, which places the writing of the Gospel in the early part of Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, A.D. 56, is supported by Luke's leisure at the time, and the fact that the Acts followed not very long after as a sequel.

VIII. *For whom written.* — On this point we have certain evidence. Luke himself tells us that the object he had in view in compiling his gospel was that a certain Theophilus "might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been (orally) instructed." Nothing more is known of this Theophilus, and it is idle to repeat the vague conjectures in which critics have indulged, some even denying his personal existence altogether, and arguing, from the meaning of the name, that it stands merely as the representative of a class. *SEE THEOPHILUS.* One or two inferences may, however, be made with tolerable certainty from Luke's words. He was doubtless a Christian, and, from his name and the character of the Gospel, a Gentile convert; while the epithet *κράτιστος*, generally employed as 'a title of honor' (^{<423>}Acts 23:26; 24:3; 26:25), indicates that he was a person of official dignity. He was not an inhabitant of Palestine, for the evangelist minutely describes the position of places which to such a one would be well known. It is so with Capernaum (4:31), Nazareth (1:26), Arimathea (23:51), the country of the Gadarenes (8:26), the distance of Mount Olivet and Emmaus from Jerusalem (^{<4012>}Acts 1:12; ^{<4213>}Luke 24:13). By the same test he probably was not a Macedonian (^{<4162>}Acts 16:12), nor an Athenian (^{<4172>}Acts 17:21), nor a Cretan (^{<4273>}Acts 27:8,12). But that he was a native of Italy, and perhaps an inhabitant of Rome, is probable from similar data. In tracing Paul's journey to Rome, places which an Italian might be supposed not to know are described minutely (^{<4273>}Acts 27:8, 12, 16); but when he comes to Sicily and Italy this is neglected. Syracuse and Rhegium, even the more obscure Putteoli, and Appii Forum and the Three Taverns, are mentioned as to one likely to know them. (For other theories, see Marsh's *Michaelis*, volume 3, part 1, page 236; and Kuinol's *Praeologomena*.) All that emerges from this argument is that the person for whom Luke wrote in the first instance was a Gentile reader. But, though the Gospel is inscribed to him, we must not consider that it was written for him alone, but that Theophilus stands rather as the representative of the whole Christian world; not, as we have already seen, of the Gentiles, as such, to the exclusion of the Jews, but the whole race of man, whom Luke had in his eye; and for whom, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the

work was adapted "as the Gospel of the nations (τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔθνῶν πεποικίота, Origen, apud Euseb. 6:25), full of mercy and hope assured to the whole world by the love of a suffering Savior" (Westcott, *Study of Gospel*, page 218).

IX. Contents of the Gospel. — After the brief preface the value of which it is difficult to overestimate as throwing light on the history of the composition of the gospels in general, and the true theory of scriptural inspiration — the narrative of the Gospel may be divided into four portions:

- 1.** The time preceding our Lord's public life, including the conception and birth of John the Baptist, and of Christ, his circumcision, presentation in the Temple, and the single incident recorded of his childhood (~~Q¹⁰~~ Luke 2:41-51), comprised in the first two chapters. The whole of this portion is in form, and to a considerable extent in substance, peculiar to our evangelist. See § X.
- 2.** A large number of originally detached and independent narratives, comprising our Lord's baptism, temptation, and Galilæan ministry, almost the whole being common to Luke with the other synoptists (~~Q¹⁰~~ Luke 3:50-9:49).
- 3.** A large section, sometimes, but improperly, termed the gnomology, containing narratives of events and reports of discourses belonging to the period from the close of our Lord's direct Galilean ministry to his visit to Jericho a few days before his royal entrance into Jerusalem, and mostly occurring during the actual journey (~~Q¹⁰~~ Luke 9:50-18:14). The whole of this, in its present form, is peculiar to Luke.
- 4.** The last days of Christ: his entry into Jerusalem, discourses in the Temple, his sufferings and death, his resurrection and ascension, common to Luke and the other evangelists in substance, though there are considerable differences in detail in the narratives of the passion and resurrection (especially the journey to Emmaus), and that of the ascension is entirely Luke's own (~~Q¹⁰~~ Luke 18:15-24:53).

X. Integrity of the Gospel — the first two Chapters. — The Gospel of Luke is quoted by Justin Martyr and by the author of the Clementine Homilies. The silence of the apostolic fathers only indicates that it was admitted into the canon somewhat late, which was probably the case. The evidence of the Marcionite controversy is, as we have seen, that our gospel was in use before A.D. 120. A special question, however, has been raised

about the first two chapters. The critical history of these is best drawn out perhaps in Meyer's note. The chief objection against them is founded on the garbled opening of Marcion's Gospel, who omits the first two chapters, and connects 3:1 immediately with 4:31. (So Tertullian, "Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberiani proponit Deum descendisse in civitatem Galileae Capharnaum," *cont. Marc.* 4:7.) But any objection founded on this would apply to the third chapter as well; and the history of our Lord's childhood seems to have been known to and quoted by Justin Martyr (see Apology, 1, § 33, and an allusion, *Dial. cum Tryph.* 100) about the time of Marcion. There is therefore no real ground for distinguishing between the first two chapters and the rest; and the arguments for the genuineness of Luke's Gospel apply to the whole inspired narrative as we now possess it (see Meyer's note; also Volckmar, page 130).

XI. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on Luke's Gospel: Origen, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* 3:979); also *Scholia* (in *Bibl. Patr.* Gallandii, 14); Athanasius, *Fragmenta* (in *Opp.* I, 2); also *Commentaria* (ib. 3:31); Ambrose, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 1:1257); Augustine, *Quaestiones* (in *Opp.* 4:311); Jerome, *Homiliae* [from Origen] (in *Opp.* 7:245); also *Expositio* (in *Opp.* [Supposita] 10, 1:764); Cyril Alex., *Additamentum* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* 9:741); *Commentaria* (ed. Smith, Lond. 1858, 4to; *Commentary*, tr. by same, *ibid.* 1859, 2 volumes, 8vo); Eusebius, *Excepta* (*ibidem*, 1:107); Titus Bostrensis, *Commentarius* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 4:415); Apollinarius Laodicensis, *Fragmenta* (in Mai, *Class. Auct.* 10:495); Bede, *In Lucam* (in *Opp.* 5:217; *Works*, ed. Giles, 10 and 11); Photius, *Specimen* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* I, 1:189); Nicetas Senon. *Catena*, (ib. 9:626); AElfridus Rivellensis, *Homiliae* (in *Bibl. Max. Patr.* 23:1); Bonaventura, *Expositio* (in *Opp.* 2:3); Albertus Magnus, *Commentarii* (in *Opp.* 10); Decorosus, *Latudes* (in Mai, *Script. Vet.* 9:182); Zwingle, *Annotationes* (in *Opps.* 4:181); Brentius, *Homiliae* (in *Opp.* 5); Lambert, *Commentarius* (Norib. 1524, Argent. 1525, 8vo); Agricola, *Commentarius* (Aug. Vind. 1515, Norib. 1525, Hag. 1526, 8vo); Sarcer, *Scholia* (Basil. 1529, Francft. 1541, 8vo); Bullinger, *Commentaria* (Tigur. 1546, fol.); Hofmeister, *Commentarius* [includ. Matthew and Mark] (Lovan. 1562, fol.; Paris, 1563, Colon. 1572, 8vo); Logenhagen, *Commentarius* [from Augustine] (Antwerp, 1574, 8vo); Soar, *Commentaria* (Conimb. 1574, Par. 1578, fol.); Stella, *Commentarius* [Rom. Cath.] (Salmart. 1575, Complut. 1578, Lugdun. 1580, 1583, 1592, Rom. 1582, Antw. 1582, 1584, 1591, 1600, 1605, 1608, 1613, 1622,

1654, Mosgunt. 1680, fol.; Ven. 1583, Mayence, 1681, 4to); De Horosco, *Commentarius* (Complut. 1579, 4to); Gualther, *Homiliae* (Tigur. 1585, fol.); Piscator, *Analysis* (Sigen. 1596, 1608, 8vo); De Melo, *Commentaria* (Vallis. 1597, fol.) Toletus, *Commentarian* [on chapter 1-13 (Rom. 1600, Par. 1600, Colon. 1612, fol.; Ven. 1600, 4to); Winckelmann, *Commentarius* (Francf. 1601, Giess. 1609, Lub. 1616 8vo); Del Pas, *Commentaria* (Romans 1625, 2 volumes, fol.); Corderius, *Catena* (Antw. 1628, fol.); Novarinus, *Expensus* (Lugd. 1642, fol.); Gomarus, *Illustratio* (in pop. theolog. 1:149); A Lapide, *In lucam* (Antwerp, 1660, fol.); Spielenberg, *Commentarius* (Jen. 1663, 4to); Hartsocker, *Aantekingen* [continued by Molinaeus] (Amst. 1687, 4to); Tolaar, *Verklaring* (Hamb. 1741, 3 volumes, 4to); Pope, *Erlauterung* (Bremen, 1777, 1781, 2 volumes, 8vo); Anon. *Amerk.* (Lps. 1792, 8vo); Morus, *Praelectiones* (Lips. 1795, 8vo); Schleiermacher, *Versuch* (volume 1:1817, 8vo; trans. Essay, Lond. 1825, 8vo); Major, *Notes* (Lond. 1826, 8vo); Bomermann, *Scholiac* (Lips. 1830, 8vo); Stein, *Kommentar* (Halle, 1830, 8vo); Wilson, *Questions* (Cambridge, 1830, 12mo); Sumner, *Exposition* (3d ed. 1833, 8vo); Watson, *Exposition* [chapter 1-13] (in *Works*, 13; also separately, N.Y. 8vo); Short, *Lectures* (London, 1837, 12mo); Sirr, *Notes* (part 1, London, 1843, 8vo); Trollope, *Commentary* (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Thomson, *Lectures* (Lond. 1849-51, 3 volumes, 8vo); Ford, *Illustration* (Lond. 1851, 8vo); Gunning, *Readings* (London, 1854, 8vo); Foote, *Lectures* (Glasg. 1857, 2 volumes, 8vo); Goodwin, *Commentary* (Lond.. 1865, 8vo); Stark, *Commentary* (London, 1866, 2 volumes, 12mo); Van Doren, *Commentary* (Lond. and N.Y. 1868, 2 volumes, 12mo); (Godet, *Commentaire* (Neufchatel, 1870, 8vo). **SEE GOSPELS.**

Luke Of Prague

one of the most celebrated bishops and writers of the Unitas Fratrum, or the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, was born about 1460, in Bohemia, and studied at the University of Prague, where he attained to the degree of A.B. A member of the Utraquist, or National Church, he quitted Prague in consequence of difficulties with the Roman Catholics, sought out the Brethren, whose simple faith and stanch confession of it attracted him, and joined their communion about 1480. At that time they were on the eve of serious dissensions, owing to the gradual separation of two parties among them, the one extreme, the other moderate in its views of the discipline. The former represented the illiterate, and the latter the educated portion of the membership. Luke, being a thoroughly learned man, gifted with great

executive ability, and distinguished for his unassuming piety, soon won a prominent position. He held to the moderate party, but enjoyed the confidence of many on the other side. In 1491 he was sent, with three associates, on a visit to the East, in order to find, if possible, a body of Christians free from the corruptions of the age, with whom the *Unitas Fratrum* might establish a fellowship. Returning from this journey without having accomplished its object, he devoted himself to literary labors, and wrote a number of works treating of the points in dispute among the Brethren. These publications contributed in it a little to the ascendancy of the moderate party, and to the final pacification of the Church in 1494, after the most violent of the extremists had seceded, and organized a sect of their own, called the Amosites, which soon degenerated into fanaticism. Three years later, Luke undertook a mission to the Waldenses of Italy and France, and on his return in 1500 was elected bishop. His sound judgment and unflinching courage sustained the Brethren in times of persecution; his sense of the dignity and proprieties of public worship served to develop their ritual; his enthusiastic conviction of the scriptural character of their faith opened the way for their rapid increase among the higher classes; and his wonderful diligence gave them a literature far superior to that of the Utraquists and of the Bohemian Roman Catholics. In 1505 he published a *Catechism* and a *Hymn-book*, the first evangelical works of this kind in the Middle Ages. Having, in 1518, become the senior bishop of the Church and president of its ecclesiastical council, he began to watch the progress of Luther's Reformation with close attention, and in 1522 sent a deputation to Wittenberg in order to present the good wishes of the Brethren. The result, however, was not satisfactory. Luke disagreed with Luther in regard to the doctrines both of the Lord's Supper and of justification by faith. On the one hand, he upheld the spiritual presence, and, on the other, he gave undue prominence to good works. Each published a defense of his own views. Luther wrote with moderation, and in a friendly spirit; Luke was more severe in his strictures. His stand-point touching justification, however, was not, as Gindely asserts, a Romish one. He was led to extremes by his desire to prevent a misuse of the doctrine of free grace. This purpose induced him, in 1524, to renew his correspondence with Luther. A second deputation visited Wittenberg, and gave him a full account of the discipline of the Brethren, in the hope that he would introduce a similar system among his followers, and thus bring about a reform not merely of Christian doctrine, but also of Christian life. But again the negotiations failed. Indeed, they produced a personal estrangement between Luke and Luther,

and for a time all intercourse with Wittenberg was broken off. The real cause of this disagreement is not clear. In part it was owing to the grave offense which the deputies took at the loose morals of the Wittenberg students, and to the freedom with which they denounced their manner of life. Luther, on his side, attacked the rigorism of the Brethren in his *Tischreden*. In the following years the Brethren suffered a severe persecution in Bohemia. Luke himself was seized, loaded with chains, and imprisoned, and escaped execution only through the intervention of a powerful noble belonging to the *Unitas Fratrum*. After his liberation he was active for a few years longer, although suffering from a most painful disease, and died at Zungbunzlau December 11, 1528. His literary labors were astonishing. He was the author of more than eighty different works, written partly in Latin and partly in Bohemian, and consisting of doctrinal, exegetical, and polemical treatises. The most of them have been lost. For a further account of his life, see Gindely, *Geschichte der Bohnz. Briider*, volume 1, book 1, chapter 3, and book 2; Crozer, *Geschichte d. alten Bruderkirche*, 1:95-192; Czerwegka, *Geschichte der Evang. Kirche in Böhmen*, volume 2, chapters 3-7. (E. de S.)

Luke's, St., Day

a festival observed in the Greek and Romish churches on the 18th of October.

Lukewarm

(χλιαρός, tepid), moderately warm; spoken figuratively of Christians in a half-backslidden state (^{cf} Revelation 3:16), who are threatened with the divine excision, as we instinctively reject from the mouth water in this insipid state.

Lullus Of Mayence,

a noted German prelate of the Romish Church, flourished in the 8th century as successor of Boniface, in the archbishopric of Mayence. He was a native of England, and was educated in the cloister of Meldun, but went to Germany on invitation of Boniface, and was his ambassador to pope Zachary about 754. He attended the Council of Attigny in 763, and of Rome in 769. In 785 he baptized Witikind, leader of the Saxons. He founded the cloister of Hersfeld, and on his death in 786 was buried there. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:221.

Lully, (Lull Or Lulle), Raymond

surnamed the *Doctori Illuminatus*, an eminent Spanish philosopher and theologian, was born at Palma. on the island of Majorca, about 1234. In early life he followed his paternal profession of arms, and abandoned himself to all the license of a soldier's life. Even when married he continued to pursue pleasures inconsistent with conjugal fidelity, and the theme of his poetical compositions was sensual love. About the year 1266, sick and tired of debauchery, he retired to a desert to lead a life of solitude and rigorous asceticism. Here he pretended to have visions, and, among others, a manifestation of Christ on the cross, who called him to his service, and to the conversion of the Mohammedans. He therefore at once engaged in diligent study to prepare for the labors and duties of a missionary. Having mastered the Arabic, and thoroughly entered into the spirit of Arabian philosophical writings, he took to the use of his pen for the conversion of the Saracens, seeking to demonstrate the truth of Christianity in opposition to all the errors of infidels. His first work was his *Ars major* or *generalis*, which has so severely tested the sagacity of commentators. This work is the development of the method of teaching known subsequently as the "Lullian method," and afforded a kind of mechanical aid to the mind in the acquisition and retention of knowledge by a systematic arrangement of subjects and ideas. Like all such methods, however, it gave little more than a superficial knowledge of any subject, though it was of use in leading men to perceive the necessity for an investigation of truth, the means for which were not to be found in the scholastic dialectics, and it was published by Lully with the special aim of serving as the preparatory work to a strictly scientific demonstration of all the truths of Christianity.

The king of Majorca, hearing of his reputation, called Lully to Montpellier, where, in 1275, he wrote his *Ars demonstrativa*, and founded a convent for the preparation of Minorites as missionaries to the Saracens. This was the first linguistic school for missionary purposes. In 1287 he went to Paris, where he lectured on the *Ars generalis* to a large number of students, and before Bertauld de St. Denis, chancellor of the university. He next went to Rome to seek the countenance of the pope for his plan of establishing missionary schools, which he thought would prove more effective than the Crusades of which he said, "I see many knights going to the Holy Land in the expectation of conquering it by force of arms; but, instead of accomplishing their object, they are in the end all swept off themselves. Therefore it is my belief that the conquest of the Holy Land should be

attempted in no other way than as thou (Christ) and thy apostles undertook to accomplish it — by love, by prayer, by tears, and the offering up of our own lives." Meeting, however, with but little success, he returned to Tunis in 1291, and commenced labors as a missionary by holding conferences with the most learned Mohammedan scholars and theologians. In proclaiming to them the truth of the Christian religion, he insisted especially on the necessary adaptation which a perfect Being could not fail to establish between the primary cause and its effect, and attempted to explain the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation by purely metaphysical arguments. He was, however, expelled by the king of Tunis, and owed his life only to the intercession of a learned and liberal Mohammedan. Lully now went back to Paris, resumed his teaching there, and wrote his *Tabula generalis* and *Ars expositiva*, which are a continuation of his former works, and present the same ideas under a different form. In 1298 he succeeded in establishing at Paris, under the protection of king Louis Philippe le Bel, a college where his method was taught. France was at that time in great ferment: Philippe le Bel was planning the destruction of the order of Knight Templars, and Boniface VIII, in revindicating the right previously claimed by Gregory VII, had aroused the greatest opposition in France. Lully himself, after having again in vain applied to Rome for help in carrying out his plans, withdrew to labor wherever an opportunity offered itself. He sought by arguments to convince the Saracens and Jews on the island of Majorca. In 1301 he went to Cyprus, and thence to Armenia, exerting himself to bring back the different schismatic parties of the Oriental Church to orthodoxy. He then visited Hippone, Algiers, and other cities on the coasts of Africa, and finally Bugia, then the seat of the Mohammedan empire. Here he publicly lectured in Arabic, proclaiming "that Christianity is the only true religion; the doctrine of Mohammed, on the contrary, false; and this he was ready to prove to every one." He was again imprisoned, but made his escape by the aid of some Genoese merchants, enduring many hardships on his journey to Europe by shipwreck. He finally reached Paris, and there resumed his lectures with great success. In 1311 the Council of Vienne, mainly by his influence, no doubt, decided that, in order to facilitate the conversion of the heathen, professors of Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldee, two for each language, should be established at Rome, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca; those at Rome to be maintained and paid by the pope; those at Paris by the king of France, etc.; and excluded the doctrines of Averroes from the schools. But Lully could not long bear the

easy but monotonous life he was leading as a teacher and philosopher; so, on August 14, 1314, he once more crossed to Africa, where, after laboring at first secretly, then openly, he was at last stoned to death by order of the king, June 30, 1315. His body was recovered by some Genoese merchants and brought back to Europe. According to another account, he was still alive when rescued, but so seriously wounded that he died in sight of his native island.

Lully appears to have been in many points in advance of his contemporaries. Although at the time of his conversion he inclined to a life of asceticism, he afterwards declared himself strongly against the monastic spirit of his age. He deplored it as a great evil that pious monks retired into solitudes, instead of giving up their lives for their brethren, and preaching the Gospel among the infidels. Concerning pilgrimages, he contrasted the gorgeous processions of the pilgrims with the entry of Christ into Jerusalem; what he did to seek men, and what they do to seek him, and exclaimed, "We see the pilgrims travelling away into distant lands to seek thee, while thou art so near that every man, if he would, might find thee in his own house and chamber.... The pilgrims are so deceived by false men, whom they meet in taverns and churches, that many of them, when they return home, show themselves to be far worse than they were when they set out on their pilgrimage." As a theologian, Lully, as we have seen from his history, was a self-taught man, not having been trained in the school of any of the great teachers of his time. The speculative and the practical were intimately blended in his mind, and so they are also in his system. "His speculative turn entered even into his enthusiasm for the cause of missions, and his zeal as an apologist. His contests, growing out of this latter interest, with the school of Averroes, with the sect proceeding from that school which affirmed the irreconcilable opposition between faith and knowledge, would naturally lead him to make the relation subsisting between these two a matter of special investigation. It is true, the enthusiasm for truth which filled his mind, the union of a fervid imagination with logical formalism, led him to form extravagant hopes of a fancied absolute method adapted to all science — applicable, also, to the truths of Christianity, and by which these truths could be demonstrated in a convincing manner to every man. Yet his writings generally abound — far more than that formal system of science, his *Ars magna* — in deep apologetic ideas. The enthusiasm of a most fervent love to God, a zeal equally intense for the cause of faith and the interests of reason and

science, expressed themselves everywhere in his works" (Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 4:426).

One of his biographers states that the works of Lully numbered four thousand. Most of them are contained in an edition published at Mayence (10 volumes, fol.), under title "*Lulli Opera omnia, per Baccholum collecta, curante electore Palatino, et edita per Saltzingerum.*" They may be divided into four classes:

I. Works concerning the "*Ars magna*:" *Ars generalis*; *Ars demonstrativa*; *Ars inventiva*; *Ars expositiva*; *Ars brevis*; *Tabula generalis*; *Ars magna generalis ultima* (this latter was published separately, Majorca, 1647); *Abor Scientiae* (Barcelon. 1582); *Liber Quaestionum super quatuor libris sententiarum* (Lyons, 1451); *Quaestiones magistri Thomae Alubatensis solute secundum Artem* (Lyons, 1451).

II. Religious works: *De articulis fidei Christianae demonstrative probatis* (Majorca, 1578); *Controversia cum Homero Sarraceno* (Valencia, 1510); *De Demonstratione Trinitatis per aequiparantiam* (Valencia, 1510); *Liber matalis pueri Jesu.*

III. Against the Averroists: *Libri duodecim Principiorum Philosophiae, contra Averrhoistas* (Strasb. 1517); *Philosophiae, in Averrhoistas, Expositio* (Paris, 1516).

IV. The works in which he speaks of himself, as the Phantasticus (Paris, 1499), and a very curious biography of R. Lully preserved in MS. in the college of Sapiencia, at Rome, and which appears to have been written by himself. To these must be added his numerous unpublished works, preserved in the Imperial Library, the libraries of the Arsenal and Ste. Genevieve, at Paris, and those of Angers, Amiens. the Esscurial, etc. We might also mention a number of works on alchemy generally attributed to him, but distinguished critics incline to the opinion that they are due to another person of the same name. Indeed, it appears certain that under the name of R. Lulle several distinct persons have been confounded together.

See Wadding, *Vie de R. Lulle*; Bouvelles, *Epistol. in Vit. R. Lull. eremitae* (Amiens, 1511); Pax, *Elogium Luli* (Alcala, 1519); Segni, *Vie de R. Lulle* (Majorca, 1605); Colletet, *Vie de R. Lulle* (Paris, 1646); Perroquet, *Vie et Martyre du docteur illumine R. Lulle* (Vendome, 1667); Vernon, *Hist. de le saintete et de la doctrine de R. Lulle* (Paris, 1668); *Dissertacion*

historica del rulto in memoril del beato R. Lulli (Majorca, 1700); Loev, *De Vita R. Lulli specimen* (Halle, 1800); Delecluze, *Vie de R. Lulle, in the Revue des Deux Mondes*, November 15, 1840; Haureau, *Hist. de la Scholastique*, 2; Renan, *Averrhoes et l'Averrhoisme*; Rousselot, *Hist. philosophique dut Moyen-Age* 3:76-141; Helfferich, *Raymond Lull* (Berl. 1858, 8vo); and especially Ritter, *Gesch. d. Chrisil. Philos.* 4:486 sq.; Maclear, *Hist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages*, page 354 sq.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biogr. Generale*, 32:222; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:558. (J.H.W.)

Luminum Dies

(Day of Lights), another name for the Epiphany (q.v.), supposed to be the day of our Savior's baptism, and so named because baptism was frequently called lux, or lights

Lump

(**hl bÐ]** *debelah'*), a round mass of any substance pressed together, specially of dried figs (^{<2107>}2 Kings 20:7; ^{<2382>}Isaiah 38:21; "cake," ^{<0258>}1 Samuel 25:18; 30:12; ^{<3240>}1 Chronicles 12:40). The Greeks adopted the Heb. term in a softened form, **πάλᾱθη**, which the Sept. uses. This was the usual shape in which figs were preserved for sale or use among the ancients, and is still found in the modern package called a "drum of figs." (See Celsii *Hierobot.* 2:377-379; J.E. Faber on Harmar's *Obs.* 1:389 sq.) **SEE FIG.**

The term rendered "lump" in the New Test. is **φύραμα**, a kneaded mass, e.g. of potter's clay prepared for molding (^{<612>}Romans 9:21), or of dough (proverbially, ^{<416>}1 Corinthians 5:6; ^{<419>}Galatians 5:9; tropically, ^{<6116>}Romans 11:16; ^{<417>}1 Corinthians 5:7). **SEE POTTERY.**

Lumper, Gotfried

a noted Benedictine, was born in 1747, and entered in his youth the Benedictine cloister of St. George at Villingen, in the Black Forest of Badlen. He remained there in various offices, and as theological teacher, till his death in 1801, and distinguished himself by his works on Church History, the chief of which is *Historia theologico-critica de vita, scriptis atque doctrina SS. Patrum, aliorumque scriptorum ecclesiasticorum trium*

primorum saeculorum (Augsburg, 1783-1799, 13 volumes, 8vo). See Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexicon*, s.v.

Lumsden, William O.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Alexandria, Virginia, about 1805. He was converted in the fifteenth year of his age, was received into the Baltimore Annual Conference in 1824, and held the following appointments in the states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia: 1824, Prince George's; 1825, Harford; 1826, Bedford Circuit; 1827, Phillipsburg; 1828, Gettysburg; 1829, Fairfax; 1830, Stafford; 1831, Prince George and St. Mary's; 1832-3, Montgomery; 1834, Severn; 1835, Springfield; 1836-7, Carlisle Circuit; 1838-9, Fairfax; 1840, Westmoreland; 1841-2, Winchester Circuit; 1843-4, Calvert; 1845-6, William Street, Baltimore; 1847, Whatcoat, Baltimore; 1848, Baltimore Circuit; 1849, Summerfield. In 1850 failing health obliged him to take a supernumerary relation. He died May 15, 1868. He was an active and efficient laborer in the vineyard of the Lord to the last. Though he was a supernumerary for eighteen years, he ceased not to preach of "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." See *Conf. Minutes*, 1869, page 13.

Luna, Pedro De.

SEE *BENEDICT XIII* (A).

Lunatic

(*σεληνιαζομαι*, to be moon-struck, as the Latin term *lunaticus* also signifies, a term the origin of which is to be found in the belief that diseases of a paroxysmal character were affected by the light, or by the changes of the moon), in Greek usage is i.q. epileptic, the symptoms of which disease were supposed to become more aggravated with the increasing moon (comp. *Lucan. Tox.* 24); in the N. Test. (and elsewhere) the same malady is ascribed to the influence of daemons or malignant spirits (^{<400>}Matthew 4:24; 17:15; comp. *Lucan. Philops.* 16; *Isidor. Orig.* 4:7; *Manetho*, 4:81, 216). In the enumeration of ^{<400>}Matthew 4:24, the "lunatics" are distinguished from the daemoniacs; in ^{<4075>}Matthew 17:15, the name is applied to a boy who is expressly declared to have been possessed. It is evident, therefore, that the word itself refers to some disease affecting both the body and the mind, which might or might not be a sign of possession. Perhaps the distinction in the one case was that of periodicity or lucid

intervals, in contrast with the continual demency of the possessed. *SEE DAEMONIAC*. Persons of this description are highly venerated in the East as saints, or individuals highly favored of heaven. In Egypt, according to Lane (Modern Egyptians, 1:345 sq.), "Lunatics who are dangerous to society are kept in confinement, but those who are harmless are generally regarded as saints. Most of the reputed saints of Egypt are either lunatics, or idiots, or impostors. Some of them go about perfectly naked, and are so highly venerated that even women do not shun them. Moen of this class are supported by alms, which they often receive without asking for them. An idiot or a fool is vulgarly regarded by them as a being whose mind is in heaven, while his grosser part mingles among ordinary mortals; consequently he is regarded as an especial favorite of heaven." This opinion entertained of lunatics by the Orientals serves to illustrate what is said of David when he lied to Achish, king of the Philistines, and feigned himself mad, and thus saved his life (⁽⁻⁰²¹⁰⁾1 Samuel 21:10-15). Also the words of the apostle are thought to be illustrated from the same superstitious custom: "For ye suffer fools gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise" (⁽⁻⁴⁷¹¹⁹⁾2 Corinthians 11:19). *SEE MADNESS*.

Lundy, Benjamin

an American philanthropist, of Quaker parentage, was born at Handwich, Sussex County, N.J., January 4, 1789. At the age of nineteen he went to learn the saddler's trade in Wheeling, Virginia, and there gained an insight into, and a lasting hatred of, negro slavery. He organized in 1815 an association called the "Union Humane Society," and soon after joined Charles Osborne, Esq., in publishing *The Emancipator*, at Mount Pleasant, O. In 1821 he successfully started a monthly entitled *The Genius of Universal Emancipation*, into which he afterwards merged *The Emancipator*. In 1824 he delivered his first antislavery address at Deep Creek, North Carolina, and lecturing and journeying about on foot from place to place, organized about fourteen abolition societies in that state, besides some in Virginia. In the same year he removed *The Genius* to Baltimore, and issued it weekly. In 1825 he visited Hayti, and made provisions there for emancipated slaves. In 1828 he visited the antislavery advocates of the East, and lectured in their principal cities. In 1828-9 he was assaulted for alleged libel, censured by the court, and compelled to remove his paper to Washington, and finally to Philadelphia, where he gave it the name of *The National Inquirer*, and finally it merged into *The Pennsylvania Freeman*. In 1838 his property was burnt up by the proslavery

mob which fired Pennsylvania Hall. Undaunted, he began anew by issuing *The Genius* at Lowell, La Salle County, Illinois, and there continued until his death, August 22, 1839. See Earle, *Life, Travels, etc.*, of Benj. Lundy; Greeley, *American Conflict*, 1:111; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Lunsford, Lewis

a Baptist preacher, born in Stratford County, Virginia, in 1753, began to preach when seventeen at the Potomac (now Hartwood) Church. Later he traveled in Westmoreland, Northumberland, Lancaster, and all the counties of the northern Virginia Neck, and several churches sprang up as the fruit of his toil; among others, Nomini and Wicomico. On the establishment of Moratico Church in 1778, he became its pastor for life. His sect was much persecuted at the time he was preaching in Richmond Co., and Lunsford was arrested, and thereafter tried in vain to get license to preach. He never was ordained, because he thought a Church's call was sufficient. Faithful study in and out of his profession made up for a limited schooling. He died in Essex County, Virginia, October 26, 1793. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6:125 sq.

Lunt, William Parsons, D.D.

an eloquent and popular Unitarian divine, born at Newburyport, Massachusetts, April 21, 1805, was ordained pastor of the Second Unitarian Church in New York, June 19, 1828; left here Nov. 19, 1833, and became pastor of the Unitarian Church in Quincy, Massachusetts. June 3, 1835, where he remained until his death, March 20, 1857. See Drake, *Dict. Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Lupetino, Fra Baldo

one of the first martyrs to the Protestant cause in Italy in the 16th century, was born of ancient and noble parents in Albano, and actively propagated the reformed opinions in Venice. On becoming provincial within the Venetian territories of the Franciscan monks (to whose order he had been previously admitted) he urged the young men not to assume monastic orders. One of his contemporaries gives the following account of his further career. "After having long preached the Word of God in both the vulgar languages (the Italian and Sclavonian) in many cities, and defended it by public disputation in several places of celebrity with great applause, he was at last thrown into close prison at Venice by the inquisitor and papal

legate. In this condition he continued during nearly twenty years to bear an undaunted testimony to the Gospel of Christ, so that his bonds and doctrine were made known not only to that city, but to the whole of Italy, and even to Europe at large, by which means evangelical truth was more widely spread.... At last this pious man, whom neither threatenings nor promises could move, sealed his doctrine by an undaunted martyrdom, and exchanged the filth and protracted tortures of a prison for a watery grave." See M'Crie's *History of the Reformation in Italy* (Phila. 1842), pages 105, 221.

Lupset, Thomas

an English scholar and theologian, was born in London in 1498; was educated at English schools, but took the degree of B.A. in Paris. In 1518 he obtained the chair of rhetoric at Oxford University. Later he was secretary to the Italian ambassador. On his return he took charge of the education of the natural son of Wolsey in Paris. In 1530 he was appointed prebend of Salisbury. He died December 27, 1532. Among his works we notice *Epistolae Varias*, in the *Epistolae saliquot emdit. Virorum* (Belle, 1520): — *Treatise teaching how to die well* (1534): — *An Exhortation to young Men* (1540, 8vo): — *Treatise of Charity* (1546, 8vo): — *Rules for a godly Life* (London, 1660). See Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, volume 32, s.v.

Lupus, St.

The Roman Catholic Church commemorates three saints by this name. The most important of them was born at Toul about the beginning of the 5th century. He was of a good family, and received a good education. He was afterwards married to Pimeniola, sister of Hilarius, bishop of Aries. Seven years after he abandoned his wife and children, and joined the disciples of St. Honoratus, who were there laying the foundations of the afterwards renowned convent of Lerins. In 426 he returned to Macon, and was elected to the see of Troyes, and greatly distinguished himself by his learning, both classical and theological. In 429 a council of the bishops of Gaul sent him, together with Germain of Auxerre, to Brittany, to oppose the Pelagian heresy, which was making great progress in that country. In 451, when Attila conquered Troyes, we find the barbarian king in intimate association with the bishop, and in his retreat Attila was accompanied by Lupus as far as the shores of the Rhine. Lupus died, according to tradition, July 29, 479.

His most distinguished contemporaries called him "episcopus episcoporum," the Jacob of his age, and praised him particularly for his experience and his knowledge in all ecclesiastical matters. We possess only two works of his. One of them is an answer to some canonical questions propounded by Talassius, bishop of Angers, and to be found among the *Instrumenta* of the Gallia Christiana (volume 4, col. 39). It contains some interesting information concerning marriage among the clergy. There is, it says, no general rule on this point: in the churches of Autun and Troyes married deacons are ordained without difficulty; but those who were single when ordained are not permitted to marry, and a married priest, on losing his wife, cannot marry again. (Comp. Lea, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, page 84.) His other work is a letter to Apollinarius, published in Achery, *Spicilegiune*, 5:579. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 1:486; *Gallia Christ.* 12, col. 485; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie*, 8:564; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 32:16. (J.N.P.)

Lupus, Christian

SEE WOLF.

Lupus, Servatus, Or Loup, De Ferrieres

a French ecclesiastical writer, was born in the neighborhood of Sens about the year 805; studied at the abbey of Ferrieres, and afterwards at Fulda, under the celebrated Rabanus Maurus. Eginhard instructed him in the classics. In 836 he returned to Sens, where he soon acquired a great reputation for learning. He was called to the court of the empress Judith, and became a favorite both with Louis le Debonnaire and his successor, Charles the Bald. In 841, the latter prince, having resolved to remove Odon, abbot of Ferrieres, appointed Lupus in his stead. This intervention of the royal power in the affairs of the Church displeased the ecclesiastical authorities, and Lupus failed to secure their sanction until he had obtained from king Charles a charter granting to the monks of Ferrires the right of appointing in future their own abbots. This charter is to be found in the *Galliat Christisana*, among the *Instrumenta* of volume 12, column 8. Lupus had great influence both with the king and with the clergy, and was present at all the councils held in France from 844 to 859, taking an active part in their proceedings. When the Normans landed in France in 861 he sought refuge in the diocese of Troyes. Still in the same year we find him present at the Council of Pistes, and in 862 at that of Soissons. There is no mention

made of him afterwards; whether he died then, or whether, as would appear from the chronicle of Robert of Auxerre, he was exiled from Ferriress, and his rival Guanelon appointed in his stead, does not appear. His works, so far as they were then extant, were collected by Etienne Baluze, and published first in 1644, then, with notes and corrections, in 1710, 1 volume 8vo. His treatise *De tribus Quaestionibus* discusses free-will, the twofold predestination, and the question whether Christ died for all men, or only for the elect. Gottschalk had mooted these three questions, strongly maintaining the necessity of grace; John Scotus Erigena, Rabanus Maurus, and Hincmar had more or less defended the doctrine of free-will. Lupus here attempts to conciliate these two opposite views, without, however, concealing his preference for that of Gottschalk. He thinks that, in the fallen human nature, free-will does indeed, to some extent, participate in our good impulses, yet is of no effect compared with grace. These impulses themselves originate in grace, and can only avail through grace; but, at the same time, grace enlightens the will, which becomes then a voluntary agent in continuing the work thus begun by grace alone. The Jansenists often quoted these views of Lupus. See *Gallia Christ.* volume 12, col. 159; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 5:255; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gener.* 32:19; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:562; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:459, 482.

Luque, Hernando De

the first Spanish bishop of Peru, was born in Darien, Isthmus of Panama, towards the close of the 15th century. After teaching a short time, he became priest and vicar of Panama. In 1525, as appears from subsequent events, he represented the licentiate Caspar de Espinosa, principal alcalde in Darien, in that famous written and consecrated contract between himself, Pizarro, and Almagro, by which he was to furnish the money for the outfit and expenses of an expedition for the conquest of Peru, the success of which depended mainly upon his exertions. His services were rewarded by the king of Spain with the bishopric, and he was, besides, declared *Protector of the Indians of Peru*. He died suddenly in 1532. See Oviedo y Valdes, *Historia general y natural de las Indias*, etc. (edit. de M. Amador de los Rios); Herrera, *Historia general de los Viajes en has India occidentales*; Prescott, *Hist. of Peru*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, volume 32, s.v.

Luria

SEE LORIA.

Luscinius, Othmar.

SEE NACHTIGALL.

Lush

SEE LAISH.

Lusk

H.K., a Presbyterian minister, prosecuted his college studies at the Western University, in Monongahela City, and graduated with high honors. In 1842 he entered the theological seminary at Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, and in 1846 was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Chartiers. For a time he labored in many of the vacant places of the Church, but subsequently received a call from the congregation of Cambridge, N.Y. He afterwards accepted a call from the congregation of Hulton, where he spent the rest of his ministry. He died October 25, 1862. Mr. Lusk was gifted with a simplicity of manners which made him eminently social. Familiar with the government and discipline of the Church, he filled an important place in its courts. His convictions of truth and duty were such as to prompt a fearless and unswerving advocacy of what he deemed to be right and proper. See Wilson, *Presbyt. Historical Almanac*, 1863, page 358. (J.L.S.)

Lust

(usually ἡωαῖ ἐπιθυμία), in the ethical sense, is used to express sinful longings-sinful either in being directed towards absolutely forbidden objects, or in being so violent as to overcome self-control, and to engross the mind with earthly, carnal, and perishable things. Lust, therefore, is itself sinful, since it is an estrangement from God, destroys the true spiritual life, leads to take pleasure in what displeases God and violates his laws, brings the spirit into subjection to the flesh. and makes man a slave of sin and ungodliness. Lust, therefore, is the inward sin; it leads to the falling away from God; but the real ground of this falling away is in the will. It took place in the earliest days of mankind (Romans 1:21), and is natural to all in the unregenerated state; it can only be abolished by Christ. The nature of man is not changed, only his empirically moral mode and place of

existence. Lust, the origin of sin, has its place in the heart, not of a necessity, but because it is the center of all moral forces and impulses, and of spiritual activity. The law does not therefore destroy sin, nay, it rather increases it, yet not in an active manner, but by the sinner's own fault. The psychological reason of this is, that the law does not destroy the lust, even while accompanied by punishment; consequently the estrangement from God can only be canceled by regeneration. This takes place in the reconciliation with God through Christ, because, in giving his Son as a ransom for sinners, God has manifested his love in such a manner as to awaken man, and give him the strength to love God again. This love of God forms the substance of regeneration, and of the operations of the Holy Spirit, and destroys sinful lust by bringing man into union with God, or by the reception of the Spirit of Christ through faith. According to Matthew v. 28, "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." This forcible expression is correct, for he who is regenerated, and whose heart is filled with true love of God, and who is possessed of the Spirit of Christ, cannot have such worldly lusts. He, therefore, who looks on a woman to (πρός) lust after her, or, in other words, he in whom her sight will awaken the lust of carnal pleasure, has already committed adultery in his heart. In ^{<4049>}Mark 4:19 (^{<4032>}Matthew 13:22; ^{<4084>}Luke 8:14): "And the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful;" by lusts we are to understand the objects of desire, for lust does not enter the heart, but, on the contrary, proceeds from it, as appears from ^{<4059>}Matthew 15:19: "For out of the heart proceed [through lust] evil thoughts [sins], murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." In ^{<4024>}Romans 1:24: "Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts;" and verse 26, it is not God who awakened the lusts, but man, who had withdrawn from God, and made gods unto himself to worship. In view of its final object, this estrangement from God is a mystery, as it is an act of free volition. So in ^{<4062>}Romans 6:12: "Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof;" it can be understood how one could be good so far as intentions are concerned, while yet sin would reign in the lower ego — in the perishable body (compare with 7:19, ^{<4057>}Galatians 5:17). But the apostle considers man, spiritually and bodily, as a whole. He who lives in God through Christ, and is dead unto sin (^{<4061>}Romans 6:11), must not let lust govern his perishable body, or listen to his desire, but, on the contrary, these ought no longer to

exist in him; the body is to be made as subservient to righteousness as the spirit, for it is the temple of the spirit, and therefore is the instrument wherewith the human mind, animated by the Holy Spirit, is to act. Accordingly it is stated in ^{<8175>}Romans 7:5, "For when we were in the flesh [before being regenerated], the motions [acts] of sins, which were by the law [which were shown by the law as such], did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death." So in ^{<8177>}Romans 7:7, 8: "What shall we say, then? Is the law sin [the original source of sin]? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin [the fact of its existence within me] but by the law; for I had not known lust [that it was evil] except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But [my natural] sin [the principle of sin, or lust], taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence [sinful desires resulting from the general lusts of the flesh]. For without the law sin was dead [i.e. not absent, but partly in the sense of not being recognized as sin or lust, and partly because the knowledge of the restrictions imposed by the law served but to increase the desire for what it forbade]." **Χωρίς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά** is a general and popularly expressed aphorism, which is not received in theory. In ^{<8516>}Galatians 5:16, 17, 24, we are directed, "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesi [sin] lusteth against [in contradiction with] the [Holy] Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the thing that ye [simply] would; but they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh (in the regeneration), with the affections and lusts." The effect of the strife between the flesh and the Spirit is to prevent the evil which man desires after the flesh. The Holy Spirit helps man to triumph over lust. The image of God is never entirely obliterated, but the lusts of the flesh can lead into enormous sins, and have done so. In like manner, in ^{<8124>}Romans 1:24, etc.; ^{<802>}Ephesians 4:22 (^{<5185>}Colossians 3:5 comp. with ^{<8102>}Ephesians 2:2; ^{<8183>}Titus 3:3): "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;" lust (estrangement from God), as an impulse of free volition, is the original source of error which obscures both the mind and the heart. Further, ^{<8121>}Romans 1:21, 22; ^{<8189>}1 Timothy 6:9 ("But they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition"); ^{<8122>}2 Timothy 2:22 ("Flee also youthful lusts"); ^{<8122>}Titus 2:12 ("Teaching us that, denying ungodliness [**ἀσίβειαν**] and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world)." Christians can and must be in the world, but not of the world, and must hold themselves aloof

from its contamination. So, again, ^{<3012>}James 1:27; ^{<6021>}1 Peter 2:11 ("Dearly beloved, I beseech you, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul"); ^{<6001>}1 Peter 4:1-3 ("He that has suffered in the flesh [ethically, is dead unto the flesh] hath ceased from sin; that he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. For the time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in lasciviousness, lusts, excess of wine, revelings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries"); compare ^{<6001>}1 Peter 1:4; ^{<6020>}2 Peter 2:10,18; 3:3; ^{<6016>}Jude 1:16. Once more, ^{<6015>}1 John 2:15-17: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof." Finally, ^{<3014>}James 1:14,15: "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death (or misery)." The N.T. teaches us that man should eagerly avail himself of the power of sanctification proffered through grace to overcome lust and the consequent sin. — Krehl, *Neu-test. Worterbuch*. **SEE TEMPTATION.**

Lustration

a formal and public application of water in token of consecration or expiation. Such acts were prevalent not only among heathen nations, more especially those of the southern climates, such as the Indians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans (compare Wetstein. *Nov. Test. Evang.* ^{<4006>}Matthew 3:6), but also among the Jews (see Häner, *De lustratione Hebraeorum*, Wittenb. 1733). With these latter they were preparations for divine services of a different nature, and even for private prayer (Judith 12). They formed a part of the offering-service, and more especially of the sin-offering (Leviticus xvi); and for that reason the prayer-houses (προσευχαί) were usually established in the vicinity of running waters (compare Kuinol, ad Act. 16:13). Josephus (*Ant.* 18, 1:5) gives an account of the manifold lustrations of the Essenes. In the language of the prophets, cleansing with water is used as an emblem of the purification of the heart, which in the Messianic age is to glorify the soul in her innermost recesses, and embrace the whole of the theocratic nation (^{<2665>}Ezekiel 36:25 sq.; ^{<3801>}Zechariah 13:1). Such declarations gave rise to or nourished the expectation that the advent of the Messiah would manifest itself by a preparatory lustration, by

which Elijah or some other great prophet would pave the way for him. This supposition lies evidently at the bottom of the questions which the Jews put to John the Baptist (~~Ⓐ~~John 1:25; compare Matthew and ~~Ⓐ~~Luke 3:7), whether he was the Messiah, or Elijah, or some other prophet? and if not, why he undertook to baptize? (compare Schneckenberger, *Ueber das Alter der Judischen Proselytentaufe*, § 41 sq.). Thus we can completely clear up the historical derivation of the rite, as used by John and Christ, from the general and natural symbol of baptism, from the Jewish custom in particular, and from the expectation of a Messianic consecration. *SEE BAPTISM.*

Among the ancient Greeks, and more particularly the Romans, lustrations were of most solemn import. Those of which we possess direct knowledge are always connected with sacrifices and other religious rites, and consisted in the sprinkling of water by means of a branch of laurel or olive, and at Rome sometimes by means of the aspergillum, and in the burning of certain materials, the smoke of which was thought to have a purifying effect. Whenever sacrifices were offered, it seems to have been customary to carry them around the person or thing to be purified. Lustrations were made in ancient Greece, and probably at Rome also, by private individuals when they had polluted themselves by any criminal action. Whole cities and states also sometimes underwent purifications to expiate the crime or crimes committed by a member of the community. The most celebrated purification of this kind was that of Athens, performed by Epimenides of Crete, after the Cylonian massacre. Purification also took place when a sacred spot had been unhallowed by profane use, as by burying dead bodies in it, as was the case with the island of Delos. *SEE ABLUTION.*

The Romans performed lustrations on many occasions on which the Greeks did not think of them, and the object of most Roman lustrations was not to atone for the commission of crime, but to obtain the blessing of the gods upon the persons or things which were lustrated. Thus fields were purified after the business of sowing was over, and before the sickle was put to the corn. Sheep were purified every year at the festival of the Palilia. All Roman armies before they took the field were lustrated, and, as the solemnity was probably always connected with a review of the troops, the word *lustratio* is always used in the sense of the modern review. The establishment of a new colony was always preceded by a *lustratio* with solemn sacrifices. The city of Rome itself, as well as other towns within its dominion, always underwent a *lustratio* after they had been visited by some

great calamity, such as civil bloodshed, awful prodigies, and the like. A regular and general lustratio of the whole Roman people took place after the completion of every lustrum, when the censor had finished his census, and before he laid down his office. This lustratio (also called lustrum) was conducted by one of the censors, and held with sacrifices called *Suovetaurilia*, because the sacrifices consisted of a pig (or ram), a sheep, and an ox. It took place in the Campus Martius, where the people assembled for the purpose. The sacrifices were carried three times around the assembled multitude. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiquities*, s.v. Lustratio.

Something of the nature of lustration prevails in the use of "holy water" (q.v.) by the Roman Catholics.

Lutei

earthy, one of the terms of reproach with which the first Christians were assailed by their persecutors.

Luther, Martin,

the greatest of the Reformers of the Christian Church, whose name is the watchword of Protestantism, and marks a new aera in the history of Europe.

I. Youth. — He sprang from an old and widely-extended German family, of which there are documentary traces as early as 1137. He was born at Eisleben, a village of Lower Saxony, November 10, 1483 (see, however, an argument for a later date, 1484, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1872) fifteen years before the martyrdom of Savonarola. As one of the heralding stars declined to its setting in blood, the Morning Star of the Reformation drew near the horizon of the new day. His father, Hans Luther, was a miner of the village of Moehra. His mother's name was Margaretha Lindemann. His parents subsequently removed to Mansfeld, and there his father became a man of property and town senator.

Luther grew up under pious but rigorous discipline. His father was characterized by severity, tempered with great honesty and clearness of judgment. Luther's mother was a woman of earnest piety, which, however, had also a tinge of harshness. Luther went to school at Magdeburg in 1497, in 1498 to Eisenach, and in 1501 he entered the University of Erfurt. Here he took the Bachelor's degree in 1503, and the degree of Master of

Arts, which entitled him to teach in the university, in 1505. He was designed for the profession of the law; but a prevailing discomfort and occasional anguish of mind, under a sense of sin and the dread of the wrath of God, heightened first by the sudden, violent death of a friend, and later by a stroke of lightning which fell near his feet, determined Luther quite otherwise. He vowed to St. Ann that he would become a monk. The evening before his entrance to the cloister of the Augustinians he spent in lively conversation and song with his university friends, and the first announcement to them of his purpose was made at the close of the festal hours. "To-day you see me; after this you will see me no more," said Luther. When night was passing into morning, July 17, 1505, he presented himself for admission at the convent — soon to become the birthplace of Lutheran Protestantism and of the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law.

II. Cloister Life (1505-1517). — He passed through his novitiate, and finally, in opposition to his father's wishes, to whom it seemed that his son had chosen "a life little differing from death," took the vows, and was consecrated to the priesthood May 2, 1507. Luther had entered the priesthood to find peace for his soul. He says, "I chose for myself twenty-one saints, read mass every day, calling on three of them each day, so as to complete the circuit every week; especially did I invoke the holy Virgin, as her womanly heart was more easily touched, that she might appease her Son. I verily thought that by invoking three saints daily, and by letting my body waste away with fastings and watchings, I should satisfy the law and shield my conscience against the goad; but it all availed me nothing: the further I went on in this way the more was I terrified, so that I should have given over in despair had not Christ graciously regarded me, and enlightened me with the light of the Gospel." From his deep depression of soul he was lifted by a brother in the cloister, who fixed his attention on the article in the Apostles' Creed, "I believe in the remission of sins." Staupitz, one of the noblest men of his time, dealt with Luther very faithfully. "Staupitz," says Luther, "once comforted me on this wise: 'You would be a painted sinner, and have a painted Christ as a Savior. You must make up your mind that you are a very sinner, and that Christ is a very Savior.' "I sought to make out the meaning of Paul in the term 'the righteousness of God,' and at last I came to apprehend it thus: Through the Gospel is revealed the righteousness which availeth with God — a righteousness by which God in his mercy and compassion justifieth us, as it is written, 'The

just shall live by faith.' The expression, 'the righteousness of God,' which I so much hated before, became now dear and precious, my darling and most comforting word and that passage of Paul was to me the true door of Paradise."

Luther now zealously devoted himself to the earnest study of theology. "The writings of Biel and D'Ailly he could repeat almost word for word; Occam he read long and carefully, and rated his acumen higher than that of Thomas and Scotus. He read Gerson with diligence, but the entire writings of Augustine he had read more frequently and fixed more thoroughly in his memory than any others" (Melancthon, *Vit. Luth.*). "Next after the holy Scriptures," says Luther, "no teacher in the Church is to be compared with Augustine; take the entire body of the fathers together, there is not to be found in them half that we find in Augustine alone" (*Werke*, 14:209). It was an unconscious presage when Luther, on entering the cloister, took the name of Augustine. Among the mediaeval writers, Bernard held the highest place in Luther's regard. "If ever there was a holy monk, Bernard was that monk. He is golden when he teaches and preaches — then he surpasses all the doctors in the Church" (*Werke*, 12:1696; 22:2050). Augustine and Bernard became increasingly precious to him as his continued studies of the holy Scriptures brought him to a profounder acquaintance with the truth. In 1508 his scholarship received acknowledgment by a call to the chair of philosophy in the newly-founded University of Wittenberg, the capital of the old electorate. The university was under the protection of the elector (Frederick) — not of an ecclesiastic — which was a happy circumstance for its part in the future. Its patron saints were Paul and Augustine. Luther went thither, and lectured on dialectics and physics according to Aristotle. In 1509 he became Baccalaureus ad Biblia; 1511, Sententiarius (*Sentences of Lombard*, first two books), Formatus (*Sentences*, last two books); October 4, 1512, Licentiatus (to teach theology in general); and October 19, 1512, Doctor of Theology, a degree which involved not a mere honor, but an office, in receiving which Luther swore "to teach purely and sincerely according to the Scriptures." He now transferred his labors from philosophy to theology. His favorite books, on which he delivered his earliest theological lectures, were the Psalms and the Epistle to the Romans. The lectures rested upon a study of the Vulgate and of the fathers. Philosophy he still prized, but most of all as a handmaid to true theology, which, he says, "searches for the kernel of the nut, the marrow of the fruit."

A journey to Rome was made by Luther in 1510, on foot. He went partly in the interests of his order, and yet more as a pilgrim. As the Eternal City rose before his eyes, he fell on his knees. and fervently exclaimed, "Hail, sacred Rome! thrice hallowed with the blood of martyrs!" St. Peter's was half finished. The man now looked upon it who was to make its completion the bankruptcy of Rome, though Rome held the world's coffers in her hands. New Rome stood on the heaped graves of the dead, old pagan city. Luther was not insensible to the historical and antiquarian interest which clustered around every site, but every other feeling was subordinate to the religious one. He was full of honest fervor, full of pious credulity. He went up the staircase of Pilate on his knees, yet with his heart protesting as he crept: Not thus do "the just live by faith." He looked upon the handkerchief of Veronica; he gazed on the heads of Paul and Peter, and his strong sight was too much for his strong credence — he pronounced the heads carvings in wood, and bad carvings. Luther saw the pomps and the corruptions of Rome, but his heart remained fixed still in its strong love to the "Roman Church, honored of God above all others" (1519).

The visitation of the cloisters of Misnia and Thuringia, conducted by Luther (1516), in the absence of the provincial Staupitz (who was then in the Netherlands), was the means of opening Luther's eyes to the corruptions among the people and the clergy, but did not shake his faith in the Church. "His first prejudices were enlisted in the service of the worst portion of the Roman Catholic Church; his opening reason was subjected to the most dangerous perversion; and a sure and early path was opened to his professional ambition. Such was not the discipline which could prepare the mind for any independent exertion; such were not the circumstances from which any ordinary mind could have emerged into the clear atmosphere of truth. In dignity a professor, in theology an Augustinian, in philosophy a Nominalist, by education a mendicant monk, Luther seemed destined to be a pillar of the Roman Catholic Church, and a patron of all its corruptions."

The first light of the Gospel as Luther sheds it, beams forth in his lectures on the Psalms and Romans. Among his earliest works are his series of sermons on the Ten Commandments, his exposition of the penitential psalms, printed in 1517, and his exposition of the Lord's Prayer, delivered during Lent in 1517, and printed in 1518. He had become a student of Tauler and of the "German theology." The influence of the pure and profound mysticism of these books shows itself in all of Luther's later life,

for true mysticism is the internal mirror of the truth of God. Luther's advance in Biblical study, and the influence of this loftier mysticism, brought him more and more out from the influence of Aristotle and of scholasticism. He was unconsciously preparing for the opening of that grand part which he was to play in the history of the Church and in the history of mankind.

The traffic in indulgences (q.v.) had been brought into the vicinity of Wittenberg, with the approval of the archbishop of Mayence, by Tetzel, a Dominican monk. The expressions with which Tetzel recommended his treasure appear to have been marked with peculiar impudence and indecency. But the act had in itself nothing novel or uncommon; the sale of indulgences had long been recognized as the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, and was sometimes censured by its more firm or more prudent members. But the crisis had at length arrived in which the iniquity could no longer be repeated with impunity. The cup was at length full, and the hand of Luther was destined to dash it to the ground. In the attitude which Luther took toward this traffic, his design was not to array himself against the Church, but to vindicate her against what he believed to be an abuse of her sacred name. At the confessional and in the pulpit he began to warn his people. He wrote earnest letters of remonstrance to the bishops of Brandenburg and Mayence, holding in regard to repentance that a distinction is to be made between the internal repentance, which is of the heart, and the external thing of confession and satisfaction. Receiving unfavorable comments on his position from the prelates, he determined to make his opposition public.

III. *First Movements as a Reformer* (October 31, 1517-May 4, 1521). — On the 31st of October, 1517, at midday, Luther affixed to the castle church at Wittenberg ninety-five theses, which he proposed to defend at the university, completely denying the position on which Tetzel rested the merits of indulgences. He declared, in substance, that the command of Jesus to repent implies that the whole life is to be a repentance, not to be confounded with the confession and satisfaction made to a priest. Repentance, indeed, demands with that which is internal an external mortification of the flesh. The power of the papal indulgence can go no further than the penances imposed by the pope himself. The papal indulgence, consequently, can produce no reconciliation with God, nor, in fact, take away the guilt of the smallest daily sin. The pope can only announce and confirm the forgiveness imparted by God. This, indeed, is

not to be despised, yet it can be found without the pope's indulgence where there is true compunction and faith. The true treasure of the Church is not a treasure of indulgences entrusted to the pope, but is the Gospel of the grace of God. He distinctly held the obtaining of grace to be a thing of immediate relation between the soul and God. In these theses Luther believed that he expressed throughout the mind of the pope, who he supposed was ignorant of the abuses that had been practiced in his name. It seems at first remarkable that Luther gives so little prominence to faith in the theses, and in the sermons on indulgence and grace which appeared simultaneously with the theses, and were meant for the people, November 1517. But a careful study will show that his conception of repentance is that larger Biblical one in which it embraces both penitence and faith. Repentance is sometimes used as synonymous with penitence, and we then speak of repenting and believing, repentance and faith. Sometimes repentance covers both, and then God is said to command men everywhere to repent. Thus, in the 12th art. of the Augsburg Confession, it is said: "Repentance properly consists of these two parts: The first is contrition, or the terrors of a conscience smitten with acknowledged sin. The other part is faith, which is conceived from the Gospel or absolution, and believes that for Christ's sake sins are remitted." "This first act of Luther's evangelical life," says Gieseler, "has been hastily ascribed by at least three eminent writers of very different character — Bossuet, Hume, and Voltaire — to the narrow monastic motive, the jealousy of a rival order. It is asserted that the Augustinian friars had usually been invested in Saxony with this profitable commission, and that it only became offensive to Luther when transferred to the Dominicans. There is no ground for this assertion. The Dominicans had been for nearly three centuries the peculiar favorites of the holy see, and objects of all its partialities; and it is particularly remarkable that, after the middle of the fifteenth century, during a period scandalously fruitful in the abuse in question, we very rarely meet with the name of any Augustinian as employed in that service. Moreover, it is almost equally important to add that none of the contemporary adversaries of Luther ever advanced this charge against him, even at the moment in which the controversy was carried on with the most unscrupulous wrath." The influence of the theses was instantly felt far and wide. "The theses," says Luther himself, "ran clear through all Germany in fourteen days, for all the world was complaining about the indulgences; and because all the bishops and doctors were silent, and nobody was willing to bell the cat, Luther became a renowned doctor, because at last somebody had come who took

hold of the thing." Luther, in his frank, artless confidence that the pope would be his most enthusiastic patron, was soon undeceived, but his higher trust was strengthened by the course of events. "If," said he, "the work be of God, who call overthrow it?" (Compare here the article *SEE LEO X* in this volume, especially page 363 sq. A careful reprint of the theses, after the original, is given in Ranke's *Reformation's Geschichte*.)

In 1518 the Augustinian Order held a convention at Heidelberg. All of Luther's friends counseled him against going thither, as his life was threatened. Luther, faithful to the vow to his order, went, on foot, to the convention. In Heidelberg he disputed on theses in theology and philosophy; on free-will and the fall; grace, faith, justification, and good works. He took ground against Aristotle. An immense audience, not only of students, but of citizens and courtiers, attended the disputation. Amongst the auditors were Bucer, Brentius, and others, destined to play a memorable part in the scenes of the coming Reformation. Meanwhile the principles maintained in the ninety-five theses had provoked the assaults of a number of stanch adherents to the practice of the indulgence traffic; but Luther stoutly defended himself against all of them in his "Resolutions," that is, solution of points in dispute concerning the virtue of indulgences; and, still hoping for redress from Rome, sent these to Leo X. His appeal was first of all to holy Scripture, and, next to this, to Augustine, as the profoundest expositor of Scripture among the fathers.

While the elector, in the interest of the university, protected Luther, Rome avoided coming to the last extremity. As early as February 1518, the pope had instructed the general of the Augustinian Order, Gabriel Venetus, to turn Luther from the path he was following. As this measure failed of success, Luther had been called forward for trial to Rome. By the intercession of the elector, in place of appearing at Rome to answer the citation, the appointment was made that cardinal Cajetan should give him a hearing at Augsburg. Urban, the orator of the marquis of Montferrat, tried his arts of persuasion previous to Luther's meeting Cajetan. To him Luther said, "If I call be convinced that I have said anything in conflict with the understanding of the holy Roman Church, I will at once condemn it, and retract it." Urban said, "Do you think the elector is going to hazard his land for you?" Luther replied, "I would in no wise have it so." "Where, then, will you abide?" Luther answered, "Under the cope of heaven." The Italian replied, "Had you the pope and the cardinals in your power, what would you do?" "I would," said Luther, "give them all due honor and reverence."

At this the messenger, after the Italian manner, biting his thumbs, went away (Fuller, *Abel Redivivus* [Nichols], 1867, 1:44).

The cardinal himself attempted, October 1518, to bring "little brother Martin" to submission, but without success. "I don't wish to talk more with this beast; he has a deep eye, and marvellous speculations in his head." The good offices of Staupitz, the head of the Augustinians, and a firm friend of Luther, were also called in to move Luther, but the service was not one after his heart. When Luther asked Staupitz for some other interpretation of the Scripture than that on which his faith rested, Staupitz acknowledged that he could not give it, and showed where his heart was when he said to Luther "Remember, dear brother, that thou hast begun in the name of Jesus." In order that Luther might not be hampered, Staupitz had absolved him from the vow of obedience to the order. Luther finally appealed from "our most holy master Leo X, illy informed, to Leo X, to be better informed." Having reason to fear violence, he made his escape in the night of October 20. Staupitz furnished him with a horse and an old guide. Luther, disguised in a long mantle, barefooted, and unarmed, rode until the evening of the day following, and when dismounted, could not stand, but lay helpless on the straw. At Grafenthal he was overtaken by count Albert of Mansfeld, who laughed heartily at Luther's style of horsemanship, and insisted on having him as his guest. Two days after Luther's departure the appeal was fastened to the door of the cathedral at Augsburg.

The papal bull of the month following condemned the attacks upon indulgences, and claimed for the pope the power of delivering sinners from all punishments due to every sort of transgression. Luther, now despairing of any reasonable accommodation with the pontiff, finding that nothing short of the six letters " r e v o c o " would answer, appealed on November 25, 1518, from the pope to a general council. Leo, however, by this time aware of the greatness of the schism likely to occur in the German Church, seeing around Luther fast gathering the great, and the strong, and the learned, hastily dispatched Miltitz, the papal chamberlain and legate, whose moderation and skill adapted him for the mission of conciliation. Though he utterly failed to procure any recantation, he yet succeeded in obtaining from Luther (1519) an expression of submissiveness, and induced him to write to the pope a letter full of courtesy and humility, promising silence if it were also imposed on his adversaries. *SEE LEO X.*

IV. Leipsic Disputation. — But the vanity and eagerness of his opponents were too great to allow the stipulation any practical force. They saw spurs to be won, and would not lift their lances from rest. Eck in the previous year (1518) had challenged Carlstadt to a disputation, but his whole course proved that Luther was to be the main object of his attack, and Luther hesitated not to appear in defense. The disputation took place at Leipsic, in the Pleissenberg Castle, from June 26 to July 16, 1519. Carlstadt was no match for Eck, who was incomparably the best debater on the side of Rome in the century. The discussion was so tedious at times that the hall was emptied. The debate itself, and the part Luther himself took during its progress, have already been spoken of in the article ECK *SEE ECK* ,

The breach with Rome was decided at these disputations by Luther's declaration that among the articles of Huss there were also some condemned by the Council of Constance completely Christian and evangelical, thus clearly denying, de facto, the authority of the Church to decide in matters of faith. In August 1520, appeared the reformatory writing, "To the Christian Nobles of the German Nation, of the bettering of the Christian State." In this work Luther unsparingly exposed what the pope had done to convert the Germans, a noble, loyal race, into treacherous perjurers, and showed with what forbearance Germany had borne these indignities. The German knighthood had offered to draw sword in Luther's defense, but he declined the aid of all earthly power, as out of keeping with the holy interests of the kingdom. This great book showed to the knights that Luther's arms were mightier than theirs. In his book, "Of the Babylonish Captivity of the Church," October 6, 1520, Luther presented the doctrinal aspects of the Reformation, as in his book to the nobles he had looked at it in its political relations. He demanded the total abrogation of indulgences as "devilish institutions," the restoration of the cup to the laity, the limitation of the number of the sacraments: "If we wish to speak rigidly, there are in the Church two sacraments only." He declared transubstantiation to be no article of faith, and set forth the view that "true bread and true wine," not their mere accidents, remain in the Supper. He urges the cessation of external ecclesiastical satisfactions. Through the whole he argues the sufficiency of the faith by which alone man is justified. It might have seemed fixed that reconciliation with the Church of Rome was no longer possible; yet, as the result of a second conference with Miltitz at Lichtenberg, October 12, 1520, Luther expressed himself willing once more to test the question. If reconciliation

were to be had at all, the sermon "Of the Freedom of a Christian Man" (Wittenb. 1520) breathed the very spirit in which alone it was possible. It is "pleasant, without polemics, full of devoutness, and of the overwhelming might of love to God and love to man. In it the reformatory principle appears in its depth, its rich devotional spirit, its religious freshness. Its life-breath is the spirit of the higher peace; it contains a treasure of new impulses for the intellectual, and, indeed, the speculative life of the Christian soul. The evangelical principle, as it involves faith and love, has perhaps never been unfolded with such clearness, fullness, and depth. It is noble and full of significance that Luther appended this golden little book to his last letter to the pope (September 6, 1520), as if with a petition for a peaceful separation and a more kindly construction. But it is a happy thing besides to note the quiet self-possession, the profound repose, and clearness of soul with which Luther stood as the strife grew more threatening, and the bull of excommunication was impending. This undoubted mirror of a childlike heart, reflecting the peace of heaven, is in amazing contrast with the thunder-storm which gathered about it, and is a demonstration that the confessor of the justification which is by faith had what he confessed, and was what he taught" (Dorner, *Gesch. der Prot. Theol.* pages 101, 108). Rome had meanwhile been getting ready to settle the whole matter by a coup de main. In September 1520, Eck appeared in Germany with the papal bull, dated June 15. It condemned as heresies forty-one propositions extracted from Luther's writings, ordered his works to be burned wherever they were found, and summoned him, on pain of excommunication, to confess and retract his errors within sixty days, and to throw himself upon the mercy of the pope. This bull brought Luther to a step decisive beyond recall. Susceptible to gentleness, he met violence and threatening with unshakable courage. Like a great general, promptly accepting the warfare forced upon him, he carried the war instantly into the heart of the enemy's territory. Before the gate which opens towards the river Elster, at Wittenberg, in the presence of a vast multitude of all ranks and orders, he burned the papal bull, and with it the decree, the decretals, the Clementines, the Extravagants, the entire code of Romish canon law, as the root of all the evil, December 10, 1520. Archdeacon Manning, whose testimony here will carry peculiar weight, says: "The just causes of complaint which made Luther first address the bishops, his steady appeals through every gradation of ecclesiastical order to the award of a general council; and, on the other, the violent and corrupt administration of Leo X, ending in an excommunication against a man whose cause was still

unheard, seem effectually to clear both him and those who, for his sake, were driven from the unity of the Church from the guilt of schism" (*Unity of the Church* [London, 1842], pages 328, 329). Thus Luther broke openly, as he had already broken virtually, with Rome, forever. This final rupture gave a character of sharpest decision to his appeal to a general council, with which he prefaced the burning of the bull, and to his writings Against the Bull of Antichrist, against Emser, and others. He still continued a faithful member of the Catholic Church of the West, holding its old faith, which knew nothing of a pope with unlimited despotic authority. He stood then in many respects in the same general position which is occupied by Dollinger now. The bull of excommunication promptly followed, January 6, 1521. In consequence of Luther's daring act, the papal legate, Alexander, demanded of the Diet sitting at Worms that he should be put under the ban of the empire. But it was the wish of the estates of the empire that, in advance of giving effect to the papal bull, Luther should be summoned to appear and have a hearing before the Diet. To this Diet, against the urgent advice of his friends, under a safeguard from Charles V, who had succeeded Maximilian in 1519, Luther went, saying, "Though there were as many devils in Worms as there are tiles on its roofs, still would I enter." In the memorable transaction at Worms, "the most splendid scene in history," as it has been styled, Luther stood in the presence of the emperor, the archduke Ferdinand, six electors, twenty-four dukes, eight margraves, thirty bishops, and other princes and prelates of the realm, April 17-18, 1521. It "was the most remarkable assembly ever convened on earth an empire against a man! Lucas Cranach's picture represents Luther as he stood there, so lone and strong, with his great full heart — a second Prometheus, confronting the Jove of the 16th century and the German Olympus." "His friends were yet few, and of no great influence; his enemies were numerous and powerful, and eager for his destruction: the cause of truth, the hope of religious regeneration, appeared to be placed at that moment in the discretion and constancy of one man. The faithful trembled." But Luther was victorious in his good confession. Having examined the books laid before him, April 17, he acknowledged them as his own. After deep reflection, for which he had solicited time, he defended himself on the following day in an address of two hours in length. He upheld freedom of conscience, and denied the right of the priesthood to control by force the religious convictions of men. His manner was free from all vehemence, his expression was modest, gentle, and humble; "but in the matter of his public apology he declined in no one particular from the

fullness of his convictions. Of the numerous opinions which he had by this time adopted at variance with the injunctions of Rome, there was not one which in the hour of danger he consented to compromise." At the close of his speech, which was in German, he complied with the request to repeat it in Latin, for the sake of the emperor and of others. When urged with the direct question whether he would recant, he replied in Latin, "Unless I shall be convinced by the testimonies of the Scriptures or by evident reason (for I believe neither pope nor councils alone, since it is manifest they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am bound by the Scriptures I have quoted, and my conscience is held captive by the word of God; and as it is neither safe nor right to act against conscience, I cannot and will not retract anything." He added in German, "Here I stand; I cannot otherwise; God help me. Amen" (*Acta Wormatiæ habitæ*, in *Opera* [Jena], 2:414. The historical character of these last [German] words has been disputed [see Burckhardt, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1869], but without good grounds). Luther's enemies now made violent efforts to effect his ruin. They counseled the violation of the imperial safe-conduct. They appealed to the crime of Constance as a precedent. Charles replied that if honor were banished from every other home, it ought to find refuge in the heart of kings. The ban of the empire was published May 25, 1521. It made Luther an outlaw.

V. *The Wartburg Exile and the Return* (May 5, 1521-1522). — On Luther's return from Worms the imperial herald accompanied him to the border of Hesse. At this point Luther, with no companion but Amsdorf, turned his face towards Mohra, to visit his grandmother. At Altenstein, May 4, in the Thuringian Forest, he was seized by masked horsemen, and was taken for protection by his friend the elector to the Wartburg, the Patmos of the opening apocalypse of history (see "Leo and Luther," by Eugene Lawrence, in *Harper's Monthly*, 39:91-106). Here, in the apparel of a knight, he was known as Jungker George. His enemies accounted for his sudden disappearance by asserting that he had been carried off by the devil, a theory which, from their point of view, does not give to that august person the due generally conceded to his sagacity — if Rome was right, there was no one whom the devil had so much reason to wish to keep on earth as Luther. The leisure enjoyed by Luther at the Wartburg was employed by him in preparing the first draught of the translation of the New Testament. After an exile of ten months he was called back to Wittenberg, March 6, 1522, by the disorders which had broken out. The Augustinian monks had abrogated the mass; in the transactions which took

place between them, the university, and the elector, Carlstadt had intermeddled. Carlstadt had gone on at once to introduce what, in his judgment, were manifest consequences of Luther's principles. The communion was administered in both kinds, with the exclusion of the sacrificial elements and of the mass, and without confession. A great number of the usual ceremonies also were set aside, and the marriage of the priests, and of others under ecclesiastical vows, was introduced. The radical violence of the whole tendency and of its modes gave evidence that Carlstadt was availing himself of Luther's absence to attempt what he would not have dared to do when Luther was present. The passionate violence of Carlstadt was fanned by the Zwickau Prophets, who at this time made their appearance at Wittenberg. The wild storm of iconoclasm was met by Luther with discussion for the scholar, with sermons for the people. The personal character and force of Luther, the solid truth of his position, and his irresistible popular eloquence gained a complete victory over Carlstadt (q.v.). The two men were in heart sundered from this hour, though they did not come into open controversy until 1525. Previous to the struggle with Carlstadt the life of Luther in every element and trait had made an ineffaceable impression of grandeur on the hearts of the whole German nation. Every independent heart, and all the nobler Roman Catholics, acknowledged him in the highest sense a man of the people, and, in a sense not less high, a man of God. He had "opened the sanctuary of a pure faith, and in heroic struggle had kept it open" (Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.*, trans. by Robson and Sophia Taylor [Edinb. 1871], 1:97, 98). At this time took place his change from monasticism and asceticism to evangelical life: the former in 1524, when he dropped the monastic dress; the latter in 1525, when he married. Here also belong the part he took in 1529 at the colloquy in Marburg (q.v.), where an effort was made to harmonize the peculiar views of Luther and Zwingli on the Lord's Supper; and his work for the Augsburg Confession (q.v.).

VI. *Last Efforts at Conciliation with Rome.* — All the later efforts to bridge over the gulf between himself and the papacy Luther regarded as too weak, in their very conception, to justify any great solicitude either of hope or of despair on his part. At Coburg, in 1530, he warned the sanguine among his own adherents of the hopelessness of the effort to compromise with the pope without the sacrifice of the truth. "The colloquy in Wittenberg, November 1535, with Vergerius, the papal nuncio sent by Paul III, Luther considered a farce. The embassy filed into Wittenberg "with

twenty-one horses and one ass." Luther confided to his barber the chief preparation he felt it necessary to make for meeting the nuncio of the holy father, and, with a full sense of the humor of the position, put on the best clothes and the largest jewels he could command, and in the splendor of an open carriage, which would now be considered a cart, rode forth "pope of Germany, with cardinal Bugenhagen" at his side. The legate was treated with courtesy, but not with reverence. Luther declared himself willing to appear before a general council whenever it might be summoned, though he should know that it would end in his being burned. Vergerius: "The pope would not be unwilling to meet you here in Wittenberg." Luther: "Let him come; we shall be glad to see him." Vergerius: "Would you prefer his coming with an army, or without one?" Luther: "Just as he pleases; we are ready for him either way." When the legate had mounted, he said to Luther, "See to it that you are ready for the council." Luther replied, "I shall come, sir, if it costs me my head." His opinion of the proposed council was expressed in his work *Of Councils and Churches* (1539), and by his advice the evangelical (Lutheran) princes declined to participate in the council.

Melancthon in 1545 prepared the Wittenberg Reform, the sketch of a plan of union. To this Luther gave his subscription, but shortly afterwards published his book *Against the Papacy at Rome, founded by the Devil*, one of the very fiercest of his controversial works.

VII. *Luther and the Bohemians.* — On the other hand, Luther sought to perpetuate the fellowship formed with the Bohemians, who in 1536 had again sent their representatives to him. He wrote prefaces to their *Apology of the Faith* in 1533 and 1538. The dissatisfaction he had felt in 1541 with some things in their doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which appeared to him suspicious, was dispelled in 1542.

VIII. *Luther's last Days.* — The Protestant princes had drawn the sword in the feud. Luther did all in his power to preserve the peace between the princes and the emperor; but the future looked threatening, and his soul was as full of solicitude as a soul could be whose trust in God was so implicit. The council and the congregation in Wittenberg gave Luther very serious trouble. The great renown and prosperity of Wittenberg, given to it by Luther and his coworkers, had brought the evils which naturally attend the inflowing of wealth and the attainment of position. Frivolity and fashion corrupted the people. Luther fought with all his energies against the evil. In

1530, after a powerful sermon of rebuke, he withdrew, disheartened, for a long time from the pulpit. He at length left Wittenberg, and advised his wife to sell her property there. The elector himself was obliged to interpose, to restore the old relations. From the time of his return Luther continued to preach, but discontinued his lectures.

Luther's last work was one of love and conciliation. Under the pressure of many cares, he started, in February 1546, on a journey to Eisleben, to attempt a conciliation between the counts of Mansfeldt, a work in which they had solicited his good offices. For fourteen years Luther had been a sufferer from severe and complicated diseases. He was not well when he reached the inn at Eisleben, and from the beginning of his sickness had a presentiment that he would die in the place where he was born. He was able, however, to preach once. The day before his death he expressed a strong assurance that we shall know our loved ones in heaven. February 17 he was too ill to leave his bed. When Aurifaber called, he found him so much worse that he summoned medical aid at once. Rubbing and bathing afforded him temporary relief, and about nine o'clock Luther lay down upon a couch, and after gathering a little strength by an hour's rest, proposed to his attendants that he should be helped to his bed. Jonas, and Martin, and Paul, Luther's sons, and two servants, watched by his side. His pains, however, became so great that he could not remain in his bed. Count Albert and the countess sent in haste for their own physicians. Luther used everything prescribed, but spoke of nothing but his death, which he felt sure was at hand. He poured forth his soul in fervent prayer, and, after commending his soul into the hands of God, lay silent and waiting. Among the stimulants used was shavings of the horn of the narwhal, or sea-unicorn, a remedy then greatly prized. None of the stimulants had any effect. A little before his last breath Jonas and Coelius asked him whether he died in firm assurance of the truth of the doctrine he had taught. With a distinct voice, he replied "Yes." He expired about four o'clock in the morning, February 18, 1546 (C.E. Stowe, *Last Days and Death of Luther*, in the *Bibl. Repository*, 1845, pages 195, 212).

His body was taken to Wittenberg, followed along the whole route by thousands of mourners, the tolling of the bells, and the dirges which gave expression to a universal sorrow. It was interred in front of the pulpit in the Castle Church. The funeral discourses were pronounced by Bugenhagen and Melancthon. Six weeks after Luther's death his wife wrote: "My dear husband was not the minister of a city, or of a land, but of the whole world.

To have lost a principedom, to have lost an empire, would not be such a loss as I deplore" (*Briefe* [De Wette, Leidemann], 6:650).

Luther's situation in reference to earthly possessions would have been that of very moderate competence (his greatest income was about three hundred gulden), had not his unbounded charity kept him perpetually poor. The large or older cloister of the Austin monks in Wittenberg was given to him by John the Constant. It was purchased from Luther's heirs for the academy at the price of 3700 gulden. Luther purchased the Little Cloister for 430 gulden: it was sold by his heirs for 300 thalers. He also owned an orchard and garden valued at 500 gulden, the manor of Wachsdorf, a malefief valued at 1500 gulden, and the Zeilsdorf property, which sold for 956 gulden. For his books, which enriched his publishers, he would take nothing.

IX. *Domestic and Social Life.* — In the midst of the warfare which conscience compelled him to carry on with Erasmus, Carlstadt, and others, who professed to take in whole or in part the general ground against Rome, Luther entered on that domestic life, the charm of which still wins the heart of men, whose sympathies have been lost to him as a reformer, or as a conservator in reformation. June 13, 1525 he married Catharine von Bora, who had fled from the Cistercian nunnery of Nimptsch. "This was the event of his life which gave most triumph to his enemies and perplexity to his friends. It was in perfect conformity with his masculine and daring mind, that, having satisfied himself of the nullity of his monastic vows, he should take the boldest method of displaying to the world how utterly he rejected them." Luther's intercourse with his wife and children, his letters to them, the touching story of the death of Margaret and of Madeleine, present him as the model of the head of a Christian family (Krauth, *Conservative Reform*. pages 33-43; Stork, *Luther at Home* [1872]).

Luther had six children: 1. John, born June 7, 1526, was a jurist in Königsberg, and died there October 28, 1575. Some of his descendants were found in Bohemia in 1830 in a state of poverty. 2. Elizabeth, born December 10, 1527; died August 3, 1528. 3. Madeleine (Magdalene), born May 4, 1529; died October 20, 1542. 4. Martin, born November 7, 1531, studied theology, but had not the intellectual gifts necessary for the ministry; laid down his office, and died as a private citizen, March 3, 1565. 5. Paul, born January 28, 1533, was physician in ordinary at various courts, and died March 8, 1593. 6. Margaret, born in 1534, was married to George

von Kunheim, Prussian counselor, and died in 1570. See Nobbe, *Stammbaum der Familie des Dr. Luther* (Grimma, 1846); Hofman, *Catharine von Bora, oder Luther als Gatte u. Vater* (Leipzig, 1845); C. Becker, *Luther's Familienleben* (Königsb. 1858).

The direct line of male descent from Luther terminated with Martin Gottlob L., who was an advocate in Dresden, and died in 1759. The family of Luther's brother, and of Catharine von Bora, have living representatives.

The great coworkers with Luther were also his dearest personal friends. First among them were Melancthon, Amsdorf, Justus Jonas, and Bugenhagen. The *Tischreden* (Table-talk), which appeared twenty years after Luther's death, professes to be a record of his conversations, made immediately after them. It is not strictly authentic, and where it conflicts with well known and carefully avowed opinions of Luther, is of no value as testimony. It often presents the prosiest construction of the poetry of Luther's mind, and the dullest matter-of-fact perversion of his most brilliant thoughts. It confounds Luther himself with the character he dramatizes, in order to vivify his aversion to it, and the liveliest sallies of his wit and humor are given with the air of the most solid and painful judgments. Luther's annalist had the idolatry of a Boswell, but little of his skill. Nevertheless, the Table-talk is a record, though a clumsy one, of many of Luther's best sayings.

X. Luther and Erasmus. — In their negations Luther and Erasmus had many points of contact and sympathy. Luther admired the polished scholarship of Erasmus; Erasmus acknowledged the power of Luther, the purity of his motives, and the necessity for his earlier work. He wrote to Luther and of him as a friend (1519). When the diversity of their positions, the difference of their characters, and the pressure of circumstances made a conflict between them growingly probable, each dreaded the other as an antagonist as he dreaded no other man. (Compare here Luther's letter to Erasmus, cited in the article ERASMUS.) Erasmus was forced into the controversy. Had Erasmus had his own way, he would perhaps have never entered the lists against Luther, and he would never have written his Defence of freewill. The will of Erasmus was under bondage to the will of Henry VIII. Luther, with more solicitude than the presence of princes and prelates had ever given him, was obliged to take up the gage of battle. To the years 1524-1525 belongs this controversy. It began with an attack on the part of Erasmus in his book *De libero Arbistrio*. Luther wrote *De*

sesrvo Arbitrio. Erasmus wrote in reply his *Hyperaspistes*. Luther felt that Erasmus had made no new points, and that his own had been sufficiently put, and the controversy ceased. As regards the vital point in this discussion, the mass of earnest Christian thinkers from Luther's time to this have been a unit in their estimate. Erasmus simply made a development of a refined pagan naturalism (for Pelagianism is no more) under the phrases of Christianity. Luther's main point is the common ground of evangelical Christianity, though many of his particular phrases might not meet with universal approval. "Erasmus makes man at first richer than Luther does, but yet how far is Luther's conception of freedom ultimately superior to that of Erasmus, who views the highest and best element of freedom as reached in freedom of choice, and who accordingly must logically teach an everlasting possibility of falling, and make perfection eternally insecure! Luther's conception of freedom leads to godlike, real freedom by grace; fir this it could seem to be no advantage, but only a defect, to be involved in choice and hesitation" (Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theol.* transl.], 1:217). In justifying the classing of this controversy with Luther's war against Rome, Kostlin says: "Not only did Erasmus write under the pressure brought to bear on him by the papal opponents of Luther, but Luther, in his reply, shows that he recognizes the same interest as involved here, as that which had so far conditioned his whole struggle with Rome. He writes under the consciousness that in Erasmus he has again to do battle with the old principle of the Pelagianism of Rome" (2:36). (Comp. here a review of M. Durand du Laur's *Erasme in The Academy*, September 15, 1872.)

XI. The character of Luther lies so open in his life that it is hardly necessary to trace its lines. He was so ingenuous that if all the world had conspired to cover up his faults, his own hand would have uncovered them. His violence was that of a mighty nature, strong in conviction, waging the battle of truth against implacable foes. The expressions which jar upon the refined ear of the modern world were natural in a rough aera, and from the lips of one who was too pure to be prudish. The coarsenesses of the mendicant life can hardly fail to leave their traces on any man who has been subjected to them — the taint of a system in which filthiness is next to godliness, or, rather is a part of it. The inconsistencies charged upon Luther's thinking are those of a man of great intuitions, who grows perpetually, and who will not stop for the hopeless and useless task of harmonizing with the crudities of yesterday the ripeness of today. His widest diversities, after the sap of Reformation began to swell in his veins,

are like those of the tree which bends with the mellow fruit of autumn, careless of consistency with its first buddings in the cold rains of March. That Luther was unselfish, earnest, honest, inflexibly brave in danger, full of tenderness and humanity, the ideal of Germanic strength and of Germanic goodness; that he was one of the great creative spirits of the race, mighty in word and deed, matchless as a popular orator, one of the very people, yet a prince among princes, a child of faith, a child of God — this is admitted by all (see Krauth's *Conservative Reformat.* pages 45-87).

There is scarcely another instance in history in which an individual, without secular authority or military achievement, has so stamped himself upon a people, and made himself to so great an extent the leader, the representative, the voice of the nation. He has been to Germany what Horner was to Greece. "He was the only Protestant reformer," says Bayard Taylor, "whose heart was as large as his brain." (See "An Interview with Martin Luther," in *Harper's Monthly*, 22:231.) Luther was well-set, not tall, was handsome, with a "clear, brave countenance," and fresh complexion. His eyes were remarkable for their keenness, "dark and deep-set, shining and sparkling like a star, so that they could not well be looked upon," as old Kessler describes them. The fullness of face given him in his later pictures was the result, not of robustness, but of a dropsical tendency, resulting from his early austerities. His physical life was largely one of suffering. His habits were abstemious, and his enjoyments at the table were social, not Epicurean. His voice was not loud nor strong. Melancthon's happy phrase touching Luther's words is, that they were "fulmina," not "tonitrua" — it was their lightning, not their thunder, by which their mighty effects were produced. The papal system, the upas of the ages, which they struck, is not dead, but it is riven and blasted from its crown to its root.

XII. *Luther as a Conservator.* — The culmination of Luther's epic for the world at large is undoubtedly the defense at Worms. An obvious source of the diminution of interest in the later years of Luther's life is that the carrying through of what had been so grandly begun presents, in the nature of the case, less that brings before the mind, in all the magic of its unparalleled power, the personal character of Luther. When the warfare is ended, the life of the greatest soldier becomes as tame as that of the ordinary man. But, beyond this, a diminished interest and a divided sympathy are due to the fact that in the development of doctrine and of the constitution of the Church Luther took a position on which the Protestant world has divided. The occasion for the exhibition of Luther's conservatism

was given by his conflict with the Zwickau Prophets (1522) and Carlstadt, and by the dreadful excesses of the peasant insurrections. In these he encountered what claimed to be results of the German mystical thinking — a mysticism which he himself had cherished; he found that these wild fanatics put their own construction upon his views of Christian liberty and the rights of the congregation, and appealed to those views in self-defense. These results and this construction Luther looked upon with abhorrence. Luther brought to a fuller exhibition what was the real difference in principle between the position of these fanatics and his own. He saw that they consciously ignored and rejected a principle without which reformation would be transformed into a radical and violent revolution, foreign in its own nature to the whole genius and history of Christianity. This principle is that of the unbroken historical life and development of the Church. Not as a something isolated from the Church, but as a divine power within it, had the truth of God reached the soul of Luther. The power which opened to Luther the true nature of repentance, justification, and grace, had not simply lingered in the Church, but had ripened in it, and the Reformation could no more have been, nor Luther have been Luther, without the Church in history, than without the Word. Men are begotten of God through the Word, but the Church is the mother who bears them. The Word of God is the all-sufficient rule of faith, but it must be seen or heard in order to be applied; and the rule of faith does not write itself, print itself, circulate itself, or speak itself, and all the ordinary organs of its perpetuation, circulation, and application are within the Church. The divinity of the Word and the divinity of the Church are doctrines not only in harmony with each other, but necessary to each other's existence. The first without the second is fanaticism, sectarianism, and hopeless individualism; the second without the first is popery. The movement of Luther, from the hour of its riper self-perception, was so completely churchly and historical that the fanatics hated Luther more than they hated the pope. Among the evidences that Luther felt the need of building the sound, as well as of thinning down and removing the rotten, may be mentioned the Wittenberg Order of the Congregations, 1522; the Leisnig Order of the General Fund, 1523; letter to the landgrave of Hesse in regard to the Homberg Church-Order, 1527; the Visitation, 1527-1529; the part he took in the arrangement of the consistories and for the government of the Church.

Those who do not sympathize with his conservatism yet admit that Luther's personal religious character was deep and consistent, and that in the sphere of conscience, and where he stands on the verities of his own internal experience, he is the unshakable reformer. But it is said by these objectors that where his own immediate religious consciousness ceases he shows himself under the influence of his earlier views; that, unknown to himself, he stands forth with the "ineffaceable traces of the monk, the priest, and the scholastic theologian." By this supposition is solved the fact that, while he rejected the mass as it embodied the idea that the Lord's Supper is a proper sacrifice, and rejected transubstantiation, he yet found it impossible to abandon the thought that the Lord's Supper veils the mystery of redemption, and is "more than an act in which a congregation unites in a pious and believing memorial." This it was, they think, which led him "to a conception of the sacrament obscure and indeterminate, and to a doctrine which maintains on a scholastic basis the presence of Christ, and the ubiquity, the omnipresence of his body." From the same direction comes the charge that, "blinded by the halo which to the eyes of the people invests the head of the imperial majesty, he overlooked the fact that it is not only Christian for a great cause to go cheerfully to the scaffold, but that it is also Christian and manly for inalienable rights to resist imperial oppression with the sword." Luther's holding back, and Luther's scruples, are charged as the main cause that the Evangelical States made so little use of the favorable opportunities which were so often presented in the political relations of the times; opportunities which, rightly used, would have enabled them to seize and to maintain the pre-eminence.

To these objections it may be answered that all that is of real importance in the judgment of Luther's position as to the Lord's Supper hinges upon the question, Is his doctrine the Biblical one? If it be Biblical, the main objections vanish. They could at the worst fix no more than the charge of doing a right thing in a wrong way. If we were to concede for Luther in these controversies what he confessed for himself at Worms, that he had fallen into personal expressions which did not become his character as a Christian, nor as a minister of Christ, yet we could say for him, as he said for himself at the same great era, the question is not concerning his person, but his doctrine. If the doctrine be unbiblical, the proof of that fact swallows up all minor questions. But those who prize the thing will at least forgive the mode. Loving him for the "re" in which he was "fortiter," they will absolve him for its sake for having carried the "fortiter" also into the

"modo." Here, as elsewhere, the estimate of Luther's character is properly made from the position of those who harmonize with his views, not of those who differ from him, for the practical difference between the construction of firmness and obstinacy usually is, that firmness stands fast to what we cherish, and obstinacy holds stiffly to what we reject, or care nothing about. To the Romanist Luther was obstinate at Worms, firm at Marburg; to the Zwinglian portion of Protestants he was obstinate at Marburg, firm at Worms.

As regards Luther's political position, it may be said that it saved the Reformation in its infancy; and when evil counsels of the friends of Protestantism harmonized with the efforts of the Romanists to drag the question of the aera into the arena of state-struggle, the Reformation was brought to the verge of ruin. Had Luther shared the political views of the Zwinglian side of the Reformation, the appeal to arms made in the Thirty Years' War might have come a century earlier, and might have ended in the overthrow of the Reformation. But once in his career did Luther yield to the pressure of political considerations (the bigamy of the landgrave of Hesse), and in that yielding the Reformation received its severest blow, and the name of Luther its solitary blot. His simple trust in God was the highest principle. It was, though Luther did not think of it as such, the highest policy.

A complete, comprehensive, and systematic statement of his doctrines was never given by Luther, not even in his confessional writings. Others have endeavored to arrange his views in systematic order: Kirchner, *Thesaurus* (in Latin, 1566; in German, 1566, 1570, 1578); Theodosius Fabricius, *Loci Communes* (Lond. 1593; 1651, Latin; and in German, 1597); Mains, *M.L. Theologia Pura* (1709; with a Supplement, 1710); Beste, *N.L.'s Glaubenslehre* (Halle, 1845). In this general class may also be mentioned And. Musculus, *Schatz* (1577), and Salzmann, *Singularia Lutheri* (1664, fol.). It was Luther's work to restore doctrine, he left to others the arrangement of it. He made history, others might write it. Luther's great aim constantly was to give prominence and strength to those doctrines which were denied, ignored, or corrupted. His plan of warfare was that of attack rather than of defense. He fought many battles, but underwent and conducted few sieges. "The wealth of his theological knowledge and teaching rests essentially upon his direct mighty grasp, intuition, and unifying view of truth. As the result of this, it is the peculiarity of his mind that there is a relative throwing into the background of that aspect and

endowment of intelligence which are directed to calm reflection upon the diverse individual elements and parts of the object, to notional formulating, to logical or dialectical systematizing" (Kostlin, *The Theology of Luther* [1863]). The grand impulse of his life was to testify to the truth; so to impart the knowledge in which his own soul had found healing and salvation that it might be to others health and life.

XIII. *Polemics and Irenics.* — Inflexible in his opposition to Rome, he yet showed himself solicitous to preserve peace while peace was possible. Very gradually and very cautiously he declared himself for the right of armed resistance, when, in the conscientious judgment of men learned in the law, the nature of the violation of rights is such as to demand war as the sole possible mode of self-defense.

1. The doctrine of the *Lord's Supper* grew to a subject of extended conflict, and of far-reaching doctrinal and practical power in Luther's life and in the Reformation. It became, indeed, a touchstone. The laws of interpretation which determined the doctrine of the Supper either way, conditioned more or less the entire distinctive characteristics of both tendencies in the Reformation. While he was engaged in the controversy with Carlstadt, he heard, November 12, 1524, that Zwingle, and January 13, 1525, that OEccolampadius held the same views — "the poison widely creeping." There were, indeed, three mutually contradictory processes of interpretation; each of the three overthrew the other two, and was overthrown by them; but as they concurred in the one result, the denial of the true presence, Luther regarded them from the beginning as essentially one view.

2. *Luther's course in the sacramental controversies* exercised an immense influence on the internal and external history of the Reformation, and on nothing in his history has Protestant sentiment been so completely and so passionately divided. In his sermon on the venerable sacrament (1519), in which he for the first time presented with comparative fullness the evangelical view of the Lord's Supper, he still retained the doctrine of transubstantiation. His own doctrine of the true presence of the body and blood of Christ without a change in the elements ("true bread and wine remains") he first brought clearly forth in his work on the adoration of the holy sacrament (1523), addressed to the Bohemian Brethren, who had directed their inquiries to him. They claimed that they held an objective gift of God in the sacrament; and, although their doctrine has been asserted by

some to be that of a purely spiritual presence, they gave it such an approximation to the doctrine maintained by Luther that he was entirely satisfied with their statement. He discussed the question further in a letter to the preacher at Strasburg (1525), and in a preface to the Suabian Syngramma (1526), with which he declared himself in harmony. He fought earnestly against the doctrine of the Lord's Supper proposed by Carlstadt and Zwingle, which had the common feature that it regarded the Lord's Supper not so much a divine institution as a movement of man towards God. Over against their views Luther designates the forgiveness of sins as the special, distinctive grace of this sacrament, as in that forgiveness Christ has laid the efficacy of his passion. That bread remains bread, and is yet, in the sacramental complex, the body of Christ, involves to faith no contradiction. He defended his views in the *Sermon of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ* (1526); *that the Words "This is my Body" still standfast* (1527); and in *Confession touching the Supper* (1529). The colloquy at Marburg (1529) only in part removed his suspicions of Zwingle: "You have another spirit than we." The Schwabach *Articles* gave renewed expression to the doctrine of the true presence, even stronger than that in the articles which were drawn up at Marburg to express the consent and dissent of the two parties. A more hopeful turn of mind was called forth by the visit of Bucer to Coburg in 1530. As a result of this visit, Luther, in letters to Albert of Prussia and to the people of Frankfort, expressed himself more gently towards Zwingle. The Wittenberg Concord of 1536 resulted from this new movement. This Concord led to a temporary friendly recognition of the Swiss, and a correspondence with them; but all the old distrust showed itself again in the Short Confession touching the Holy Sacrament (1544). Luther had set himself with unshakable decision against every league of the Evangelical (Lutheran) States with the Swiss. He had not been able, however, to deter the landgrave Philip from forming a league with them. In the conflict with Zwingle there had been a special development of Luther's Christological views, and an expansion and distinctiveness imparted to his entire theological thinking.

3. The controversies which most deeply distressed Luther were those which took place within the Evangelical Church itself. The Osiandrian controversy in Nuremberg, 1533, in regard to the general form of public absolution, to which Andrew Osiander (q.v.), who was constitutionally self-opinionated, objected on the ground that many were unprepared for

absolution, was decided by Luther with that thorough moderation which never failed him when he believed that principle was not compromised. He thought the form unobjectionable, but advised that if Osiander felt scruples he should be allowed to omit it, without censuring those who used it, or being censured by them. He quenched the Antinomistic controversy excited in Wittenberg in 1537 by John Agricola (q.v.), who had been one of his dearest friends. Agricola completely retracted his erroneous views, but the tenderness of the old confidence and love was never restored.

XIV. Literary Activity. — The activity of Luther in the period which followed his return to Wittenberg was largely directed to the internal shaping of the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church. Among its richest results may be mentioned,

1. his German hymns in the first German Hymn-book (1524), and the Wittenberg Hymnbook (1529). He stands forth in these as the father and founder of German hymnology and Church music. *SEE HYMNOLOGY*. He was the author of thirty-six hymns, and of several original melodies adapted to them.

2. His *Order of Divine Service and of the Congregation* (Wittenberg, 1523); his *Formula Messae et Communionis* (1524); *German Mass and Order of Divine Service* (1526) (all of these are given in *Sunday Services of the Churches of the Reformation*, by C.P. Krauth), with which he connected his Ritual of Baptism and Marriage, and a form of Confession. The great visitation in the states of the elector of Saxony (1527-1529) led to Melancthon's writing the Book of Visitation. This was revised by Luther, and issued anew in 1538.

Among Luther's greatest labors are to be mentioned the two *Catechisms* (1529), and his *Translation of the Bible*. This he commenced with the New Testament in 1522; the Old was sent out in parts, commencing in 1525, and was issued complete in 1534. The final revision was made in 1541, and the latest edition of this final revision, which Luther himself helped to correct, typographically, appeared in 1545. The Bible of Luther is acknowledged masterpiece — one of the wonders of the intellectual world. "The modern German attained its full development and perfect finish in Luther's version. By means of that book it obtained a currency which nothing else could have given it. It became fixed; it became universal; it became the organ of a literature which, more than any other since the

Greek, has been a literature of ideas. It became the vehicle of modern philosophy, the cradle of those thoughts which at the moment act most intensely on the human mind" (Hedge). "He created the German language," says Heine.

XV. *Activity in Church Constitution.* — He took an active interest in the constitution of the Consistories: *Bedenken — Considerations of the Theologians touching Consistories* (1538). An important part was borne by Luther in the preparation of the confessional writings of the renewed Church. He was, in conjunction with other divines, the author of the Marburg Articles and Schwabach Articles (1529), which furnished the basis and, to a large extent, the material, both doctrinal and verbal, of the Augsburg Confession (1530), during the direct preparation and presentation of which Luther was at Coburg. As he was under the ban of the empire, to have appeared at Augsburg would have almost certainly cost him his life, and would have made all negotiation impossible, as it would have been regarded as an open act of aggression on the part of the Protestant princes. He was brought, therefore, to the nearest point at which he could be safe, and where he could be consulted. His influence at Augsburg was no less real and hardly less direct than if he had been there in person. The great hymn "Eine feste Burg" is generally supposed to have been written at this time, but there are strong grounds for believing that it appeared in 1529. In 1537 he prepared the Schmalcald Articles, to be laid before the council which had been summoned to convene at Mantua. In aiding in giving to the Church her proper external relations, Luther exercised his influence by letters, and by his writings in connection with the Diet of Nuremberg and of Ratisbon, the religious Peace of Nuremberg (1532), and the Interim of Ratisbon (1536). At the formation of the Torgau alliance (1526) and of the Schmalcald League (1530) he had sent his opinion and advice, and, with his counsel to his elector, the protestation was made at Spire (1529).

XVI. *Memorials.* —

1. A monumental bronze statue was erected to Luther's memory in the market-place of Wittenberg, 1817. Another monument, reared by the German nation at Worms, was inaugurated June 25, 1868.

2. The number of medals struck in honor of Luther and of his work is very great (Jincker's *Life of Luther*, illustrated by medals, in Latin, 1699, and German, 1707; Cyprian's *Hilaria Evangelicae* [1719, fol.]).

3. The third centennial anniversary of the death of Luther was observed February 18, 1846, throughout all Germany, with Wittenberg and Eisleben as its focal points. Nor was the celebration limited to Germany. Solemn memorial services were held in France, Holland, Sweden, Russia, and other countries. The anniversary was made the occasion of establishing a number of beneficent institutions. Among these were a Luther-school in Wittenberg for the poor, an evangelical Lutheran Orphanhouse in Warsawa, and the Luther-establishment in Leipzig, February 18, 1846, the object of which was to make provision for descendants of Luther, and to circulate Luther's writings, especially his translation of the Bible.

4. *Poetry and Art* have devoted many of their noblest efforts to Luther and his work. But neither Bechstein's epic ("Luther," Leipz. 1834), nor the dramas of Werner ("Martin Luther, or the Consecration of Power") and Koster, nor Trimpelmann's *Luther u. Seine Zeit* (Gotha, 1869), which is the latest attempt to dramatize Luther's life, have taken the place in the heart of the people which they would have filled had they been wholly worthy of their theme. The great war had its Achilles, but it waits for its Homer. The most ambitious effort in English in this line is Robert Montgomery's *Luther, or the Spirit of the Reformation* (3d edit. Lond. 1843).

5. Among the *paintings* of renown, the first place historically is due to Luther's portrait by Lucas Cranach. It is now in the possession of Winter, in Heidelberg. The copies and engravings of it have been multiplied by millions. Busts or portraits of Luther are found in many of the Protestant (Lutheran) churches on the Continent, and in some in America.

XVII. *Literature.* — Luther's separate works amount to about four hundred. In a collected shape his works have appeared in the following editions:

1. 1539-1559, 20 volumes folio (at Wittenberg), by order of the elector John Frederick. Seven of the volumes are in Latin (1545-1558), and one (Breslau, 1563) is the Index. 2. 1555-1558, 12 volumes folio (Jena). Four are Latin. The Index (1573 and 1592) was completed by Aurifaber (Eisleben, 1564-1565, 2 volumes folio). Text more trustworthy than that of the Wittenberg.

- 3.** 1661-1664, 10 volumes folio (Altenburg), by order of the duke Frederick William; edited by J. Ch. Sagitarus. German only. A supplement to these three editions was published in 1702, by J.G. Seidler (Halle, 1702).
- 4.** 1729-1740, 23 volumes folio, German (Leipzig); best of the folio editions.
- 5.** 1740-1753, 24 volumes 4to, German, J.G. Walch (Halle). Preferred to the others because of its fullness, and the incorporation of important documents; objected to because of inaccuracies, and liberties with the text.
- 6. a.** 1826-1857. 67 volumes 12mo, German (Erlangen); edited by John G. Plochmann and John C. Irmischer. It is the most critical of all the editions.
- b.** The Latin series of the same edition is not yet completed.

Selections from Luther's works, or abridgments, have been edited by F.W. Lommler (Gotha, 1816-17, 3 volumes), by Vent (Hamb. 1826-27, 10 volumes), by Pfitzer (Frankf. 1837), by Otto von Gerlach (1840-1848, 24 volumes), and by Zimmermann (1846-1850, 4 volumes, 8vo). For the German Christian people, by Frobenius, Schellbach, and others (1847-1855). Political writings, by Mundt (Berl. 1844). *Kirchen-Postille*, by Francke (Leipzig, 1844). Manual Concordance of Luther's writings, edited by Lomler and others (Darmstadt, 1827-1831, 9 volumes). See Bretschneider, *Luther an Unsere Zeit* (Erfurt, 1817).

Translations from Luther into English are catalogued in Lowndes's *Bibliographer's Manual* (Bohn, 1860), pages 1415-1417.

Luther's *Letters* have been edited, 1. by G. Th. Strobel (1780-83) and by De Wette (1825-28); supplement by Seidemann (1856). 2. Correspondence edited by Burckhardt (1866). See Veessenmayer, *Literargeschichte* ("Literary History of the Collections of Luther's Letters," Berlin, 1821).

The "*Table-Talk*" (*Tischreden*, Aurifaber, 1566; Stangwald, 1571, 1591) has been critically edited by Forstemann and Bindseil (1844-48). The most complete translation into English is by Capt. Henry Bell (Lond. 1652, folio; 2d edit. 1791; new edit. Burckhardt, 1840 [garbled]; transl. by Wm. Hazlitt, London, 1848; new edit., with additions, London [Bohn], 1857; Philad. 1868).

The writers on the life of Luther are numerous (Fabricii *Centifolium* [Hamburg, 1728, 1730 2 volumes; Ukert, 1817]; E.G. Vogel, *Biblioth. Biographica Luth.* [Halle, 1851], give the literature), namely, Melancthon, *Historia de vita et Actis Lutheri* (Wittenberg, 1546; edited by Augusti, Breslau, 1817; with Preface by Neander, Berl. 1841; transl. by Zimmermann, Göttingen, 1816; in English, London, 1561, 1817); Cruciger (1553); Mathesius. *Geschichte Luther's*, in *Seventeen Sermons* (Nurnberg, 1565, and frequently since; edited, with observations by Rust, Berl. 1841; by Schubert, Stuttg. 1852); Selnecker (1575); Dresser (1598); Walch, in his edition of *Luthers Werke*, 24:1-875;. Keil (2d ed. Leipz. 1764, 4 volumes); Schrockh (Leipzig, 1778); Tischer (Leipz. 1793; new edit. 1803); Ukert (Gotha, 1817, 2 volumes [rich in notices of literature]); Spieker, *Geschichte Luther's und der Reformation* (Berlin, 1818, 1 volume); Stang, *Leben u. Wirken* (1835-37; after J. Mathesius, Nurnb. 1833); G. Pfizer (Stuttg. 1836); Ledderhose (1836); Meurer, *Luther's Leben, aus den Quellen, erzahlt* (Dresden, 1843-1846 [transl. N.Y. 1848], 1852; 3d edit. 1870; abridged, 1850, 1861, 1869); F.W. Genthe, *Leben u. Werke* (Eisleb. 1841-45); Jiurgens, *First Divis.* 3 volumes — reaches only to 1517 (Leipz. 1846-47); Weydmann (1850), H. Gelzer, *Historical Sketches, with pictorial illustrations* by G. Konig (Hamb. 1851; transl., with an Introduction and view of the Reformation in England by Croly, 1853, 1858; 3d ed. Bohn, 1860; reprinted, Philadelphia, with Introduction by T. Stork, 1854); J.A. Jander, *Luther's Leben* (Leipzig, 1853); K. Zimmermann (Darmstadt, 1855); G.A. Hoff, *Vie de Luth.* (Paris, 1860); H.W.J. Thiersch, *Luther, Gustav Adolph, ud Maximilians I* (Nordl. 1869); Jikel, *Dr. M.L. Gesch. seines Lebens und seiner Zeit* (1870); Schultz (E.S.F.), *Luther's Leben u. Wirken* (Berl. 1870); Lang, *M.L.* (1870). The biographical dictionaries and the encyclopaedias all have articles on Luther. Among the former may be mentioned Bayle, among the latter the *Britannica* (Bunsen) and *Herzog* (by Kostlin). Many of the most important works which treat of Luther's life, as, for example, Sleidan, Scultetus, Seckendorftenzel, Spalatine, Myconius, among the older writers, and Marheineke, Ranke, D'Aubigne, Waddington, among recent ones, present it in its connections with the history of the Reformation (q.v.).

The most noticeable lives of Luther from *Roman Catholic* hands are by Cochlaeus (1549; tr. into German by Hueber, 1582), Ulenberg (1622; trans. into German, Mainz, 1836), Michelet (1833-35, trans. by Lawson,

1836; by G.H. Smith and by Hazlitt, 1846), and Audin (Par. 1838, 1850; transl. Philad. 1841; by Trumbull, London, 1854).

The best known by *English* hands are by Bower (1813), Riddle (1837), and John Scott (London, 1832; New York, Harpers, 1833). The Schonberg-Cotta family (1864) is the best picture of Luther from an English pen; little more than the frame is fiction.

From the hands of *American* authors we have lives by Sears (1850), Weiser (1848, 1866), Loy (tr. of Frick, 2d edit. 1869), J.G. Morris (*Quaint Sayings and Doings concerning Luther*, 1859), and A. Carlos Martyn (1866).

The third centennial of Luther's death, February 18, 1846, called forth an immense number of writings: Ortmann, Pasig, Kothe, Meurer, Petermann, Heyl, John, and Loschke. Petermann and others published histories of Luther's last days, and of his death and burial. There appeared at this time the account of Luther's last hours by two eye-witnesses, Justus Jonas and Coelius of Mansfeld; Luther's sermons, hitherto unprinted, edited by Holk (from the MSS. of the Wolfenbuttel Library); selections from Luther's German letters, by Doring; and Luther's hymns, by Kurtz, Wackernagel, and Crusius. Among the best books called forth is the prize work of Hopf — his critique (*Wurdigung*) of Luther's translation of the Bible, with reference to the older and the more recent translations (1847).

On Luther's theology, see Julius Kostlin, *L.'s Theologie*, "Luther's Theology, in its historical unfolding and in its internal connection" (Stuttgart, 1863); *L.'s Theologie*, "Luther's Theology, with special reference to his doctrine of Atonement and Redemption" (Harnack, 1862-7); Dorner, *Gesch. der Protest. Theolog.* (Manchen, 1867; trans. by Robson and Sophia Taylor, Edinb. 1871, 2 volumes); Plitt, *Einleitung in die Augustana* (Erlangen, 1868); Chr. Weisse, *Luther's Christologie* (1855); Luther's *Philosophie von Theophilus* (1 Theil, die Logik, Hanover, 1870).

On Luther's German style, see Dietz, *Wörterbuch zu Dr. M. L.'s Deutschen Schriften* (Leipsic, 1868); Opitz, *Die Sprache L.* (Halle, 1869).

(On the character and merits of Luther, Ackermann L. *Seinens Vollen Werth und Wesen nach, aus seinen Schriften dargestellt* (I Heft, "Luther im Kampf," Jena, 1871). For other literature, **SEE REFORMATION.** (C.P.K.)

Lutheran Church, Lutheranism, Lutherans.

I. The name "Lutherans," as a designation of all those who were in sympathy with Luther's views, was, at the opening of the Reformation, first applied to them by Eck (q.v.) and pope Hadrian VI, and was meant as a term of depreciation, and at first and for a considerable time designated the entire body of those who opposed the corruptions of Rome. The official and proper titles of the particular churches on which the name Lutheran has finally been fixed are "Protestant" (q.v.), "Evangelical" (q.v.), and "Adherents of the Augsburg Confession." The Protestant Evangelical Church of the Augsburg Confession has not, as a whole, to this hour, by any official act, received or acknowledged the title "Lutheran," but has tolerated it because of the historical necessities of the usage. Like the name "Christian" itself, invented by enemies, it has been borne until it has become a name of honor. It became more and more the received term for the Protestant Evangelical Church in consequence of the struggles of that Church with the Zwinglian and Calvinistic-Reformed without, and the Philippists within. It marked Lutheranism in antithesis to Calvinism, and the thoroughgoing adherence to the faith of Luther, over against the changes furtively introduced and extended under the plea, true or false, of the authority of Melancthon (q.v.; also *SEE PHILIPPISTS*).

The Lutheran Church is the ecclesiastical communion which adheres to the rule and articles of faith restored in the Reformation, of which Luther was the chief instrument. The acceptance of this rule (God's Word) and the confession of this faith are set forth in the Augsburg Confession of 1530, which is the common confession of the entire Lutheran Church. The major part of the Lutheran Church formally and in terms acknowledges, and the rest of it, almost without exception, virtually acknowledges the Apology of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, the Schmalcald Articles of 1537, the two Catechisms of Luther of 1529, and the Formula of Concord of 1579, as accordant with the rule of faith and with the Augsburg Confession. These confessions, together with the oecumenical creeds, form the Book of Concord of 1580, and are often styled the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church. The system of faith and life involved in the Church's Confession is Lutheranism, the Church which officially receives it is the Lutheran Church, and the members of that Church are Lutherans. The faith of the Lutheran Church is thus summarily presented by Dr. Chas. P. Krauth (*Conservative Reformation*, page 127): "We are justified by God, not

through any merits of our own, but by his tender mercy, through faith in his Son. The depravity of man is total in its extent, and his will has no positive ability in the work of salvation, but has the negative ability (under the ordinary means of grace) of ceasing its resistance. Jesus Christ offered a proper, vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice. Faith in Christ presupposes a true penitence. The renewed man co-works with the Spirit of God.

Sanctification is progressive, and never reaches absolute perfection in this life. The Holy Spirit works through the word and sacraments, which only in the proper sense are means of grace. Both the Word and the Sacraments bring a positive grace, which is offered to all who receive them outwardly, and which is actually imparted to all who in faith embrace it." The chief peculiarities of Lutheran doctrine, which have to any considerable degree become subjects of controversy outside of the body itself, relate to (1.) Original Sin, (2.) the Person of Christ, (3) Baptism, and (4) the Lord's Supper. These will be found specially treated under those heads. Luther's own views on the last point will be detailed under the art. *SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION*. For a more complete view of the doctrines of Lutheranism, see Krauth, *Conservative Reformation* (Phila. 1871), and Prof. Jacobs in the *Mercersburg Review*, January 1872, page 77 sq.; Zöckler, *Augsburische Confession* (1870).

II. Origin and Extent. — The rupture with the dominant part of the Church of Rome, and the formation of the new communion, was made inevitable by the Diet at Spires in 1529, at which the solemn protestation of the evangelical princes was presented, in opposition to the imperial recess (decree) in its bearing on the great religious interests of the time. This event gave to the Lutheran Church the title **PROTESTANT** *SEE PROTESTANT* (q.v.), by which it is almost exclusively known in parts of Europe. The rupture was completed by the events connected with the presentation of the Augsburg Confession in 1530. The fundamental principle of the Lutheran Church prevented its formation into a new, concentrated, and united whole, like that which had grown to such enormous proportions and baleful power in the Church of the West. Nor was it Luther's object to form an independent Church. He hesitated as much in the establishment of an independent organization as do the leaders of the Old Catholic movement in our day (1872). Luther's single aim, like Dollinger's today, was the reformation and revival of Christianity, and the restoration of the whole Church, in its universal form, to primitive and scriptural purity. Denominationalism he knew not. His conception of the

Church comprehended Catholic Christianity. In spite of himself, however, his peculiar views, which for convenience sake we will now denominate "Lutheranism," spread rapidly, especially after the Diet of Worms (1521), and though as late as 1522 Luther himself wrote, I beseech you, above all things, not to use my name; not to call yourselves Lutherans, but Christians" (*Works*, 18:293, in the 6th Leips. ed.; comp. also Gelzer, *Life of Luther*, pages 288, 291), national churches sprang up in every country where his followers constituted the majority. These state churches were all independent of each other, and were based much upon the same fundamental principles of polity, allowing, however, of great variety in the forms of application. Instead of the bishop of Rome, the princes of the different countries now assumed the rights of bishops, and the direct rule of the Church was conducted by the Consistories (q.v.). John the Constant, elector of Saxony, followed in the steps of his brother and predecessor, Frederick the Wise, in devotion to the work of Luther. The landgrave Philip of Hesse also became an adherent. In Prussia the Lutheran doctrine was introduced in 1523 by George of Polentz, bishop of Samland. Thus, at the beginning of the year 1525, the three princes of Saxony, Hesse, and Prussia were its defenders. The Reformed doctrine found an especially ready entrance in the free imperial cities, where the voice of the people was a power. In Würtemberg it was introduced under duke Ulrich in 1534; in the bishoprics of Magdeburg and Halberstadt in 1541; in Brunswick about 1545. The views which Luther had expressed at an early period in regard to a congregational constitution were thrown into the background by the disturbances of the Anabaptists and the insurrections of the peasants. The leagues of the evangelical princes were one of the earliest forms in which there was an expression of the unity of the different parts of the Lutheran Church. The conventions of the theologians for the adjustment of doctrinal controversies tended to the same end. In the political relations of the Church the unity found expression in the "Corpus Evangelicorum" (q.v.) at the Diets.

The rapid, and, for a time, resistless growth of the Lutheran Church received its first check in the "ecclesiastical reservations" of the religious peace of Augsburg. By the terms of this peace the transition of an ecclesiastical prince was attended by a loss of his secular power. The miscarriage of the attempt at reformation by Gebhard Truchsess in the archbishopric of Cologne in 1583 was a serious disaster to the Lutheran Church. The larger part of Germany was inclined to the Lutheran faith. The

apostasy of several of the princes, as, for example, Pfalz-Neuburg, on political grounds, and the influence of the counter reformation conducted by the Jesuits in Bavaria and Austria, preserved a part of Germany for the pope; but the peace of Westphalia finally fixed the bounds of the Lutheran Church in Europe, and they remain, very much as they then were, to the present day. The transition of the elector of Saxony, of the duke of Brunswick, and of other princes to the Church of Rome, exercised no very marked influence upon their people. A large part of the higher nobility, which in the earlier movements of the Reformation had manifested, almost without exception, a drawing towards it, gradually lapsed again into Romanism. (On these perversions, and other losses to the Lutheran Church, see Lobell's *Hist. Briefe*; Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, volume 7 [1868].) At an earlier period than that of these changes, the Philippistic and Reformed churches of the Palatinate, and in Hesse, in Anhalt, and on the Lower Rhine, in East Friesland and Bremen, Lippe, Nassau, and Tecklenburg, had sundered themselves from the Lutheran Church. In the present century these churches have come together in the "Union." Beyond the bounds of Germany the Lutheran Church was firmly established in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, and in the German Baltic provinces of Russia. In Poland it was suppressed (comp. Krasinski, *Hist. of the Ref. in Poland*). In the United States of America the Lutheran Church has won a new territory. *SEE LUTHERANS IN AMERICA*. In Hungary and Transylvania the German (Saxon) nationality accepted the Lutheran confession. The Magyars became Reformed. In Sweden, Olaf and Lorenz Peterson, pupils of Luther, preached the purified faith. Gustavus Vasa, king of Sweden, greatly promoted the interests of the Lutheran Church; and at the Diet of Westeras, in 1544, the last remnants of the papal system were removed. In Denmark, as early as 1527, Christian II had favored the Reformation. Frederick I was also a decided Lutheran. Christian III called in Bugenhagen to prepare and introduce a Church discipline and ritual. Riga and Courland entered into the League of Schmalcald in 1538. Apart from the vast Lutheran element within the "Union" in Prussia, the Lutheran Church is the predominant Church in the minor German lands: Baden, Brunswick, Mecklenburg, Oldenburg, the principality of Reuss in Hesse, the Saxon lands, Schwarzburg, and Wirttemberg; also in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; in Russia, in the departments of Livonia, Esthland, St. Petersburg, Finland, and Courland. Lutherans constitute a large body in Hungary, France, the British empire, and North America. They are, in fact,

found the world over. There are not less, probably, than forty millions of them altogether. (Comp. Krauth, pages 124, 125.)

III. *Organization and Constitution.* — The first fresh impulses of the evangelical life of faith was not allowed to shape a complete congregational life in entire accordance with the pure principles which had been restored. Although the early Lutheran princes were, as a body, men of devoted piety, yet the interests of the Church in the particular state territories were subjected to political policy. The tendencies of the Romish ideas, which in every department had struck their roots too deeply into European life to be easily eradicated, put forth new vigor in the reactionary after-time. The Lutheran Church was repressed in one part of her development, and stimulated to the highest degree by her liberty in another, and by the doctrinal necessities which taxed all her resources. The result was that she matured abnormally — the strength of her polity bore no proportion to the perfection of her doctrinal system. In the organization of the Church an important part was borne by the Church visitation in Saxony in 1529, and resulted in assigning the oversight of the churches and schools to superintendents (q.v.). A Saxon Church Order of Discipline and Worship was prepared, which became, to a very large extent, the model in the organization of the state churches throughout Germany. The Lutheran Church held herself in principle remote from the two extremes of hierarchy, which absorbed the State into the Church, and Caesaropapacy, which absorbed the Church into the State. The princes and magistrates, in the time of the Church's need, took the position of provisional bishops. They were the supreme officers in the Church, its highest representatives. In the execution of the duties thus assumed they called to their aid Consistories (q.v.), an official board composed of clergymen and laymen. A condition of things which had been justified by the immediate necessity of the Church gradually became normal in the "Episcopal system." The provisional became legalized into the fixed, and the head of the State was in effect the chief bishop of the Church. Such a distinction as Rome had made between clergy and laity, and which ignored the great New-Testament doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, was no longer recognized. The ministry ceased to be a self-perpetuating, independent order, and was regarded as a divine office, with a divine vocation, given by Christ's command, through the Church. A hierarchical division of the clergy, as of divine right, was rejected as at war with the Christianity of the New Testament and of the early Church; but the propriety and usefulness of

grades in the ministry (bishops, superintendents, provosts), as of human right only, was acknowledged, and they are retained in some countries. Thus, in Denmark, in the very infancy of Lutheranism, evangelical bishops took the place of the deposed Roman Catholic prelates; while in Sweden the prelates embracing the Reformed doctrine were continued in office, and thus secured to that country "apostolical succession" in the High-Church sense. Very generally the rule of the Church is by consistories, but as these depend upon the instructions of the congregations, the ultimate power lies with the latter. *SEE CONSISTORY; SEE SYNOD; SEE CHURCH.*

IV. Progress. — The internal history of the Church became largely a process of the development of doctrine (see Hundeshagen, *Beitr. z. Kirch.-politik*); and in this progress, naturally enough, opposition was encountered, and gave rise to controversies with parties both from within and without. In the earliest period of the history of the Lutheran Church, her chief struggles were with Popery, the Anabaptists, and the Sacramentarians. These controversies drew the boundary-lines of her own territory, as biblical over against Rome, historical and conservative over against Anabaptism and the more radical type of Protestantism. To the fixing of the bounds of her territory succeeded a long series of efforts to bring that territory under complete and harmonious cultivation. To be consistent in general over against systems which, as systems, were indefensible, was not enough. The Lutheran system was to bring all its own parts into working harmony, and hence the various dissensions and difficulties when it was yet in its infancy. The most important of the internal controversies which arose during this effort are:

- 1.** The *Antinomistic*, from 1537 to 1540, on the relation between the Gospel and the law, the use of the law, and its necessity. *SEE AGRICOLA, JOHN.*
- 2.** The *Osiandrian*, from 1549 to 1567, on redemption, justification, and sanctification. *SEE OSIANDER ANDREW.*
- 3.** The *Majoristic*, from 1551 to 1562: Are good works necessary to salvation? and in what sense? *SEE MAJOR, GEORGE.*
- 4.** The *Stancaristic*, 1552: According to what nature was Christ's redemptory work wrought out — the divine, the human, or both?

5. The *Synergistic*, from 1555 to 1570, on the question whether there is an active cooperation on the part of man before and on his conversion.

6. The *Flacian*, 1561: Is original sin substantial or accidental? *SEE FLICIUS ILLYRICUS*. All these controversies had a common aim — they wished to define more perfectly the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith, to show what it presupposed and what it involved, to exhibit its objective and subjective aspects. All doctrines were viewed in these controversies in their relations to the central doctrine, and the great aim was to adjust them to it (see Dorner, *Geschichte der Prof. Theologie* (1867; in English dress, Edinb. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo). A deeper impression was made upon the life of the people by the controversies which grew out of the interim in 1548, involving the mode of worshipping God. It touched matters which appealed to the senses as well as to the convictions of the worshippers. Out of it arose the *Adiaphoristic* controversy (q.v.) (1550-1555): Whether the Church could permit certain usages, in themselves indifferent, to be imposed upon her by force or civil policy. The vehement opposition of the Flacians to the Philippists also had a great influence upon the shaping of the Lutheran Church. Unfortunately, however, these divisions among the Protestants gave the Romanists many advantages: they tended at the Diet of Augsburg (1566) to change the political situation greatly in favor of the Roman Catholics, and protracted the strife for years (Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte*, 7:63). *SEE INTERIM*. Against Calvinism, the controversy turned especially upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and the associated doctrine of the Person of Christ, and the doctrine of predestination. It involved the whole essential diversity between Lutheranism and Calvinism; also the Philippistic tendency, so far as it approximated to Calvinism in some features (Crypto-Calvinism). To compose these differences and close up these questions within the Church was the aim of the Formula of Concord, which after various ineffectual efforts in the same general direction at the Assembly of the Electors in Frankfort (1558), at the Assembly of the Princes in Naumburg (1561), and at the Altenburg Colloquy (1568), was finally carried to a successful completion at Cloister Bergen, near Magdeburg, in 1577. *SEE CONCORD, FORMULA OF*. The preparation of the Formula of Concord is the last act in the series of events which gave full confessional shape to the doctrines of the Lutheran Church.

During Luther's lifetime the Lutheran Church had taken a firm and final position over against the Roman Catholic. The Augsburg Confession was

the rallying point of the friends of the revised faith. The Apology defended the Confession in Melancthon's incomparable manner; the Schmalcald Articles gave forth Luther's trumpet note of a battle in which no quarter could now be given — a battle for victory or death. The people had their Manual in the Shorter Catechism, and the pastors, in using it, had the Larger Catechism, the best commentary on the lesser. Yet these immortal documents did not exhaust the development of the faith. Even in the individual peculiarities of Luther and Melancthon there were impulses to conflicting tendencies. After Luther's death the Lutheran Church was threatened with a schism, which might have been followed by the complete triumph of Rome over the whole reformatory work. On the one side was the gentler, unionistic tendency of Melancthon and his party (the Philippists), yearning for union, and temporizing sometimes with Calvinism, and yet more frequently with Romanism. On the other side stood the stricter party, headed by Amsdorf, Flacius, and Wigand. Over against the Church of Rome on the one side, and the Reformed Church on the other, the Lutheran Church insisted earnestly on the doctrines which distinguished and separated her from both. She was unwilling that open questions should be perpetuated, and desired that the points of controversy should be adjusted and closed. Shall theology be simply a mode of thinking, or shall it be a system of faith? was the question involved. Shall it be a ball for the play of theologians, or a world for the firm footing of believers? The controversies which now arose took their root in questions which involved the relations of the two parties, on the one side to Romanism, on the other to Calvinism. Toward the Church of Rome the question in controversy had reference to the doctrines of redemption and justification. The intellectual centers of these struggles were the *universities* (q.v.). Wittenberg at this period was the home of the Melancthonian theology. Its great antagonist in the interests of the conservative Lutheranism was Jena, which for various causes — some of the subordinate ones, no doubt, being of a political character — had been founded in 1558 by the older Saxon line. It was the citadel of conservative Lutheranism until its exponents were driven from it for conscience sake. Their refuge proved to be Magdeburg. This period reaches its culmination in the preparation of the Formula Concordise, in which the Swabian tendency, whose great representatives were Brentius and Andreai, obtained official recognition (compare Schmid, *Geschichte der Abendmahlslehre*). The orthodoxy thus fixed was dominant from this time to the beginning of the 18th century. Its elaborate polemics were built up on almost

impregnable doctrinal authority. The scholastic acuteness and dryness more and more supplanted the freer and more vital faith of the Reformation. The religion of the heart was too much absorbed into the elaborate system of theology. The temple was solid and grand, but the hearthstones of the people were too often cold. George Calixtus (1586-1656) revived in Helmstadt the humanism of Melancthon. His school became involved with orthodoxy in the *Syncretistic controversy* (q.v.). It sought, in the interests of Church peace, to soften the asperities of dogmatic disputes and the exclusiveness of the doctrinal systems. The plan on which it proposed to accomplish this result was to distinguish between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, and to return to the yet largely vague and general expressions of the first five centuries, which, while they regarded a pure faith as necessary to salvation, endured, without deciding the conflicting opinions on various points. The most unsparing and one of the ablest opponents of this tendency was Abraham Calovius (q.v.). Spener produced a revival of religious feeling by pietism. This active Christianity was needed in opposition to the one-sided scholasticism which had grown up in the Church. So far it revived the truer Lutheranism of the first aera. But it soon deviated into an outward form of religious life. The Biblical theology of its representatives degenerated into arbitrary interpretations and applications of Scripture. *Pietism* (q.v.), in various shades, made good its footing in the Church. It wrought in its better forms a more earnest spirit in theology. Next to Spener, as a representative of the best type of pietism, was Aug. Hermann Francke (q.v.). Its most distinguished opponents were Johann Benedict Carpzov (q.v.) and Valentine Ernest Lischer (q.v.). The inflexible narrowness of the Church life was alleged as a ground of separation from the Church by the mystical fellowships which attached themselves to J. Bohme, Gichtel, and Dippel, and by the Church of the Brethren. By these movements, and by Bengel and the theosophy of Oetinger, the dominion of the mediaevalism of the seventeenth century was broken. Under the influence of rationalism, at the end of the eighteenth century, the points of distinction between the Lutheran and the Reformed churches, both in Church life and in theology, lost more and more their significance. Efforts at union, which were vigorous without being in any high sense earnest, were made, especially in Westphalia and on the Rhine. These efforts resulted in very little until after the Wars of Liberation. From that great series of struggles went forth an intense religious feeling through all Germany. It was felt alike in both the Protestant churches. It stood in strong opposition to the shallow spirit of rationalism, but was, in the nature

of the case, more interested at the beginning in the great common principles of the religious life of the whole Protestant movement than with particular, and still more than with specific distinctive doctrines. Prussia now took steps for a "union" of all the Protestants. By the Lutheran conservatives this new movement was looked upon with distrust. The union, they held, depended for its moral power upon a depreciation in part of the confession. It had been made possible by rationalism; but its perplexity was that, if it remained true to what was in so large a part its original source, it lost its power on men in proportion as their convictions were heightened and intensified; if, on the other hand, it abandoned the mild laxity of rationalism, it at once helped to restore the way to a strict confessionism. It is impossible for men to be intelligently earnest, either as Reformed or Lutheran, and regard the differences of the two churches as of little importance. Claus Harms, in his theses, treated the union as a rationalistic volatilization of the very substance of the faith. Among the people of conservative stamp also, the changes in the liturgy, the hymn-books, and in the Church usages of various kinds, were regarded with suspicion and dislike as an assault upon the religion of the fathers. Under these circumstances, the "Old Lutheran" movement, under the leadership of Scheibel, in Breslau, Huschke, the distinguished jurist, and Steffens, the natural philosopher, separated itself from connection with the State Church and formed an independent communion. *SEE OLD LUTHERANISM*. The religious life of the Church continued to suffer from the evils which in the course of her history had been fixed upon German Lutheran Protestantism. Prominent among them were the hampering of the congregational life — a life which was demanded by the principles of Lutheranism — and the repression of public life which characterized the first half of the nineteenth century. The newly-awakened religious life withdrew itself, in consequence, very largely into the smaller religious circles, and derived from them more or less of a pietistic hue. *SEE PIETISM*. These circles themselves drew more and more toward the ancient orthodoxy. To this they were impelled by the unionistic efforts, and the havoc created by infidelity and rationalism. The new theological tendencies were met by the system set forth in the Confessions. The feeling grew that without a restoration of the old relations of fealty on the part of ministers to the great Church standards there would be no internal harmony in the Church. This opposition to union first embodied itself in the Lutheran Conferences held at Leipzig in 1843, and subsequently. Rudelbach was the earliest leader of this movement. He was succeeded by Harless. It gained strength by the

civil commotions of 1848, so that at that time it demanded of the members of the conferences a subscription to the symbolical books. Under this tendency were formed the provincial associations, which united with the Lutheran Conventions at Wittenberg in 1849 and 1851. In these conventions, as well as in a great variety of publications, a strong opposition to the "union" was developed. It was evident that the conservatives were a unit on the two points — the dissolution of the state union and the complete re-establishment of the Lutheran Church. The prevailing political current in Prussia from 1852 favored this tendency. (See below, under *Ritual and Worship*.) In the different lands and provinces of Germany, the efforts in the one direction of emancipation and restoration bore the common character of earnestness and vigor, but in forms and modes shaped by circumstances. In Bavaria the leaders were Lohe, Thomasius, and Harless. In Mecklenburg its great representatives were Kliefoth and Krabbe. In Hanover its chief organs were the Conference at Stade, and Petri, Mtinchmeier (*Dogma of the Invisible and Visible Church*, 1854), and Uhlhorn; on the Rhine itself, and in Westphalia, Ravensberg. The "New Lutheranism" was not, indeed, a internal unit in all its views. Among its great theologians, Hoffmann and Kahnis completely alienated their early friends. In Bavaria, Löhe (died 1872), in carrying through his principles, came into conflict with the government in the Lutheran Church.

Efforts were made to annul the union and restore genuine Lutheranism. Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur, who will be considered above any suspicion of sympathy with the distinctive theology of Lutheranism, gives the history and characteristics of the two doctrinal tendencies, the unionistic mediating and the Lutheran, which come into conflict at this point: "The controversies arising from the question of the union have had this result in dogmatics, that no man can defend the Church doctrine without either taking position with the doctrines held in common — the consensus-dogmatik — or taking the strictly confessional position. As the chief opponents of the union are the Lutheran theologians, who, with all their strength, give force to their confessional interest, the main opposition to the dogmatik of the consensus is offered by the Lutheran dogmatik. On the side of the consensus the main representatives are theologians of the school of Schleiermacher, among whom are Nitzsch, Lücke, J. Müller, Dörner, and others. To relieve the union from the charge of lacking confessional character, they find it necessary to maintain a distinct dogmatical system.

But as it is essential to the idea of the union to set aside the particular distinctive doctrines which sunder the confessions, the system of the theologians of the union can only accept the ground common to both. In this spirit Nitzsch, in the *Urkundenbuch d. Esvangelischen Union* (1853), and J. Muller, *The Evangelical Union, its Nature and divine Right* (1854), have attempted to present, in the different articles, a formula exhibiting the agreement of the confessions. The consensus, however, can only be brought about by a limiting and tempering of the two doctrines to a medium in which the sharpness of the antithesis is lost. This method of union may be applicable to a certain set of doctrines, but it goes to pieces of necessity on the distinctive doctrines which can allow of no modification without loss of their essential character. The principle on which the theology of the consensus rests is that that alone is essential in Protestantism in which the two confessions agree. Schleiermacher was the first to maintain this, but his object was by it to neutralize and render indifferent both systems, in order to set them aside as antiquated, and to substitute for them a point of view in consonance with modern culture. With all the care which Schleiermacher takes to give himself the appearance of complete harmony with the ancient system, it is easy to see that the new form of consciousness breaks through the old, and that the old is retained simply to introduce the new, and to smooth the way for it. In the case of these doctrinaries of the union, however, the dogmatics of the consensus is a mere illusion, which has no ground except in their lack of mental freedom. They find the particularism of the confessional systems too narrow for them; they are urged by something within them to sustain a freer relation to those systems; and there is no ignoring the fact that they take a position which has gone beyond them. But they are not willing to confess this to themselves; instead of looking forward where their proper goal lies, they turn backwards. They are constantly recurring to the point on which the confessional differences originally rested. They desire to establish by the Church confessions what they hold to be the real substance of the evangelical faith. Yet they must themselves confess that they cannot be satisfied that they are throughout in harmony with either the Lutheran or the Reformed doctrine, and that on this ground they are wishing for what can be found in neither. The more the two systems are compared, the more do they show that the one excludes the other. This is the contradiction out of which there is no escape, the code in which there is a perpetual revolution between union and confession. The sympathy for the old system is lost, and yet there is lack of force and courage to rise to a new one. Men

know in their hearts that they are no longer at one with the Church, and yet they are afraid to break with it outwardly. They hold fast to the union, and yet cannot let go of the confessional. Is it a matter of wonder that all the dogmatic products of this school of theologians have an air of feebleness, superficiality, and lifelessness? From the dogmatic position it is impossible to deny that the opponents of the theology of the union are right; from it we must justify the Lutheran theologians, whose system, with all the offensiveness of its particularism, has at least the advantages of character, decision, and logical consistency" (*Kirchengeschichte des Neunz. Jahrh.* [Tübing. 1862], pages 409-411).

Mecklenburg isolated itself by its exclusive statechurchism. Even the Hanoverian Catechism, with which the earliest agitations in North Germany had been connected, did not secure the unmixed approval of the portion of the Church with whose views it was in sympathy. New Lutheranism has been accused of manifesting a tendency towards Romanizing, especially in the doctrine of the ministry, of the sacraments, and of the Church. To the ministerial office it is charged with imputing a hierarchical priestly character. It is charged with holding that ordination confers a divine authority for the ministration of the Word and sacraments, and for the discipline and government of the Church. With this tendency has been connected a desire to restore private confession, which its opponents say is almost equivalent to auricular confession. With it has arisen a strong opposition to the presbyterial constitution. It is said to maintain that the sacraments derive their operativeness from the "office of the means of grace." In connection with this view, an exalted importance is attached to the sacraments. The Lord's Supper is made the proper center of the public service. The whole artistic sense has been developed in this movement; a higher interest has been excited in the proper performance of the ritual, and, indeed, of the whole liturgical service of the Church. The intoning and the whole musical element in worship has been assigned its old place of esteem. This school has been charged with maintaining that, in order to preserve the pure doctrine, a view of tradition in affinity with that of Rome is to be held. Subjection to the authority of the Church is to be substituted for individual faith. The most important literary organ of this tendency has been Hengstenberg's *Ervangelische Kirchenzeitun*, established in 1827, which maintains within the Prussian union, with immense force and success, the position of distinctive Lutheranism. This tendency separated itself from the orthodoxy which bore the tinge of pietism, and

from the mediating theology, especially in the work of inner missions (q.v.), with which it refused to cooperate, on the ground that it was not churchly. In the Prussian Church it opposed itself to the regulations of the congregations, and to the constitution of the State Church. In the department of missions to the heathen (the term foreign missions has ceased to answer since it has become the fashion for one set of Christians to establish missions for the conversion of another set), the revised New Lutheranism has pursued an independent course. Against this Dorner expressed himself, in a memorial of the Prussian High Consistory in 1866, which did not, however, prevent the newly-acquired state churches (such as Hanover, etc.) from being placed under the care of the minister of cultus. The Lutherans outside of Prussia, the Mecklenburgers, Bavarians, and others, at the conference at Hanover in 1868, with the Hanoverians, and others in Church fellowship with them, made use of the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession (of the Church and its true unity) to keep up the agitation against all union with the rest of the State Church of Prussia. See *Neue Evassgel. Kirchenzeitung* (1868); Ritschl, in Dorner's *Zeitschrift fur das Kirchen-recht* (1869); Matthes, *Allgemeine Kirchliche Chronik* (1871).

V. *Ritual and Worship (cultus) of the Lutheran Church.* — The foundation for these was laid by Luther in his *Formula Missae* (1523) and his *German Mass* (1525). In these he proceeded upon the principle, which he expressed and defended, that the Church service was not to be abrogated as a whole; that the vital parts of it had a noble origin; that the great thing was to purge off its excrescences and defilements, and to restore to its true place in it the Word of God, which had been more and more neglected. In conformity with Luther's fundamental principles, the ritual was purified, the neglected elements replaced, and the more necessary parts developed still further. It was brought back to the standard of the Bible, and of early pure Catholic antiquity. The Lord's Supper, restored to its true position, became the grand point of culmination in all the chief services. The office of the Word was renewed. Preaching became a great indispensable element of the chief public services. The congregation took a direct part in the service in response and singing. The services were held in the vernacular of the country, though a certain proportion of the familiar old Latin part of the services was in many cases continued, mainly, however, in order to retain the noble Church-music, until time had been given to fit it to a vernacular service complete in all its parts. Luther

insisted simply on an organization of worship which should preserve its rich treasures and resources. Services for the morning and evening, and for the days of the week, were retained or arranged. More than all, congregational singing was developed. In conformity with these views, there arose the service of the Lutheran type which we find in the agenda (q.v.) of the 16th and 17th centuries. In northern, eastern, and middle Germany the Wittenberg order was followed, and is maintained to this day. The service is of moderate length, and is rich liturgically.

The forms established in the era of the Reformation were more or less broken through, or altered in a very wretched manner, in consequence of the theological revolution which marked the 18th century. With the religious life, whose reviving power was felt towards the close of the first quarter of the 19th century, came a strong desire for relief from these mischievous changes. To this desire, at least as one of its greatest motives, the Prussian agenda owes its origin; yet, alike in the mode of its introduction and in elements which pervaded it throughout, it involved a breach with the original Lutheran type, to which it claimed in large measure to conform. As this fact became more and more manifest, the effort was made to bring the forms of the agenda into harmony with the better elements which still survived in the congregations; yet, after all that could be done in this way, the result was imperfect and unsatisfactory. In consequence of this, in the most recent period, a still closer approximation has been made in Prussia to the original Lutheran ritual. One set of influential thinkers, as Hifling and Kliefoth, contended for an unconditional repristination of the worship of the Reformation time. Others held that various changes were necessary to adjust what was furnished by the history in Church worship with the well-grounded views of the present and the actual needs of the congregations.

The "agenda" became a source of special trouble in the controversy between the Unionists and the "Old Lutherans." The contest on the agenda raged particularly severe in Silesia. Among the most active participants in this struggle were the pastors Scheibel, Berger, Wehrhahn, and Kellner, at Hinigern. A pacific royal order of February 28, 1834, in regard to the continued force of the confessions, accomplished little. Nor was the conflict allayed by the rescript of the Consistory of Breslau, May 15, 1834, which demanded that the clergy who had not acceded to the Union should use the revised agenda of 1829, and forbade any public attacks upon the Union. In consequence of infraction of these orders the offending

clergymen were suspended (1834). In Honigern the military were called in to force open the Church for the introduction of the State-Union service (December 24, 1834). Similar disturbances arose in Halle in connection with Guericke, professor in the university, who was removed by the government in 1836. But this opposition element was not to be seduced by flattery nor terrified by force. In a synod held at Breslau in 1835 they had resolved to exhaust all legal measures to secure for themselves purity, independence, and integrity in doctrine, worship, and constitution. Missionary preachers traveled from place to place, administering baptism and the Lord's Supper. In Berlin and Erfurt new congregations were formed. In the Mark and in Silesia a special apostolical Church constitution was adopted. Among the decided Lutherans, however, there were two tendencies. The stricter tendency demanded a complete separation from the State Church. The relatively more moderate party, with which Guericke stood, desired to carry out their Lutheran convictions within the State Church as far as the legal concessions allowed them to do so. These troubles matured a purpose in thousands of the oppressed confessors of the faith to leave their native land for conscience sake. In spite of various concessions on the part of the government, a great emigration to Australia took place under the leadership of Kavel. To these "pilgrim fathers" of our day were added many from Saxony, led by Stephan, and from Wurtemberg and the Wupperthal. From 1838, and especially after the advent of Frederick William IV to the throne of Prussia (1840), the tone of the government towards the Lutherans became milder.

VI. *"Separate Lutherans."* — A royal general concession was issued July 23, 1845, for the relief of those Lutherans who held themselves aloof from the State "Evangelical" Church. They were granted the right to form congregations of their own, and to have them united under a common direction, which was not to be subject to the control of the State Church. The congregation, having obtained the consent of the state to its formation, could call pastors, whose vocation was to be confirmed by the Direction, and who were to be ordained by ordained ministers. The baptisms, confirmations, proclamation of the bans, and marriages of these clergymen were acknowledged in law, and their Church registers were to be received in evidence. Their obligation as regarded the taxes and burdens of the parochial connection was to be determined by the common law. Under these provisions the Lutherans constituted a High Consistory in 1841 under the presidency of professor Huschke. This official board is the supreme

ecclesiastical authority for the Lutherans in Prussia. It consists of four regular members; it is controlled by the Synod, and has charge of the purity of the Church in doctrine and life, of the reception of new congregations, the regulation of the parochial relations, and the appointments of clergymen; to it is committed the decision in complaints made by the officials of the churches and of the higher schools. It has oversight of the ritual, of the decisions in ecclesiastical cases, and of censures, the calling of synods, and similar matters. The clergy are supported by a fixed salary, and by perquisites. The processes of Church discipline are monition, temporary exclusion from the communion, the making of apologies in various degrees, and final excommunication. The Church service is conducted according to the agenda which have been in use; the preaching on free texts requires the permission of the Board of the High Consistory; the Lord's Supper is an essential part of the chief service. The Lutherans are not obliged to send their children to the United schools. Thus the Lutheran Church in Prussia obtained a definite independent foundation. In 1847 the High Consistory had in its care twenty-one congregations recognized by the state, and numbering about nineteen thousand souls. Of these the largest proportion was in Silesia — ten congregations, with 8400 members. The smallest proportion was in Westphalia and in the Rhine Provinces. In addition to these Separate Lutherans there was an immense number of Lutherans who, in consequence of concessions guaranteed by the government, remained in the State Church. Outside of Prussia, a Lutheran movement was felt in Nassau in 1846, in which Brunn of Steeten, near Runkel, was leader. The government and the deputies declined to authorize the formation of a separate Lutheran commission. The connection between the Lutherans was strengthened by the press and by conventions. Their literary organs were the *Zeitschrift für Lutlerische Theologie*, edited by Budelbach and Guericke; the *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, edited by Harless and others; and various popular periodicals, such as the *Pilger aus Sachsen*, the *Sonntagsblatt*, and others. Conventions were held at Berlin, Triglaff, and Gnadau. The Lutheran Conference in Leipsic held its first session in 1843. With the great political movement of 1848 the interests of the Positive Lutherans entered on a new era. Of the urgent demands made at that time for the separation of Church and State, they took advantage especially in their struggle against the Union established by the State Church. Meanwhile the difference of conviction between the Lutherans within the Union and those separated from it was not completely removed. The Separate Lutherans urged the impossibility of a Lutheran

clergyman's remaining with good conscience in the Union. The Lutherans who did not withdraw from the government Church nevertheless began to come into closer association under the leadership of Goschel, Stahl, Heubner, and Schmieder. Their views and claims were supported by Hengstenberg's *Kirchenzeitung*, and by provincial associations in Saxony, Pomerania, Silesia, and Posen. They agreed, at a meeting in Wittenberg, in September 1849, on the following principles: "We stand upon the Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; our congregations have never justly ceased to be Lutheran congregations; we demand the recognition and adherence to the Lutheran Confession in worship, the order of the congregation, and Church government; first of all is to be insisted on the freeing of the altar service from everything that is dubious, and the giving of the stamp of the Confession to the entire service; furthermore, there should be in the government of the Church a management which would give security to confessional independence; finally, there should be a guarantee of Lutheran principles in the constitution of the congregations." These aims they did not, however, propose to secure by separation, but by contending within the State Church for the rights of the Lutheran Church in the districts belonging to it. This decision rendered more bitter the feeling of alienation between the Lutherans who remained in the State Church and those who separated from it. In addition to these internal controversies, there arose also differences with the civil government of the Church, especially on the part of Lutherans within the State Church. These differences were caused partly by the establishment of the High Consistory in 1850, and partly by the proposed Evangelical Order of Congregations, which was opposed on the ground that the Confession was not sufficiently secured. The High Consistory attempted to meet the opposition, and to harmonize feelings by various concessions; but, with a growing consciousness of need and of right, the Lutherans constantly rose in their demands. They asked for the abolition of the mixed boards, the institution of exclusively Lutheran faculties, the return of the Church property, and for other changes looking in the same general direction. The result finally was the issue of a cabinet order of July 12, 1853, which showed that the king, Frederick William IV, was determined to make no further concessions. The stricter Lutherans had shown themselves unwilling to cooperate in various movements of the time. Thus had they declined to cooperate in the plan of the Inner Missions (1849), and opposed the confederation of churches proposed at the Church Diet at Wittenberg in 1849. In other lands the struggles of the Lutheran

Church for truth and right continued. The University of Erlangen was the center of the struggle in Bavaria, and Harless, the president of the High Consistory, one of its great supports. But at the General Synod at Anspach, in consequence of opposition on the part, of the congregations, the stricter Lutheran views could not be carried out in regard to creed, Church government, changes in the liturgy, confession, and Church discipline. Here also arose the stricter party, with the pastors Löhe and Wacheren, which took ground against fellowship at the Lord's Supper with the reformed, and favored separation from the State Church. This party was resisted by the High Consistory. In Nassau, the two Hesses, Hanover, and the Saxon duchies, the stricter Lutheranism had adherents. As a rule the mission festivals were their centers of union. In Baden, under pastor Eichhorn as leader, the conflict with the government resulted in a legal separation from the State Church in 1856. In Saxony, especially about Schönburg, the stricter Lutheran clergy were numerous. The emigration of Stephan injured the cause very much in the general estimation. During these public movements various questions of profound interest in scientific theology were discussed by the great divines in the Lutheran Church. Among the most important of these discussions was, 1, that between Hoffmann in Erlangen and Philippi in Rostock on the doctrine of the atonement; 2, the controversy in Mecklenburg, which resulted in the deposition of professor Baumgarten in 1858. A convention of clergymen and laymen at Rothenmoor in 1858 represented the strictest Lutheranism, of which Kliefoth had been the especial promoter. See F.J. Stahl, *Die Lutherische Kirche u. die Union* (Berl. 1859). (C.P.K.)

Lutherans In America.

I. Early History. — The celebrated German divine, Dr. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg (q.v.), is generally and justly recognized as the founder of the Lutheran Church in America. He arrived in this country in 1742. Long previous to his coming, however, the Lutherans had gained a footing here. Adherents of the Church of the great German reformer first came to these shores of the West from Holland in 1621. In consequence of the severe measures adopted by the Synod of Dort (1618-19), the stay of non-Calvinists had been made uncomfortable in the mother country, and with the first Dutch settlers in the province of New Amsterdam (now New York) came several Lutheran immigrants, seeking here a home, and a place to worship God agreeably to the dictates of their conscience. They had

come, however, without a shepherd, and for years were dependent upon lay supervision and instruction. The first Lutheran communicants who brought thither one to minister unto them came from Sweden in 1638, and settled on the banks of Delaware Bay, where now stands the thriving city of Wilmington. For many years the Swedish Lutherans only were favored with ministerial care. The first to perform this duty was Reorus Torkillus (died in 1643), whose successor, John Campanius, "a man of enlightened zeal deeply interested in his work, and burning with a strong desire to promote the spiritual interests of the aborigines," was the first to publish in this country Luther's Smaller Catechism, and first to furnish it to the Red Man in his own vernacular — "perhaps the first work ever rendered into the Indian language, and the Swedes most probably were the first missionaries among the Indians in this country." Strangely enough, the Swedes were also the first to fall away from their mother Church and enter into communion with those of the Protestant Episcopal Church — a result due, no doubt, in a great measure, to the want of complete organization, as we shall see below.

Dr. Muhlenberg, as we have noted above, was of the German Church, and, though his labors were mainly confined to those of his own nationality, the influence of this man of God extended over all Lutherans in the states, and caused them to be "of one heart and one mind," and to keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The first German Lutherans preceded the doctor very nearly one hundred years. He himself, as we have seen, came hither in 1742; the first of his countrymen in the faith reached these shores in 1644. They came in company with the Dutch, and, like the latter, for a long time depended on lay instruction. By 1653 they had increased in strength sufficiently to seek the services of a preacher, but in vain they directed a petition to the Dutch Directory to secure permission for such a step. In 1664, finally, the much-coveted privilege came to them from the English authorities, who, immediately upon their acquisition of this territory, granted the Lutherans religious liberty. The first to preach to the German Lutherans in their own vernacular was Jacob Fabricius, who reached this country in 1669. The first house of worship, however, they enjoyed two years later (1671); but they were deprived of it by the Dutch in 1673. It was rebuilt in 1703 (on the south-west corner of Broadway and Rector Street). The Lutherans enjoyed a decided accession in 1710, when four thousand Germans, the victims of civil oppression and religious persecution, who had fled for refuge to England under the patronage of

queen Anne, came to the provinces of New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. Quickly others followed, until in 1717 their large numbers began to excite the serious apprehension of the civil authorities. In Pennsylvania the government actually felt it its duty to direct the attention of the "Provincial Council" to the fact "that large numbers of foreigners from Germany, strangers to our language and constitution, had lately been imported into the province." All these people had come without their ministers, and so it happened that, by settling in Pennsylvania and South Carolina, they were deprived of the regular ministrations of the sanctuary, and dependent for religious instruction upon those of their own number best informed "in heavenly things." A colony of German Lutherans, refugees from civil oppression and Romish intolerance at Salsburg, was founded under better auspices in Georgia in 1734. Their pastors were John Martin Bolzius and Israel Christian Gronau. In the following year they received large accessions from the mother, another country, and by the time of Dr. Mühlenberg's arrival the Lutherans of Georgia formed quite a considerable Christian band (over 1200 of them). Indeed, it is said that these Lutherans exerted a very salutary influence on the piety of John and Charles Wesley.

As early as 1733, the German Lutherans of Philadelphia and other places had sent urgent petitions for ministerial help and pecuniary aid to the Lutherans of England and of the mother country. At Halle, where now flourished the pious Aug. Hermann Francke, their prayers were heard, and by the untiring exertions of the founder of the "Halle Orphan Asylum," the future founder and leader of American Lutheranism was induced to leave his native land, and "to relieve," among his brethren of the faith and fellow-countrymen who had sought a home in the wilds of America, "the spiritual destitution that prevailed, to gather together the lost sheep, and to preach to them the truths of the Gospel." With the year 1742, therefore, opens a new epoch in the history of the Lutheran Church in America — the epoch in which it assumed organic form. No man could have been more eminently fitted than was H.M. Mühlenberg for the mission to be accomplished. "He possessed piety, learning, experience, skill, industry, and perseverance." He was, moreover, "deeply interested in the work to which he had devoted himself, as is apparent from the manner in which he discharged his duties, and the condition in which he left the Church at the time of his decease." When he came there was an absence of all organization. It is true the Swedish brethren gave assistance to their German brethren freely and

cheerfully, but this was by no means sufficient to advance the interests of Lutheranism. Mühlenberg saw this clearly, and he at once applied himself to the task of effecting an organic union of German Lutherans at least. The greatest obstacle he found in the want of preachers and of houses of worship; but he was not in the least discomfited by this jejuneness of his beloved Church. His influence at home was that of a pious and devoted servant of the Lord, and he soon drew a number of his former associates and friends to this side of the Atlantic, so that by 1748, only six years after his landing on these shores, he was enabled to call around him the strongest and ablest representatives of the Lutheran ministry in America, to counsel together and form a synod. The Swedes had contented themselves with the election of one of their own number as provost (q.v.), to preside over them and act as their representative before the country. Mühlenberg, however, desired stricter conformity to the rules and regulations of the mother Church, and, as the fate of the Swedish Lutheran Church afterwards showed, his course proved to be the only safe way towards a perpetuation of the Lutheran Church in America. The men who joined Mühlenberg in the convention at Philadelphia, August 14, 1748, for the purpose of organizing the first Lutheran synod in America, were Brunnholtz, Handschuh, and Hartwig, of the German, and Sandin and Naesman, of the Swedish Lutheran Church. It was by this body that the first German Lutheran was regularly set apart in this country to the work of the ministry. His name was John Nicholas Kurtz. He was not, however, the first Lutheran minister ordained here. As early as 1701, Falkner, a student of divinity, was ordained by the Swedish ministers Rudman, Bjork, and Auren, to labor in the Swedish Lutheran Church; quite an eventful act, also, because it set aside forever the supposition that the Swedish Lutherans received the doctrine of the episcopacy in the sense in which it is taught in the Anglican Church. After 1748 the synod met regularly each year, and these meetings "were attended with the most beneficial results. They not only advanced the prosperity of the Church, but the hands of the brethren were strengthened, and their hearts encouraged. They promoted kind feeling, and formed a bond of union among the churches." In 1765 a private theological seminary was started, under the care of Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt, and in 1787 the Legislature of Pennsylvania established Franklin College, "for the special benefit of the Germans of the commonwealth, as an acknowledgment of services by them rendered to the state, and in consideration of their industry, economy, and public virtues." There were, in the year of Mühlenberg's arrival in this country, in

Pennsylvania alone 110,000 Germans, and of these about two thirds were of the Lutheran Church. One of the sons of Dr. H.M. Mühlenberg — Henry Ernest — at this time pastor of the Lutheran Church in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, was honored with the distinction of first president of this now widely celebrated institution of learning. In 1791 the Lutheran Church received further recognition for its services to education by the Pennsylvania Legislature in the gift of 5000 acres of land "to the free-schools of the Lutheran Church in Philadelphia," the center of Dr. Henry Melchior Mühlenberg's labors.

During the Revolutionary days the Lutherans acted the part of patriots and Christians; many of their number came forward in defense of the country of their adoption. Dr. Muhlenberg, among others, had two sons in the army; one of them exchanged the gown for the colonel's uniform. In consequence of this identification of the Lutherans with the cause of American liberty, the English came to dislike them greatly, and many were the sufferings and deprivations to which they were subjected; several of their churches were burned or desecrated, and all manner of oppression was visited upon them. The close of the War of Independence. however, left them, if anything, gainers in the struggle. Aside from the liberal donations which they received in Pennsylvania, as we have seen above, they received large accessions from the very ranks of their enemies. Many of the German soldiers who, by the ignominious treaty of the English with the Hessians, had been brought to this country to exterminate the love of freedom, at the close of hostilities concluded to remain this side the Atlantic, and became valuable members of the Lutheran Church in America. Out of 5723 soldiers that had come here from Brunswick, 1200, with seven officers and their chaplain, at one time entered the fold of American Lutheranism. Of the Hessians, also, some 7000 remained to swell the number of adherents to the Church of the great German reformer.

Not so auspicious was the outlook at the close of the eighteenth century. On October 7, 1787, the patriarch and founder of the Lutheran Church in America departed this life, and the Church was bereft of its great stronghold. There had been slowly growing, ever since the establishment of American independence, a decided preference for the introduction of the English language into the exercises of public worship. The older and more conservative portion of the Church contended for the use of the language which the great reformer had so much embellished and invigorated, and of which he was really the second father. Some of the Germans even believed

that their language might actually be made the language of the country, and thus the proposition of the younger and Americanized portion for the use of the English proved an occasion of discord and alienation, "resulted in serious injury to the Church, and almost caused its total ruin.... Thousands abandoned their parental communion, and sought a home among other denominations, because their children did not understand the German, while many who remained, because of their limited acquaintance with the language, lost all interest in the services, and became careless in their attendance on the ministrations of the sanctuary." Dr. Mühlenberg had counseled due consideration of the wants of this young and growing element, and frequently himself preached in English; but his tongue once silent, the conservative element impolitically gloried in its wisdom (comp. here Dr. S.S. Schmucker's *Am. Luth. Ch.* [5th edit. Philad. 1852, 12mo], pages 27-29). The first Lutheran Church in which the English was exclusively used was not built until 1809, and it remained for many years the only one to represent the English-speaking element in the Lutheran Church. Efforts for more complete and effectual organization were made in New York State in 1785 by the establishment of the New York Synod; hitherto the Pennsylvania Synod was the only ministerium (q.v.) in existence. In 1803 a synod was organized in North Carolina; in 1819, in Ohio; in 1820, both in Maryland and Virginia. In 1816 the educational advantages of the Church also received new strength by the founding of a theological seminary at Hartwick, N.Y. — the first public training-school of the American Lutherans for young men prospecting the holy office of the ministry. An asylum for orphans the Lutheran Church had founded as early as 1749, in the midst of the thriving colonists at Ebenezer, in Georgia. It was widely known as the "Salzburger Waisenhaus," and is said to have received no little encouragement from Whitefield.

II. *Organization of the General Synod of American Lutherans.* — The need of a central bond of union for the different synods extending over a territory so vast as that of the United States gave rise in 1820 to the formation of a "general synod" — "a starting-place and a central radiating point of improvement in the Church." There were at this time 170 ministers connected with the Lutherans, and 35,000 communicants in the Lutheran connection. Of these, 135 preachers and 33,000 communicants were represented at the meeting which, October 22, 1820, formed the General Synod. The constantly increasing influx of European Lutherans frequently gave rise to the manifestation of the most diverse opinions on ecclesiastical

matters, and, in consequence, to many controversies, first of a milder, and gradually of a more decided character, until a schism became inevitable. Even previous to the outbreak of our civil war there had been frequent secessions of several of the synods from the general body, but the strife of 1861-65 gave a more decided influence in favor of the establishment of rival bodies by the side of the "General Synod." The first to establish themselves independently were the Southern Lutherans, who instituted a "Southern General Synod," later known as the "General Synod of North America," and now (1872) embracing 5 synods, 92 ministers, 175 churches, and 13,457 communicants.

A more serious division was, however, preparing, on doctrinal grounds, in the Northern synods. The constitution of the General Synod did not make membership dependent upon an adhesion to the letter of the "Augsburg Confession" of 1530, the great standard of faith of the early Lutheran Church. While heartily indorsing the Augsburg Confession as the most important historical document as regards the doctrines of the Church, the constitution aimed to secure to all Lutherans the liberty of rejecting some utterances of that confession which had early been discarded by a considerable number of the followers of Luther as unevangelical and semi-papal. This feature was obnoxious to the strict Lutheran party, which wished Lutheranism to remain for all time to come as defined by the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and which desired to bring back the whole Lutheran Church of the United States to this point.

III. *Organization of the "General Council."* — The party differences, after creating frequent disturbances at the meetings of the General Synod, led to an open rupture in 1864, when the Franckean Synod, a New York State body, which was regarded by the Confessional Lutherans as positively unchurchly and heretical, was admitted to the General Synod. In consequence of this act the oldest synod, that of Pennsylvania, withdrew from the Convention. At the next meeting of the General Synod, in 1866, the Pennsylvania Synod was consequently declared by the president and a majority of the delegates out of practical connection with the General Synod. In reply to this decision, the Pennsylvanians called on all Lutherans adhering to the letter of the Augsburg Confession of 1530 to organize upon this basis a new and genuine Lutheran Church. The call was responded to by a number of synods hitherto connected with the General Synod, and also by some independent synods, and a preliminary convention was held in December, 1866, at Reading, Pennsylvania. This meeting drew

up a constitution, and provided for the convention of the first "General Council" of the new organization as soon as the constitution should be adopted by ten synods. The preliminaries having been complied with, the "General Council" met at Fort Wayne November 20, 1867. Twelve synods, representing 140,006 communicants, a larger number than the combined membership of the two other organizations — the "General Synod" and the Southern "General Synod of North America" — together, were in attendance. A resolution was passed inviting those only "who are in the unity of the faith with us, as set forth in the fundamental articles of this General Council," as "visiting brethren," making this body distinctively Confessional in the character of its Lutheranism. The last Convention of the "General Council," held at Rochester, New York, in November 1871, was presided over by Dr. Chas. P. Krauth, of Philadelphia. At this meeting there were only nine synods, representing 511 ministers, 971 congregations, and 141,875 communicants. Two other synods — the Danish-Norwegian Augustana Synod and the Indiana Synod — had, however, announced their intention to join the "Council". A meeting is now (November 1872) in progress at Akron, Ohio. Its proceedings will have to be given in the Appendix volume IV. Movement towards the Formation of a General Conference. — The tendency of a majority of the American churches towards ecclesiastical union has of late made an impression also on the Lutheran communicants, and there is now in progress a movement for the organization of a new body, to be called the "General Conference," with the avowed object of making it "the organization of a general Lutheran body, on the basis of the unqualified reception of all the symbolical books as a bond of union between all Lutheran synods in America." This movement was started several years ago, mainly by the independent synods (see for list, V. Statistics). At the meeting held at Fort Wayne, Indiana, November 14, 1871, about 60 members were present, representing most of the independent synods. The reports of the meeting for final organization, which was to be held in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, on the second Wednesday of July 1872, have not yet come to our notice. If all the six independent synods have adopted the Constitution and joined the "General Conference," this body is now the strongest in the Lutheran connection, its membership exceeding that of either the General Synod or of the General Council. (Comp. Schäffer, *Early Hist. of the Lutheran Church in America*; Schmucker, *Amer. Luth. Church* [5th edition, Phila. 1852]; and the excellent article in Schem, *Deutsch-Amerikan Conv. Lexikon*, 6:690-704; *Annual to New Amer. Cyclop.* 1871.)

V. Statistics. — We are enabled to present our readers with the latest statistics of the Lutheran Church in the United States of America. The almanacs for 1890 furnish a list of—theological seminaries, 26; colleges, 25; female seminaries, 11; academies 37; charitable institutions (orphan homes, infirmaries, hospitals, etc.), 56; Church boards and societies, 27. The General Synod embraces — synods, 23; ministers, 979; churches, 1437; communicants, 151, 404. The General Council embraces — synods, 8; ministers, 910; churches, 1552; communicants, 259,801. The Southern General Synod embraces — synods, 9; ministers, 201; churches, 385; communicants, 37,528. The grand total is — synods, 58; ministers, 4692; churches, 7948; communicants, 1,099,868. The periodicals are — English, 48; German, 51; Norwegian, 16; Swedish, 26.

Picture for Lutherans

For special local and national statistics of the Lutheran Church, *SEE AMERICA; SEE ANHALT; SEE AUSTRIA; SEE BADEN; SEE BAVARIA; SEE BELGIUM; SEE BOHEMIA; SEE BRUNSWICK; SEE BREMEN; SEE CARINTHIA AND CARNIOLA; SEE DENMARK; SEE ENGLAND; SEE FRANCE; SEE HESSE; SEE HOLLAND; SEE HUNGARY; SEE ICELAND; SEE LIPPE; SEE LUBECK; SEE MECKLENBURG; SEE MORAVIA; SEE NORWAY; SEE OLDENBURG; SEE POLAND; SEE PRUSSIA; SEE RUSSIA; SEE SAXONY; SEE SILESIA; SEE STEIERMARK; SEE SWEDEN; SEE THURINGIA; SEE TRANSYLVANIA; SEE UNITED STATES; SEE WESTPHALIA; SEE WURTEMBERG.* For missions of the Lutheran churches, *SEE MISSIONS.*

On the history of the Lutheran Church, compare Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology* (Phila. 1871, 8vo), especially chapter 4; Gobel, *Die religiösen Eigenthümlichkeiten d Luth. u. ref. Kirchen* (1837); Augusti, *Beitrag z. Geschichte u. Statistik der Evangel. Kirche* (1838); Wiggers, *Statistik* (1842, 2 volumes); Harnack, *Die Luth. Kirche im Lichte d. Gesch.* (1855); Kahnis, *Germanz Protestantism* (1856); Seiss, *Ecclesia Lutherana, a brief Survey of the Evang. Luth. Church* (1868); Dosmer, *Gesch. der Protest. Theologie* (1867); Müller (J.T.), *Die symbolischen Bücher der evangel. Luth. Kirche* (Stuttg. 1860, 8vo); Plitt, *Lutheranische Missionen* (Erlangen, 1871, 8vo).

Lütke­mann, Joachim

a German theologian, was born at Demmin, in Pomerania, December 15, 1608; studied at Stettin, and afterwards at the universities of Greifswalde and Strasburg; then traveled through France and Italy; and was magister legente of the philosophical faculty of Rostock in 1638, and appointed professor of metaphysics in 1643. He published at this time several philosophical works, such as his *Lineamenta cosporis physici* (Rostock, 1647). He also preached at the same time, and soon acquired great reputation by his eloquence and Christian earnestness. He became involved, however, in a quarrel with the strict orthodox party of Mecklenburg, upheld by the duke, on the question of the humanity of Christ in his death. Lütke­mann defended his views in his *Dissertatio physico-theologicac de vero homine*, maintaining that the human nature of Christ ended in his death. He was expelled for these views, but immediately called to Brunswick as general superintendent and court preacher. Here he prepared in 1651 a School Discipline, and in 1652 a Church Discipline, which were adopted in Brunswick. He died in 1655. His most important works were devotional, and in this line he may be ranked next to Arndt and Muller. The principal are: *Vorschmack d. gottlichen Gute* (Wolfenb. 1643): — *Vom irdischen Paradies*: — *Harfe auf zehn saiten*. See P. Rethmeyer, *Schicksalen, Schriften u. Gaben Lütke­mann's* (Brunswick); Tholuck, *Akad. Leben*, part 2, page 109; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:536; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, volume 2, § 217.

Lutz, Johann Ludwig Samuel

a distinguished German theologian, historian, and biographer, was born at Bern in 1785; studied first in his native city, then at the universities of Tübingen and Göttingen; was in 1812 appointed professor of the gymnasium, and rector of the literary school of Bern; in 1824 became pastor of Wynau, and afterwards of Bern; and was there in 1833 appointed professor of exegesis. He died September 21, 1844. Among his works the most noteworthy is *Gesch. der Reformation in Basel* (Basle, 1814, 8vo). His theological lectures were published by Riutschi and Ad. Lutz, under the title *Biblische Dogmatik und Hermeneutik* (1847 and 1849). See Hundeshagen, *Lutz, ein theolog. Charakterbild*, 1844; *Neuer Nekrolog d. Deutschesn*, volume 22; Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 10:631; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Gen.* 32:314. (J.N.P.)

Lutz (Or Lucius), Samuel

one of the most important representatives of early pietism in Switzerland, was born in 1674. His father, the pious and learned pastor of Biglen, was his first teacher. Lutz at first turned his attention especially to mathematics, the classics, and Hebrew, then to Church discipline, and finally left all these to devote himself exclusively to the study of Scripture, and the works of the fathers and reformers, especially Luther's. German pietism was then beginning to strike root in Switzerland, in spite of all the efforts of the orthodox party, headed by the theologians of Berne. To oppose it, a committee was appointed to take charge of all things pertaining to religion, and in 1699, by its influence, several prominent and influential preachers, tainted with pietism, were exiled or deprived of their office, a number of adherents of the pietist party fined or otherwise punished, and several stringent laws passed to secure the "uniformity of faith, doctrine, and worship." Finally both the citizens and clergy were obliged to take the so-called *oath of association* — a sort of Test Act. Lutz's first and rather insignificant appointment as pastor was at Yverden in 1703. Here he labored faithfully for twenty-three years, winning the respect and affection not only of the German, among whom he labored, but also of the French inhabitants. As he was accused of pietism, all attempts to secure more important appointments, with a view to increasing his sphere of usefulness, were defeated, in spite of his reputation for learning and eloquence, until about 1726, when he was appointed pastor of Amfoldingen. In 1738 he removed to Diessbach, where he died, May 28, 1750. His collected works were published under the title *Wohlriechender Strauss v. schonen u. gesunden Himmelsblumens* (Basle, 1736 and 1756, 2 volumes). See Leu, *Schweiz. Lexikon*, 12; Haller, *Bibl. d. Schweizergesch.* 2:290; Hurst's Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*, 1:191 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:621.

Lux Mentis

(the light of the mind), another name for baptism, so called on account of the instruction in the Christian religion which was given to the candidates for baptism before they were admitted to the sacred ordinance. — Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.

Luxury

a disposition of mind addicted to pleasure, riot, and superfluities. Luxury implies a giving one's self up to pleasure; voluptuousness, an indulgence in the same to excess. Luxury may be further considered as consisting in,

1. Vain and useless expenses;
2. In a parade beyond what people can afford;
3. In affecting to be above our own rank;
4. In living in a splendor that does not agree with the public good. In order to avoid it, we should consider that it is ridiculous, troublesome, sinful, and ruinous. See Robinson's *Claude*, 1:382; Ferguson, *On Society*, part 6, section 2; Buck, *Theological Dictionary*, s.v.

Luz

(Heb. *id.* לוז , a nut-bearing tree, either the almond or hazel, as in ^{<0337>}Genesis 30:37 [but according to Fürst, after Hiller, *sinking*, as of a valley]; Sept. Λουζά, but in ^{<0389>}Genesis 28:19 unites with the preceding word Οὐλαμλούζ), the name of two places.

1. The ancient name of the Canaanitish city on or near the site of Bethel (^{<0389>}Genesis 28:19; 35:6; 48:3), on the border of Benjamin (^{<0683>}Joshua 18:13); taken and destroyed, with all its inhabitants (except one family that had acted as spies), by the descendants of Joseph (^{<0023>}Judges 1:23). The spot to which the name of Bethel was given appears, however, to have been at a little distance in the environs of Luz, and they are accordingly distinguished in ^{<0642>}Joshua 16:2, although the Heb. name of Bethel eventually superseded the Canaanitish one Luz; or rather, perhaps, Luz was the name of a locality near which Bethel was afterwards built. The form of the name in the Sept., Eusebius, and the Vulg. seems to have been derived from ^{<0683>}Joshua 18:13, where the words לוז אֶתְכַלֵּא, should, according to ordinary usage, be rendered "to the shoulder of Luzah;" the *ah*, which is the particle of motion in Hebrew, not being required here, as it is in the former part of the same verse. Other names are found both with and without a similar termination, as Jotbah, Jotbathah; Timnath, Timnathah; Riblah, Riblathah, Laish and Laishah are probably distinct places. Van de Velde is confident that he has recovered the site of Luz in

the modern ruins called Khurbet el-Lozeh, one hour and a half west of Beth-el (Notes to the 2d ed. of his *Map*, page 16). *SEE BETHEL.*

2. A small place in the district of the Hittites, founded by an inhabitant of the former Luz, who was spared on the destruction of this place by the tribe of Benjamin (~~1:26~~Judges 1:26); and this seems to dispose of the identification with the ruins still found on Matthew Gerizim (Stanley, page 231 sq.), bearing the name of Luza (Seetzen, *Reise*, 1:174; Wilson, 2:69), about ten minutes beyond the trench of the Samaritan sacrifice (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, page 331). Schwarz thinks the site may be identified with that of wady Luzacn, in the interior of the desert of et-Tih, north-west of Jebel el-Aralf, (on the strength of the Talmudic statement that this place lay without the bounds of Palestine (*Palest.* page 213). This is doubtless the wady Lussan described by Dr. Robinson as a broad plain swept over by torrents from the mountains on the right, destitute of any fountain or water, and containing only a few remains of rude walls and foundations, which he regards as the traces of the Roman station *Lysa* along this route (*Researches*, 1:276, 277). Rosenmüller (*Alterth.* II, 2:129) refers the name to Luza, a city, according to Eusebius (*Onomast.* s.v.), lying three miles from Shlechem; but this could not have been Hittite territory. Studer (*Buch d. Richter*, page 45) adopts a suggestion of D. Kimchi, that a city of the Phoenicians (Kittim, so Eusebius, *Κεττεύμ*, *Onomast.* s.v. 2) is meant. Probably it was some place near Hebron, in southern Palestine, where the Hittites were settled. *SEE HITTITE.*

Luz

SEE HAZEL.

Luzzatto, Mose Chayim, Ben-Jacob

the great modern Jewish mystic of Italy, was born at Padua in 1707, and enjoyed the highest educational advantages the country of his birth could afford. When a youth of only twenty, his extended studies in Hebrew literature, especially the cabalistic writings, secured for him a universal reputation. Had he known how to avoid mysticism, he might have proved one of the greatest ornaments of Judaism, but the Cabala (q.v.) led him astray, and he not only compiled a second Zohar (q.v.), but actually came to believe himself the predicted Messiah of his people. He was excommunicated, and obliged to quit Italy. For a time he flourished in Amsterdam, and about 1744 he removed to the Holy Land. He died shortly

after, at Safet, in May 1747, and was buried at Tiberias. Of his multifarious works twenty-four are yet unedited; twenty-eight have been published, comprising treatises in theology, dogmatic and cabalistical, philosophy, morals, and rhetoric, and a body of poetry, devotional, lyrical, and dramatic. His most important writings are cited in Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrews Literature*, page 393. See also Grilz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, 10:369-383; and his biography in Kerem Chemed (1838), 3:113 sq. (J.H.W.)

Luzzatto, Samuel David

one of the most noted Jewish writers of our day, the Jehudah ha-Levi (q.v.) of the 19th century, was born at Trieste (Italy) in 1800, the scion of one of the most eminent Italian families. He received a thorough academical training, and early displayed great ability as a writer. Greatly interested in the study of the history and literature of his people, he became one of the most prominent writers in this field. Says Graitz (*Gesch. d. Juden*, 11:502), "If Krochmal and Rapaport were the fathers of Jewish history, Luzzatto must be acknowledged as her mother." He brought to light the most beautiful pages of Jewish history of the Franco-Spanish epoch — the tragical fate of the Jews in the persecutions of the Middle Ages and the reformatory period — which had been given up as lost; and thereby prepared the way for the labors of Kayserling, Sachs, Zunz, and others. Luzzatto also labored creditably in the department of O.-T. exegesis, and when the collegio rabbinico was opened at Padua in 1829, he became one of its professors, continuing in this service until his death in 1865. He wrote Hebrew, Italian, French, and German. His diction is graceful and exceedingly pleasant. His essays and treatises in this field appeared first in the "Bikkure Ittim," and afterwards (1841, etc.) in the "Kerem Chemed," published in Vienna and then in Prague by a man of great learning in Jewish literature, Samuel L. Goldenberg, of Tarnapol. One of his best works is his *Dialogues*, etc., on the Casbala, the Zohar, the antiquity of the vowel-points and accents of the Bible (1852), which shows the folly of the Cabala, the origin of the Zohar in the 13th century, and the vowel-points in the 5th, and the accents probably in the 6th. Luzzatto also published on Hebrew grammar, *Prolegomena ad una gram. Hebr.*; and later a complete Hebrew grammar, *Oheb Guer* (rg bhwa); a work on the Aramaic version of Onkelos (Vienna, 1830); an Italian version of *Job* (Livorno, 1844); *French Notes on Isaiah* (in Rosenmüller's version, Leips. 1834); *Heb.*

Notes on the Pentateuch (Vienna, 1850); and finally Isaiah, an Italian translation with an extensive Hebrew commentary (Vienna, 1850). See Grintz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 11:499 sq.; Jost, *Geschichte d. Judenthums*, 3:345 sq.; *Maggid*, 1864-1865; *The Israelite* (Cincinnati. Ohio), January 19, 1872. (J.H.W.)

Luzzatto, Simone

(Heb. *Simcha*), a noted rabbi who flourished at Venice about 1590, exerted no small influence on the Italian Jews of the 16th century. He was an associate of Leo da Modena (q.v.), and aided the latter greatly by his superior abilities. He died in 1663. He wrote *Via della Fede*, in which he teaches that the prophecies of Daniel refer rather to a by-gone age than to a future Messiah. This peculiar view has given rise to the belief that he accepted Jesus as the Messiah (see Wolf, *Bibl. Jud.* 3:1128). His most valuable work, however, is his *Discorso circa il stato degli Hebrei* (Venice, 1638), in which he ably defends Judaism and the Jews. The excesses of the Cabalists he deplored, and stoutly opposed all relation with them. See Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 10:162 sq. (J.H.W.)

Lybon Or Libo

a city mentioned in the Antonine Itinerary as being situated thirty-two Roman miles from Heliopolis (Baalbek), and the same distance from Laodicea. Its name has elsewhere been displaced in the same itinerary by that of Conna. The modern village of Lebweh is doubtless the same (*Bibl. Sacr.* 1848, page 699), although the distances have become corrupted (Porter, *Damascus*, 2:322 sq.). It is a poor village, in the middle of a basin, on a low tell among the streams on the eastern slope of Lebanon, with some remains of antiquity, and a considerable Arabian history (Robinson, *Later Res.* page 532 sq.).

Lybrand, Joseph

an eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Lutheran parentage in Philadelphia, October 3, 1793; was converted at about ten; entered the Philadelphia Conference in April 1811; was presiding elder on Philadelphia District in 1824-8; 1834-8 was on stations in Philadelphia; desisted from labor in 1843 at Harrisburg, and died April 24, 1845. Mr. Lybrand was a man of deep fidelity to God, and immovable fidelity to man. As an eloquent preacher he had few equals in the American pulpit. His style was elegant

and weighty, full of masterly argument and powerful exhortation, and many souls were added to the Church by his long and blessed ministry. So strong was his conviction in his duty to preach only that he refused to accept some of the most important offices in the gift of his denomination. Thus he declined in 1832 to assume the responsibilities of the publishing house taken from Dr. Emory, who had been elected bishop. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 3:598.

Lycaö'nia

(*Λυκαονία*, either from the mythological name Lycaön, or from *λύκος*, a wof), a province of Asia Minor, having Cappadocia on the east, Galatia on the north, Phrygia on the west, and Isauria and Cilicia on the south. These boundaries, however, are differently described by ancient authors (Ptolemy, 6:16; 5:6; Pliny, 5:25; Strabo, 14:663; Livy, 38:38). It extends in length about twenty geographical miles from east to west, and about thirteen in breadth. It was an undulating plain, involved among mountains, which were noted for the concourse of wild asses. The soil was so strongly impregnated with salt that few of the brooks supplied drinkable water, so that good water was sold for money; but sheep throve on the pasturage, and were reared with great advantage (Strabo, 12:568; Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 8:69). Lycaonia first appears in history in connection with the expedition of Cyrus the younger (Xenophon, *Anab.* 1:2, 19; 3:2, 23; Cyrop. 6:2, 20). The inhabitants were a hardy race, not subject to the Persians. and lived by plunder and foray (Dionysitus, *Per.* 857; Prisc. 806; Avien. 1020). With these descriptions modern authors agree (Leake's *Journal*, page 67 sq.; Rennel, *Geog. of West. Asia*, 2:99; Cramer, *As. Min.* 2:63; Mannert, *Geog.* VI, 2:190 sq.). It was a Roman province when visited by Pau. (*Acts* 14:6), and its chief towns were Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, of which the first was the capital (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.). "The speech of Lycaonia" (*Acts* 14:11) is supposed by some to have been the ancient Assyrian language, also spoken by the Cappadocians (Jablonsky, *Disquis. de Lingua Lycaonica*, Berlin, 1714; also in his *Opusc.* 3:3 sq.); but it is more usually conceived to have been a corrupt Greek, intermingled with many Syriac words (Guhling, *Dissesrt. de Lingua Lycaonica*, Viteb. 1726), since the people appear, from the account in the Acts, to have adopted the Grecian mythology as the basis of their religion (see Sommel, *De Lingua Lyc.* Lond. 1787). "It is deeply interesting to see these rude country people, when Paul and Barnabas worked miracles among them, rushing to the conclusion that the strangers were Mercury and Jupiter, whose visit to

this very neighborhood forms the subject of one of Ovid's, most charming stories (Ovid, *Metam.* 8:626). Nor can we fail to notice how admirably Paul's address on the occasion was adapted to a simple and imperfectly civilized race (~~4415~~ Acts 14:15-17). See Bomer, *De Paulo in Lycaonia* (Lips. 1708). *SEE ASIA MINOR*; *SEE PAUL*.

Lyc'ia

Picture for Lycia

(Λυκία, prob. from λύκος, a wolf; according to some, from its earliest king, Lycus; for a Shemitic origin of the name, see Simonis, *Onomast.* N.T. page 101; Sickler, *Handb.* page 568), a province in the south-west of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Rhodes, having Pamphylia on the east, Phrygia on the north, Caria on the west, and the Mediterranean on the south. The last eminences of the range of Taurus come down here in majestic masses to the sea, forming the heights of Cragus and Anticragus, with the river Xanthus winding between them, and ending in the long series of promontories called by modern sailors the "Seven Capes," among which are deep inlets favorable to seafaring and piracy. It forms part of the region now called Tekeh. It was fertile in corn and wine, and its cedars, firs, and other trees were celebrated (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 12:5). Its inhabitants were believed to be descendants of Cretans, who came thither under Sarpedon, brother of Minos. One of their kings was Bellerophon, celebrated in mythology. Lycia is often mentioned by Homer (*Il.* 6:171; 10:430; 12:312; *Odys.* 5:282, etc.), according to whom it was an ally of Troy. Herodotus assigns several ancient names to the country (1:173). The Lycians were a warlike people, powerful on the sea, and attached to their independence, which they successfully maintained against Craesus, king of Lydia, and were afterwards allowed by the Persians to retain their own kings as satraps, and their ships were conspicuous in the great war against the Greeks (*Herod.* 7:91, 92). After the death of Alexander the Great, Lycia was included in the Greek Seleucid kingdom, and was a part of the territory which the Romans forced Antiochus to cede (Livy, 37:55). It was made, in the first place, one of the continental possessions of Rhodes, *SEE CARIA*; but before long it was politically separated from that island, and allowed to be an independent state. This has been called the golden period of the history of Lycia (see further in Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.). It is at this time that it is named in 1 Macc. 15:23, as one of the countries to which the Roman senate sent its missive in favor of the Jews. The victory

of the Romans over Antiochus (B.C. 189) gave Lycia rank as a free state, which it retained till the time of Claudius, when it was made a province of the Roman empire (Sueton. *Claud.* 25; *Vespas.* 8). At first it was combined with Pamphylia, and the governor bore the title of "Proconsul Lycise et Pamphylia" (Gruter, *Thes.* page 458). Such seems to have been the condition of the district when Paul visited it (~~4201~~ Acts 21:1; 27:5). At a later period of the Roman empire it was a separate province, with Myra for its capital. Lycia contained many towns, two of which are mentioned in the New Testament: Patara (~~4201~~ Acts 21:1, 2) and Myra (~~4275~~ Acts 27:5); and one, Phaselis, in the Apocrypha (1 Mace. 15:23). This region, abounding in ancient remains and inscriptions (the last copiously illustrated by Schmidt, Jena, 1868, fol.), was first visited in modern times by Sir Chas. Fellows. See his *Journal* (London, 1839, 1841); Forbes, *Travels* (London, 1847); Texier, *L'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1838); *Encycl. of Useful Knowledge*, 14:210 sq.; Cramer's *Asia Minor*, 2:282 sq.; Mannert, *Geogr.* VI, 3:150 sq.; Cellarius, *Notit.* 2:93 sq.

Lych-gate

Picture for Lych-gate

or LICH-GATE (Anglo-Sax. lie or lice, a body or corpse), i.e., corpse-gate, is a covered gate erected, especially in England, at the entrance of a churchyard, beneath which the persons bearing a corpse for interment were wont to pause, sometimes to read the burial-service under this sheltered place. It is also applied to the path by which a corpse is carried.

Lychnoscope

(an opening for watching the light), a name assigned by conjecture to an unglazed window or opening, which is frequently found near the west end of the chancel, and usually on the south side, below the range of the other windows, and near the ground. What purpose these low side windows served in churches is not now known.

Lycus

(*Wolf*), a river of Palestine, mentioned by ancient geographers as situated between ancient Biblus and Berytus (Strabo, 16, page 755; Pliny, 5:20). This is evidently the modern Nahr el-Kelb (Dog River), at the mouth of which, about 2 ½ hours N.E. of Beirut, are found the remarkable rock-

tablets of ancient victorious kings (Wilson, 2:405; Robinson, *Later Res.* page 619 sq.).

Lyd'da

(Λύδδα, ^{<403>}Acts 9:32, 35, 38; from the Heb. "Lod, **db**, *strife*; Sept. Λόδ v.r. Λώδ, ^{<382>}1 Chronicles 8:12; Λυδδών v.r. Λοδαδί and Λοδαδίδ, by union with the following name, ^{<373>}Ezra 2:33; ^{<407>}Nehemiah 7:37; Λύδδα, ^{<415>}Nehemiah 11:35; 1 Macc. 11:34; so also Josephus), a town within the limits of the tribe of Ephraim; according to Eusebius and Jerome, nine miles east of Joppa, on the road between that port and Jerusalem; according to the *Antonine Itin.*, thirty-two miles from Jerusalem and ten from Antipatris. It bore in Hebrew the name of LOD, and appears to have been first built by the Benjamites, although it lay beyond the limits of their territory (^{<382>}1 Chronicles 8:12); and we find it again inhabited by Benjamites after the exile (^{<373>}Ezra 2:33; ^{<415>}Nehemiah 11:35). In all these notices it is mentioned in connection with Ono. It likewise occurs in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. 11:34) as having been taken from Samaria and annexed to Judaea by Demetrius Nicator; and at a later date its inhabitants are named among those who were sold into slavery by Cassius when he inflicted the calamity of his presence upon Palestine after the death of Julius Caesar (Josephus, *Ant.* 14:11, 2; 12:6). In the New Testament the place is only noticed under the name of Lydda, as the scene of Peter's miracle in healing Aeneas (^{<403>}Acts 9:32, 35). Some years later the town was reduced to ashes by Cestius. Gallus, in his march against Jerusalem (Josephus, *War*, 2:19, 1); but it must soon have revived, for not long after we find it at the head of one of the toparchies of the later Judaea, and as such it surrendered to Vespasian, who introduced fresh inhabitants from Galilee (Josephus, *War*, 3:3, 5; 4:8). At that time it is described by Josephus (*Ant.* 20:6, 2) as a village equal to a city; and the Rabbins have much to say of it as a seat of Jewish learning, of which it was the most eminent in Judaea after Jabneh and Bether (Lightfoot, *Parergon*, § 8; *Horae Heb.* page 35 sq.; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* page 399 sq.). About the time of the siege it was presided over by rabbi Gamaliel, second of the name (Lightfoot, *Chor. Cent.* 16). Some curious anecdotes and short notices from the Talmuds concerning it are preserved by Lightfoot. One of these states that "queen Helena celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles there!" In the general change of names which took place under the Roman dominion, Lydda became Diospolis (Ptolemy, 5:16, 6; Pliny, 5:15; see Reland,

Palaest. page 877), and under this name it occurs in coins of Severus and Caracalla, and is often mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. It was early the seat of a bishopric, and at the different councils the bishops are found to have subscribed their names variously, as of Lydda or Diospolis; but in the later ecclesiastical records the name of Lydda predominates. Tradition reports that the first bishop was "Zenas the lawyer" (⁵⁸¹³ Titus 3:13), originally one of the seventy disciples (Dorotheus, in Reland, page 879); but the first historical mention of the see is the signature of "Atius Lyddensis" to the acts of the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325; Reland, page 878). The bishop of Lydda, originally subject to Caesarea, became at a later date suffragan to Jerusalem (see the two lists in Von Raumer, page 401); and this is still the case. In the latter end of 415 a council of fourteen bishops was held here, before which Pelagius appeared, and by whom, after much tumultuous debate, and in the absence of his two accusers, he was acquitted of heresy, and received as a Christian brother (Milner, *Hist. of Ch. of Christ*, cent. 5, chapter 3). The latest bishop distinctly mentioned is Apollonius, in A.D. 518. Lydda early became connected with the homage paid to the celebrated saint and martyr St. George, who was not less renowned in the East than afterwards in the West. He is said to have been born at Lydda, and to have suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia in the earliest persecution under Diocletian and Maximian, at the end of the 3d century. His remains were transferred to his native place, and a church erected in honor of him by the emperor Justinian. This church, which stood outside the town, had just been leveled to the ground by the Moslems when the Crusaders arrived at Lydda; but it was soon rebuilt by them, and they established a bishopric of Lydda and Ramneh. Great honors were paid by them to St. George, and they invested him with the dignity of their patron: from this time his renown spread more widely throughout Europe, and he became the patron saint of England and of several other states and kingdoms. The church was destroyed by Saladin in 1191, and there is no evidence that it was ever rebuilt, although there was in later centuries an unfounded impression that the church, the ruins of which were then seen, and which still exist, had been built by the English king Richard. From that time there has been little notice of Lydda by travelers. It now exists, in a fruitful plain, one mile north of Rama, and three east of Jaffa, under its ancient name of Lud or Ludda (Lidd in Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, pages 69, 456). Within a circle of four miles still stand Ono (Kefr Auna), Hadid (el-Hadithehs), and Neballat (Beit-Neballah) associated with Lod in the ancient records. The water-course outside the

town is said still to bear the name of Abi-Butrus (Peter), in memory of the apostle (Tobler, page 471). The town is, for a Mohammedan place, busy and prosperous (see Van de Velde, *Syr. and Palest.* 1:244). Buried in palms, and with a large well close to the entrance, it looks from a distance inviting enough, but its interior is very repulsive on account of the extraordinary number of persons, old and young, whom one encounters at every step, either totally blind, or afflicted with loathsome diseases of the eyes. It is a considerable village of small houses, with nothing to distinguish it from ordinary Moslem villages save the ruins of the celebrated church of St. George, which are situated in the eastern part of the town. The building must have been very large. The walls of the eastern end are standing only in the parts near the altar, including the arch over the latter; but the western end remains more perfect, and has been built into a large mosque, the lofty minaret of which forms the landmark of Lud. As the city of St. George, who is one with the famous personage El-Khudr, Lydda is held in much honor by the Moslems. In their traditions the gate of the city will be the scene of the final combat between Christ and Antichrist (Sale's *Koran*, note to chapter 43; and *Prel. Disc.* 4, § 4; also Jalal ad-n, *Temple of Jerusalem*, page 434). See Raumer, *Palastina*, page 208; Robinson, *Bib. Researches*, 2:55; Sandys, *Travailes*; Cotovicus, *Itiner.* pages 137, 138; D'Arvieux, *Memoires*, 2:28; Pococke, *Description*, 2:58; Volney, *Voyage*, 1:278; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:291 sq.

Lydgate, John

an ancient English theologian, celebrated particularly as a poet, one of the successors of Chaucer, was a monk of the Benedictine abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, in Suffolk. The dates of only a few of the events of his life have been ascertained. He was ordained a subdeacon in 1389, a deacon in 1393, and a priest in 1397, whence it has been conjectured that he was born about 1375. He seems to have arrived at his greatest eminence about 1430. After a short education at Oxford he traveled in France and Italy, and returned a complete master of the language and literature of both countries. He chiefly studied Dante, Boccaccio, and Alain Chartier, and became so distinguished a proficient in polite learning that he opened a school in his monastery for teaching the sons of the nobility versification and composition. Although philology was his subject, he was not unacquainted with the philosophy of the day: he was not only a poet and a rhetorician, but a geometrician, an astronomer, a theologian, and a

disputant. He died about 1461. — *English. Cyclop.* s.v.; Warton, *Hist. Engl. Poetry*; Chambers, *Cyclop. Eng. Lit.* 1:40 sq.

Lydia

(Λυδία), the name of a country, and also of a woman in the New Testament.

1. The Hebrew LUD ("Lydia" in ^{<3615>}Ezekiel 30:5; *SEE LUDIM*), a province in the west of Asia Minor, supposed to have derived its name from Lud, the fourth son of Shem (^{<3102>}Genesis 10:22). Thus Josephus states "those who are now called *Lydians* (Λυδοί), but anciently Ludimn (Λούδοι), sprung from Lud" (Λούδα, Ant. 1:6, 4; compare Bochart, Opera, 1:83, and the authorities cited there). *SEE ETHNOLOGY*. Lydia was bounded on the east by Greater Phrygia, on the north by AEolis or Mysia, on the west by Ionia and the AEgean Sea, and on the south it was separated from Caria by the Meander (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v.). The country is for the most part level (Schubert, *Reisen*, 1:369 sq.). Among the mountains, that of Tmolus was celebrated for its saffron and red wine (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 6:2, 21). Lydia, however, lay on the west coast of Asia Minor, and thus was far removed from the other possessions of the Shemitic nations. Greek writers inform us that Lydia was originally peopled by a Pelasgic race called hicseonians (Homer, *Iliad*, 2:866; 10:431), who received their name from Maeon, an ancient king (Bochart, l.c.). They also state that the name *Lydians* was derived from a king who ruled them at a later period (Herod. 1:7) About eight centuries B.C. a tribe of another race migrated from the east, and subdued the *Maeonians*. These were the Lydians. For some time after this conquest both nations are mentioned promiscuously, but the Lydians gradually obtained power, and gave their name to the country (Kalisch, *On Genesis 10*; Dionysius, 1:30; Pliny, 5:30; comp. Strabo, 12:572; 14:679). The best and most recent critics regard these Lydians as a Shemitic tribe, and consequently the descendants of Lud (Movers, *Die Phonicier*, 1:475). This view is strengthened by the description of the character and habits of the Lydians. They were warlike (Herod. 1:79), skilled in horsemanship (ib.), and accustomed to serve as mercenaries under foreign princes (7:71). Now, in ^{<369>}Isaiah 66:19, a warlike people called Lud is mentioned in connection with Tarshish and Pul; and again in ^{<370>}Ezekiel 27:10, the prophet says of Tyre, "They of Persia, and of Lud, and of Phut, were in thine army, thy men of war." There can scarcely be a doubt that this is the Shemitic nation

mentioned in Genesis, and which migrated to Western Asia, and gave the province of Lydia its name. The identity has recently been called in question by professor and Sir Henry Rawlinson, but their arguments do not seem sufficient to set aside the great mass of circumstantial evidence in its favor (Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1:160, 659, 667; comp. Kalisch, ad loc. Gen.; Prichard, *Physical History of Mankind*, 4:562 sq.; Niebuhr, *Lectures on Ancient History*, 1:87; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, page 745). In the palmy days of Lydia its kings ruled from the shores of the AEgean to the river Halys; and Craesus, who was its king in the time of Solon and of Cyrus, was reputed the richest monarch in the world (Strabo, 15:735). He was able to bring into the field an army of 420,000 foot and 60,000 horse against Cyrus, by whom, however, he was defeated, and his kingdom annexed to the Persian empire (Herod. 1:6). Lydia afterwards formed part of the kingdom of the Seleucidae; and it is related in 1 Macc. 8:8, that Antiochus the Great was compelled by the Romans to cede Lydia to king Eumenes (comp. Apian. *Syr.* 38). Some difficulty arises in the passage referred to from the names "India and Media" found in connection with it; but if we regard these as incorrectly given by the writer or by a copyist for "Ionia and Mysia," the agreement with Livy's account of the same transaction (37:56) will be sufficiently established, the notice of the *maritime* provinces alone in the book of Maccabees being explicable on the ground of their being best known to the inhabitants of Palestine. In the time of the travels of the apostles it was a province of the Roman empire (Ptolemy, 5:2, 16; Pliny, 5:30). Its chief towns were Sardis (the capital), Thyatira, and Philadelphia, all of which are mentioned in the New Testament, although the name of the province itself does not occur. Its connection with Judaea, under the Seleucidne, is referred to by Josephus (*Ant.* 12:3, 4). The manners of the Lydians were corrupt even to a proverb (Herod. 1:93). See Th. Menke, *Lydiaea* (Berlin, 1844); Cramer, *Asia Minor*, 1:413; Forbiger, *Handb. der Alten Geogrs.* 2:167; Clinton, *Fasti Hellen. Appendix*, page 361; Niebuhr, *Lectures on Anc. Hist.* 1:82; Cellarius, *Notitiae*, 1:108 sq.; Mannert, *Geogr.* VI, 3:345 sq.; Allgem. *Welthistor.* 4:623 sq.; Beck, *Weltg.* 1:308 sq.; Heeren, *Ideen*, I, 1:154 sq.

2. A woman of Thyatira, "a seller of purple," who dwelt in the city of Philippi, in Macedonia (~~Acts~~ Acts 16:14, 15). A.D. 47. The commentators are not agreed whether "Lydia" should be regarded as an appellative, or a derivative from the country to which the woman belonged, Thyatira, her native place, being in Lydia. There are examples of this latter sense; but the

preceding word **ὄνόματι** seems here to support the former, and the name was a common one. (See Biel and I. Hase in the *Bibl. Brem.* 2:411; 3:275; 5:670; 6:1041; *Symb. Brem.* II, 2:124; compare Ugolini *Thesaur.* 13:29.) Lydia was not by birth a Jewess, but a proselyte, as the phrase "who worshipped God" imports. It was at the Jewish Sabbath-worship by the side of a stream (^{<4163>}Acts 16:13) that the preaching of the Gospel by Paul reached her heart. She was converted, being the first person in Europe who embraced Christianity there, and after she and her household had been baptized she pressed the use of her house so earnestly upon the apostle and his associates that they were constrained to accept the invitation. As her native place was in the province of Asia (^{<4164>}Acts 16:14; ^{<4128>}Revelation 2:18), it is interesting to notice that through her, indirectly, the Gospel may have come into that very district where Paul himself had recently been forbidden directly to preach it (^{<4165>}Acts 16:6). We infer that she was a person of considerable wealth partly from the fact that she gave a home to Paul and his companions, partly from the mention of the conversion of her "household," under which term, whether children are included or not, slaves are no doubt comprehended. Of Lydia's character we are led to form a high estimate from her candid reception of the Gospel, her urgent hospitality, and her continued friendship to Paul and Silas when they were persecuted. Whether she was one of "those women who labored with Paul in the Gospel" at Philippi, as mentioned afterwards in the epistle to that place (^{<4168>}Philippians 4:3), it is impossible to say. The Lydians were famous for the art of dyeing purple vests (Pliny, 7:57; Max. Tyr. 40:2; Valer. Flacc. 4:368; Claud. *Rapt. Proserp.* 1:275; Aelian, *Anim.* 4:46), and Lydia, as "a seller of purple," is supposed to have been a dealer in vests so dyed rather than in the dye itself (see Kuinol on ^{<4144>}Acts 14:14).

Lyd'ian

(^{<4169>}Jeremiah 46:9). *SEE LUD; SEE LUDIM; SEE LYDIA.*

Lydius, Balthasar

a Dutch theologian of German origin, was born at Umstadt, near Darmstadt, about 1577; studied at Leyden; became pastor at Streefkerk in 1602, and in 1608 at Dordrecht. He was present at the Synod of Dort. He died in 1629. Lydius was a violent opponent of the Remonstrants. Of his literary labors, one deserves special mention, *Waldensisa* (now very rare, Rotterdam, 1616-17; 2d ed. Amsterdam, 1623, 2 volumes, 8vo), in which

he seeks to show an intimate connection between the Moravians and Waldensians. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 20:63, 64.

Lydius, Jacob

a Dutch theologian, son of the preceding, flourished about the middle of the 17th century at Dordrecht, and took a prominent part in the synod held there. He died in 1688. Some of his works deserve special mention: *Agonistica Sacra, sive Syntagma vocum et phrasium agonisticarum quae in Scriptura occurrunt* (Rott. 1657, 12mo): — *Florum Sparsio ad historium passionis Jesu Christi* (ibid, 1672, 8vo). See Brandt, *Hist. of the Reformation in the Low Countries*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 22:388.

Lydius, Johannes

(1), a German theologian, brother of Balthasar, was born at Frankfort about 1577, and became pastor at Oudewater (the birthplace of Arminius) in 1602. He died in 1643. Like his brother Balthasar, he is noted for his opposition to Arminianism. He was the editor of the works of Clemanges, Wessels, etc. See Herzog, *Real-Enclcyklop.* 20:64.

Lydius, Johannes

(2), one of the early Dutch ministers of the Reformed Church in America, was educated in Holland, and settled at Schenectady and Albany, N.Y., in 1702. Like his predecessors in the same Church, he labored successfully for the instruction and salvation of the Mohawk Indians. He ministered among the tribes of the "Five Nations," and received from the governor and council suitable compensation for his services. He died March 1, 1710. About thirty Indian communicants were in connection with his Church at his decease. He is represented by his contemporary, Reverend Thomas Barclay, of the Church of England, in a report to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, as "a good, pious man," who "lived in entire friendship" with him, "and sent his own children to be catechized." — *Documentary Hist. of New York* 3:897; Dr. Rogers's *Hist. Discourse*. (W.J.B.T.)

Lydius, Martin

a noted Dutch theologian, father of Balthasar and Jacob, was born at Lubeck, Germany, in 1539 or 1540, of Dutch parentage. and was educated at the universities of Tübingen and Heidelberg, where in 1566 he was

employed at the Collegium Sapientie as teacher. On account of persecution in the Palatinate, he went to Holland, and became in 1579 pastor of a Church at Amsterdam. Upon the founding of the university at Franecker in 1585, he was called thither as professor. He died in 1601. He is noted for the part he took in the Arminian controversy. It is he who forwarded to Arminius the works of Koornhert and Arnold Cornelius for refutation, which resulted instead in the conversion of Arminius. See Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 20:61 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* 3:970, 971. **SEE ARMINIANISM.**

Lye, Edward

an English philologist and clergyman, was born at Totnes, Devonshire, and was educated at Hertford College, Oxford; took holy orders in 1719; was presented to the living of Haughton Parva, Northamptonshire; in 1750 became vicar of Yardley Hastings, and died in 1767. He acquired distinction by his researches in the Saxon language and literature. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.

Lye, Thomas

an English Nonconformist clergyman, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. While minister at All-Hallows, Lombard Street, London, he was called upon to take oath against the king; refusing, he was ejected in 1651; reinstated, he was once more expelled, because of his refusal to take the oath of uniformity, in 1662. He was very popular among Puritan families. His Sermons were published (Lond. 1660, 4to; 1662; 1681). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Am. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.; Stoughton, *Eccles. Hist. of Engl.* (Church Restoration), 1:278.

Lyell, Thomas, D.D.,

a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Richmond County, Virginia, May 13, 1775. Though educated in the Protestant Episcopal Church, he became in early life a Methodist, and officiated on the Frederick Circuit, Va., also in Providence, R.I., and was chaplain to Congress. In 1804, however, he became rector of Christ's Church, N.Y., and remained ever after in that connection. In 1803 he was made A.M. by Brown University, and in 1822 D.D. by Columbia College. Through a long ministry he held on the even tenor of his way, and was an active member of

almost every institution connected with the diocese of New York. He died March 4, 1848. — Sprague, *Annals*, 5:495.

Lyford, William

an English theologian and zealous Calvinist, was born in 1598 at Perpmere (Berkshire); graduated at Oxford; became a fellow of Magdalen College; entered the Church; became vicar of Sherborne, Dorsetshire, and spent the remainder of his life there. He died in 1653. Among other sermons and treatises are published, *Cases of Conscience propounded in the Timple of Rebellion* (which preaches tolerance to all parties): — *Principles of Faith and of a good Conscience* (Lond. 1642; Oxford, 1652, 8vo): — *An Apology for our public Ministry and Infant Baptisms* (Lond. 1652, 1653, 4to): — *The plain Man's Senses exercised to discern bota good and evil* (*ibid.*. 1655, 4to). See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, volume 32, s.v.; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Lyle, John, A.M.,

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rockbridge County, Virginia, October 20, 1769, and graduated at Liberty Hall in 1794. Soon after he was employed in teaching, pursued his theological studies, and was licensed in 1797. He was ordained in 1799, and in 1800 took charge of the churches of Salem and Sugar Ridge, in Clark County. In 1805 he was appointed a missionary within the bounds of the Cumberland Presbytery, and subsequently a commissioner of the General Assembly. He removed to Paris, Bourbon County, Kentucky, in 1807, established an academy, and at the same time preached to the churches of Cave Ridge and Concord. He next supplied the church of Mount Pleasant, in Cynthiana, Harrison County, and passed the summer of 1814 in the counties of Bourbon, Harrison, Nicholas, and Fayette, preaching chiefly to the colored people. Having been instrumental, between 1815 and 1818, in the settlement of ministers on the field of his own labors, he devoted the rest of his life to missionary service, in which he was successfully engaged till his death in Paris, Kentucky, July 22, 1825. He published *Contributions to Periodicals*: — *A New American English Grammar* (1804): — *A Sermon on the Qualifications and Duties of Gospel Ministers* (1821). — Sprague, *Annals*, 4:178.

Lyman, Henry

an American missionary, was born at Northampton, Massachusetts, November 23, 1809, and graduated at Amherst College in 1829. He went as a missionary to Sumatra, and was killed there by the Battahs, with Mr. Minson, January 28, 1834. He published *Condition of Females in Pagan Countries*.

Lyman, Joseph

D.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 14, 1749, at Lebanon, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1767, was chosen tutor in 1770, in which position he remained two years, and was installed pastor in Hatfield, Mass., March 4, 1772, where he died March 27, 1828. He was elected president of the Hampshire Miss. Society in 1812, vice-president of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1819, and president in 1823. Dr. Lyman published several occasional Sermons (1787-1821). — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:10.

Lyman, William

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born about 1763, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1784. He was pastor at Haddam, Conn., and China, N.Y., and died in 1833. The College of New Jersey honored him with the doctorate in divinity in 1808. Dr. Lyman published four *Occasional Sermons* (1806, 1807, 1810). See Drake, *Hist. Amer. Biog.* page 570; Allibone, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2, s.v.

Lynch, Thomas M.,

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Wilkerson County, Mississippi, August 1, 1826, was converted at Oxford, Ga., while a student at the university, at once joined the Church, and was licensed to preach in 1847, and shortly after was admitted to the Alabama Conference. His cultivated mind, his rare gifts in oratory, and his deep piety at once commended him to the love and confidence of the Conference. Enon Circuit was his first, and Marianna and Appalachicola his second appointment, when, in 1849, his health failed, and it became necessary for him to locate. By 1858 he had sufficiently recovered to re-enter upon his life-work, and he now consecutively served his church at Lowsndesboro, Pineville, Prattville, and the Socapatoy Circuit. In the last-

named place his health was again affected by the extent of the work and arduousness of its duties, and he retired from active work. He died in Coosa County, Alabama, April 18, 1867. "In all the relations of life he sustained the character of a gentleman of the highest type. Possessing a rich fund of knowledge, and gifted with conversational powers that statesmen and courtiers might envy, he ever drew around him, by the affability of his manners and sweetness of his spirit, a large circle of friends, and held them by an indissoluble cord." As a preacher his word had power and unction. See *Minutes of Conferences of M.E. Church South*, 3:128.

Lynde, Sir Humphrey

an English writer of note, was born in 1579, and was educated first at Westminster School, and then at Christ Church, Oxford; was made bachelor of arts in 1600. He was a member of several Parliaments, and enjoyed other national honors, but he deserves a place here only on account of his works, among which are *Via tuta* (Lond. 1628, 8vo, and often) and *Ancient Characters of the Visible Church*, etc. He died June 14, 1636. See *Gen. Biog. Dict.* s.v.

Lyon, Asa

a Congregational minister, was born at Pomfret, Connecticut, December 31, 1763, and graduated at Dartmouth College in 1790. He was pastor of the Congregational Church at Sunderland, Mass., from October 4, 1792, to September 23, 1793; at South Hess, Vermont, from December 21, 1802, to March 15, 1840; and was a member of Congress from Vermont from 1815 to 1817. He was appointed chief judge of Grand Isle County in 1805, 1806, 1808, and 1813; and was during nine years a state representative. He was an able preacher. His published sermons and patriotic addresses show a high order of talent and scholarship.

Lyon, Hervey

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Walden, N.Y., January 18, 1800, and was educated at Union College, pursued a course of theology at Princeton, N.J., and soon after removed to Ohio. Here, in 1828, he was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Huron, and ordained pastor of the Church in Vermilion. In 1830 he removed to Brownhelm, Ohio, and engaged in the occupation of teaching at the academy in Richfield, Ohio. He died March 7, 1863. Mr. Lyon was a superior teacher, and much beloved by his pupils;

as a Christian, he enjoyed a spirit remarkable for its depth and intensity. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1864, page 309. (J.L.S.)

Lyon, John C.

a noted German minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Leonsberg, in the kingdom of Wurtemberg, Germany, February 11, 1802. His parents were of the Lutheran faith, and John received a Christian training. In 1817 he emigrated to this country, and some nine years later was brought nearer the cross, at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. and, after due preparation, entered the ministry, in which he continued for thirty-four years, preaching both to English and German congregations with great acceptance. He received consecutively the following appointments: 1828, Baltimore Conference, Huntington; 1829, Gettysburgh; 1830, Carlisle Circuit; 1831, Baltimore; 1832-33, Baltimore, Sharp Street, and Asbury; 1834, superannuated; 1835, Lexington; 1836, Lewisburgh Circuit; 1837-38, Rockingham; 1839-40, Augusta; 1841, York; 1842-45, New York Conference, Second Street German Church; 1846-48, Philadelphia; 1849-52, presiding elder of New York German District; 1853-54, East Baltimore; 1855-56, New York, Second Street; 1857, Fortieth Street; 1858-59, Philadelphia; 1860, Frederick City; 1861, East Baltimore. In 1862 he was superannuated, and died May 16, 1868. "Brother Lyon was an earnest, faithful worker in the Gospel, never tiring, esteeming all labor light which served to advance his Master's glory.... He was a mighty man of God in the pulpit, a devout and holy man in life, a pleasant companion, a kind husband, a good father, a sweet singer in Zion, a useful laborer, turning many to righteousness." — *Conf. Minutes*, 1869, page 108.

Lyon, Mary

a teacher and female philanthropist, born in Buckland, Massachusetts, February 28, 1797, is noted as the founder of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary in South Hadley, over which she presided until her death, March 5, 1849. A feature of her plan (at first much opposed) was the performance of the institution's domestic labor by teachers and pupils, intending to give them independence of servants, self-denial, health, and interest in domestic duties. She set forth her views in *Tendencies of the Principles embraced and the System adopted in the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary* (1840),

and in the Missionary Offering (1843). See Hitchcock, *Life and Labors of Mary Lyon* (1851); Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biography*, s.v.

Lyons

a city of France, situated on the Rhone, 316 miles by railway south-south-east of Paris, is noted in ecclesiastical history for two oecumenical councils which were held there:

I. In 1245, consisting of 140 bishops, and convened for the purpose of promoting the Crusades, restoring ecclesiastical discipline, and dethroning Frederick II, emperor of Germany. It was also decreed at this council that cardinals should wear red hats.

II. In 1274. There were 500 bishops and about 1000 inferior clergy present. Its principal object was the reunion of the Greek and Latin churches. — Hook, *Dictionary*; Smith, *Tables of Church History*; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v.

Lyons, Israel

a noted English scholar of Jewish parentage, was born at Cambridge in 1709, and after the completion of his studies, mainly dependent upon his own efforts, he became instructor of Hebrew at the University in Cambridge. He died in 1770. Besides valuable contributions to mathematical science, he wrote *The Scholar's Instructor, or Hebrew Grammar* (1735, 8vo; 2d ed., greatly enlarged, 1757): — *Observations and Inquiries relating to various Parts of Scripture History* (1761). This last-named work is supposed by some to have been written, however, by his father. See *General Biographical Dictionary*, s.v.

Lyons, James Gilbourne

D.D., LL.D., an episcopal clergyman and educator, a native of England, emigrated to America in 1844, and began his clerical labors at St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N.J. In 1846 he removed to Philadelphia, and established himself as a teacher of the classics. His educational success secured him the position of principal of Haverford Classical School, which he held until his death, February 3, 1868.

Lyra

(also *Lyrtanus*), NICHOLAS DE, so called from Lyre, in Normandy, the place of his nativity, was born about 1270. He entered the Order of the Franciscans at Verneuil in 1291, and completed his studies in Paris. Here he studied successfully, was admitted to the degree of doctor, and became a distinguished lecturer on the Bible. Besides his studies at the university, he privately devoted himself to the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of Hebrew, and his association with converts of Jewish faith at this time has probably given rise to the opinion, even now held by some, that Nicholas de Lyra was born of Jewish parents, and was himself a convert to Christianity. His own writings, however, flatly contradict this report, as has been shown by Wolf (*Bibliotheca*, 1 and 3, s.v.); and Nicholas himself tells us, in one of his works (the polemical treatise), that he had but little association with Jews, and depended mainly upon the experience of other Christians for his delineation of Jewish character and customs (compare Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7:513). His great learning, refined taste, and eminent worth, raised him to the principal offices of his order, and secured him the friendship of the most illustrious persons of his age. He died at Paris October 23, 1340. It is especially as a writer that Lyra is justly celebrated, and, as has been frequently asserted, he became, by his thorough expositions of the Scriptures, one of the greatest aids of the reformers of the 16th century. whence the couplet on Luther's exegetical labors by the enemies of the great German reformer:

*"Si Lyra non lyrasset
Lutherus non saltasset."*

Nicholas de Lyra's chef d'oeuvre is his *Postillae perpetuae in universa Biblia* (Rome, 1471-72, 5 volumes fol.; best edit. Antw. 1634, 6 volumes fol.), which brought him the title of "doctor planus et utilis" — or, better, which immortalized the name of Lyra. The great merit of this commentary consists in the embodiment of the sober-spirited and ingenious explanations of Rashi, whose mode of interpretation Lyra regarded as his model, as he frankly states, "Similiter intendo non solum dicta doctorum Catholicorum, sed etiam Hebraeorum maxime rabbi Salomonis, qui inter doctores Hebraeos locutus est rationalibus, ad declarationem sensus literalis inducere." De Lyra even adopts the well-known Jewish four modes of interpretation denominated $\mu drp = dws$, mystical; $\text{ç} wrd$, allegorical;

wmd, spiritual; fçp, literal, which he thus expresses in verses in the same prologue (i.e., the first), from which the former quotation is made.

*"Litera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,
Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia."*

He gives, however, the preference to the literal sense.

"All of them, says he, in the second prologue, "presuppose the literal sense as the foundation. As a building declining from the foundation is likely to fall, so the mystic exposition which deviates from the literal sense must be reckoned unbecoming and unsuitable." Even in the interpretation of the N.T., where Rashi failed him, acquaintance with the Rabbinical writings and Jewish antiquities enabled him to illustrate largely by allusion to the manners and customs of the Hebrews. He also wrote a treatise in defense of Christianity, and against Judaism, entitled *Tractatus fratris Nicolai de Lyra de Messia ejusque adventu, una cum responsione ad Judaeorum argumenta quatuordecim contra veritatem Evangeliorum*, which he finished in 1309. It is generally appended to his commentary, and is also given in the polemical work entitled the *Hebraeomastix* of Hieronymus de Sancta-fide (Frankf. 1602, page 148 sq.). For the different editions of De Lyra's works and translations into French and German, see Grasse, *Tresor des Livres rares et precieux*, s.v.; see also Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics* (ed. 1843), page 175 sq.; Dr. Adam Clarke, *Sacred Lit.* s.v.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* 2, s.v.

Lyre

SEE HARP.

Lysa'nias

(Λυσανίας, a common Greek name) is mentioned by Luke, in chapter 3:1, as tetrarch of Abilene, on the eastern slope of the anti-Lebanon, near Damascus, at the time when John the Baptist began his ministry, A.D. 25. SEE ABILA. It happens, however, that Josephus speaks of a prince named Lysanias who ruled over a territory in the neighborhood of Lebanon in the time of Antony and Cleopatra, and that he also mentions Abilene as associated with the name of a tetrarch Lysanias, while recounting events of the reigns of Caligula and Claudius. These circumstances have given to Strauss and others an opportunity for accusing the evangelist of confusion

and error, but we shall see that this accusation rests on a groundless assumption.

(a.) What Josephus says of the Lysanias who was contemporary with Antony and Cleopatra (i.e., who lived sixty years before the time referred to by Luke) is, that he succeeded his father Ptolemy, the son of Mennleus, in the government of Chalcis, under Mt. Lebanon (*War*, 1:13,1; *Ant.* 14:7, 4), and that he was put to death at the instance of Cleopatra (*Ant.* 15:4,1), who seems to have received a good part of his territory. It is to be observed that Abila is not specified here at all, and that Lysanias is not called tetrarch.

(b.) What Josephus says of Abila and the tetrarchy in the reigns of Caligula and Claudius (i.e., about twenty years after the time mentioned in Luke's Gospel) is, that the former emperor promised the "tetrarchy of Lysanias" to Agrippa (*Ant.* 18:6,10), and that the latter actually gave to him "Abila of Lysanias" and the territory near Lebanon (*Ant.* 19:5, 1; comp. *War*, 2:12, 8).

Amid the obscurity which surrounds this name, several conjectures have been indulged in, which we will here notice.

1. According to Eusebius (whom others have followed, such as Bede and Adrichomius; see Corn. a Lapid. *in Luc.* 3:1), Lysanias was a son of Herod the Great. This opinion (the untenableness of which is shown by Valesius, on Eusebius, *Hist. Esccl.* 1:9, and by Scaliger, *Animadver. on Euseb. Chron.* page 178) has no other foundation than the fact that the evangelist mentions Lysanias with Herod Antipas and Philip.

2. To the older commentators, such as Casaubon (*On Baronius, Ann.* 31, Num. 4), Scaliger (*loc. cit.*), and others (see Corn. a Lap. and Grotius, *ad loc.*), this difference of dates presented no difficulty. Allowing historical credit to Luke (on which subject see Dr. Mill, *Pantheistic Princip.* part 2, page 16 sq.), no less than to Josephus, they at once concluded that two different princes of the same name, and possibly of the same family, were referred to by the two writers. (See also Kuinol, *On Luke 3:1*; Krebsius, *Observ.* page 110-113; and Robinson, *Biblioth. Sacr.* 5:81).

3. This reasonable solution, however, was unsatisfactory to the restless critics of Germany. Strauss and others (whose names are mentioned by Bleek, *Synopt. Erkl.* 1:156, and Meyer, *Komment.* 2:289) charge the

evangelist with "a gross chronological error;" a charge which they found on the assumption that the Lysanias of Chalcis mentioned by Josephus is, identical with the Lysanias of Abilene, whom Luke mentions. This assumption is supported by a hypothesis which is incapable of proof, namely, that Abilene, being contiguous to Chalcis, was united to the latter under the rule of Lysanias, the son of Ptolemy. It must, however, be borne in mind that Josephus nowhere speaks of Abilene in connection with this Lysanias; nor, indeed, does he mention it at all until many years after the notice by Luke. He calls Antony's victim simply ruler of Chalcis. Moreover, it is of importance to observe that the tetrarchical division of Palestine and neighboring districts was not made until after the death of Herod the Great; so that, in his haste to inculcate the evangelist, Strauss in effect, attributes to the historian, whom he invidiously opposes to Luke as a better authority, an amount of inaccurate statement which, if true, would destroy all reliance on his history; for we have already seen that Josephus more than once speaks of a "tetrarchy of Lysanias," whereas there were no "tetrarchies" until some thirty years after the death of Ptolemy's son Lysanias. It is, therefore, a juster criticism to conclude (against Strauss, and with the earlier commentators) that in such passages as we have quoted above, wherein the historian speaks of "Abila of Lysanias" and "the tetrarchy of Lysanias," that a later Lysanias is certainly meant: and that Josephus is not only accurate himself, but a voucher also for the veracity of Luke. But there is yet stronger evidence to be found in Josephus of the untenableness of Strauss's objection and theory. In his Jewish War (2:12, 8) the historian tells us that the emperor Claudius "removed Agrippa [the second] from Chalcis [the kingdom, be it remembered, of Strauss's Lysanias] to a greater kingdom, giving him in addition the kingdom of Lysanias" (ἐκ δὲ τῆς Χαλκίδος Ἀγρίππαν εἰς μείζονα βασιλείαν μετατίθησι... προσέθηκε δὲ τὴν τοῦ Λυσανίου βασιλείαν). Ebrard exposes the absurdity of Strauss's argument by drawing from these words of Josephus the following conclusion-inevitable, indeed, on the terms of Strauss — that Agrippa was deprived of Chalcis, receiving in exchange a larger kingdom, and also Chalcis! (See Ebrard's *Gospel Hist.* [Clark], pages 145, 146) The effect of this *reductio ad absurdum* is well put by Dr. Lee (*Inspiration* [1st ed.], page 394, note), "Hence, therefore, Josephus does make mention of a later Lysanias [on the denial of which Strauss has founded his assault on Luke], and, by doing so, fully corroborates the fact of the evangelist's intimate acquaintance with the tangled details of Jewish history in his day." Many eminent writers have expressly accepted Ebrard's

conclusion, including Meyer (loc. cit.) and Bleek (loc. cit.). Patritius concludes an elaborate examination of the entire case with the discovery that "the later Lysanias, whom Luke mentions, was known to Josephus also, and that, so far from any difficulty accruing out of Josephus to the evangelist's chronology, as alleged by objectors to his veracity, the historian's statements rather confirm and strengthen it" (*De Evangeliiis*, 3:42, 25). It is interesting, also, to remark that, if the sacred writer gains illustration from the Jewish historian in this matter, he also repays him the favor, by helping to clear up what would otherwise be unintelligible in his statements; for instance, when Josephus (*Ant.* 17:17, 4) mentions "Batanaea, with Trachonitis and Auranitis, and a certain part of what was called 'the house of Zenodorus, as paying a certain tribute to Philip" (σύν τινι μέρει οἴκου τοῦ Ζηνοδώρου λεγομένου); and when it is remembered that "the house of Zenodorus" included other territory besides Abilene (comp. *Ant.* 15:10, 3, with *War.* 1:20, 4), we cannot but admit the force of the opinion advanced by Grotius (as quoted by Dr. Hudson, *On the Antiq.* 17:11, 4), that "when Josephus says some part of the house or possession of Zenodorus was allotted to Philip, he thereby declares that the larger part of it belonged to another. This other was Lysanias, whom Luke mentions" (see also Krebsius, *Observat.* page 112).

4. It is not irrelevant to state that other writers besides Strauss and his party have held the identity of Luke's Lysanias with Josephus's son of Ptolemy, and have also believed that Josephus mentioned but one Lysanias. But (unlike Strauss) they resorted to a great shift rather than assail the veracity of the evangelist. Valesius (on Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 1:10), and, more recently, Paulus (Comment. ad loc.), suggested an alteration of Luke's text, either by an erasure of τετραρχαῦντος after Ἀβιληνῆς, or retaining the participle and making it agree with Φιλίππου as its subject (getting rid of Λυσανίου as a leading word by reducing it to a mere genitive of designation by its transposition with τῆς — q.d. τῆς Δυσανίου Ἀβιληνῆς τετραρχοῦντος), as if Philip had been called by the evangelist "tetrarch of Ituroea, Trachonitis, and the Abilene of Lysanias." This expedient, however, of saving Luke's veracity by the mutilation of his words is untenable, not having any support from MS. authority.

5. Still others think it probable that the Lysanias mentioned by Josephus in the second instance is actually the prince referred to by Luke. Thus, instead of a contradiction, we obtain from the Jewish historian a confirmation of the evangelist; and the argument becomes very decisive if, as some think,

Abilene is to be excluded from the territory mentioned in the story which has reference to Cleopatra.

In conclusion, it is worth adding, that in modern times a coin has been discovered bearing the inscription **Λυσαῶνίου τετραρχου καὶ ἀρχιερέως**, and Pococke also found an inscription on the remains of a Doric temple, called Nebi Abel, the ancient Abila, fifteen English miles from Damascus, which makes mention of Lysanias, tetrarch of Abileze. Both the coin and the inscription refer to a period subsequent to the death of Herod (Pococke's *Description of the East*, II, 1:115, 116; and Sestini, *Lettere et Dissertationi numismatiche*, 6:101, tab. 2, as quoted by Wieseler, *Chronolog. Synops.* page 183). Similarly, the geographer Ptolemy mentions an " Abila which bears the surname of Lysanias," "**Ἀβίλα ἐπικληθεῖσα Λυσαῶνίου** (5:18). See Davidson's *Introduct. to N.T.* page 218. **SEE ABILENE.**

Lyszynski, Casimir

a martyr of philosophical atheism, descended from a noble family of Lithuania, was educated in the Jesuit college of Wilna, where he greatly distinguished himself by his talents, but from whence he was finally expelled on account of his singular religious views. He then commenced to study law, and in 1680 was appointed one of the judges of Brzeski, in Lithuania. He now turned his attention again to theology, and wrote, in the form of remarks on Alstedt's Natural Theology, a lengthy refutation of the proofs of the existence of God. He used in his arguments some incautious expressions, and on a journey to Warsaw he was arrested, October 31, 1688, on the plea that, by denying the existence of God, the author of all law, Lyszynski had become an outlaw. An ecclesiastical tribunal, presided over by the bishop of Livonia, was appointed to try his case. A former friend of Lyszynski appeared as his accuser, and, after the incriminating books had been examined, he was sent before the diet to be punished. The states went again over the whole case. Brzeska repeated his charges, maintaining, among other things, that in using in his works the expression "ita non athei credimus," Lyszynski had declared himself an atheist, and denied the existence of God by asserting that God did not create man, but that man invented God. Lyszynski answered that he had intended his works as an examination of the proofs of the existence of God, mentioning the fundamental objections of unbelievers only as a preliminary argument, and that he meant to live and die in the communion of the Church in which

he was brought up. His defense, however, was not deemed satisfactory, and the senate condemned him to suffer death at the stake. The royal verdict was that Lysczynski's MSS. should be publicly burned by the executioner along with himself, and that the house in which he wrote his works should be torn down. The sentence was afterwards altered, and he was beheaded before being burned, March 31, 1689. See C.F. Ammon, *C. Lysczynski, ein Beitrag z. Gesch. d. idealen Atheismus* (Gstting. 1802); Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 8:628. (J.N.P.)

Lyser

(also LEISER or LEYSER), an eminent Lutheran theologian, was born at Winnenden, in Württemberg, March 18, 1552, and was educated at the University of Tübingen. In 1573 he became pastor at Gellersdorf, in Austria, where he soon distinguished himself as a preacher. He often preached also in Vienna, and thus became acquainted with the emperor Maximilian II. He was made D.D. by the University of Tübingen July 16, 1576, being then under 25 years old. After remaining for two years at the court of the elector August of Saxony, he became pastor and professor at Wittenberg. After the adoption of the "Formula Concordiae," he and J. Andrea devised a new organization for the university; he was also commissioned to revise the text of the Lutheran translation of the Bible, etc. After the death of the elector August in 1586, Calvinism began to regain the ascendancy in Saxony, and Lyser left Wittenberg, generally regretted by the university and the community, to accept a call to Brunswick as coadjutor or vice-superintendent. He, however, returned to Wittenberg in 1592, and shortly after became preacher at the court of Dresden. Here he continued in the faithful discharge of his arduous duties, honored not only by the prince, but also by the emperor Rudolph. He died February 22, 1610. His principal works are a continuation of Chemnitz's *Harmonia IV Evangelistarum* (which was completed by John Gerhard), *Erläuterungen u. drei Fragen* (1598), and a number of *Predigten*, particularly *Vier Landtags-predigten* (1605). See Polhyc. Leyser III, *Officium pietalis, quod C.D. Polyc. Leysero debuit et persolvit pronepos* (Lpz. 1706); Gleich, *Annales ecclesiastici*; Adami, *Vit. theol.*; Spizel, *Templ. hon.*; Erdmanns, *Lebensbeschr. d. Wittenb. Theol.* etc.; Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 8:628 sq.

Lys'ias

(*Λυσίας*, a common Greek name), the name of two men mentioned, one in the Apocrypha, and the other in the New Testament.

1. A Syrian "nobleman of the blood royal" whom Antiochus Epiphanes, when setting out for Persia, appointed guardian of his son, and regent of that part of his kingdom which extended from the Euphrates to the borders of Egypt (1 Macc. 3:32; 2 Macc. 10:11; compare Josephus, *Ant.* 12:7, 2; Appian, *De rebus Syr.* 46). Acting under the special orders of the king, Lysias collected a large force for the purpose of carrying on a war of extermination against the Jews. This army, under the command of the generals Ptolemy, Nicanor, and Gorgias, was surprised and put to flight by Judas Maccabaeus near Emmaus (1 Macc. 3:38-4:18; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:7, 3, 4). In the following year, B.C. 165, Lysias himself invaded Judaea with a still larger army, and joined battle with Judas in the neighborhood of Bethsura. The Syrians were again defeated, and so decisively that Judas was able to accomplish his great purpose, the purification of the Temple, and the re-establishment of divine worship at Jerusalem (1 Macc. 4:28-61; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:7, 5-7). Lysias retired to Antioch. and, while preparing for a fresh campaign, the death of Epiphanes left him in virtual possession of the supreme power. Shortly afterwards (probably B.C. 163), with an army equal in number to the former two combined, with three hundred war-chariots and two-and-thirty elephants, and accompanied by the young king Antiochus Eupator, he again entered Judaea from the side of Idumaea. Having taken the fortified city of Bethsura, he advanced to Jerusalem and laid siege to the Temple. Meeting here with a stouter resistance than he had anticipated, and hearing that Philip, a rival claimant to the guardianship of the king, was returning from Persia, he hastily concluded a peace with the Jews, and set out for Antioch. On reaching this city he found it in the possession of his rival. In the engagement which followed Philip was defeated and slain. Another and more formidable opponent, however, soon appeared in the person of Demetrius Soter, first cousin of the king, who, escaping from Rome, landed at Tripolis, and laid claim to the throne. The people rose in his favor, and Antiochus and Lysias were seized and put to death (1 Macc. 6-7. 2; 2 Macc. 13-14:2; Joseph. *Ant.* 12:9, 10; Appian, *De rebus Syr.* 47).

In the second book of Maccabees an account is given at some length of an invasion of Judaea by Lysias, made before the final invasion, but after the

death of Epiphanes (2 Macc. 11). It is scarcely possible to reconcile this with the more trustworthy narratives of the first book, and it is clear from 2 Macc. 9:28-10:10, that the writer is not following a strictly chronological order in this part of his history. Internal evidence seems to favor the opinion that this narrative has been compiled from separate and partial accounts of the two invasions referred to in 1 Macc. 4-6, the writer too hastily inferring that they described the same event. — Kitto. "There is no sufficient ground for believing that the events recorded are different (Patritius, *De Consensue Macc.* § 27, 37), for the mistake of date in 2 Macc. is one which might easily arise (compare Wernsdorf, *De fide Macc.* § 66; Grimm, on 2 Macc. 11:1). The idea of Grotius that 2 Macc. 11 and 2 Macc. 13 are duplicate records of the same event, in spite of Ewald's support (*Geschichte*, 4:365, note), is scarcely tenable, and leaves half the difficulty unexplained."

2. CLAUDIUS LYSIAS, the chiliarch (χιλίαρχος, "chief captain") who commanded the Roman troops in Jerusalem during the latter part of the procuratorship of Felix, and by whom Paul was secured from the fury of the Jews, and sent under guard to the procurator Felix at Caesarea (⁴²³Acts 21:31-38; 22:24-30; 23:17-30; 24:7, 22). A.D. 55. Nothing more is known of him than what is stated in these passages. From his name, and from ⁴²⁸Acts 22:28, it may be inferred that he was a Greek who had become a Roman citizen. His proper rank appears to have been that of military tribune, and his note to his superior officer is an interesting specimen of Roman military correspondence (comp. Wernsdorf. *Cl. Lysiae Oratio*. Helmst. 1743). *SEE PAUL.*

Lysim'achus

(Λυσίμαχος, a frequent Greek name), the name of two men mentioned in the Apocrypha.

1. "The son of Ptolemneus of Jerusalem," commonly supposed to be the translator into Greek of the Book of Esther (see the close of the Sept. version). The Apocryphal "rest of the Book of Esther," A.V., says, "In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemneus and Cleopatra, Dositheus, who said he was a priest and Levite, and Ptolemus his son, brought this epistle of Phurim, which they said was the same, and that Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemeulls, that was at Jerusalem, had interpreted it" (11:1). There is, however, no reason to suppose that the translator was also the author of

the additions made to the Hebrew text. *SEE ESTHER, APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO.*

2. A brother of the Menelaus whom Antiochus appointed high-priest (B.C. cir. 171). Menelaus left him temporarily "in his stead in the priesthood," and encouraged him to commit many sacrileges. Thus he roused the indignation of the common people, who rose against him and killed him (2 Macc. 4:29, 39). The Vulgate erroneously makes him the successor instead of the deputy of Menelaus.

Lysons, Daniel

an English divine and writer, eldest son of the Reverend Samuel Lysons, rector of Rodmarton, in Gloucestershire (1804-33), was educated at Gloucester and at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, at which university he attained the degree of M.A. in 1785. Later he filled the curacy of Putney. He died January 3, 1834. He published a sermon or two, and a History of the Origin and Progress of the Meeting of the three Choirs of Gloucester, Worcester, and Hereford; but his fame rests entirely upon his topographical works, which are excellent for their laborious research, accuracy of description, and useful record of matters which most probably would otherwise have been irrecoverably lost. On this point consult the *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v., and Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, s.v.

Lys'tra

(ἡ Λύστρα, ^{<4446>}Acts 14:6, 21; 16:1; τὰ Λύστρα, ^{<4448>}Acts 14:8; 16:2; ^{<5311>}2 Timothy 3:11), a city in Asia Minor, of much interest in the history of Paul and Timothy.

We are told in the 14th chapter of the Acts that Paul and Barnabas, driven by persecution from Iconium (verse 2), proceeded to Lystra and its neighborhood, and there preached the Gospel. In the course of this service a remarkable miracle was worked in the healing of a lame man (verse 8). This occurrence produced such an effect on the minds of the ignorant and supersstitious people of the place that they supposed that the two gods, Mercury and Jupiter, who were said by the poets to have formerly visited this district in human form, *SEE LYCAONIA*, had again bestowed on it the same favor, and consequently were proceeding to offer sacrifice to the strangers (verse 13). The apostles rejected this worship with horror (verse

14), and Paul addressed a speech to them, turning their minds to the true Source of all the blessings of nature. The distinct proclamation of Christian doctrine is not mentioned, but it is implied, inasmuch as a Church was founded at Lystra, which in post-apostolic times was so important as to send its bishops to the ecclesiastical councils (Hierocles, *Synecd.* page 675). The adoration of the Lystrians was rapidly followed by a change of feeling. The persecuting Jews arrived from Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium, and had such influence that Paul was stoned and left for dead (^{<4449>}Acts 14:19). On his recovery, he withdrew, with Barnabas, to Derbe (verse 20), but before long retraced his steps through Lystra (verse 21), encouraging the new disciples to be steadfast. It is not absolutely stated that Paul was ever in Lystra again, but, from the general description of the route of the third missionary journey (^{<4482>}Acts 18:23), it is almost certain that he was.
SEE PAUL.

It is evident from ^{<51810>}2 Timothy 3:10, 11, that Timothy was one of those who witnessed Paul's sufferings and courage on the above occasion; and it can hardly be doubted that his conversion to Christianity resulted partly from these circumstances, combined with the teaching of his Jewish mother and grandmother, Eunice and Lois (^{<51015>}2 Timothy 1:5). Thus, when the apostle, accompanied by Silas, came, on his second missionary journey, to this place again (and here we should notice how accurately Derbe and Lystra are here mentioned in the inverse order), Timothy was already a Christian (^{<44401>}Acts 16:1). Here he received circumcision, "because of the Jews in those parts" (verse 3); and from this point began his connection with Paul's travels. We are doubly reminded here of Jewish residents in and near Lystra. Their first settlement, and the ancestors of Timothy among them, may very probably be traced to the establishment of Babylonian Jews in Phrygia by Antiochus three centuries before (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 4). Still it is evident that there was no influential Jewish population at Lystra: no mention is made of any synagogue, and the whole aspect of the scene described by Luke (Acts 14) is thoroughly heathen. As to its condition in heathen times, it is worth while to notice that the words in ^{<44413>}Acts 14:13 (τοῦ Λιὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως) would lead us to conclude that it was under the tutelage of Jupiter. Walch, in his *Spicilegium Antiquitatum Lystrensiarum* (Dissert. 1 in *Acta Apostolorum*, Jena, 1766, volume 3), thinks that in this passage a statue, not a temple, of the god is intended.

Pliny (5:42) places Lystra in Galatia, and Ptolemy (5:4, 12) in Isauria; but these statements are quite consistent with its being placed in Lycaonia by

Luke, as it is by Hierocles (*Synecd.* page 675). This city was south of Iconium, but its precise site is uncertain, as well as that of Derbe, which is mentioned along with it. Colossians Leake remarks that the sacred text appears to place it nearer to Derbe than to Iconium; for Paul, on leaving that city, proceeded first to Lystra, and thence to Derbe; and in like manner returned to Lystra, to Iconium, and to Antioch of Pisidia (see Walch, *Diss. in Act. Apost.* 3:173 sq.). He also observes that this seems to agree with the arrangement of Ptolemy (5:4, 12), who places Lystra in Isauria, and near Isaura, which seems evidently to have occupied some part of the valley of Sidy Shehr, or Bey Shehr. Under the Greek empire, Homonada, Isaura, and Lystra, as well as Derbe and Laranda, were all included in the consular province of Lycaonia, and were bishoprics of the metropolitan see of Iconium. Considering all the circumstances, Colossians Leake inclines to think that the vestiges of Lystra may be sought with the greatest probability of success at or near Wiranc Khatuiz, or Khatzun Serai, about thirty miles to the south of Iconium. "Nothing," says this able geographer, "can more strongly show the little progress that has hitherto been made in a knowledge of the ancient geography of Asia Minor than that of the cities which the journey of St. Paul has made so interesting to us, the site of one only (Iconium) is yet certainly known" (*Tour and Geogr. of Asia Minor*, page 102). Mr. Arundell supposes that, should the ruins of Lystra not be found at the place indicated by Colossians Leake, they may possibly be found in the remains at Karahissar, near the lake Bey-shehr (*Discoveries in Asia Minor.*) Still more lately, Mr. Hamilton (*Researches in Asia Minor*, 2:319) identifies its site with the ruins called Bin-bir-Kilisseh (the "Thousand and one churches"), at the base of a conical mountain of volcanic structure named the Karadagh (generally thought to be those of Derbe, but which, according to his arguments, must be sought elsewhere, perhaps at Divle), as being more considerable (a bishop of Lystra sat in the Council of Chalcedon, according to Hierocles, *Synecd.* page 675), and on the direct road from Iconium to Derbe. Another traveler ascended the mountain, and says, "On looking down I perceived churches on all sides of the mountain, scattered about in various positions.... Including those in the plain, there are about two dozen in tolerable preservation, and the remains of perhaps forty may be traced altogether" (Falkner in Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 1:202). Comp. Mannert, *Geogr.* VI, 2:189 sq.; Forbiger, *Handb.* 2:322.

Lytle, David

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born, of Presbyterian parentage, at Salem, N.Y., October 31, 1826, was converted in the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1847, joined the Church in 1848, was licensed to preach in 1854, and joined the Troy Conference. He successively preached at Granville, (1857) Argyle and North Greenwich, (1859) Whitehall, (1861) Mechanicsville, (1863) Third Street Church, Troy, (1865) Westport, (1867) North Chatham, and lastly at Rock City Falls, N.Y., where he died October 13, 1869. He "was possessed of a sound understanding, good judgment, and a kind and sympathizing nature. He was ardent and firm in his friendships, a kind husband and father, a faithful Christian, a good preacher, excelling as a pastor." During his second year at Argyle an epidemic broke out; but he continued at his post of duty, nursing the sick, and giving counsel and advice to the dying. See *Conf. Minutes*, 1870, page 140.

Lyttleton, Charles

LL.D., an English divine, born at Hagley, Worcestershire, in 1714, was educated at Eton and at University College, Oxford; rector of Alvechurch, Worcester, in 1742; dean of Exeter in 1748; bishop of Carlisle in 1762, and president of the Society of Antiquaries in 1765. He died December 22, 1768. He published one sermon (Lond. 1765, 4to), and left various interesting scientific works. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, volume 2, s.v.

Lyttleton, George, Sir

an English peer and celebrated politician, who was born in Worcestershire in 1708-9, and educated at Eton and Christchurch, Oxford; entered Parliament in 1730, held several high political offices, was raised to the peerage in 1759, and died in 1773, is noted also as the author of *Observations on the Conversion and Apostleship of St. Paul* (1747, 8vo, and often; last edit. 1854, 12mo), a work which elicited much praise for the able defense it furnishes for the truths of Christianity, or, as Leland (*Deistical Writers*, page 156 sq.) says, constitutes of itself "a demonstration sufficient to prove Christianity to be a divine revelation." Another work of lord George Lyttleton of interest to us is his *Dialogues of the Dead* (1760). He had a son, Thomas, who died young, and who was as conspicuous for profligacy as his father for virtue. See Johnson, *Lives of*

the Poets, 3:391-400; Phillimore, *Life of Lord Lyttleton*, (1845); Lond. *Quart. Rev.* 1846 (June); *Monthly Review*, 1772 (April and May); 1774 (December); Allibone, *Dict. of British and American Authors*, 2:1150.